

Final Environmental Impact Report
State Clearinghouse No. 2020029071

CRESCENTA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL FIELD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

for Glendale Unified School District

Prepared for:

Glendale Unified School District

Contact: Hagop Kassabian, Planning, Development, and Facilities
349 W. Magnolia Avenue
Glendale, California 91204
818.507.0201

Prepared by:

PlaceWorks

Contact: Addie Farrell, Principal
700 S. Flower Street, Suite 600
Los Angeles, California 90017
213.623.1443
info@placeworks.com
www.placeworks.com



Table of Contents

Section	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.2 FORMAT OF THE FEIR.....	1-1
1.3 CEQA REQUIREMENTS REGARDING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	1-2
2. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS	2-1
3. REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR	3-1
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	3-1
3.2 DEIR REVISIONS IN RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS.....	3-1

Table of Contents

This page intentionally left blank.

1. Introduction

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq.).

According to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15132, the FEIR shall consist of:

- (a) The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) or a revision of the Draft;
- (b) Comments and recommendations received on the DEIR either verbatim or in summary;
- (c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies comments on the DEIR;
- (d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process;
- (e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

This document contains responses to comments received on the DEIR for the Crescenta Valley High School (CVHS) Field Improvement Project (the proposed project) during the public review period, which began January 21, 2021, and ended March 8, 2021. This document has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and represents the independent judgment of Glendale Unified School District, who is the Lead Agency for the proposed project. This document and the circulated DEIR make up the FEIR, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132.

1.2 FORMAT OF THE FEIR

This document is organized as follows:

Section 1, Introduction. This section describes CEQA requirements and content of this FEIR.

Section 2, Response to Comments. This section provides a list of agencies and interested persons commenting on the DEIR; copies of comment letters received during the public review period, and individual responses to written comments. This section also includes responses to written and verbal comments received at a public meeting held by the Glendale Unified School District (District) on February 17, 2021, regarding the DEIR. To facilitate review of the responses, each comment letter and verbal comment has been reproduced and assigned a number (A1 and A2 for letters received from agencies and organizations, and R1 through R55 for letters, emails, and verbal comments received from residents). Individual comments within each letter have been numbered and the letter is followed by responses with references to the corresponding comment number.

1. Introduction

Similarly, individual issues raised in each verbal comment have been numbered and the summary of the comment is followed by responses with references to the corresponding comment number.

Section 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR. This section contains revisions to the DEIR text and figures as a result of the comments received by agencies and interested persons as described in Section 2, and/or errors and omissions discovered subsequent to release of the DEIR for public review.

The responses to comments contain material and revisions that will be added to the text of the FEIR. District staff has reviewed this material and determined that none of it constitutes the type of significant new information that requires recirculation of the DEIR for further public comment under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. None of this new material indicates that the project will result in a significant new environmental impact not previously disclosed in the DEIR. Additionally, none of this material indicates that there would be a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact that will not be mitigated, or that there would be any of the other circumstances requiring recirculation described in Section 15088.5.

1.3 CEQA REQUIREMENTS REGARDING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be “on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. At the same time, reviewers should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible. ...CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.”

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (c) further advises, “Reviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.” Section 15204 (d) also states, “Each responsible agency and trustee agency shall focus its comments on environmental information germane to that agency’s statutory responsibility.” Section 15204 (e) states, “This section shall not be used to restrict the ability of reviewers to comment on the general adequacy of a document or of the lead agency to reject comments not focused as recommended by this section.”

In accordance with CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21092.5, copies of the written responses to public agencies will be forwarded to those agencies at least 10 days prior to certifying the environmental impact report. The responses will be forwarded with copies of this FEIR, as permitted by CEQA, and will conform to the legal standards established for response to comments on DEIRs.

2. Response to Comments

Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the Lead Agency (Glendale Unified School District) to evaluate comments on environmental issues received from public agencies and interested parties who reviewed the DEIR and prepare written responses.

This section provides all written responses received on the DEIR and the Glendale Unified School District's responses to each comment.

Comment letters/emails, summary of verbal comments, and specific comments are given letters and numbers for reference purposes. Where sections of the DEIR are excerpted in this document, the sections are shown indented. Changes to the DEIR text are shown in double underlined text for additions and ~~strikeout~~ for deletions.

The following is a list of agencies and persons that submitted comments on the DEIR during the public review period.

Number Reference	Commenting Person/Agency	Comment Format	Date of Comment	Page No.
Agencies and Organizations				
A1	County of Los Angeles Fire Department	Letter	03-02-2021	2-3
A2	Los Angeles County Sheriff Department	Letter	03-04-2021	2-9
Residents				
R1	Stephen Small	Phone Message	01-26-2021	2-15
R2	Claudia McCollum	Email	02-14-2021	2-19
R3	Michele Morris	Email	02-15-2021	2-23
R4	Michele Morris	Phone Message	02-15-2021	2-29
R5	Unknown Name	Phone Message	02-15-2021	2-33
R6	Alex Stupakis	Phone Message	02-15-2021	2-37
R7	Lindsay Ljungkull	Email	02-16-2021	2-41
R8	Alex Stupakis	Email	02-17-2021	2-45
R9	John Pawlak	Email	02-17-2021	2-49
R10	Michele Morris	Phone Message	02-17-2021	2-53
R11	Monica Pawlak	Letter	02-17-2021	2-57
R12	Philip Moore	Email	02-17-2021	2-61
R13	Shawn Foley	Google Form	02-17-2021	2-65
R14	Mike Allen	Google Form	02-17-2021	2-69
R15	Rosemary Johnston	Google Form	02-17-2021	2-73
R16	Gabriel Pena-Lora	Google Form	02-17-2021	2-77
R17	Monica Pawlak	Google Form	02-17-2021	2-81
R18	Gabriel Pena-Lora	Google Form	02-17-2021	2-85
R19	Jonathan Tinsman	Google Form	02-17-2021	2-89
R20	Alex Stupakis	Google Form	02-17-2021	2-93

2. Response to Comments

Number Reference	Commenting Person/Agency	Comment Format	Date of Comment	Page No.
R21	Shawn Foley	Verbal - Public Meeting	02-17-2021	2-97
R22	Rosemary Johnston	Verbal - Public Meeting	02-17-2021	2-101
R23	Monica Pawlak	Verbal - Public Meeting	02-17-2021	2-105
R24	Ji Suh	Verbal - Public Meeting	02-17-2021	2-109
R25	Alex Stupakis	Verbal - Public Meeting	02-17-2021	2-113
R26	Mike Allen	Verbal - Public Meeting	02-17-2021	2-117
R27	Jonathan Tinsman	Verbal - Public Meeting	02-17-2021	2-121
R28	Dave Warren	Email	02-19-2021	2-125
R29	Alex Stupakis	Email	02-19-2021	2-129
R30	Philip Moore	Letter	03-07-2021	2-133
R31	Luis Granados	Email	02-23-2021	2-139
R32	Rosemary Johnston	Email	03-01-2021	2-143
R33	Dan and Julie Molina	Email	03-02-2021	2-147
R34	Maria [Last Name Missing]	Phone Message	03-02-2021	2-151
R35	Talin Yeghianians	Email	03-03-2021 ^a	2-155
R36	Rob Skinnell	Email	03-05-2021	2-159
R37	Alex Stupakis	Email	03-05-2021	2-163
R38	Tab Artis	Email	03-05-2021	2-167
R39	Hovsep Barseghian	Phone Message	03-06-2021	2-171
R40	Joseph Johnston	Email	03-07-2021	2-175
R41	Bridgit Johnston	Email	03-07-2021	2-179
R42	Matt Tanaka	Email	03-07-2021	2-183
R43	Ali Cooper	Email	03-07-2021	2-187
R44	John Cooper	Email	03-07-2021	2-191
R45	Philip Moore	Email	03-07-2021	2-195
R46	Alec Derhovanessian	Phone Message	03-08-2021	2-199
R47	Peter Roses	Email	03-08-2021	2-203
R48	Emily Johnston	Email	03-08-2021	2-207
R49	Beth Johnston	Email	03-08-2021	2-211
R50	Richard Denzin	Email	03-08-2021	2-215
R51	Lynda Bayly	Email	03-09-2021	2-219
R52	Brianna Johnston	Email	03-08-2021	2-223
R53	Monserrat De Lira	Email	03-09-2021	2-229
R54	Emily Johnston	Email	03-09-2021	2-235
R55	Christine Rodriguez	Email	03-15-2021	2-239
R56	Claudia McCollum	Email	03-31-2021	2-243

Notes:

^a Duplicate email received March 27, 2021.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER A1 – County of Los Angeles Fire Department (Page 1 of 3)



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES FIRE DEPARTMENT

1320 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-3294
(323) 881-2401
www.fire.lacounty.gov

"Proud Protectors of Life, Property, and the Environment"

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

HILDA L. SOLIS
FIRST DISTRICT
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
SECOND DISTRICT
SHEILA KUEHL
THIRD DISTRICT
JANICE HAHN
FOURTH DISTRICT
KATHRYN BARGER
FIFTH DISTRICT

DARYL L. OSBY
FIRE CHIEF
FORESTER & FIRE WARDEN

A1



March 2, 2021

Glendale Unified School District
Planning Department
349 West Magnolia Avenue
Glendale, CA 91204

Dear Planning Manager:

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, "CRESCENTA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL FIELD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT," WOULD REDEVELOP THE AREA NORTH OF THE EXISTING TRACK AND FIELD AND SOUTH OF THE TENNIS COURTS TO INSTALL PERMANENT BLEACHERS AND NEW FIELD LIGHTING FOR THE EXISTING TRACK AND FIELD, ADDITIONAL IMPROVEMENTS WOULD INCLUDE A RESTROOM AND STORAGE/MAINTENANCE BUILDINGS, A PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM, A TEAM ROOM, AND A CONCESSION STAND, LOCATED AT 2900 COMMUNITY AVENUE, LA CRESCENTA, FFER 2021001211

The Notice of Availability of Environmental Impact Report has been reviewed by the Planning Division, Land Development Unit, Forestry Division, and Health Hazardous Materials Division of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department.

The following are their comments:

PLANNING DIVISION:

We have no additional comments.

For any questions regarding this response, please contact Loretta Bagwell, Planning Analyst, at (323) 881-2404 or Loretta.Bagwell@fire.lacounty.gov.

A1-1

SERVING THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THE CITIES OF:

AGOURA HILLS	CARSON	EL MONTE	INGLEWOOD	LAWDALE	PICO RIVERA	SIGNAL HILL
ARTESIA	CERRITOS	GARDENA	IRVINDALE	LOMITA	POMONA	SOUTH EL MONTE
AZUSA	CLAREMONT	GLENORA	LA CANADA-FLINTRIDGE	LYNWOOD	RANCHO PALOS VERDES	SOUTH GATE
BALDWIN PARK	COMMERCE	HAWAIIAN GARDENS	LA HABRA	MALIBU	ROLLING HILLS	TEMPLE CITY
BELL	COVINA	HAWTHORNE	LA MIRADA	MAYWOOD	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	VERNON
BELL GARDENS	CUDAHY	HERMOSA BEACH	LA PUENTE	NORWALK	ROSEMAD	WALNUT
BELLFLOWER	DIAMOND BAR	HIDDEN HILLS	LAKEWOOD	PALMDALE	SAN DIMAS	WEST HOLLYWOOD
BRADBURY	DUARTE	HUNTINGTON PARK	LANCASTER	PALOS VERDES ESTATES	SANTA CLARITA	WESTLAKE VILLAGE
CALABASAS		INDUSTRY		PARAMOUNT		WHITTIER

2. Response to Comments

LETTER A1 – County of Los Angeles Fire Department (Page 2 of 3)

March 2, 2021
Page 2

LAND DEVELOPMENT UNIT:

This project is located entirely in the City of Glendale. Therefore, the City of Glendale Fire Department has the jurisdiction concerning this project and will be setting conditions.

A1-2

This project is in close proximity to the jurisdictional area of Los Angeles County Fire Department; however, this project is unlikely to have an impact that necessitates a comment concerning general requirements from the Land Development Unit of the Los Angeles County Fire Department.

For any questions regarding the report, please contact Inspector Claudia Soiza at (323) 890-4243 or claudia.soiza@fire.lacounty.gov.

FORESTRY DIVISION – OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS:

The statutory responsibilities of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department's Forestry Division include erosion control, watershed management, rare and endangered species, vegetation, fuel modification for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, archeological and cultural resources, and the County Oak Tree Ordinance. Potential impacts in these areas should be addressed.

Under the Los Angeles County Oak tree Ordinance, a permit is required to cut, destroy, remove, relocate, inflict damage or encroach into the protected zone of any tree of the Oak genus which is 25 inches or more in circumference (eight inches in diameter), as measured 4 1/2 feet above mean natural grade.

A1-3

If Oak trees are known to exist in the proposed project area further field studies should be conducted to determine the presence of this species on the project site.

The County of Los Angeles Fire Department's Forestry Division has no further comments regarding this project.

For any questions regarding this response, please contact Forestry Assistant, Joseph Brunet at (818) 890-5719.

HEALTH HAZARDOUS MATERIALS DIVISION:

The Health Hazardous Materials Division of the Los Angeles County Fire Department has no comments or requirements for the project at this time.

A1-4

Please contact HHMD senior typist-clerk, Perla Garcia at (323) 890-4035 or Perla.garcia@fire.lacounty.gov if you have any questions.

If you have any additional questions, please contact this office at (323) 890-4330

2. Response to Comments

LETTER A1 – County of Los Angeles Fire Department (Page 3 of 3)

March 2, 2021
Page 3

Very truly yours,



RONALD M. DURBIN, CHIEF, FORESTRY DIVISION
PREVENTION SERVICES BUREAU

RMD:ac

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

A1. Response to Comments from County of Los Angeles Fire Department, dated March 2, 2021.

- A1-1 This comment provides an introduction to the comment letter. The commenter indicates that the Planning Division has no further comments regarding the DEIR.
- A1-2 The commenter notes that the proposed project is within the jurisdiction of City of Glendale Fire Department. However, the proposed project is within the jurisdiction of the LA County Fire Department as noted on page 5.9-3 of the DEIR and confirmed in their response to a service questionnaire (see Appendix E to the DEIR). The commenter indicates that the Land Development Unit has no further comments regarding the DEIR.
- A1-3 This comment provides an overview of the County's Oak Tree Ordinance and states that the Forestry Division has no further comments regarding the DEIR.
- A1-4 The commenter indicates that the Planning Division has no further comments regarding the DEIR.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER A2 –Los Angeles County Sheriff Department (Page 1 of 3)

A2



OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

HALL OF JUSTICE

ALEX VILLANUEVA, SHERIFF



March 4, 2021

Mr. Jeff Bohn
Glendale Unified School District
Facilities Planning Development & Support Operations
349 West Magnolia Avenue
Glendale, California 91204

Dear Mr. Bohn:

**REVIEW COMMENTS
NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
CRESCENTA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL FIELD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

Thank you for inviting the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Department) to review and comment on the January 2021 Notice of Availability (NOA) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project (Project). The proposed Project is located on the southernmost portion of the 18.5-acre campus of Crescenta Valley High School (High School), at 2900 Community Avenue in the unincorporated area of La Crescenta. The proposed Project involves the redevelopment of an area north of, the existing track and field and south of the tennis courts to accommodate the installation of 3,442-seat permanent bleachers and installation of four 100-foot-tall light poles around the perimeter of the running track. Additional improvements would also include a 1,300-square-foot storage room, 1,860-square-foot restrooms a 540-square-foot concession stand along the northern perimeter of the Project site and a 2,254-square-foot home team room along the southeastern perimeter of the Project site.

A2-1

The proposed Project is located within the service area of our Department's Crescenta Valley Sheriff's Station (Station). The DEIR concluded that the proposed Project impact to Public Services – Police Protection is less than significant prior to mitigation. However, our Department disagrees with this conclusion since the increase in population as a result of activities/events may require additional patrol deputies for law enforcement services. Currently, the Department has a School Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Agreement

A2-2

211 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

A Tradition of Service
— Since 1850 —

2. Response to Comments

LETTER A2 –Los Angeles County Sheriff Department (Page 2 of 3)

Mr. Bohn

- 2 -

March 4, 2021

for Special Events By and Between the County of Los Angeles and Glendale Unified School District (GUSD). In order to mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant, the GUSD and/or High School shall contact the Station to discuss the needs and services required for each event based upon anticipated attendance and additional law enforcement service requirements.

A2-2
cont'd

We also recommend that security measures be implemented to the concession stand, team room, restrooms and storage/maintenance buildings to discourage potential vandalism and/or theft. In addition, a Construction Traffic Management Plan should also be established as part of the proposed Project to address construction-related traffic congestion and emergency access issues. If temporary lane closures are necessary for the installation of utilities, emergency access should be maintained at all times. Flag persons and/or detours should be provided as needed to ensure safe traffic operations, and construction signs should be posted to advise motorists of reduced construction zone speed limits.

A2-3

Public Services Section 5.9.2 Police Protection, page 5.9-6 of the DEIR, incorrectly states that the Department has an average response time of 3.5 minutes in 2018-2019. Per the Response to Request for Sheriff's Department Service Information previously issued by the Department on June 1, 2020, the Station indicated that the average time for emergent calls for service is 3.2 minutes.

A2-4

The Department reserves the right to amend or supplement our assessment upon subsequent reviews of the proposed Project once additional information becomes available.

A2-5

Also, for future reference, the Department provides the following updated address and contact information for all requests for review comments, law enforcement service information, California Environmental Quality Act documents and other related correspondence:

Tracey Jue, Director
Facilities Planning Bureau
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
211 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attention: Planning Section

2. Response to Comments

LETTER A2 –Los Angeles County Sheriff Department (Page 3 of 3)

Mr. Bohn

- 3 -

March 4, 2021

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (323) 526-5657, or your staff may contact Ms. Rochelle Campomanes of my staff, at (323) 526-5614.

Sincerely,

ALEX VILLANUEVA, SHERIFF



Tracey Jue, Director
Facilities Planning Bureau

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

A2. Response to Comments from Los Angeles County Sheriff Department, dated March 4, 2021.

A2-1 The commenter provides an accurate summary of the proposed project as analyzed in the DEIR. The District has engaged the Los Angeles County Sheriff Department during the scoping period for the DEIR, and their response has been incorporated into the DEIR (see Section 5.9 of the DEIR). No further response is warranted.

A2-2 The commenter indicates that the project site is within the service area of the Crescenta Valley Sheriff's Station, which is consistent with information found on page 5.9-5 of the DEIR. The commenter indicates they disagree with the DEIR conclusion that the project would result in less-than-significant environmental impacts, as the project could result in an increase in population from new activities/events that require law enforcement services. The commenter references the School Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Agreement for Special Events By and Between the County of Los Angeles and the District. They indicate that, in order to mitigate impacts, the District shall contact the Station to discuss future event needs.

The District notifies the Station for all events as a current best practice and coordinates with the Station directly regarding law enforcement needs for events. This coordination will continue for all future events to be held at the campus, consistent with ongoing practice. The DEIR has been updated to reflect this practice (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the DEIR*). The proposed text change does not require recirculation of the EIR because it does not provide significant new information that would give rise to a new significant environmental impact; a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact; or suggest a project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt it.

The threshold for determining significant environmental effects in the DEIR is as follows (as stated on page 5.9-6 of the DEIR):

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if the project would:

PP-1 Result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection services.

The conclusion of less-than-significant impacts in the DEIR is consistent with the requirements of CEQA. While notification and coordination between the District and Station would occur, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for additional resources or facilities that require the construction of new facilities, the construction of which could result in significant effects to the environment. Therefore,

2. Response to Comments

this commitment to coordination is reflected in the DEIR, the environmental impact determinations are consistent with the requirements of CEQA.

- A2-3 The commenter recommends security measures to be implemented at the new project components, including the concession stand, team room, restrooms, and storage/maintenance buildings. All new structures would be equipped with the standard security measures as other structures on campus, including security lighting and exterior surveillance cameras where appropriate. All new facilities would be within the enclosed and secure campus. Additionally, the District provides security guards onsite during events and games, including private security and at least one law enforcement officer, and will continue to do so as part of the proposed project.

The commenter requests a Construction Traffic Management Plan to address traffic-related congestion and emergency access issues. This issue is addressed in detail on page 5.10-8 of the DEIR, as show below. This information remains accurate, and no changes are needed.

Because of the limited nature of the proposed improvements, a significant number of construction trips to/from the site is not anticipated. Once materials are delivered to the site, all construction activities would occur on-site within the existing boundaries of the school campus and would not disrupt off-site traffic flows. Lane closures are not anticipated, and no off-site roadway improvements are required or proposed that would have the potential to interrupt area circulation or redirect traffic. As such, project construction is not anticipated to substantially disrupt area traffic or cause a significant increase in daily traffic on area roadways or at local intersections, thereby adversely affecting existing conditions. Per standard construction procedures, the construction contractor would prepare and implement a traffic control plan to ensure that public safety and emergency access are maintained during the construction phase. Implementation of the traffic control plan would ensure that existing conditions are not adversely affected or substantially degraded by project construction.

- A2-4 The commenter notes an error in the average response time that is included on page 5.9-6 of the DEIR. The DEIR has been updated to reflect this change (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the DEIR*). The proposed text change does not require recirculation of the EIR because it does not provide significant new information that would give rise to a new significant environmental impact; a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact; or suggest a project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt it.
- A2-5 The commenter concludes their comments and provides updated contact information for future coordination. This information is noted and no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R1 – Stephen Small (Phone Message Received) (1 page)

R1

Resident Comment – Phone Message

The following is a summary of comments provided to the District's voicemail.

01/26/2021 - Stephen Small, resident at Mayfield Ave. Received NOA regarding DEIR for CVHS field improvement project dated 01/21/2021. Call back about the project and the impact it could potentially have on being a local resident. 818-653-8076.

R1-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R1. Response to Comments from Stephen Small, received January 26, 2021.

R1-1 The commenter indicates they live on Mayfield Avenue and that they received the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the DEIR and requested a call back. The District returned the phone call and provided information on how to join the public meeting that was held on February 17, 2021. As no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R2 – Claudia McCollum (1 page)



GUSD

R2

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Proposed stadium

1 message

claudia mccollum <mccollumclaudia@hotmail.com>
To: "cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Sun, Feb 14, 2021 at 12:26 PM

I am against this project. The money should be spend in better projects.
This would create a nightmare to the city of La Crescenta.
Safety, traffic and many other problems will arise if this project goes through.

R2-1

Sincerely

Claudia

Sent from my iPhone

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R2. Response to Comments from Claudia McCollum, dated February 14, 2021.

R2-1 The commenter expresses opposition to the proposed project, indicating problems with safety and traffic. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics, as discussed in detail in Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*, and the accompanying Appendix D Traffic Study, have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." As no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R3 – Michele Morris (1 page)



GUSD

R3

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

From Michele Morris, a CVHS neighbor re: the DEIR and my concerns

1 message

luckynumberis12 <luckynumberis12@aol.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net
Cc: Michele Morris <luckynumberis12@aol.com>

Mon, Feb 15, 2021 at 12:13 PM

Unfortunately, because of a previously scheduled ZOOM meeting I will not be able to attend your meeting but my friend will let me know if my letter was considered. I was at the December 2019 meeting. I did not yell at anyone 😊😊

R3-1

MY CONCERNS ARE:

My residence, 2863 ALTURA AVENUE, is the very last house on the north side of the street and along with my neighbors, we have been severely impacted by almost everything that has been approved for the high school and I don't remember anyone involved in putting together a DEIR contacting us individually to get our input except for the sports building re: any problems one of the projects would cause us. These projects include the \$42,000,000.00 renovation, work on the football field, the sports/medical building, ugly storage containers and a porta potty for residents and visitors to see and smell EVERYDAY. We were also impacted severely by the huge addition to the elementary school. There were articles in the local weekly paper and some of us received notifications somewhere on our property but most of us are flag lots, rear residents did not receive anything.

R3-2

1. How is the school/ school district going to keep spectators from blocking our driveways during games. Don't say "call the sheriff's department.

R3-3

2. Who's going to pick up leftover food and trash and water bottles and beer cans and cigarette butts left by people watching the game. It happens after graduation, Fourth of July etc etc. Who's going to keep spectators from walking up our driveway and urinating? All of this has happened. Trespassing.

R3-4

3. I talked to many many people last year trying to get flammable debris removed from the storm basin and no one will claim the property, cal trans has been out multiple times and the water co and Harry Leon promised to do it before he'd let me do it but nothing happened. Students and spectators go down there to smoke etc. All of this is leading to why do the neighbors of the school need to always be responsible for trying to get the school district to follow through on the above concerns during and after school events?

R3-5

How are spectators who park in the elementary school parking lot going to get to the games etc, is the gate to the softball field going to be left open for anyone to walk through. The parking lot, softball field and access road all border my property. I am not saying yes or no to your project, I am telling you what always happens and the district being responsible for all of the above needs to be included in the report.

R3-6

NONE OF OUR CONCERNS EXCEPT FOR THE LIGHTS WERE ADDRESSED IN YOUR REPORT. PLEASE CONTACT ME, I WILL BE HAPPY TO SHOW YOU WHAT I AM TALKING ABOUT, OTHERWISE YOU REALLY HAVE NOT MADE A COMPLETE AND ACCURATE REPORT WHICH SHOULD INCLUDE THE INDIVIDUAL NEIGHBOR'S ENVIRONMENTS. Also, we need an after game contact number for when the lights are left on, that has happened too and it does impact our individual environments.

R3-7

Michele Morris
Sent from my iPad

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R3. Response to Comments from Michele Morris, dated February 15, 2021.

- R3-1 The commenter indicates they were unable to attend the public meeting held on February 17, 2021. Please note that the presentation and audio files are available for viewing on the District's website at <http://www.gusd.net/CVHSCommunityMeeting>. The District thanks you for your involvement in the CEQA review process for the proposed project.
- R3-2 The commenter indicates they live on Altura Avenue in close proximity to Crescenta Valley HS and that they are regularly impacted by school activities and past projects. They express that they were not aware of DEIRs had been prepared for prior projects and activities at the Crescenta Valley HS and the nearby Crescenta Valley Elementary School. The proposed project that is the subject of this DEIR is limited only to the installation of bleachers, a home team room, concession stand, score board, and field lighting, as described in detail in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of the DEIR, as modified as part of the FEIR. Other past projects referenced by the commenter underwent their own separate approval process, which may or may not have included full preparation of an EIR (often, school projects can be exempt from CEQA). These other activities are considered part of the "baseline" existing environmental conditions in the DEIR, where appropriate.
- R3-3 The commenter questions how the District would keep spectators from blocking private driveways during events. As a result of public comments received regarding access, the project description has been revised on page 3-9 as part of this FEIR, as shown below, to close pedestrian access at this side of the campus at the terminus of Altura Avenue. The proposed text change does not require recirculation of the EIR because it does not provide significant new information that would give rise to a new significant environmental impact; a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact; or suggest a project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt it.

No change in site ~~access or~~ parking would occur. As part of the project, an 8-foot fence would be installed at the northeast end of the track and field and the existing turnstile would be locked and not used. Campus access at this location would be limited to an emergency gate for fire/paramedic uses and District vehicle access only. This would prohibit pedestrian access to events at the track and field, with the intent to limit pedestrian and vehicular activity along Altura Avenue east of the campus. This would discourage use of that end of campus for anything except emergencies. Games and events would utilize the existing primary Ramsdell Avenue entrance as well as other campus entrance points only.

Given the elimination of pedestrian access, parking issues would likely be reduced in this location. Additionally, parking impacts are addressed under Impact 5.10-4 (page 5.10-9 of the DEIR), which includes Altura Avenue specifically (Zone 1). The DEIR requires

2. Response to Comments

Mitigation Measure T-1 prior to large events, where overflow street parking occurs, taking place at the field. This would include preparation of an event traffic control plan. This plan would require signage be placed at locations along local streets in the vicinity, which would include Altura Avenue. Traffic officers would also be stationed at key intersections/locations to assist in alleviating illegal parking. As part of this plan, additional parking areas in the vicinity would be identified by the District, which would help reduce overflow of street parking as well. While these measures would reduce parking-related impacts, the DEIR concludes that impacts could still remain significant and unavoidable.

- R3-4 The commenter questions who will pick up post-event trash in the neighborhood and prevent trespassing, indicating this is an ongoing issue for events that already occur at the facility. Related, as this is an ongoing current condition, Appendix A to the DEIR (page 58) indicates that the proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of current events. Page 5.9-7 of the DEIR indicates that the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) has sufficient resources to respond to incidents associated with the proposed project. Page 5.7-9 of the DEIR indicates that trash and waste storage areas would be designed to reduce the potential for pollution introduction as it relates to water quality. The District provides trash cans all along Ramsdell Avenue, and trash cans would be provided within the field viewing area, bleachers, etc. Due to liability reasons, they are not included beyond the campus property.
- R3-5 The commenter raises an issue unrelated to the proposed project, regarding a request for the removal of flammable debris from the adjacent easement to the south of the Crescenta Valley HS campus that is owned by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and is not on District property. All elements of the proposed project are within the limits of the school campus. The District is unaware of any relationship of this easement to the proposed project, and it is not reasonably foreseeable to assume that environmental impacts associated with students illegally entering this property would occur.
- R3-6 The commenter questions how event attendees would access events at Crescenta Valley HS if they were to park at the nearby La Crescenta Elementary School. If this facility is used as a designated parking facility for events, patrons would walk through the softball field and down from the main campus.
- R3-7 The commenter indicates that none of the issues raised in the enclosed comments were addressed within the DEIR. Please see the above-provided responses for more information. The commenter also requests that a phone number be available for residents if event lights are left on. Mitigation Measure AE-1 was updated as shown below to incorporate the commenter's suggestion of providing a phone number for residents to report non-emergency incidents. The proposed text change does not require recirculation of the EIR because it does not provide significant new information that would give rise

2. Response to Comments

to a new significant environmental impact; a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact; or suggest a project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt it.

AE-1 The Glendale Unified School District shall minimize the effects of new sources of nighttime lighting by incorporating the following measures into project design and operation:

- All lighting shall be shielded and directed downward onto the athletic fields to minimize potential light escape and/or spillover onto adjacent properties.
- The new athletic field lights shall be shall shut off automatically at 10:00 pm. A voicemail phone number and contact information will be posted on the school website and made available to neighbors that can be used in the rare event lights remain on past 10:00 pm, or to report any (non-emergency) incidents related to use of the field for large events. The District will manage and respond to all calls received.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R4 – Michele Morris (Phone Message Received) (1 page)

R4

Residential Comment – Phone Message

The following is a summary of comments provided to the District's voicemail.

02/15/2021 - **Michelle Morris**, 818-606-7812, regards to notice regarding the DEIR, would like someone to call her back. Not all environmental issues at the site. Neighborhood was not included in the DEIR, no one talked to the neighbors about it.

R4-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R4. Response to Comments Michele Morris, received February 15, 2021.

R4-1 The commenter requests more information from the District and indicates the neighbors were not informed. Please see responses to comments provided by this commenter (R3 and R10). Regarding notification, the District sent the Notice of Availability (NOA) and notice of public meeting to a 500-foot mailing radius, which includes residences on Altura Avenue in proximity to the campus.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R5 – Homeowner (unknown name) (Phone Message Received) (1 page)

R5

Resident Comment – Phone Message

The following is a summary of comments provided to the District’s voicemail.

02/15/2021 – Homeowner (unknown name) at 2859 Altura Ave., calling to get a copy of the DEIR. 818-275-3215

R5-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R5. Response to Comments Homeowner (unknown name), received February 15, 2021.

R5-1 The commenter indicated that they would like a copy of the DEIR. As stated in the Notice of Availability (NOA), the DEIR is available for public review at the Glendale Unified School District's website (<https://www.gusd.net/CVHSField>). A physical hard copy could be obtained upon request. As no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R6 – Alex Stupakis (Phone Message Received) (1 page)

R6

Resident Comment – Phone Message

The following is a summary of comments provided to the District's voicemail.

02/15/2021 - Alex Stupakis, 3037 Altura Ave., 818-808-2934. Resident, Big proponent of permanent stands and lights at CVHS field, thinks we need it, long overdue, something that the community will benefit from, the school will benefit from, most importantly our students will benefit from, playing games on their home field and providing flexibility for practices, for all sports, think that it would be a cohesive effect for our community to go see games at our field. Know it's not perfect, will be trash, crowd noise, lights, but some lights have come a long way in their technology to minimize flash and glare. Certainly more energy efficient than the existing lights that are being used. We need it for our community, for the long term good of our community. If I wanted to live in an area, city, I look at quality of life issues, look at schools, look at parks. I think our school without a home field is a little bit ridiculous for a school like CVHS with such a proud tradition. Playing home games at somebody else's field is not only costly but it's ridiculous for those boys and girls, and cumbersome to deal with.

R6-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R6. Response to Comments Alex Stupakis, received February 15, 2021.

R6-1 The commenter expresses general support for the proposed project. No comments are provided regarding the content or adequacy of the DEIR and no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R7 – Lindsay Ljungkull received February 16, 2021. (1 page)



GUSD

R7

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

CRESCENTA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL FIELD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

1 message

Lindsay Ljungkull <ljungkull@me.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Tue, Feb 16, 2021 at 10:52 AM

Hello,

I am writing in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project. I live on Altura Ave at the back of CV field. I am really concerned about the parking situation on my street. We already have many people parking here for use of the field for practices and soccer, but regularly hosting large events would be a dramatic difference, as noted in the DEIR. I request that a plan for mitigation of the impact on parking for the surrounding residential streets be made - not ONLY in cases of expected full-capacity, but for ALL events. Off-site parking, within walking distance or by shuttle, and closing all adjacent streets to non-residents, would be a place to start.

The district NEEDS to look into parking at private lots and develop a plan that would not place this huge parking and transportation burden on the immediate residents.

As a parent of an incoming CV student, I am glad to see that the school is providing more resources for the students, but it should not come at such a great cost to the community. Solving the parking issue is certainly not an impossible task and should be undertaken seriously as it is integral to the proposed field improvement.

Lindsay Ljungkull
ljungkull@me.com
323-385-5537

2822 Altura Ave.
La Crescenta, CA 91214

R7-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R7. Response to Comments Lindsay Ljungkull, dated February 16, 2021.

R7-1 The commenter expresses concern regarding neighborhood street parking as a resident who lives in proximity to the field, for current events as well as proposed future larger events that would be accommodated by the proposed project. The commenter suggests the Mitigation Measure T-1, which requires the District prepare an event traffic control plan, apply to all events (not just those expecting full capacity). As indicated in Mitigation Measure T-1, the plan shall determine additional parking spaces at nearby vacant or underutilized parking lots and require that District safety personnel be available to direct event traffic to and from available designated parking areas. Information regarding available parking in the vicinity that will be developed as part of this plan will become important information that the District will utilize for events that are already held at the field in current conditions. However, there are certain elements of that plan (traffic control personnel) that are not practical (or warranted) for regular practices, smaller games, and gatherings that occur at the field in current conditions. Further information regarding parking will be considered by the District for all events. Mitigation Measure T-1 was updated as shown below to incorporate the commenter's suggestion of utilizing shuttles between off-site parking lots and the campus.

T-1 Prior to any ground disturbing activities, the District shall prepare an event traffic control plan. The plan shall be implemented during major sporting events held at CVHS (e.g., where near-full or full capacity is anticipated, such as at varsity or championship football games). The plan shall require that, immediately prior to each major sporting event, documentation of all available off-street parking supplies and temporary signage be placed at appropriate, pre-determined locations along local streets in the vicinity of available event parking areas. The plan shall also determine additional parking spaces at nearby vacant or underutilized parking lots and require that District school safety traffic control personnel be available to direct event traffic to and from available designated parking areas. Additionally, the plan shall consider the provision of a shuttle service in the event that off-site parking lots are available and used for individual events (this would vary on an event-by-event basis). The traffic officers shall be stationed at the intersections to help improve traffic flow and ensure public safety during peak travel times to and from major sporting events held at CVHS. All temporary directional signage shall be removed by traffic control personnel following each major stadium event.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R8 – Alex Stupakis received February 17, 2021 (1 page)



GUSD

R8

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Permanent stands and lights

1 message

Alex Stupakis <alexstupakis@sbcglobal.net>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Wed, Feb 17, 2021 at 12:33 PM

I believe that the benefits of Permanent stands and lights far outweigh any issues that may accompany.

Permanent stands and lights are an important addition to the High School..benefiting the students, the school, the community the district.

Permanent stands and lights would benefit in reduced costs and time in bussing students and band equipment for home games. Permanent stands and lights will allow scheduling flexibility in the use of the field for the school.

Permanent stands and lights would allow the elimination of games on Thursday nights, which is a school night! How do the athletes do their homework or study for a big test if they are playing or performing at a game on a school night?!

Permanent stands and lights would cause a intangible, unifying effect to the community! Just think, parents and fans may be able to walk to see a game!

Permanent stands and lights may cause some problems with noise or traffic, but we neighbors deal with that all the time for home basketball games or graduation. Parking can be mitigated with cooperation with, say, the Baptist church, and existing staff parking off of Ramsdell.

I am a neighbor, only 1/2 block from the school at 3037 Altura Ave.

I know about traffic, parking and trash.

I do not have any children in school and therefore have no motivation for my children.

Permanent stands and lights will assure the long term viability of the school and the district.

It's overdue...We need it for our current and future children in our community!

Thank you.

Alex Stupakis
818-808-2934

R8-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R8. Response to Comments from Alex Stupakis, dated February 17, 2021.

R8-1 The commenter expresses general support for the proposed project, citing benefits to the District, the students, and the community. The commenter suggests that parking solutions could be provided at the nearby Baptist Church and at existing staff parking that is provided on campus off Ramsdell Avenue. These are parking suggestions that will be considered during preparation of the event traffic control plan as required by Mitigation Measure T-1 in the DEIR.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R9 – John Pawlak (1 page)



GUSD

R9

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Field improvement project response

1 message

John Pawlak <johnpawlak@live.com>
To: "cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Wed, Feb 17, 2021 at 1:34 PM

Dear GUSD,

As a resident living within the first block of the CV high school track, I strongly oppose this field improvement project for three very important reasons.

First, this plan makes no mention of how the school will address the increased congestion to traffic and parking which is already a serious problem during regular school activities. Lines of cars clog our streets making it nearly impossible to back out of or pull into our driveway during special events and this plan to use existing parking without any proposal to create more parking access on CVHS's own property will turn an already serious problem into a nightmare for those residents living closest to the track.

R9-1

The second issue is traffic safety. Acknowledging that the pedestrian crosswalk at Altura was a good first step, cars are still able to speed south on Ramsdell from Community all the way down to Montrose Ave. without having to stop. Ideally, a stop sign should be installed at Altura as a way to help prevent serious injury to pedestrians.

R9-2

Thirdly, the invitation for more public parking on our streets will inevitably result in an increased trash problem which the school has failed to take responsibility for in the past. Student cleanup crews have come and gone and past complaints to the principal from numerous residents have gone on answered or addressed.

R9-3

Ever since this proposal has been presented to the neighborhood there has been no indication that the school is open to development of solutions regarding any of these issues. They have only informed us that this is what is going to happen knowing full well that the increased traffic will have a negative effect on our community. Ideally, CVHS needs to develop parking for students and the general public for special events. The DEIR analysis specifically states that the proposed project would result in "significant, unavoidable adverse impacts relating to the aesthetics of the proposed lighting, including spectator related noise and parking".

R9-4

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this very important matter.

Monica Pawlak
Altura Ave. Resident 20+yrs

J. Pawlak

Response GUSD .pdf
13K

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R9. Response to Comments from John Pawlak (February 17, 2021).

- R9-1 The commenter expresses opposition to the proposed project and indicates they live within proximity to the project site. They comment the DEIR does not discuss how the school will address traffic congestion, which is a current problem. The DEIR includes an analysis of traffic and parking which is presented in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, and is based on a detailed supporting Transportation Assessment (Appendix F to the DEIR). The DEIR includes Mitigation Measure T-1, which requires the District to develop an event traffic control plan for events at the field. This would include documentation of all available off-street parking supplies, temporary signage, and traffic officers to assist with congestion control and management. The DEIR acknowledges that parking-related impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The comment does not state specifically how the traffic analysis fails to address these issues; therefore, no specific response can be provided.
- R9-2 The commenter expresses concern regarding traffic safety, specifically mentioning the pedestrian crosswalk at Altura Avenue/Ramsdell Avenue, and requests a stop sign at this location. This location contains a user-controlled signalized crosswalk. The Transportation Assessment (Appendix F to the DEIR) evaluated this location specifically for existing and project conditions. The installation of a stop sign at this location has not been determined to be required to reduce traffic-related environmental impacts. However, the District will consider all comments and recommendations as part of its decision-making for this project.
- Additionally, the District will implement an event traffic control plan as part of planning for events at the facility (Mitigation Measure T-1). This will include, among other measures to be considered by the District, the potential use of crossing guards at uncontrolled locations, including marked and unmarked crosswalks in the vicinity of the school site without traffic controls such as traffic signals. Physical improvements to pedestrian crossing locations are not planned to be implemented by the District as part of the proposed project.
- R9-3 The commenter expresses concern regarding increased trash in the surrounding neighborhood as an ongoing issue. Appendix A to the DEIR (page 58) indicates that the proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of current events. Page 5.9-7 of the DEIR indicates there the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) has sufficient resources to respond to incidents associated with the proposed project. Page 5.7-9 of the DEIR indicates that trash and waste storage areas would be designed to reduce the potential for pollution introduction as it relates to water quality. The District provides trash cans all along Ramsdell Avenue, and trash cans would be provided within the field viewing area, bleachers, etc. Due to liability reasons, they are not included beyond the campus property.

2. Response to Comments

- R9-4 The commenter expresses concern that the District does not address community concerns regarding the proposed project. All comments received during the public comment period have been responded to in this Final EIR and will be provided to the District Board of Education for review when considering whether to approve the project. The commenter also reiterates concerns regarding the need for additional parking. See response to comment R9-1, above, and Mitigation Measure T-1 in the DEIR which addresses parking and general event circulation.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R10 – Michele Morris (1 page)

R10

Resident Comment – Phone Message

The following is a summary of comments provided to the District’s voicemail.

02/17/2021 - Michelle Morris, left a message yesterday. Regarding DEIR report. Would like a call back | R10-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R10. Response to Comments Michele Morris, received February 17, 2021.

R10-1 The commenter requests a call back from the District. The District returned the phone call and provided information on the purpose of the meeting and how the commenter can join.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R11 – Monica Pawlak (1 page)

R11

Dear GUSD,

As a resident living within the first block of the CV high school track, I strongly oppose this field improvement project for three very important reasons.

First, this plan makes no mention of how the school will address the increased congestion to traffic and parking which is already a serious problem during regular school activities. Lines of cars clog our streets making it nearly impossible to back out of or pull into our driveway during special events and this plan to use existing parking without any proposal to create more parking access on CVHS's own property will turn an already serious problem into a nightmare for those residents living closest to the track.

R11-1

The second issue is traffic safety. Acknowledging that the pedestrian crosswalk at Altura was a good first step, cars are still able to speed south on Ramsdell from Community all the way down to Montrose Ave. without having to stop. Ideally, a stop sign should be installed at Altura as a way to help prevent serious injury to pedestrians.

R11-2

thirdly, the invitation for more public parking on our streets will inevitably result in an increased trash problem which the school has failed to take responsibility for in the past. Student cleanup crews have come and gone and past complaints to the principal from numerous residents have gone on answered or addressed.

R11-3

Ever since this proposal has been presented to the neighborhood there has been no indication that the school is open to development of solutions regarding any of these issues. They have only informed us that this is what is going to happen knowing full well that the increased traffic will have a negative effect on our community. Ideally, CVHS needs to develop parking for students and the general public for special events. The DEIR analysis specifically states that the proposed project would result in "significant, unavoidable adverse impacts relating to the aesthetics of the proposed lighting, including spectator related noise and parking".

R11-4

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this very important matter,

Monica Pawlak
Altura Ave. Resident 20+yrs

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R11. Response to Comments from Monica Pawlak, dated February 17, 2021.

- R11-1 This comment is the same as comment letter R9. Please refer to response to comment R9-1.
- R11-2 This comment is the same as comment letter R9. Please refer to response to comment R9-2.
- R11-3 This comment is the same as comment letter R9. Please refer to response to comment R9-3.
- R11-4 This comment is the same as comment letter R9. Please refer to response to comment R9-4.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R12 – Philip Moore (1 page)



R12

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Locked out of meeting

1 message

Gmail philmooremusic <philmooremusic@gmail.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Wed, Feb 17, 2021 at 6:27 PM

I've followed the registration process and I am locked out of this meeting:

<https://glendaleusd.zoom.us/83067823073>

How are we supposed to comment on this project?

Philip Moore

R12-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R12. Response to Comments from Philip Moore, dated February 17, 2021.

R12-1 The commenter indicates they were unable to attend the community meeting held on February 17, 2021, and inquires how they can provide comment. The recording of the presentation can be found on the District's website at <http://www.gusd.net/CVHSCCommunityMeeting>. Additionally, the commenter provided a subsequent comment letter, which is responded to in this FEIR (see Comment Letter R30, below).

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R13 – Shawn Foley (1 page)

R13

Resident Comment – Google Form

2/17/2021 13:23:22

Shawn Foley

Request for the installation of a crosswalk curb extension (bulb-outs) for the crosswalk at the Ramsdell Ave. and Altura Ave. intersection, to slow vehicles and safeguard the increased pedestrian traffic resulting from the CVHS Field Improvements.

R13-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R13. Response to Comments from Shawn Foley, dated February 17, 2021.

R13-1 The commenter requests the installation of a crosswalk curb extension (bulb-outs) for the existing crosswalk at Ramsdell Avenue and Altura Avenue, to slow vehicles and safeguard pedestrians. The District will implement an event traffic control plan as part of planning for events at the facility (Mitigation Measure T-1). This will include, among other measures to be considered by the District, the potential use of crossing guards at uncontrolled locations, including marked and unmarked crosswalks in the vicinity of the school site without traffic controls such as traffic signals. Physical improvements to pedestrian crossing locations are not planned to be implemented by the District as part of the proposed project. No further response is required.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R14 – Mike Allen (1 page)

R14

Resident Comment – Google Form

2/17/2021 17:46:27

Mike Allen

Will prople be entering the football stadium on east Altura Ave.?

| R14-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R14. Response to Comments from Mike Allen, dated February 17, 2021.

R14-1 The commenter questions whether people would enter the field and bleachers on east Altura Avenue. Primary pedestrian access would be provided through the main campus. In response to community feedback, the project description in the FEIR has been revised to prohibit general pedestrian access on the east side of the campus near the terminus of Altura Avenue (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the Draft EIR*). District will install an 8-foot fence at the northeast end of the track and field and will lock the existing turnstile from use. Campus access from this location would be limited to an emergency gate for fire/paramedic uses and District vehicles only. This would prohibit pedestrian access to events at the track and field, with the intent to limit pedestrian and vehicular activity along Altura Avenue east of the campus. This would discourage use of that end of campus for anything except emergencies. The DEIR has been updated to reflect pedestrian closure at the northeast end of the track and field (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the DEIR*).

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R15 – Rosemary Johnston (1 page)

R15

Resident Comment – Google Form

2/17/2021 17:04:39

Rosemary Johnston

The EIR Draft confirms neighborhood impact in light, sound, parking and security as being unavoidable. There is no plan for GUSD or CVHS to offer solutions for these problems. We are hoping for good faith action to address and possibly mitigate these issues. If not, we will seek legal recourse as the quality of life in our neighborhood is directly affected. In addition, we note that the lights have moved from 80 to 100 feet high which will also impact our home directly (we are adjacent to CVHS) in an unacceptable manner. What plans are there for sound and light walls?

R15-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R15. Response to Comments from Rosemary Johnston, dated February 17, 2021.

R15-1 The commenter expresses general concerns related to parking, lights, noise, and security. There are specific mitigation measures in the DEIR to address these issues. The commenter notes the change of height in the light fixtures between the 80 feet discussed in the NOP and the 100-foot light fixtures discussed in the DEIR. Taller poles allow for lighting fixtures to be aimed more directly to the sport field and would reduce spill light (refer to Illustration AE-1, *Light Trespass*, on page 5.1-5 of the DEIR). Each light pole would be mounted with 12 light fixtures and utilize Musco lighting lamps and equipped with external glare control visors. The lighting proposed is standard for high school sports safety. The lighting would be designed to reduce illumination levels to zero at the site perimeter and would be controlled to direct the light in a more precise manner compared to typical floodlights. The proposed project incorporates Mitigation Measure AE-1 to further reduce lighting impacts to adjacent properties. The DEIR evaluated lighting impacts of 100-foot light poles and properly discloses potential impacts to adjacent residences (see Impact 5.1-2 beginning on page 5.1-9 of the DEIR).

The commenter states that there will be unavoidable noise impacts with implementation of the project. This is consistent with the findings of the DEIR for operational noise during full-capacity events. The commenter states that there are no plans for solutions to this impact and asks about for sound walls. This is incorrect, as the DEIR includes Mitigation Measure N-2, which requires that the District retain an acoustical consultant during the final design of the PA system to reduce noise impacts to the degree feasible through measures which may include, but are not limited to, a sound wall along the property line to the east and recommendations for the final location of speakers/light poles. Prior to the first sports field event, the PA system contractor will perform a system check to verify that spill-over noise is minimized in the adjacent community.

Public safety is addressed in Chapter 5.9.2, *Police Protection*, which has been updated as part of this FEIR (see Chapter 3 of the FEIR).

No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." As no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R16 – Gabriel Pena-Lora (1 page)

R16

Resident Comment – Google Form

2/17/2021 17:05:08

Gabriel Pena-Lora

tbd

| R16-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R16. Response to Comments from Gabriel Pena-Lora, dated February 17, 2021.

R16-1 The commenter did not provide a comment on the DEIR that can be addressed. Please also see response to comment R18, provided by the same commenter.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R17 – Monica Pawlak (1 page)

R17

Resident Comment – Google Form

2/17/2021 17:07:15

Monica Pawlak

Dear GUSD,

As a resident living within the first block of the CV high school track, I strongly oppose this field improvement project for three very important reasons.

First, this plan makes no mention of how the school will address the increased congestion to traffic and parking which is already a serious problem during regular school activities. Lines of cars clog our streets making it nearly impossible to back out of or pull into our driveway during special events and this plan to use existing parking without any proposal to create more parking access on CVHS's own property will turn an already serious problem into a nightmare for those residents living closest to the track.

The second issue is traffic safety. Acknowledging that the pedestrian crosswalk at Altura was a good first step, cars are still able to speed south on Ramsdell from Community all the way down to Montrose Ave. without having to stop. Ideally, a stop sign should be installed at Altura as a way to help prevent serious injury to pedestrians.

Thirdly, the invitation for more public parking on our streets will inevitably result in an increased trash problem which the school has failed to take responsibility for in the past. Student cleanup crews have come and gone and past complaints to the principal from numerous residents have gone on answered or addressed.

Ever since this proposal has been presented to the neighborhood there has been no indication that the school is open to development of solutions regarding any of these issues. They have only informed us that this is what is going to happen knowing full well that the increased traffic will have a negative effect on our community. Ideally, CVHS needs to develop parking for students and the general public for special events. The DEIR analysis specifically states that the proposed project would result in "significant, unavoidable adverse impacts relating to the aesthetics of the proposed lighting, including spectator related noise and parking".

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this very important matter,

Monica Pawlak

Altura Ave. Resident 20+yrs

R17-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R17. Response to Comments from Monica Pawlak, dated February 17, 2021.

R17-1 Refer to response to Comment Letter R9, which contains the same comments.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R18 – Gabriel Pena-Lora (1 page)

R18

Resident Comment – Google Form

2/17/2021 17:09:01

Gabriel Pena-Lora

This hearing has not been noticed correctly. All stakeholders were not notified.

R18-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R18. Response to Comments from Gabriel Pena-Lora, dated February 17, 2021.

R18-1 The commenter states the hearing was not noticed correctly and that all stakeholders were not notified. The virtual public meeting held on February 17, 2021, was an informational public meeting (not a hearing where a decision on the project was to be made). Regardless, notification of the availability of the DEIR and of the public meeting (the NOA) was distributed to residences (owner and occupant) within a 500-foot radius of the project site. It also was distributed to individuals who participated in the scoping meeting held for the project in March 2020 and to responsible local and state agencies that may have an interest in the project. Last, the notice was provided to all students and families of those who attend Crescenta Valley HS. The noticing of the DEIR and the public meeting meets the requirements for noticing in CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(a)(3), which requires direct mailing to the owners and occupants of property contiguous to the parcel on which the project is located.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R19 – Jonathan Tinsman (1 page)

R19

Resident Comment – Google Form

2/17/2021 17:54:26

Jonathan Tinsman

Where can we view the actual EIR and not just a selected abbreviation powerpoint? And what about traffic studies? For traffic around the highschool and parking

R19-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R19. Response to Comments from Jonathan Tinsman, dated February 17, 2021.

R19-1 The commenter asks where they can view the DEIR in its entirety, including a traffic study, and not just the PowerPoint presentation that was presented during the informational community meeting held on February 17, 2021. As indicated throughout the presentation, which is located on the project web page at <http://www.gusd.net/CVHSCommunityMeeting>, the presentation was a summary of the content that can be found in the DEIR and associated technical appendices. The DEIR and appendices (including Appendix F for the Transportation Assessment), can be found at <https://www.gusd.net/CVHSField>.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R20 – Alex Stupakis (1 page)

R20

Resident Comment – Google Form

2/17/2021 17:47:20

Alex Stupakis

yes I would like to submit a comment

| R20-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R20. Response to Comments from Alex Stupakis, dated February 17, 2021.

R20-1 The commenter indicated he would like to submit a comment during the community meeting held on February 17, 2021. Please see response to comments R6 and R8, above, for responses to this commenter.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R21 – Shawn Foley (1 page)

R21

Resident Comment – Public Meeting

The following is a summary of verbal comments provided during the public meeting on February 17, 2021.

2/17/2021

Shawn Foley

Commenter states that that the project provides 3,400 additional seating capacity, and states that the EIR does not address pedestrian safety. Commenter states that 3,400 people is a large increase to that area. Commenter lives near the intersection of Ramsdell and Altura. There is a crosswalk on Altura, and a lot of close calls between pedestrians and vehicles at that crosswalk. The speed limit is 30 mph during non school hours and traffic often will exceed 30 mph. Commenter proposes curb extensions at the crosswalk (also known as blue-outs) to increase pedestrian safety. Commenter states that these curb extensions have already been installed at some area schools, including Rosemont Middle School, Valley View Elementary School, Dunsmore Elementary, and Abraham Elementary. Commenter states that the average cost for these extensions is \$13,000 and as little as \$2,000. The curb extensions would be a visual reminder that GSD is invested in student safety community well being. The commenter request consideration of this proposal.

R21-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R21. Response to Comments from Shawn Foley, received February 17, 2021.

R21-1 The commenter states the DEIR does not address pedestrian safety and indicates they live near Ramsdell Avenue and Altura Avenue, specifically referencing the crosswalk in this location and requesting curb extensions (bulb-outs). The District will implement an event traffic control plan as part of planning for events at the facility (Mitigation Measure T-1). This will include, among other measures to be considered by the District, the potential use of crossing guards at uncontrolled locations, including marked and unmarked crosswalks in the vicinity of the school site without traffic controls such as traffic signals. Physical improvements to pedestrian crossing locations are not planned to be implemented by the District as part of the proposed project. No further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R22 – Rosemary Johnston (1 page)

R22

Resident Comment – Public Meeting

The following is a summary of verbal comments provided during the public meeting on February 17, 2021.

2/17/2021

Rosemary Johnston

Commenter lives on Altura Avenue, very close to the school. Commenter is concerned about pedestrian safety. | R22-1

Commenter is concerned about the number of parking places allotted for the number of seats that are proposed in the bleachers. Commenter states, from experience, a lot more kids like to drive to these games than is usually accounted for. | R22-2

Commenter is concerned about a lack of transparency through the process. Commenter states that there has been very little communication other than via word of mouth from other neighbors even though they live next door. | R22-3

Commenter states that they have attended everything and have been involved. Commenter states that the EIR does not include mitigation for lighting and sound problems. | R22-4

Also, commenter states that security was not addressed in the EIR. There is a rise in crime with large events in large stadiums like the project. EIR does not provide security to provide safety for community members going to/from games and events. | R22-5

Commenter states that the District is ignoring sound and access regulations. There are events going on constantly that start well before the sound on the weekends and go through all day on Sunday. Commenter requests to see more addressed to event schedules and requests to see who is going to manage and maintain security of the event. | R22-6

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R22. Response to Comments from Rosemary Johnston, received February 17, 2021.

- R22-1 The commenter states they live on Altura Avenue in proximity to the campus, and is concerned about pedestrian safety. Please see page 5.10-7 of the DEIR regarding pedestrian-related impacts. See also response to comment R21, above. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." As no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.
- R22-2 The commenter is concerned about parking supply and indicates more people drive to games than typically accounted for. The project parking analysis (contained in Appendix F to the DEIR) assumed what was estimated to be typical aspects of arriving spectators of major events at the facility, including average passengers per vehicle and percentage split for automobile trips out of total trips. The analysis assumed an at-capacity event in order to provide a conservative analysis, which is expected to occur only during certain varsity games and championship games. The District will implement an event traffic control plan (Mitigation Measure T-1), which will include available parking in off-street areas that can be secured and/or leased by the District during capacity events. No further response is warranted.
- R22-3 The commenter is concerned about a lack of transparency through the process and states that there has been very little communication other than via word of mouth from other neighbors even though they live next door. Notification of the availability of the DEIR and of the public meeting (the NOA) was distributed to residences (owner and occupant) within a 500-foot radius of the project site. It also was distributed to individuals who participated in the scoping meeting held for the project in March 2020 and to responsible local and state agencies that may have an interest in the project. Last, the notice was provided to all students and families of those who attend Crescenta Valley HS. The noticing of the DEIR and the public meeting meets the requirements for noticing in CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(a)(3), which requires direct mailing to the owners and occupants of property contiguous to the parcel on which the project is located.
- R22-4 The commenter states that the EIR does not include mitigation for lighting and sound problems. Please see Mitigation Measures AE-1 regarding lighting and N-1 regarding noise. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.
- R22-5 The commenter states that security was not addressed in the EIR, indicates a rise in crime with large events. Public safety is addressed in Chapter 5.9, *Public Services*, which has been

2. Response to Comments

updated as part of this FEIR. The comment does not address the adequacy of analysis contained the DEIR. Therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

- R22-6 The commenter states that the District is ignoring sound and access regulations. There are events going on constantly that start well before the sound on the weekends and go through all day on Sunday. Commenter requests to see more addressed to event schedules and requests to see who is going to manage and maintain security of the event. The sports fields would be used in accordance with the adopted Board Policy and scheduling practices, and a detailed schedule showing planned use is provided in Table 3-2 of the DEIR. As discussed in response A2-3, the District coordinates with LASD and provides one law enforcement officer and private security during events and games. The comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR. No changes to the EIR are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R23 – Monica Pawlak (1 page)

R23

Resident Comment – Public Meeting

The following is a summary of verbal comments provided during the public meeting on February 17, 2021.

2/17/2021

Monica Pawlak

Commenter states that they have lived in the community for almost 25 years. Commenter states that traffic is a major issue and is very concerned about traffic and parking issues. Commenter states that there is very limited communication from the school, and it does not seem that they have addressed how existing parking will be used. States that there are 1,053 parking spaces needed and there's a deficiency of 205 parking spaces. Commenter assumes this includes street parking.

R23-1

Commenter states that they have a major issue with trash right now and that again is also going to be increased. Commenter states that they have gone to the school numerous times and things have not improved.

R23-2

Commenter summarizes concerns: Traffic safety, trash, and parking. Commenter is not as concerned about the lighting. Commenter states that there is no where for people to park and states that they have had cars towed out of their driveway, because the cars literally blocked the entire driveway. Commenter is concerned about access into and out of their driveway after COVID.

R23-3

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R23. Response to Comments from Monica Pawlak, received February 17, 2021.

- R23-1 The commenter expresses concern regarding traffic and parking issues referencing a deficiency of 205 parking spaces. The commenter correctly cites the disclosed deficiency in parking of 205, which includes street parking, which requires the District to develop an event traffic control plan for events to occur at the field. This would include documentation of all available off-street parking supplies, temporary signage, and traffic officers to assist with congestion control and management. The DEIR acknowledges that parking-related impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The comment does not state specifically how the traffic analysis fails to address these issues; therefore, no specific response can be provided. The indicate limited communication from the school, which is a separate issue from the environmental impacts that are disclosed in the DEIR.
- R23-2 The commenter expresses concern regarding trash from past and current operations. The public nuisance described by the comment would be addressed in accordance with applicable District practices and policies, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would respond to reports of illegal activities on public rights-of-way. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no changes to the EIR are warranted.
- R23-3 The commenter reiterates concerns about traffic safety, trash, and parking. They indicate lighting is not as much a concern. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." Because no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R24 – Ji Suh (1 page)

R24

Resident Comment – Public Meeting

The following is a summary of verbal comments provided during the public meeting on February 17, 2021.

2/17/2021

Ji Suh

Commenter states that they live just north of the school. Their major concern is foot traffic and parking. Commenter states that they have noticed during events, people park and block their driveway and foot traffic is very heavy. The commenter is concerned about the events that will be going on, events will not be limited to football season but other events as well. The commenter is concerned whether events will be year around and states that the events would be an inconvenience for those who live in the immediate neighborhood and unbearable. Commenter requests more information about the use and the frequency of the inconvenience. Commenter is concerned about the amount of parking and blocking driveways when drivers are squeezed for space, foot traffic, and the possible danger that could pose for pedestrians and drivers alike.

R24-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R24. Response to Comments from Ji Suh, received February 17, 2021.

R24-1 The commenter states that they live just north of the school and expresses concern regarding foot traffic and parking. These issues are addressed specifically in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, of the DEIR. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter; therefore, no further response is warranted. The commenter also requests information regarding the use and the frequency of events. Please refer to Table 3-2 in the DEIR for this information.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R25 – Alex Stupakis (1 page)

R25

Resident Comment – Public Meeting

The following is a summary of verbal comments provided during the public meeting on February 17, 2021.

2/17/2021

Alex Stupakis

Commenter lives half a block from the high school gym. Commenter states that they deal with parking, trash, and traffic for a while now, especially with events -- games, graduations. These events are temporary and not permanent. States that the EIR did not compare the existing lighting, which is archaic by standards of modern lighting and how that might increase or decrease accordingly. Commenter states that lighting needs to be compared, because the school is using old equipment and it's used practically every night for soccer. Commenter states that there is savings with new lighting (LED versus what is used now).

R25-1

Commenter states that the EIR failed to mention the savings for the district. The district has the bus down to Glendale for home games, band, cheer, players, etc.. The project would eliminate the need to bus students and it would eliminate the Thursday games.

R25-2

Commenter states that the parking on Community and Ramsdale and the Baptist Church has been ignored and states that there is parking at the high school, which was not discussed during the display.

R25-3

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R25. Response to Comments from Alex Stupakis, received February 17, 2021.

- R25-1 The commenter indicates they live in proximity to the project site and already experience issues related to events (parking, traffic, trash). They indicate the DEIR should have considered the difference (presumed reduction) in lighting impacts from the temporary portable lighting fixtures that are used for certain nighttime events. The commenter is correct that the DEIR evaluated the increase in lighting impacts from the typical baseline condition, which is no lighting. The increase in lighting from no lighting presents a more conservative assessment of impacts. It is correct that the existing lights used, though shorter in height, often have more substantial light spill than the proposed modernized lights, given their old technology. However, for the purposes of determining significant impacts under CEQA, the baseline was appropriately and more conservatively considered to be no lighting.
- R25-2 The commenter states that the EIR failed to mention the savings for the District, given the project would eliminate the need to bus students and it would eliminate the Thursday games. Although economic and social effect of the project may be included in the EIR, evidence of social or economic impacts that do not contribute to or are not caused by physical impacts on the environment are beyond the scope of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines 15131, PRC 21082.2(2)).
- R25-3 The commenter states that the parking opportunities on Community Avenue and Ramsdale Avenue and the Baptist Church on La Crescenta Avenue should be considered. Mitigation Measure T-1 requires preparation of an event traffic control plan, which will identify additional parking spaces at nearby vacant or underutilized parking lots. This issue is adequately addressed in the DEIR, and no changes are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R26 – Mike Allen (1 page)

R26

Resident Comment – Public Meeting

The following is a summary of verbal comments provided during the public meeting on February 17, 2021.

2/17/2021

Mike Allen

Commenter lives to the east side of the campus on Altura. Commenter states that during the last public meeting at the Sheriff's Department, they raised a comment about how people are going to enter the football field on the side of Altura Avenue. Commenter wanted to know if someone has looked into it and did not see it mentioned. The commenter is concerned because there are not sidewalks, people are parking on a fairly narrow street. If people are allowed entrance through this street, it would be a major concern for pedestrians.

R26-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R26. Response to Comments from Mike Allen, received February 17, 2021.

R26-1 The commenter questions how pedestrians would access the football field on the side of Altura Avenue. Primary pedestrian access would be provided through the main campus. The project description in the FEIR has been revised to prohibit general pedestrian access on the east side of the campus near the terminus of Altura Avenue (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the Draft EIR*). District will install an 8-foot fence at the northeast end of the track and field and will lock the existing turnstile from use. Campus access from this location would be limited to an emergency gate for fire/paramedic uses and District vehicles only, which would prohibit pedestrian access from this location and limit pedestrian and vehicle activity along Altura Avenue east of the campus. The DEIR has been updated to reflect pedestrian closure at the northeast end of the track and field (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the DEIR*). If the neighboring elementary school is used as a designated parking facility for events, patrons would access through the softball field and down from the main campus.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R27 – Jonathan Tinsman (1 page)

R27

Resident Comment – Public Meeting

The following is a summary of verbal comments provided during the public meeting on February 17, 2021.

2/17/2021

Jonathan Tinsman

Commenter appreciates receiving a copy of the EIR. Commenter states that parking is one of his biggest comments. Commenter states that the picture used to show parking in the presentation is of pre-study conditions with everything being green, but if you look at the EIR all the neighborhoods surrounding the school are red for about three blocks, believes it is after mitigation. Commenter states that this is large concern as it relates to safety, parking, and blocking driveways. Commenter inquires if this is not going to be able to be mitigated down to a lower than red status or what is going to be the plan for the district. The commenter asks if the District has looked at joining with the Baptist Church and offering to build a two-story parking structure to help with the parking for the events. This would help alleviate some of that parking by designating parking on the true status through a district paid parking structure.

R27-1

Commenter states that the comments raised by others about saving the district money and transporting costs are not a benefit to anybody except the district. Commenter states that none of the people who are going to be negatively impacted are really going to be benefiting from the saved costs on transporting students to Glendale High School and states that this is a moot point.

R27-2

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R27. Response to Comments from Jonathan Tinsman, received February 17, 2021.

- R27-1 The commenter expresses concerns regarding parking and suggests parking at the Baptist Church as a potential option to develop a parking garage. Mitigation Measure T-1 requires preparation of an event traffic control plan, which will determine additional parking spaces at nearby vacant or underutilized parking lots, including the Baptist Church. The District is not considering nor has funding for development of a parking structure at this time.
- R27-2 The commenter states that cost savings of hosting events on campus only benefits the district. Although economic and social effects of the project may be included in the EIR, evidence of social or economic impacts that do not contribute to or are not caused by physical impacts on the environment are beyond the scope of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines 15131, PRC 21082.2(2)).

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R28 – Dave Warren (1 page)



GUSD

R28

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

CVHS Field Improvement

1 message

dave warren <davcwar@yahoo.com>
To: "cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 12:25 PM

My name is Dave Warren and I live at [3033 Altura Ave.](#), just a few houses west of the high school. I have lived here for 27 years and have had one child attend CV High. I have always wondered why such an amazing sports program did not have its own facilities. Traffic, trash and parking have always been problems but the high school has always listened to us. I do not see how football games a few Fridays in the fall will change the situation. I have never attended a CV football game at Glendale High (except a few when my son was on the JV team) but I would attend them if they were at CV. I think the new facility would provide a community building opportunity.
Build it!!!

R28-1

Sincerely,

Dave Warren

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R28. Response to Comments from Dave Warren, received February 17, 2021.

R28-1 The commenter expresses general support for the proposed project. No comments are provided regarding the content or adequacy of the DEIR, and no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R29 – Alex Stupakis (1 page)



R29

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Comments

1 message

Alex Stupakis <alexstupakis@sbcglobal.net>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 2:43 PM

Placeworks did not compare the current light pollution at the field. The lights that were used before Covid on a nightly basis were light polluting, energy inefficient compared to modern lighting. R29-1

Placeworks did not compare existing parking/ traffic at home basketball games vs events like football games post permanent stands/lights. In addition, the home basketball games are on school nights and Friday nights. Football games are usually held on a Friday night, not school nights. And can't fans park using staff parking at the corner of Ramsdell and Community? Or the small lot at Community and Glenwood? Or the small lot that is on Ramsdell that has a delivery door? Or the small lot outside of the Music Building? And all the parking on the Ramsdell bridge across the 210 freeway? Or the staff parking lot off Ramsdell near Mary where the Christmas trees are picked up? And can't there be traffic cops directing traffic?? R29-2

Placeworks language was very dour and cast a negative outlook. Language like "significant unavoidable adverse impact related to aesthetics (lighting), spectator-related noise and parking". REALLY? Isn't there room for mitigation? We just have to put our heads together to come up with mitigation solutions. R29-3

More on the lighting: I think the lighting would look BETTER, more aesthetically pleasing and professional, than existing, dinosaur-era lighting that creates a less safe environment for our students and community. Again no comparison was made to the public. R29-4

I think Placeworks describing spectator-related noise as "significant unavoidable adverse impact" is way off base too! Have they been to a CV football game? They describe like it would be like crowd noise from the Rose Bowl at a UCLA football game. There may be some infrequent cheers from a limited fan base. But to describe the noise as significant...not really. AND, crowd noise is actually an ATTRACTION. When hearing crowd noise at a sporting event, it's like moths to lights... people want to join in!! Show some enthusiasm. The players certainly appreciate it!! Placeworks language gives me the impression that the noise would be CONSTANT! Aren't we talking about 5 or 6 Friday night games and other events with lesser attendance? The way Placeworks described the noise as EVERY day and constant cheering! R29-5

Thank you.

Alex Stupakis
3037 Altura Ave.
La Crescenta, CA. 91214

alexstupakis@sbcglobal.net
1 818 808 2934

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R29. Response to Comments from Alex Stupakis, received February 19, 2021.

- R29-1 The commenter indicates the DEIR should have considered the difference (presumed reduction) in lighting impacts from the temporary portable lighting fixtures that are used for certain nighttime events. The commenter is correct that the DEIR evaluated the increase in lighting impacts from the typical baseline condition, which is no lighting. The increase in lighting from no lighting presents a more conservative assessment of impacts. It is correct that the existing lights used, though shorter in height, often have more substantial light spill than the proposed modernized lights, given their old technology. However, for the purposes of determining significant impacts under CEQA, the baseline was appropriately and more conservatively considered to be no lighting.
- R29-2 The comment indicates the DEIR did not consider that there is existing parking for ongoing home games. They identify several lots that could be considered for parking for events including staff parking at Ramsdell Avenue and Community Avenue, Community Avenue and Greenwood, and others. Mitigation Measure T-1 requires preparation of an event traffic control plan, which will identify additional parking spaces at nearby vacant or underutilized parking lots. This issue is adequately addressed in the DEIR, and no changes are warranted.
- R29-3 The commenter indicates the DEIR used negative language with respect to impacts. The terminology used in the DEIR (i.e., significant and unavoidable impacts, adverse impacts, etc.) are the required terms used in the CEQA Guidelines. The DEIR incorporates mitigation measures for lighting, operational noise, and parking, which reduced impacts, but impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable. The commenter does not provide recommendations for additional mitigation measures. No further response is required.
- R29-4 The commenter expresses that they believe that the proposed project's lighting would be better and more aesthetically pleasing. The commenter states that no comparison between the existing lighting and proposed lighting was provided. Refer to response R29-1 for a discussion of the existing lighting and proposed lighting. No further response is needed.
- R29-5 The commenter disagrees with the determination that spectator-related noise would be significant and unavoidable. The commenter points out that cheering is not constant and would be limited. The commenter states that crowd noise is an attraction. As analyzed and discussed under Chapter 5.8, *Noise*, the proposed project would result in substantial periodic, operation-related noise during events. The DEIR determined that operation of the proposed project during events and games would exceed the Los Angeles County Exterior Noise Standards even with implementation of Mitigation Measure N-2. This impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable. This issue is adequately addressed in the DEIR, and no changes are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R30 – Philip Moore (Page 1 of 2)

R30

GUSD
349 West Magnolia Ave.
Glendale, CA 91204

Philip Moore
2857 Altura Ave.
La Crescenta, CA 91214

Re: Crescenta Valley Football Field Improvement Project

GUSD's plan to build a stadium will ruin the quiet neighborhood. The design calls for 6 days a week of use, Monday through Friday until 10pm and Saturdays. There's no lighting restrictions in the plan; no parking plan is in place except to use up all of the street parking available; there's no mitigation of the sound that will pummel the neighbors; there's no written plan for security which events always require; and there's no written plan to fund trash pickup. We tolerate many issues throughout the school year and generally refer to school authorities instead of involving the sheriff department when things happen out of goodwill and support of the students. That attitude will change if GUSD disrespects the neighborhood and moves forward with this project.

R30-1

Residential Zone:

La Crescenta is a quiet bedroom community and GUSD and the school board want to turn the area around Crescenta Valley high school, which is a converted middle school lot, into a busy city life and change the fundamental nature of our community. CVHS is not Glendale HS located in an urban area. CVHS is nestled in a residential area.

R30-2

Parking:

There is not enough parking in the area and the school board seems to think that street parking is readily available. The 3440 seats require a minimum of 1110 parking spots less the 250 from the school lots. There will be more cars than that required. The neighbors have shared this information with the school board from dealing with the July 4th celebrations and graduations over the years, and it has been ignored. That will require 40 blocks of neighborhood parking if only half of those spots are used by the residents. That's ridiculous!

R30-3

Light noise:

This is referred to as a bleacher improvement project, but it is a stadium conversion with stadium lights, PA systems, locker rooms, the works. I have line of sight to the football and will have four arrays of 12 1500W light bulbs shining at my house until roughly 10pm EVERY NIGHT! Instead of watching a sunset every night I get to stare at a huge light bulb. That is NOT cool.

R30-4

Sound noise:

The plan is to point the PA system away from the surrounding house. That will only mitigate a small fraction of the sound. When the drum line practices in the quad it reverberates across campus. We will be subject to multiple noise sources spread in an array across the field. Asking people to not stamp their feet is NOT a noise solution and not enforceable.

R30-5

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R30 – Philip Moore (Page 2 of 2)

Historically the school has used trees to mitigate sound at the elementary school. Trees don't do squat as anybody that lives next to the freeway can attest. The science tells us a large heavy mass will abate sound waves. GUSD will have to build a huge wall which will destroy the surrounding neighbor's house values.

R30-6

Safety:

Without a written plan for security, the home owners are left to handle security by themselves and, with traffic and parking a nightmare, any safety issues cannot be responded to quickly due to GUSD's lack of forethought and concern for their neighbors.

R30-7

The folks that are pushing this project get to go home to a quiet space, but you are taking away my right to do so. Stop this project.

The draft EIR clearly states the detrimental effects from the noise, lights and parking are "unavoidable". This is a misuse of Measure S funds that were sold to community to be used to prepare our students for their future and not for use as a glam stadium project that will ruin the quality of life for the neighbors of CVHS.

R30-8

I can not believe GUSD wants this project moving forward given the obvious technology infrastructure issues that the Covid lockdown has illuminated. Spend the Measure S funds building robust education facilities.

R30-9

Philip Moore

(818) 248-7284

2. Response to Comments

R30. Response to Comments from Philip Moore, received March 7, 2021.

R30-1 This comment serves as an introduction to the letter. The commenter expresses their opposition to the project and states that the project would ruin the neighborhood. The commenter states that there are no lighting restrictions, parking plan, mitigation for sound, written security plan, nor a written plan to fund trash pick-up. The commenter states that the neighborhood tolerates issues and generally refers issues to school authorities instead of the sheriff's department, and this would change if the project is built.

The commenter is incorrect in stating that there are no lighting restrictions. Project lighting is analyzed in Chapter 5.1, *Aesthetics*. The DEIR incorporates Mitigation Measure AE-1, which requires light shielding and that light be directed downward toward the field. Additionally, this mitigation measure requires that lighting be shut off automatically at 10:00 pm. Mitigation Measure AE-1 was further modified as part of this FEIR to require a voicemail phone number with information posted on the school website and to neighbors which can be used in the rare event lights remain on past 10:00 pm or to report any (non-emergency) incidents related to use of the field for large events (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the Draft EIR*). The District will manage and respond to all calls received (refer to response to comment R3-7). The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and no further response is warranted. Additionally, refer to response A30-4, below.

The commenter is incorrect in stating that there is no parking plan. Parking, including street parking, is analyzed in DEIR Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*. The DEIR requires Mitigation Measure T-1 prior to large events at the field, when overflow street parking occurs. This would include preparation of an event traffic control plan. This plan would require signage to be placed at locations along local streets in the vicinity, which would include Altura Avenue. Traffic officers would also be stationed at key intersections/locations to assist in alleviating illegal parking. As part of this plan, additional parking areas in the vicinity would be identified by the District, which would help reduce overflow of street parking as well. Though these measures would reduce parking-related impacts, the DEIR concludes that impacts could still remain significant and unavoidable. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no further response is warranted. Additionally, refer to response A30-3, below.

The commenter is incorrect in stating that there is no mitigation for sound. Noise is analyzed in DEIR Chapter 5.8, *Noise*, which incorporates two mitigation measures to address noise from the proposed project. Mitigation Measure N-2 specifically, addresses noise during operation of the proposed project and requires that the District implement a number of measures, including but not limited to, developing a Noise Control Plan prior to holding the first spectator event. Refer to page 5.8-19 of the DEIR for the full list of mitigation measures. Also refer to responses R30-5 and R30-6, below. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.

2. Response to Comments

The commenter states that there is no written security plan. Public safety is addressed in Chapter 5.9.2, *Police Protection*, which has been updated as part of this FEIR (see Chapter 3 of this FEIR for revisions). Refer to response R30-7, below. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.

The commenter states that there is no written plan to fund trash pick-up. As discussed in the Initial Study to the DEIR (see Appendix A), solid waste generated by the proposed project would be minimal. The public nuisance described by the comment would be addressed in accordance with applicable District practices and policies. The solid waste generated by the proposed project would be removed by waste haulers that currently serve the CVHS, and no additional funding would be needed. Solid waste generated by the proposed project would be disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations.

R30-2 The commenter states that La Crescenta is a quiet community and the project would change the nature of the community, converting the area into a busy city. The commenter states that unlike Glendale High School, CVHS is in a residential neighborhood. The entirety of the proposed project is situated within the existing District campus and is consistent with the existing land uses and activities that already occur on the project site. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.

R30-3 The commenter expresses their discontent with parking for the proposed project. The commenter states that there are not enough parking spaces, including street parking spaces, to support the proposed project. The commenter states that the project would actually result in more cars. The commenter states that the community has shared this information with the school board based on their experience with July 4th celebrations and graduations, but states that the information has been ignored.

The DEIR acknowledges that the proposed project would result in deficient parking spaces and incorporates Mitigation Measure T-1. Nevertheless, as discussed in the DEIR, the proposed project's parking impacts remain significant and unavoidable. The District will consider all comments and recommendations as part of its decision-making for this project.

R30-4 The commenter incorrectly states that the proposed project is referred to as a "bleacher improvement project." The commenter states that the project is actually a stadium conversion with lights, PA systems, locker rooms. The title of the proposed project is "Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project," which highlights that the project is not limited to bleachers. Additionally, Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of the DEIR discusses the proposed project's improvements, including but not limited to, lighting, a PA system, and a home team room. Refer to Table 1-1 in the DEIR for a project summary of field improvements.

2. Response to Comments

The commenter states that they have a line of sight of the football field and states that the field lighting will shine at their house until 10:00 pm every night. Lighting impacts to nearby sensitive receptors is addressed in Chapter 5.1, *Aesthetics*. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no further response is warranted.

- R30-5 The commenter states that the proposed project's PA systems are planned to be pointed away from the surrounding houses, and this would only mitigate a small portion of the sound. The commenter states that there will be other sources of noise associated with project operations beyond use of the PA, such as the drum line. While this is correct, the DEIR used a reasonable worst-case scenario of a full-capacity sports event at the field to assess project impacts. As detailed in the DEIR, this included not just use of the PA system but also crowd noise in the bleachers. This represents a reasonable worst-case scenario of project operational noise impacts since amplified use of the PA system would be louder than drum line practice.

The commenter states that asking people not to stomp their feet is not a solution and is not enforceable. However, this is not the only measure prescribed by Mitigation Measure N-2. In addition to signs listing prohibited activities, the District would be required to retain an acoustical consultant during the final design of the PA system to reduce noise impacts to the degree feasible through measures which may include, but are not limited to, a sound wall along the property line to the east and recommendations for the final location of speakers/light poles. Prior to the first sports field event, the PA system contractor will perform a system check to verify the spill-over noise is minimized in the adjacent community.

- R30-6 The commenter states that in the past the school has used trees to mitigate noise at the elementary school and that this is not effective mitigation for project noise impacts. The commenter states that only a wall can abate sound waves. As discussed in Response R30-5, Mitigation Measure N-2 would require the District to obtain a qualified acoustical consultant during final design of the PA system. This consultant shall prepare a report detailing recommended measures to minimize special event and game noise to the degree feasible, including but not limited to construction of a sound wall along the eastern property line and/or relocation of the speakers/poles. Therefore, the possible use of a sound wall is addressed in Mitigation Measure N-2, and no revisions to the DEIR are warranted.

The commenter also states that a wall would reduce property values. Although economic and social effects of the project may be included in the EIR, evidence of social or economic impacts that do not contribute to or are not caused by physical impacts on the environment are beyond the scope of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines 15131, PRC 21082.2(2)). This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.

2. Response to Comments

- R30-7 The commenter states that the proposed project does not have a security plan. Because of this, homeowners would be required to handle security themselves. The commenter states that due to traffic and parking, safety issues cannot be responded to quickly. Public safety is addressed in DEIR Chapter 5.9.2, *Police Protection*, which has been updated as part of this FEIR. Public nuisances would be responded to in accordance with applicable District practices and policies, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would respond to reports of illegal activities on public rights-of-way. The District currently provides security guards onsite during events and games, including private security and at least one law enforcement officer, and will continue to do so as part of the proposed project. Additionally, the proposed project would incorporate an event traffic control plan (Mitigation Measure T-1) that would require District school safety traffic control personnel to be available to direct event traffic to and from available designated parking areas and that traffic officers be stationed at the intersections to help improve traffic flow and ensure public safety during peak travel times. Incorporation of this mitigation measure would advance the flow of traffic. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.
- R30-8 The commenter expresses their opposition to the project and emphasizes that the DEIR determined that impacts related to noise, lights, and parking are unavoidable. The commenter is correct that the DEIR determined that impacts related to parking, operational-related noise, and lighting are significant and unavoidable. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and further response is not warranted.
- The commenter states that the proposed project is a misuse of Measure S funds. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.
- R30-9 The commenter states that Measure S funds should go toward building robust education facilities instead of the proposed project. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R31 – Luis Granados (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - CVHS field project



R31

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

CVHS field project

1 message

Luis Granados <lugran76@yahoo.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Tue, Feb 23, 2021 at 10:54 AM

My name is Luis Granados, I reside at 3021 Altura Ave adjacent to the school. We like our neighbors are concerned about the impact your project will have to our quality of living in the surrounding neighborhood. Even before the pandemic, our streets never ceased to have vehicle and foot traffic. Not to mention on weekends, with the soccer Mom's and weekend exercise aficionados. Our neighbors are concerned, that on any given weekend we will have the constant noise, trash, and people strolling our streets from unknown neighborhoods. The people above foothill are unconcerned about this issue, since it does not impact them? I urge GUSD to reconsider their decision before going through with this project!! Only wish I could take my home and relocated elsewhere, away from this school.

R31-1

Sent from my iPhone

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R31. Response to Comments from Luis Granados, received February 23, 2021.

R31-1 The commenter expresses their concern and opposition to the proposed project and states that the proposed project would impact their quality of life. The commenter states that the neighborhood experienced constant vehicle and foot traffic before the pandemic. The commenter lists concerns regarding noise, trash, and unknown persons strolling their neighborhood. Refer to responses to comment letter R30 for a discussion of these topics. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." Because no specific comments about the adequacy of the DEIR are provided, no further response is warranted.

The commenter asks if persons above Foothill Boulevard are concerned about the proposed project. All comments received are included in this FEIR. The commenter asks GUSD to reconsider the proposed project. The District will consider all comments and recommendations as part of its decision-making for this project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R32 – Rosemary Johnston (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - CVHS Draft EIR Response



R32

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

CVHS Draft EIR Response

1 message

Rosemary Johnston <singrosie@yahoo.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net
Cc: Joseph Johnston <hoser14@yahoo.com>

Mon, Mar 1, 2021 at 6:22 PM

To Whom it May Concern:

This email serves as my letter of concern and protest over the proposed 3,442-seat Stadium at Crescenta Valley High School.

Glendale Unified School District/CVHS is proposing a 3,442-seat stadium with 100-foot-tall light poles (draft EIR Report states the light impact cannot be mitigated), no parking plan (draft EIR Report states there is no plan for parking beyond use of local neighborhood streets), no safety plan, no traffic plan or noise abatement plan (draft EIR Report states noise levels cannot be mitigated). The project will take up to two years to complete beginning in the summer of 2022.

R32-1

With the draft EIR stating that there is no plan and no possible mitigation for several of my/our neighborhood concerns, we vigorously oppose the stadium project. My home is on every plan and photograph that shows the CVHS field: noise, light, construction. We are the immediate Altura neighbor and DIRECTLY affected with our backyard abutting the hill that currently borders the pitching dugout area. We know that the noise, which is currently loud, will be worse. We know that the lights, which already intrude in our yard, will be obnoxious on their 100 foot tall posts. We know that the parking, which already is horrendous when there are practices, competitions and events, will be unbearable - particularly since GUSD offers no additional security or oversight. Trash and vandalism will increase dramatically and those are already problems on Altura Avenue due to the walk through and traffic that exists.

The impact of this proposal on the surrounding streets, neighborhoods and businesses is huge, particularly with the well-established practice of GUSD leasing out the CVHS facilities to outside organizations. The lack of oversight by GUSD has been poor to date, with violations of sound ordinances and supposedly established hours of operation; not to mention the disregard for parking ordinances on the streets surrounding the school. There is no reason to think that a 3,442-seat stadium will not be prime rental real estate for groups beyond the CVHS Athletic and Student Life Programs with operating hours from 7am -10pm Monday – Friday and 8am-5pm on Saturday and Sunday

R32-2

CVHS was originally a junior high school and as such, is the smallest high school plant in the school district. We have lived here for 35 years; through constructions and remodeling. We have seen our driveway destroyed by truck traffic, dealt with construction noise and disruption and through it all, have supported the school in moving forward for the students and our community. It is not reasonable to ignore entire neighborhoods in planning growth. And, we, as good neighbors are willing to enter into reasonable conversation about improvements that include consideration for light, noise, parking, safety and traffic. The current plan offers no response to the very realistic concerns about practical, day-to-day realities that affect everyone who lives within a reasonable radius of the school. We will not support it.

R32-3

We hope that GUSD will be reasonable and recognize the impracticality of this proposal, looking at alternative plans and strategies for addressing the very real impact of this project on our neighborhoods. We will be glad to enter into that conversation. We are, however, prepared to continue our vigorous opposition through legal channels if it becomes necessary.

Thank you,

Rosemary Johnston
2852 Altura Avenue
La Crescenta, California 91214
singrosie@yahoo.com
818-249-7882

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiV81m0d-JKpR1Sw9fRX5xM2dHUhXUmHcF1Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 1/1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R32. Response to Comments from Rosemary Johnston, received March 1, 2021.

R32-1 The commenter states that their opposition to the proposed project. The commenter expresses their concerns over the DEIR's conclusions regarding lighting, parking, and noise. The commenter states that the proposed project does not have a safety plan nor a traffic plan. The commenter expresses their concerns regarding lighting, noise, parking, security, trash and vandalism, and states that these problems will become worse with the proposed project.

The commenter accurately explains that DEIR determined that the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to light, spectator-related noise, and parking. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." As no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.

The public nuisances related to security, trash, and vandalism would be responded to in accordance with applicable District practices and policies, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would respond to reports of illegal activities on public rights-of-way. Additionally, the District provides security guards onsite during events and games, including private security and at least one law enforcement officer, and will continue to do so as part of the proposed project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no changes to the EIR are warranted.

R32-2 The commenter states that the proposed project would result in a huge impact to surrounding streets, neighborhoods, and businesses, particularly with CVHS facilities being rented out. The commenter states that historically the District's oversight has been poor and this has led to violations of sound ordinances, parking ordinances, and hours of operation. The commenter states that the proposed project would be rented out. As discussed in Section 3.3.3, *Use and Scheduling*, of the DEIR, the proposed project may be rented to outside organizations and sporting groups consistent with the rules and regulations of the Civic Center Act through a permitting process and for a fee. Each request to use the sports field would be reviewed and approved by the District administration. The public nuisance described by the comment would be responded to in accordance with applicable District practices and policies, and/or controlled by Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and no changes to the EIR are warranted.

R32-3 The commenter explains that CVHS was originally a middle school, and they have lived next to the school for 35 years. The commenter states that through past constructions and

2. Response to Comments

remodeling efforts their driveway was destroyed by truck traffic, and they dealt with noise and disruptions. The commenter states that they have been supportive of the constructions and remodeling efforts in the past. The commenter states that they are willing to enter into reasonable conversation about improvements that include consideration for light, noise, parking, safety and traffic. The commenter states that current plans do not offer responses to real concerns that the neighborhood has. The commenter requests that GUSD look at alternative plans and strategies to address the impacts of the proposed project. The commenter expresses their opposition to the proposed project.

The commenter lists general concerns related to light, noise, parking, safety, and traffic. The DEIR evaluated two alternatives to the proposed project that may reduce environmental impacts, including a no project alternative and a bleacher and field improvements with no lighting alternative (See Chapter 7, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*). The District will consider all comments and recommendations as part of its decision-making for this project. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R33 – Dan and Julie Molina (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Principal at CVHS re: Potential Stadium impact



R33

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Principal at CVHS re: Potential Stadium impact

1 message

Molina, Dan <Dan.Molina@disney.com>

Tue, Mar 2, 2021 at 8:40 AM

To: "cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

I would respectfully suggest CVHS put the emphasis on the planning and relieving of the future onslaught of parking and litter problems with this proposed stadium. Living in harmony with your neighbors will benefit the school through future school activity support, fundraising and the neighborhood watching over the school's security (neighborhood watch).

R33-1

Respectfully,
Dan and Julie Molina
3025 Altura Ave

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiV81m0d-JKpR1Swn9fRX5xM2dHUhXUmhHcF1Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 1/1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R33. Response to Comments from Dan and Julia Molina, received March 2, 2021.

R33-1 The commenters state that CVHS should emphasize the planning and relieving of future parking and litter problems caused by the proposed project. The proposed project's impact on parking is analyzed in Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*. Mitigation Measure T-1 was incorporated to reduce the proposed project's impact on parking; nevertheless, the proposed project was found to result in a significant and unavoidable impact after implementation of the mitigation measure. Regarding litter, CVHS currently provides and will continue to provide trash cans along Ramsdell Avenue and will provide trash receptacles onsite for trash disposal. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. No further response is warranted.

The commenters state that if the school lives in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood, it would benefit the school in the future. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. No further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R34 – Maria [Last Name Missing] (1 page)

R34

Resident Comment – Phone Message

The following is a summary of comments provided to the District’s voicemail.

03/02/2021 – Maria, in response to the CVHS field improvement project, against the project, lives by the high school and thinks that it’s going to be a big problem for the neighbors when it comes to parking, lights, noise, trash, and safety all around. Not happy about this project. 818-434-3111.

R34-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R34. Response to Comments from Maria [Last Name Missing], received March 2, 2021.

R34-1 The commenter expresses general concerns related to parking, lights, noise, trash, and safety. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." As no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R35 – Talin Yeganians (Page 1 of 2)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - DEIR for Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project



R35

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

DEIR for Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project

1 message

TALIN YEGANIANS <talinnavic@gmail.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Wed, Mar 3, 2021 at 9:11 AM

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this email to brought to your attention a few logical points and the concerns that me and most of my neighbors living around CV High have regarding this project. **I know this is being pushed mostly by the people who are living way far from the school and completion of this project will not have any effect on them,** but the Board of Education and District should listen to those who will be affected the most. I attended the meeting that happened last year in CV High and I observed the followings. I will appreciate if you read all the way to the end it might be a lengthy email but, it worth to know about the facts.

R35-1

1-Parents brought up this unreasonable idea that when we bought our houses, we would know that we are buying a house next to a school.

The answer is, we bought our houses 20 years ago and this project is coming up today, the regular traffic of the school Monday to Friday 8 to 3 PM is acceptable for the neighborhood but seven days a week till 10 or 11 PM is not. My question to them why a school that designed to be a junior high with a limited land suddenly should act like a huge high school like Glendale High. If you can take some of the land from the high school and build a huge parking lot, go for it but don't count on neighbors parking spot or street parking nor the church parking lot. The great example of it is Glendale Community College (The Garfield Campus) that is buying all the house around the campus and expanding the College parking lot.

R35-2

2-The comparison and the question of why CV cannot be like Glendale High to host games

Answer is because Glendale High is designed to have a huge field and host games CV does not have parking lot it is designed and junior high. Is it fair a project be approved by counting on neighbors parking spots or church parking lot? Once my husband came home during the school hours and he was not able to park on our street, so he used the very empty parking lot of the church, but guess what after school hours when he went to move his truck found a note from church that next time do not park here. CV players parents are counting on this parking lot. I am wondering do they have any written concept or permission from church that it would be ok to park there? I just don't understand when you do not have enough parking and do not have a big facility designed for hosting games why you are pushing and putting the burden on neighbors.

The comparison of CV to Glendale High is not apple to apple and this is a fact that a person with logic will agree. This looks like as if we want to put an elephant inside a car, it cannot be fitted, there is no room, face the reality.

3- CV is located in a residential area surrounded by single homes verses Glendale High that is mostly commercial surrounded by busy streets therefore, the noise of cheering and crowd would not be an issue there, but it will be a huge inconvenience for neighbors living around the field. The lighting is another issue. Glendale High is located in a very busy neighborhood and it has been there for so long whoever is buying a house there they know what they are getting but we have bought our houses 20 years ago and we should not face this inconvenience now.

R35-3

4- Excuse that parents brough in the meeting "The parents don't want to drive to Glendale"

Please give me a break, we (the neighborhood) have to suffer because you don't want to drive 5 miles away from your home, why the neighborhood should pay the price. I have a teenager and she is active in volleyball, dancing and piano I am driving her 4 days a week to Glendale, nothing comes easy if you want your kids to be successful you have to pay the price not people living next to CV field, they don't have to suffer 7days a week till **10 or 11 PM who knows maybe 12 AM.**

R35-4

5- The safety of the neighborhood.

The suggested hours for the field to be open is even worst than actual project. Seven days a week till 10 PM and then after 10 PM kids might want to hang around maybe till 12 AM on the surrounding streets would be disaster. Have you ever questioned what will happen to the safety of the neighbors??? Kids may want to hang out or some will be angry that they lost the game and will be involved in **fights or even worse do vandalism**, we hear once in a while what is happening in Dodgers Stadium so it is not far from reality. These are things that definitely parents cannot have control over it and this

R35-5

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiV81m0d-JKpR1Swn9FRX5xM2dHUhXUmhHcF1Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 1/2

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R35 – Talin Yeganians (Page 2 of 2)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - DEIR for Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project

would be an issue. Neighbors might be calling the police department every single night for issues like this and this will be another burden for police department too.

By considering the above facts, I am hoping that you will make the right decision to keep our neighborhood safe and quiet by not approving this project and we will continue welcoming our dear CV students to our neighborhood as we did before in spite of trash and noise Monday to Friday. I know they are very anxious to start this project but, someone needs to explain to them and ask them to see it from our point of view.

R35-5
cont'd

Best regards,

Talin Yeganians

(818)269-9414

2. Response to Comments

R35. Response to Comments from Talin Yeganians, received March 3, 2021.¹

- R35-1 The commenter states that the proposed project is mainly being pushed by people who do not live near the school and would not be affected the proposed project. The commenter states that the Board of Education and the District should listen to the people who will be affected most. The commenter states that they disagree with the argument brought up by parents that they should have been aware of the consequences of buying a property near a school. The District will consider all comments and recommendations as part of its decision-making for this project, including both comments raised by parents and nearby residents. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and further response is not warranted.
- R35-2 The commenter describes existing parking limitations experienced by residents and explains why CVHS should not host games. The commenter asks if CVHS player parents have permission to park at the church. The commenter states that the proposed project would create a burden for the neighbors. The proposed project's impacts on parking is analyzed in Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*, of the DEIR. The DEIR identified mitigation measure T-1, which would require the implementation of a traffic control plan for large events; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The event traffic control plan, which will identify available parking off-street areas that can be secured and/or leased by the District during capacity events. If the securing of additional off-street parking supplies such as at the Community Life Church is feasible, as recommended in the parking analysis, the parking demand on on-street areas and associated effects—including vehicles traveling to and from on-street parking areas—could be reduced. The DEIR properly discloses the proposed project's impact on parking, and no changes to the DEIR are warranted.
- R35-3 The commenter disagrees with the comparison between CVHS and Glendale High School. The commenter states that noise and lighting concerns caused by the proposed project are not comparable to Glendale High School. The commenter reiterates that they could not have foreseen the proposed project when they bought their house 20 years ago. The DEIR states that the proposed project would allow for the relocations of CVHS sporting events, currently held at Glendale High School, to the project site. The DEIR does not compare the proposed project to Glendale High School. The DEIR evaluates the proposed project's impacts related to noise and lighting in Chapters 5.8, *Noise*, and 5.1, *Aesthetics*, respectively. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and further response is not warranted.
- R35-4 The commenter disagrees with arguments that parents brought up during the scoping meeting, including that they do not want to drive to Glendale. The commenter states that the proposed project would cause them to suffer to up to 12:00 am. The proposed project

¹ Duplicate letter received March 27, 2021.

2. Response to Comments

would have hours of operation to 10:00 pm and would not extend to 12:00 am (refer to Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of the DEIR). This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and further response is not warranted.

- R35-5 The commenter states that while the proposed project would close at 10:00 pm, event goers would hang out in the neighborhood much later. The commenter states that this poses a safety concern, including fights and vandalism. The commenter states that this would be a burden on the police department. The commenter requests that the project be denied. Public safety is addressed in DEIR Chapter 5.9.2, *Police Protection*, which has been updated as part of this FEIR. Public nuisances would be responded to in accordance with applicable District practices and policies, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would respond to reports of illegal activities on public rights-of-way. Additionally, the District provides security guards onsite during events and games, including private security and at least one law enforcement officer, and will continue to do so as part of the proposed project. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and further response is not warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R36 – Rob Skinnell (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Stadium objection



R36

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Stadium objection

1 message

Rob Skinnell <robskinnell49@gmail.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Fri, Mar 5, 2021 at 1:43 PM

I am writing yet again to express my extreme disapproval and objection to the proposed CVHS stadium project. For 35 years we have lived a few doors west of Ramsdell Avenue on Altura Avenue, and we have experienced first hand the dilatory and frustrating effects of a campus which has, over the years, become more and more of a community activity center. Every year, the trash and traffic we must endure gets worse and worse, including multiple instances of people from outside the neighborhood parking across our driveway in order to attend events at the school. If this stadium project goes through, anyone who believes these problems will not become even more severe is seriously ignorant of reality. Add to that the diminished quality of life we will experience due to light pollution from 100-foot high field lights, and greatly increased noise pollution, and you have a recipe for very angry neighbors. Then there is also the problem of events which will start and end at all hours, plus the potential for vandalism from people outside the community who have no vested interest in refraining from such behavior. If this project goes through, I can only imagine the very severe reduction in property values those of us who live in the area will suffer. If that happens, legal action may be our only recourse.

R36-1

R36-2

Along with several neighbors, I attended the public forum about this which was held at the high school a few months before the Covid-19 quarantine went into effect. That was an exercise in futility, because it was quite apparent from the start that this was nothing more than a publicity stunt; that the decision to proceed with this project was already a pre-determined fact, and that no one in charge was serious about the concerns of the surrounding residents.

R36-3

PLEASE, STOP THIS PROJECT!

Sincerely,
Robert Skinnell

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R36. Response to Comments from Rob Skinnell, received March 5, 2021

R36-1 The commenter expresses their disapproval of the proposed project. The commenter states that trash and traffic get worse every year. The commenter states that people have parked across their driveway. The commenter states that the proposed project would make these problems worse. The public nuisance described by the comment would be responded to in accordance with applicable District practices and policies, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would respond to reports of illegal activities on public rights-of-way. The District provides security guards onsite during events and games, including private security and at least one law enforcement officer, and will continue to do so as part of the proposed project. Additionally, Mitigation Measure T-1 would include an event traffic control plan that would assess the need for traffic officers to be stationed at key intersections/locations to assist in alleviating illegal parking.

R36-2 The commenter expresses concerns related to light and noise pollution. The commenter states that events would start and end at all hours. The commenter expresses concern about vandalism and reduction of property values.

The proposed project's impacts related to light and noise are analyzed and discussed in EIR Chapters 5.1, *Aesthetics*, and 5.8, *Noise*, respectively. These sections properly disclose that the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to light and spectator-related noise (see Impacts 5.1-2 and 5.8-2, respectively). No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." As no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.

The proposed project's hours of operation are discussed in Chapter 3, *Project Description*. The proposed hours of operation are 7:00 am to 10:00 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 10:00 pm on Saturday (see page 3-9 of the DEIR and refer to Section 3.3.3, *Use and Scheduling*). The DEIR adequately discusses the operation and use of the proposed project, and no changes to the EIR are warranted.

With regard to vandalism, illegal activities would be controlled and responded to in accordance with applicable District practices and policies if occurring on District property and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department if occurring outside of District property. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and no changes to the EIR are warranted. The commenter's concern about property values points to an economic-related effect. Although economic and social effect of the project may be included in the EIR, evidence of social or economic impacts that do not contribute to or

2. Response to Comments

are not caused by physical impacts on the environment are beyond the scope of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines 15131, PRC 21082.2(2)). This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and further response is not warranted.

- R36-3 The commenter states that they attended the public meeting about the proposed project before the pandemic started. The commenter states that public meeting was a publicity stunt and no one in charge were serious about community concerns. The commenter expresses their disapproval of the proposed project. All comments received during the scoping meeting held on March 5, 2020, at CVHS and during the public comment period were reviewed and considered for the preparation of the DEIR. The District will consider all comments and recommendations as part of its decision-making for this project. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R37 –Alex Stupakis (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - CVHS Stands and Lights



R37

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

CVHS Stands and Lights

1 message

Alex Stupakis <alexstupakis@sbcglobal.net>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Fri, Mar 5, 2021 at 10:48 AM

I am a huge proponent of the Improvement Project! I live at 3037 Altura Ave, a half block from the school. My phone number is 818-808-2934

R37-1

My deep concern and regret is the words used, in a horribly negative light, in the "project description" and the "environmental determination".

In "project description", no explanation of HOW MUCH PARKING IS AVAILABLE AND COULD BE AVAILABLE FOR EVENTS AT THE FIELD. "No change in existing site access or provided parking would occur" is a sentence that promotes some type of explanation of facts. There is no mention of available parking in and around the school. The explanation may have mitigated neighbors concerns about parking!

R37-2

Also, in "Environmental Description" the sentence "THE DEIR ANALYSIS DETERMINED THAT THE PROPOSED PROJCT WOULD RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACT RELATED TO AESTHETICS (LIGHTING), SPECTATOR-RELATED NOISE, AND PARKING".

R37-3

REALLY? It seems to me that the modern lighting would be more aesthetically pleasing than old, out-of-date lighting currently used!

And spectator-related noise? Come on, this isn't going to be a UCLA football game at the Rose Bowl. Very infrequently are there spectator -related noise at games. Football games would be lucky to have 1,400 in attendance. I held the chains/was part of the chain gang at football games during the 2019 championship season. There was very rarely loud cheering at games! The coaches very easily could talk to the players on the field.

R37-4

Of course, the damage is done. How the notice was written was, in my opinion, poorly and was very negatively presented to us neighbors. It's almost like you want this project to fail!!

R37-5

I feel the benefits to the school like cost reduction, better use of time, no Thursday games, etc far outweigh the minimal problems which can be addressed and mitigated.

These IMPROVEMENTS are LONG OVERDUE AND NECESSARY FOR OUR SCHOOL, OUR STUDENTS AND OUR COMMUNITY. IN THE LONG RUN THESE IMPROVEMENTS WILL HELP MAINTAIN THE VIABILITY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS LIVING IN LA CRESCENTA.

Thank you.

Alex Stupakis
alexstupakis@sbcglobal.net

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiV81m0d-JKpR1Swn9fRX5xM2dHUhXUmhHcF1Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 1/1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R37. Response to Comments from Alex Stupakis, received March 5, 2021.

- R37-1 The commenter expresses their support for the proposed project. The commenter states that they disagree with the word usages that put the proposed project in a negative light. The terminology to determine the significance of environmental impacts is consistent with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.
- R37-2 The commenter states that the project description does not explain the quantity of available parking that could be available for events. The commenter states that such an explanation could appease concerns raised by neighbors about parking. Chapter 3, *Project Description*, provides an overview of available parking for the proposed project. Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*, provides a thorough discussion of parking availability, including a parking analysis (which is included in the Traffic Study, DEIR Appendix F). Section 5.10.1.2, *Existing Roadway Network*, provides the quantity of available existing parking spaces. Mitigation Measure T-1 requires preparation of an event traffic control plan, which shall determine additional parking spaces at nearby vacant or underutilized parking lots and require that District school safety traffic control personnel be available to direct event traffic to and from available designated parking areas. The DEIR adequately addresses existing parking, and no further response is required.
- R37-3 The commenter accurately quotes the last sentence from the “Environmental Description” section of the notice of availability (NOA), presumably regarding significant and unavoidable lighting impacts. The commenter disagrees with this statement and states that modern lighting would be more aesthetically pleasing than the existing lighting. See response to comment R25-1, provided by the same commenter. The DEIR adequately analyses light trespass, and no further response is required.
- R37-4 The commenter disagrees that spectator-related noise would result in a significant and unavoidable impact. The commenter states that spectator noise at games is infrequent, and games would be lucky to have 1,400 in attendance. The commenter states that loud cheering is very rare. Refer to comment R29-5 for a discussion of spectator noise. This issue is adequately addressed in the DEIR, and no changes are warranted.
- R37-5 The commenter states that the NOA was poorly written and was very negative. The NOA is a document required by CEQA, and the content of the NOA is set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(c). The NOA includes the required information and adequately discloses and summarizes the project description and main determinations of the proposed project, using the appropriate terminology. The commenter believes that the benefits that the proposed project would bring to the school—such as cost reduction, better use of time, and Thursday games—far outweigh its impacts. The commenter states that these improvements are long overdue and necessary. Although economic and social effect of the project may be included in the EIR, evidence of social or economic impacts that do not contribute to or are not caused by physical impacts on the environment are

2. Response to Comments

beyond the scope of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines 15131, PRC 21082.2(2)). This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R38– Tab Artis (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - CVHS School Improvement Project



R38

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

CVHS School Improvement Project

1 message

Tab Artis <tab@artislawfirm.com>

Fri, Mar 5, 2021 at 2:07 PM

To: "cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Cc: Christine Artis <christine@artislawfirm.com>, Madison Artis <madisonartis17@gmail.com>, Dane Artis <dane@artislawfirm.com>, Caitlin Artis <caitlin@artislawfirm.com>, Jade Jones <armywifedjones@gmail.com>

Dear GUSD:

I email you to make my voice heard regarding the proposed 3,442 seat stadium on the CV campus.

I have been a resident of La Crescenta for 56 years and presently live on Altura Avenue two blocks from the present CV field. I am a CV Grad, my wife is a CV Grad, and my four children are all CV Grads. My two youngest children were each 4 year members of the CVHS Marching Band, one of whom was the Drum Major his Senior year. My two older children were both 4-year participants in CV Sports programs.

R38-1

Please advised that I support the proposed project without any reservation. I am aware of the concerns expressed by some residents. It is my position that any negatives of this project are far outweighed by the benefits to the numerous CV Sports programs, to the CV Falcons Marching Band, and the entire La Crescenta community.

Sincerely,

Tab Artis, Esq.

The Artis Law Firm

A Professional Law Corporation

450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 600

Glendale, California 91203

(818) 532-5599

www.artislawfirm.com



The information contained in this e-mail message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient(s) named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and/or work product and as such is privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message.

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiV81m0d-JKpR1Swn9FRX5xM2dHUhXUmhHcF1Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 1/2

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R38. Response to Comments from Tab Artis, received March 5, 2021.

R38-1 The commenter describes their relationship with CVHS and states their support for the proposed project. The commenter does not raise comments related to the DEIR, and no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R39 – Hovsep Barseghian (1 page)

R39

Resident Comment – Phone Message

The following is a summary of comments provided to the District’s voicemail.

03/06/2021 – Hovsep Barseghian. Commenter called regarding the notice of availability of EIR. Commenter states that they gave opinion before and still it is the same. The commenter is opposed to this project. 818-471-7752.

R39-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R39. Response to Comments from Hovsep Barseghian, received March 6, 2021.

R39-1 The commenter indicates that they have previously given their opinion on the project. The commenter is opposed to the project. The commenter does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and further response is not warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R40 – Joseph Johnston (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - (no subject)



R40

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

(no subject)

1 message

Joseph Johnston <hoser14@yahoo.com>

Sun, Mar 7, 2021 at 7:38 PM

To: "cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

To whom it may concern,

I hope that letter greeting I just wrote has some meaning. I'm not completely convinced that the Glendale School Board cares about what the people that live in the neighborhood of CV High School think or what our concerns might be. This letter to you wouldn't be necessary if you did have any concern. My opinion has been influenced by the Glendale Board's recent past decisions.

R40-1

The prime example would be the La Crescenta Elementry building that was built a few years ago. That buiding was erected with absolutely no notice whatsoever. The lack of adequate notice afforded the construction to proceed without any objection. Consequently the people who live on the 2800 block of Altura Avenue lost their view of the beautiful San Gabriel Mountain Range for good. The Glendale Board did this without a care and now we are confronted with a much more disruptive situation. This project will affect every aspect of our homes and neighborhood. Additional noise from football games both Friday and Saturday night. Oh, I know it's said that only CV High will play their home games at the proposed stadium, but anyone with a brain knows that is a load of fresh baloney. The Glendale School Board will rent that field out to every school that needs a field, such as Loyola High rented Moyses Field for many years. Otrusive lights 6 days a week 100 ft. light standards. This idea is absolutely ridiculous.

R40-2

R40-3

Have your field designers thought at all about what these lights might do to the surrounding neighborhood? You might as well build a gigantic burger joint at the end of our street. Pedestrian traffic will be relentless. People walking down the middle of our narrow street all day long and into the evening six days a week. Rude people blocking our driveways and leaving their cars for hours on end. Irresponsible teenage drivers racing up and down the street. The litter left by people before and after games. Who's going to pick up the trash? The stadium won't be emptied out until after 10 pm, six days a week. The lights will have to remain on well past 10 pm so the clean-up crews can do their work. This notion of light out 10 pm is so much baloney. We are expected to just put up with this travesty.

R40-4

R40-5

The prime argument I hear from the people that want this stadium is that "we should have thought of this eventuality when we bought our home". How ludicrous! The Glendale School Board should have posted a notice stating they can do anything we want no matter the consequences or who will be affected. What is the School Board to do about the likelihood of the increase in crime and vandalism involving not only CV students but also visiting patrons from other parts of Southern California? The LA County Sheriffs have been less than adequate in the past. The two examples I can site are the CV Graduation Day and the 4th of July fireworks. They simply do not respond when called upon and they don't provide a reason. Highschool football games can be highly charged emotional affairs. My wife and I bought our home 35 years ago. We have had a nice relationship with CV High. Are we expected now to just surrender our peaceful existence for a real stupid idea? I'm a retired Hollywood sound man and know more about sound than your EIR experts. Crowd idles, excited cheering, disappointed boos all create a very loud disruptive noise. Certainly not suitable for a quiet bedroom community.

R40-6

R40-7

If you people insist on inflicting this crazy idea on us, you better plan on a very tall sound wall at the East end of the field. At least 25 ft. I am absolutely positive that if one of you board members lived in this neighborhood you would never accept this idea. Please consider our little quiet neighborhood. You will be destroying it. It occurred to me that the Glendale School Board knew that there would be a vigorous, negative response. So with that in mind, you all thought you'd just pare down the physical dimensions to quell the angry neighborhood. Such as the grandstand capacity will be smaller. That idea won't work either. That would leave more people without a place to sit. More meandering and causing mischief. We don't want any of this and will obtain legal counsel should this project progress further.

R40-8

One thing I do know for sure is that if CV fields a lousy team, only the parents will show up at the game. That will be a slice of Heaven .

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Johnston

P.S. Dump the CV principal. She's no good. She's not forthright. She doesn't put Glendale Schools in the best light.

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiV81m0d-JkPR1Swn9FRX5xM2dUHhXUmhHcF1Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 1/2

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R40. Response to Comments from Joseph Johnston, received March 7, 2021.

- R40-1 This comment serves as an introduction to the letter and the commenter's position on the proposed project. The commenter does not think that the Glendale School Board cares about its neighbors and points to the construction of La Crescenta Elementary School as an example. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no further response is warranted.
- R40-2 The commenter states that the proposed project would affect every aspect of their homes and neighborhood. The commenter states that the proposed project would cause noise from football games on Friday and Saturday nights. The commenter states that the School Board will rent out the field to every school that needs a field. Noise caused by the proposed project, including noise generated by football games, is analyzed in DEIR Chapter 5.8, *Noise*. Additionally, DEIR Chapter 3, *Project Description*, states that the proposed project would be used by the CVHS, outside sporting groups (as permitted by CVHS), and the public under the rules and regulations of the Civic Center Act through a permitting process and for a fee. The commenter does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and further response is not warranted.
- R40-3 The commenter expresses their dislike of the proposed project's lighting. An analysis of impacts related to lighting, including the identification of mitigation measures, is included in Chapter 5.1, *Aesthetics*. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and further response is not warranted.
- R40-4 The commenter states that pedestrian traffic would be relentless. The commenter states that people walk down the middle of the street, block driveways, and race up and down the street. The commenter states that people litter before and after the games. The public nuisance described by the comment would be responded to in accordance with applicable District practices and policies, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would respond to reports of illegal activities on public rights-of-way. Additionally, the District provides security guards onsite during events and games, including private security and at least one law enforcement officer, and will continue to do so as part of the proposed project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no changes to the EIR are warranted.
- R40-5 The commenter expresses concerns about the lighting staying on past 10:00 pm. As discussed in Mitigation Measure AE-1 (as modified as part of the FEIR), the proposed project lighting would automatically shut off at 10:00 pm. Additionally, the District would provide a voicemail phone number to call in the event lights remain on past 10:00 pm, or to report any (non-emergency) incidents related to use of the field for large events. The District will manage and respond to all calls received. The proposed project's impacts related to lighting is analyzed in Chapter 5.1, *Aesthetics*. As disclosed, the proposed project's light-related impacts would result in a significant and unavoidable impact after

2. Response to Comments

incorporation of Mitigation Measure AE-1. The DEIR adequately discloses potential impacts to adjacent residences from lighting. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of this topic have been provided by the commenter. No further response is required.

R40-6 The commenter disagrees with the claim that they should have considered the project when they purchased their home. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no further response is required. The commenter also states that the proposed project would increase public safety concerns and vandalism. The commenter states that the LA County Sheriff's Department has provided inadequate response in the past. Public safety is addressed in DEIR Chapter 5.9, *Public Services*, which has been updated as part of this FEIR. The comment does not address the adequacy of analysis contained the DEIR. Therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

R40-7 The commenter states that they are a retired Hollywood sound man and know more about sound than the EIR experts. The commenter further states that crowd noise will be very loud and disruptive. Crowd noise and PA system noise were modeled using the SoundPLAN model, as explained in the DEIR, which is an industry-standard software program for noise modeling and sound propagation. The DEIR finds that project operational noise related to events at the field would remain significant and unavoidable even with all feasible mitigation implemented.

The commenter requests a 25-foot sound wall at the project eastern boundary. Per Mitigation Measure N-2, the District would be required to retain an acoustical consultant during the final design of the PA system to reduce noise impacts to the degree feasible through measures that may include but are not limited to a sound wall along the property line to the east and recommendations for the final location of speakers/light poles. Prior to the first sports field event, the PA system contractor will perform a system check to verify that spill-over noise is minimized in the adjacent community. The comment does not address the adequacy of analysis contained the DEIR. Therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

R40-8 The commenter states that the Glendale School Board knew that there would be opposition to the proposed project and pared down the physical dimensions to quell angry neighbors. The commenter states that the grandstand capacity will be smaller and would not give persons a place to sit, which would lead to more meandering and mischief. As discussed in the DEIR, the proposed project would provide a bleacher capacity of 3,442 seats, which is sufficient capacity to accommodate spectators. The comment expresses general opposition to the project and does not address the adequacy of analysis contained the DEIR. Therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R41 – Bridgit Johnston (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project - Commentary



R41

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project - Commentary

1 message

Bridgit Johnston <bridgitjohnston@gmail.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Sun, Mar 7, 2021 at 8:02 PM

Hi all,

This letter is regarding the proposed 3,442-seat Stadium at Crescenta Valley High School and my opposition to it. The most recent developments within the draft EIR highlight the very real impacts and impositions this poses to the neighborhood surrounding CVHS.

- 1. 100 foot tall light poles - stated that no mitigation possible | R41-1
- 2. No additional parking structure or transportation (buses with remote parking lots, etc.) - all provided event parking is street parking, no plans to mitigate | R41-2
- 3. No safety plan or security - no plans to mitigate | R41-3
- 4. No traffic planning or control - no plans to mitigate | R41-4
- 5. Noise levels - stated that no mitigation possible | R41-5
- 6. No oversight of current track/field usage | R41-6

CVHS leadership has shown no regard for any of the real concerns that neighbors have expressed. Parking, trash and noise are just a few of the current issues that CVHS has refused to address. I have been privileged enough to grow up in this beautiful neighborhood and graduate from CVHS. Over the years, I have seen how the lack of initiative and care from GUSD and CVHS leadership has deeply corroded any supposed 'good neighbor policy' that was in place. Currently, parking is already a nightmare, pedestrians walking on our street are at risk because there are no sidewalks nor is the street wide enough to handle more than a single lane of traffic when cars are parked on both sides of the street and there is no accountability for trash or safety. | R41-7

Our home was purchased by my family knowing that we were in proximity to two schools. We have embraced and weathered any new (reasonable) changes that have been presented. We are not opposed to planning that will truly enrich a learning environment for ALL students, we are opposed to a poorly planned glamour project that is ill-fitting of the smallest property within GUSD. That school was built as a junior high school and there are PLENTY of imperative infrastructure improvements needed before this multi-million dollar monstrosity.

GUSD in partnership with CVHS have a Monday-Friday 7 am - 10 pm, Saturday and Sunday 8 am - 5 pm schedule planned for the field. We know this is not going to be adhered to, as it already isn't adhered to. We know that the CVHS football games will not be the only large events taking place there because GUSD will rent it out to other schools and leagues to use for their large events as well. This is putting an unreasonable strain on our livelihood and the ability to live with some semblance of peace. | R41-8

As of now, there has been no effort put forth by CVHS or GUSD to address any of the current issues, let alone the magnified problems this stadium will bring with it. We insist that our very real concerns be addressed by the district before this project progresses any further. Legal counsel will be obtained should it become necessary.

--
Bridgit R Johnston
bridgitjohnston@gmail.com
mobile 818.321.5495

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R41. Response to Comments from Bridgit Johnston, received March 7, 2021.

R41-1 The commenter states their opposition to the proposed project. They reference the 100-foot-tall light poles that are proposed and state no mitigation is possible. However, the DEIR includes Mitigation Measure AE-1, which would require shielding and directing of lighting, and automatic shutoff of lights at 10:00 pm. Even though this mitigation is a requirement of the project, lighting levels would still exceed thresholds, and impacts would remain significant. The DEIR adequately discloses the potential impacts and mitigation measures.

R41-2 The commenter states no additional parking structure or transportation is provided, and that all parking is street parking. They incorrectly state that no mitigation is included. Mitigation Measure T-1 requires preparation of an event traffic control plan. The plan shall determine additional parking spaces at nearby vacant or underutilized parking lots and require that District school safety traffic control personnel be available to direct event traffic to and from available designated parking areas. The DEIR adequately discloses the potential impacts and mitigation measures.

R41-3 The commenter states there is no safety or security plan, and no plans to mitigate impacts. The threshold for determining significant environmental effects in the DEIR is as follows (as stated on page 5.9-6 of the DEIR):

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if the project would:

PP-1 Result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection services.

The DEIR has also been updated to reflect the ongoing coordination with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (see response to comment A2-2 and Chapter 3, *Revisions to the DEIR*).

R41-4 The commenter states there is no traffic planning or control. They incorrectly state no mitigation is included. Mitigation Measure T-1 requires preparation of an event traffic control plan. The plan shall determine additional parking spaces at nearby vacant or underutilized parking lots and require that District school safety traffic control personnel be available to direct event traffic to and from available designated parking areas. The DEIR adequately discloses the potential impacts and mitigation measures. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

- R41-5 The commenter states no mitigation is possible for noise. Mitigation Measure N-2 requires the District to retain an acoustical consultant during the final design of the PA system to reduce noise to the degree feasible, including but not limited to the construction of a sound wall along the eastern property line and relocation of the speakers/poles closer to the bleachers. This measure would reduce noise-related impacts to the extent feasible. However, in order to be conservative, the DEIR concludes that impacts would remain significant. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be “on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated.” As no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.
- R41-6 The commenter states that there is no oversight of the current track/field usage. This comment does not address the project as described in the DEIR or the adequacy of the DEIR. Therefore, no changes to the DEIR are warranted.
- R41-7 The commenter expresses ongoing (pre-project) concerns regarding school/neighborhood issues, including trash, noise, parking, and safety. The commenter indicates the project site was intended for use as a middle school. These comments have been reviewed by the District as part of the decision-making process for the proposed project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.
- R41-8 The commenter believes the proposed use schedule for the field will not be adhered to and reiterates neighborhood concerns about ongoing activities. These comments have been reviewed by the District as part of the decision-making process for the proposed project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R42 – Matt Tanaka (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - CVHS Stadium Development Concerns



R42

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

CVHS Stadium Development Concerns

1 message

mtanaka@mktgraphics.com <mtanaka@mktgraphics.com>
To: "cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Sun, Mar 7, 2021 at 8:54 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

I live at 3041 Evelyn Street and the new stadium will have a strong negative impact on my home and our neighbors' homes. Although we understand the desire for a stadium at Crescenta Valley High School, there are not answers to several critical community concerns:

R42-1

1. Parking – The study examines a best-case scenario with ride-sharing, less than capacity attendance, and an extremely low number of 'home' games. It was indicated that additional parking may happen at the community church, there is no plan to help with the parking issues on the streets around the high school.
2. Traffic control – The study does not examine all of the immediate streets around CVHS, including the width of those streets, lighting, sidewalks, etc. The traffic study happened during the pandemic and is not truly representative of more 'normal' traffic .
3. Pedestrian traffic – With the additional traffic, pedestrians are at higher risk, as there is often jaywalking on all streets.
4. Additional stadium uses – The study only mentions the 'few' home games that will occur, but the additional impact of other sports, external stadium rental/usage is not completely understood.
5. Light and noise pollution AND trash around the neighborhood.

R42-2

R42-3

R42-4

R42-5

It was my understanding that the Environmental Impact Report would be completed before any actions to move forward. There are several gaps in the study that are major concerns such as the impact on traffic AND parking on ALL streets around CV. During the pandemic a true traffic study is not realistic nor representative of what would exist. Additionally, there is not any indication on what the other days/nights usage will be and how often.

R42-6

In order for the local community to support this development, it is critical for these items to be answered PRIOR to moving forward with the stadium. A solid mitigation plan for each of these concerns would help reduce the stress of the unknown. There is no guarantee that ANY of these issues would be addressed if the stadium is approved without these plans in place. I would appreciate a response to the above items, how they will be addressed, and the associated mitigation plans.

R42-7

A concerned community member,

Matt Tanaka

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R42. Response to Comments from Matt Tanaka, received March 7, 2021.

- R42-1 The first paragraph serves an introduction to the comment letter. The commenter indicates that the proposed project would have a negative impact on their home and neighbors' homes. The commenter raises concerns about parking and states that there is no plan to help with parking issues on streets around the high school. The parking analysis did not assume more than 236 spaces would be available in off-street parking lots, including the main school lot, and therefore provided a conservative effects analysis. The project parking analysis (in Appendix F to the DEIR) assumed what was estimated to be typical aspects of arriving spectators of major events at the facility, including average passengers per vehicle and percentage split for automobile trips out of total trips. The analysis assumed an at-capacity event in order to provide a conservative analysis, which is expected to occur only during certain varsity games and championship games. The District will implement an event traffic control plan (Mitigation Measure T-1), which will include available parking off-street areas that can be secured and/or leased by the District during capacity events. No further response is warranted.
- R42-2 The commenter states that the traffic study did not examine all of the immediate streets around CVHS, including the width of those streets, lighting, sidewalks, etc. The commenter states that the traffic study occurred during the pandemic and does not capture normal traffic. The commenter does not provide suggestion for specific streets that should have been included in the study. The parking study assumed that on-street parking could occur where it is permitted now under existing parking regulations. Access to and from neighborhoods on expected routes to and from the school site and local parking areas were examined at the study intersection locations. The traffic and parking data was collected in March of 2019, prior to restrictions implemented in March of 2020 in response to the COVID pandemic. No further response is required.
- R42-3 The commenter states that pedestrians would be at higher risk due to additional traffic and jaywalking. Pedestrian routes to and from the campus were reviewed in the documentation of existing conditions, including the presence of striped and signed crosswalks and/or signalized crossing locations at intersections on major roadways. No lack of crosswalks or controlled locations was identified, and no changes to the DEIR are warranted.
- R42-4 The commenter states that the study only mentions a "few" home games and that additional impacts of other sporting events and external stadium usage is not completely understood. Section 3.3.3, *Use and Scheduling*, discusses the proposed uses that would occur at the proposed project. Refer to Table 3-2 in the DEIR for an outline of the events, number of events, days of the week, time, number of spectators, number of participants, and use of outdoor lighting. The proposed project would allow football-related events at CVHS. All other events currently occur at CVHS, and the proposed project would not change these events. No changes to the DEIR and no further response are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

- R42-5 The commenter lists general concerns regarding light, noise, and trash. Refer to responses to Letter R30 for a discussion of these topics. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." Because no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.
- R42-6 The commenter states that there are several gaps in the EIR, including traffic and parking. The commenter reiterates that the traffic study is unrealistic and not representative of existing conditions; however, no specific lack of information or incorrect information is identified by the commenter (see also response to comment R42-1 and R42-2, above). The commenter reiterates that information on usage is lacking; see response to comment R42-4, above. The commenter is correct that the CEQA process for the proposed project must be complete before the proposed project can be constructed.
- R42-7 This comment serves as a conclusion to the comment letter. The commenter states that the issues that they raised need to be addressed prior to the project moving forward. The commenter requests a mitigation plan for each of their concerns.

As part of the District's potential approval of the project, they would adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, which requires that all identified mitigation measures be implemented and followed. A summary of identified mitigation measures, including mitigation measures related to light, noise, and transportation, is provided in Table 1-2 of the DEIR. Additionally, each mitigation measure is discussed in its appropriate section. The commenter does not provide specific comments on the identified mitigation measures. No further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R43 – Ali Cooper (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Proposed stadium



R43

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Proposed stadium

1 message

Ali Cooper <allisonleecooper@gmail.com>
To: CVHSfield@gusd.net

Sun, Mar 7, 2021 at 9:01 PM

While I concur with my husbands letter there is a problem specific to our street. Evelyn is a very narrow street. When cars are parked on both sides of the street, as is typical on school days, it is impossible for two cars to pass. This creates a real safety issue, particularly in the event of an emergency, it would be impassable for an emergency vehicle.

Thank you,
Allison Cooper

R43-1

To Whom It May Concern:

I live at 3041 Evelyn Street and the new stadium will have a strong negative impact on my home and our neighbors' homes. Although we understand the desire for a stadium at Crescenta Valley High School, there are not answers to several critical community concerns:

1. Parking – The study examines a best-case scenario with ride-sharing, less than capacity attendance, and an extremely low number of 'home' games. It was indicated that additional parking may happen at the community church, there is no plan to help with the parking issues on the streets around the high school.
2. Traffic control – The study does not examine all of the immediate streets around CVHS, including the width of those streets, lighting, sidewalks, etc. The traffic study happened during the pandemic and is not truly representative of more 'normal' traffic .
3. Pedestrian traffic – With the additional traffic, pedestrians are at higher risk, as there is often jaywalking on all streets.
4. Additional stadium uses – The study only mentions the 'few' home games that will occur, but the additional impact of other sports, external stadium rental/usage is not completely understood.
5. Light and noise pollution AND trash around the neighborhood.

It was my understanding that the Environmental Impact Report would be completed before any actions to move forward. There are several gaps in the study that are major concerns such as the impact on traffic AND parking on ALL streets around CV. During the pandemic a true traffic study is not realistic nor representative of what would exist. Additionally, there is not any indication on what the other days/nights usage will be and how often.

In order for the local community to support this development, it is critical for these items to be answered PRIOR to moving forward with the stadium. A solid mitigation plan for each of these concerns would help reduce the stress of the unknown. There is no guarantee that ANY of these issues would be addressed if the stadium is approved without these plans in place.

A concerned community member,
Matthew Tanaka

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiv81m0d-JKpR1Swn9fRX5xM2dHUhXUmhHcF11Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 1/1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R43. Response to Comments from Ali Cooper, received March 7, 2021.

R43-1 The commenter forwards Matthew Tanaka's comment letter (included as letter R42 in this FEIR) and states that they agree with the letter. The commenter discusses that Evelyn Street is very narrow and when cars park on both sides of the street, two cars cannot pass. This commenter expresses concern with this in regard to safety and accessibility for emergency vehicles.

As discussed in Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*, of the DEIR, the proposed project would prepare a traffic control plan (Mitigation Measure T-1). Mitigation measure T-1 would require documentation of off-street parking supplies, placement of signage of available event parking areas, traffic control personnel, and traffic officers during events to improve traffic flow and public safety, which would in turn facilitate the passage of emergency vehicles. Additionally, Mitigation Measure T-1 was updated to include consideration of use of a shuttle service during events if offsite lots are used, which could reduce local street parking concerns. Refer to responses to letter R42 for responses Matthew Tanaka's letter, which was forwarded as part of this commenter's letter. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R44 – John Cooper (Page 1 of 2)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Fwd: [FWD: CVHS Stadium Development Concerns]



R44

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Fwd: [FWD: CVHS Stadium Development Concerns]

1 message

jlcoo <jccooper53@gmail.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Sun, Mar 7, 2021 at 9:10 PM

Hi,

I agree with everything stated in the below message and am very concerned about the unanswered questions in the Environmental Impact Report. Please address these issues before moving forward with your plans.

R44-1

Another concerned community member,

John Cooper

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <mtanaka@mktgraphics.com>
Date: Sun, Mar 7, 2021 at 9:06 PM
Subject: [FWD: CVHS Stadium Development Concerns]
To: John Cooper <jccooper53@gmail.com>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: CVHS Stadium Development Concerns
From: <mtanaka@mktgraphics.com>
Date: Sun, March 07, 2021 8:54 pm
To: "cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

To Whom It May Concern:

I live at 3041 Evelyn Street and the new stadium will have a strong negative impact on my home and our neighbors' homes. Although we understand the desire for a stadium at Crescenta Valley High School, there are not answers to several critical community concerns:

1. Parking – The study examines a best-case scenario with ride-sharing, less than capacity attendance, and an extremely low number of 'home' games. It was indicated that additional parking may happen at the community church, there is no plan to help with the parking issues on the streets around the high school.
2. Traffic control – The study does not examine all of the immediate streets around CVHS, including the width of those streets, lighting, sidewalks, etc. The traffic study happened during the pandemic and is not truly representative of more 'normal' traffic.
3. Pedestrian traffic – With the additional traffic, pedestrians are at higher risk, as there is often jaywalking on all streets.
4. Additional stadium uses – The study only mentions the 'few' home games that will occur, but the additional impact of other sports, external stadium rental/usage is not completely understood.
5. Light and noise pollution AND trash around the neighborhood.

It was my understanding that the Environmental Impact Report would be completed before any actions to move forward. There are several gaps in the study that are major concerns such as the impact on traffic AND parking on ALL streets around CV. During the pandemic a true traffic study is not realistic nor representative of what would exist. Additionally, there is not any indication on what the other days/nights usage will be and how often.

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiV81m0d-JKpR1Swn9RX5xM2dHUhXUmhHcF1Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 1/2

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R44 – John Cooper (Page 2 of 2)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Fwd: [FWD: CVHS Stadium Development Concerns]

In order for the local community to support this development, it is critical for these items to be answered PRIOR to moving forward with the stadium. A solid mitigation plan for each of these concerns would help reduce the stress of the unknown. There is no guarantee that ANY of these issues would be addressed if the stadium is approved without these plans in place. I would appreciate a response to the above items, how they will be addressed, and the associated mitigation plans.

A concerned community member,

Matt Tanaka

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiV81m0d-JKpR1Swn9fRX5xM2dHUhXUmhHcF1IY6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 2/2

2. Response to Comments

R44. Response to Comments from John Cooper, received March 7, 2021.

R44-1 The commenter forwards Matthew Tanaka's comment letter (included as letter R42 in this FEIR) and states that they agree with the comment letter. The commenter states that they are concerned about the unanswered questions in the environmental impact report but does not elaborate or provide additional comments beyond Matthew Tanaka's letter. Refer to responses to letter R42. No further response is necessary.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R45 – Philip Moore (Page 1 of 2)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - response to the Draft EIR for CVHS Field



R45

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

response to the Draft EIR for CVHS Field

1 message

Gmail philmooremusic <philmooremusic@gmail.com>

Sun, Mar 7, 2021 at 11:29 AM

To: CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>, Hagop Kassabian <hkassabian@gusd.net>

Cc: jfreemon@gusd.net, gkrikorian@gusd.net, nnahabedian@gusd.net, ssahakian@gusd.net, agharpetian@gusd.net, vekchian@gusd.net

GUSD

Philip Moore

349 West Magnolia Ave.

[2857 Altura Ave.](#)

[Glendale, CA 91204](#)

La Crescenta, CA 91214

Re: Crescenta Valley Football Field Improvement Project

GUSD's plan to build a stadium will ruin the quiet neighborhood. The design calls for 6 days a week of use, Monday through Friday until 10pm and Saturdays. There's no lighting restrictions in the plan; no parking plan is in place except to use up all of the street parking available; there's no mitigation of the sound that will pummel the neighbors; there's no written plan for security which events always require; and there's no written plan to fund trash pickup. We tolerate many issues throughout the school year and generally refer to school authorities instead of involving the sheriff department when things happen out of goodwill and support of the students. That attitude will change if GUSD disrespects the neighborhood and moves forward with this project.

R45-1

Residential Zone:

La Crescenta is a quiet bedroom community and GUSD and the school board want to turn the area around Crescenta Valley high school, which is a converted middle school lot, into a busy city life and change the fundamental nature of our community. CVHS is not Glendale HS located in an urban area. CVHS is nestled in a residential area.

Parking:

There is not enough parking in the area and the school board seems to think that street parking is readily available. The 3440 seats require a minimum of 1110 parking spots less the 250 from the school lots. There will be more cars than that required. The neighbors have shared this information with the school board from dealing with the July 4th celebrations and graduations over the years, and it has been ignored. That will require 40 blocks of neighborhood parking if only half of those spots are used by the residents. That's ridiculous!

Light noise:

This is referred to as a bleacher improvement project, but it is a stadium conversion with stadium lights, PA systems, locker rooms, the works. I have line of sight to the football and will have four arrays of 12 1500W light bulbs shining at my house until roughly 10pm EVERY NIGHT! Instead of watching a sunset every night I get to stare at a huge light bulb. That is NOT cool.

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiV81m0d-JKpR1Swn9fRX5xM2dHUhXUmhHcF1Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 1/2

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R45 – Philip Moore (Page 2 of 2)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - response to the Draft EIR for CVHS Field

Sound noise:

The plan is to point the PA system away from the surrounding house. That will only mitigate a small fraction of the sound. When the drum line practices in the quad it reverberates across campus. We will be subject to multiple noise sources spread in an array across the field. Asking people to not stamp their feet is NOT a noise solution and not enforceable.

R45-1
con't

Historically the school has used trees to mitigate sound at the elementary school. Trees don't do squat as anybody that lives next to the freeway can attest. The science tells us a large heavy mass will abate sound waves. GUSD will have to build a huge wall which will destroy the surrounding neighbor's house values.

Safety:

Without a written plan for security, the home owners are left to handle security by themselves and, with traffic and parking a nightmare, any safety issues cannot be responded to quickly due to GUSD's lack of forethought and concern for their neighbors.


The folks that are pushing this project get to go home to a quiet space, but you are taking away my right to do so. Stop this project.

The draft EIR clearly states the detrimental effects from the noise, lights and parking are "unavoidable". This is a misuse of Measure S funds that were sold to community to be used to prepare our students for their future and not for use as a glam stadium project that will ruin the quality of life for the neighbors of CVHS.

I cannot believe GUSD wants this project moving forward given the obvious technology infrastructure issues that the Covid lockdown has illuminated. Spend the Measure S funds building robust education facilities.

Philip Moore

(818) 248-7284

 CVHS EIR Letter Part 2.docx
15K

2. Response to Comments

R45. Response to Comments from Philip Moore, received March 7, 2021.

R45-1 This letter is a duplicate of comment letter A30. Refer to responses to letter R30.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R46 – Alec Derhovanessian (1 page)

R46

Resident Comment – Phone Message

The following is a summary of comments provided to the District's voicemail.

03/08/2021 – Alec Derhovanessian, lives in La Crescenta, pretty close to the HS, have problems with this project, building a stadium at the high school, there's no parking plan for this, no safety plan that he's aware of, no traffic plan, no vandalism, what about vandalism, trash, noise. Every year for years on Fourth of July they have a big problem in the entire neighborhood there is no place to park, people are all confused trying to find a place to park, now imagine with a stadium what's going to happen. 818-249-9411. Totally opposed to this right now.

R46-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R46. Response to Comments from Alec Derhonaessian, received March 8, 2021.

R46-1 The commenter provides opposition to the project, indicating they live in proximity to CVHS. They cite general project concerns regarding parking, safety, traffic, trash, and noise. These comments have been reviewed by the District as part of the decision-making process for the proposed project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R47 – Peter Roses (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Comment to Proposed Work and DEIR



R47

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Comment to Proposed Work and DEIR

1 message

Peter Roses <peterroses@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 1:27 PM

To: "cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Our names are Peter & Alexandra Roses, Phone 818 248 9546, email peterroses@sbcglobal.net, contact Peter Roses.

Sir-I have been a resident at [29 Northwoods Lane, La Crescenta Ca](#) since 1980 and have a thorough knowledge of the surrounding area near CV High School and the local environment. First let me state that I am appalled that GUSD would conduct a 45 day review period to the DEIR in the middle of the Pandemic Crises when citizens are concerned with scheduling vaccinations, social lockdown and at home schooling. One can only assume that the GUSD Board has planned this timing as a way to "sneak" the DEIR under the noses of the local residents hoping that they will be so consumed with the Pandemic as not to comment on this planned project. That said below are my comments to the DEIR.

R47-1

1. The Report does not give a scheduled time frame nor impact to local streets for the duration of the construction. This work is substantial, requiring new buildings, bleachers and most contentious. The installation of a string of 100' tall lighting standards circulating the 1/4 mile track. this work will require heavy machinery access and a substantial construction crew needing food, toilets and security. None of this is addressed in the DEIR.

R47-2

2. From reading the description of the work I can only assume that the intention is to construct a Football like field such that Friday night games can be played under the illumination of the 100' tall lights. Is this the intent to have Football games at CVH?

R47-3

The GUSD Board should see the lighting level at Saint Francis Football Field illuminating the field and the surrounding neighborhood in La Canada as a comparison of what the neighborhood will be subjected to.

3 I am most appalled that the DEIR buried the most important impacts in the last sentence of the "Environmental Determination", "...significant unavoidable adverse impact related to aesthetics (lighting), spectator-related noise and parking. How can the board defend such negative impacts to the neighborhood already burdened with insufficient parking, illegal parking (caused by the high school), along with spectator noise, including trash, personal and property safety at events and as stated earlier 100' lighting towers flooding the neighborhood with light.

R47-4

How does the Board balance the benefits of this project to the detriment of the neighborhood?

Peter Roses

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R47. Response to Comments from Peter Roses, received March 8, 2021.

R47-1 The commenter is a longtime resident of the community and states that they have extensive knowledge of the surrounding area and local environment. The commenter express their discontent about the public review process occurring during COVID. A public, in-person scoping meeting was held on March 5, 2020, at the CVHS Auditorium. Due to COVID restrictions, the subsequent public meeting during the public review period were held virtually on February 17, 2021. During the public review period (January 21, 2021, to March 8, 2021), public comments were accepted in various formats, including letters, emails, voicemails, and verbal comments during the public meeting. All comments received during the public comment period have been responded to in this Final EIR. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.

R47-2 The commenter states that the DEIR does not provide a construction schedule nor analyze impacts to local streets during construction, which would require heavy machinery access and a construction crew. Additionally, the commenter states that the DEIR does not address a substantial construction crew needing food, toilets, and security.

The construction schedule is discussed in Section 3.3.2, *Project Phasing*, of the DEIR. Additionally, as stated in DEIR Chapter 5.8, *Noise*, construction would comply with the County of Los Angeles Municipal Code requirements for construction activities, which would limit construction work to the hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm weekdays and Saturdays. Construction is prohibited on Sundays and holidays. As discussed in DEIR Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*, lane closures are not anticipated, and no off-site roadway improvements are required or proposed that would have the potential to interrupt area circulation or redirect traffic during construction. Once material is delivered, all construction activities would occur on-site and would not disrupt local streets.

Additionally, the construction contractor would be required to prepare a construction traffic control plan that would ensure that construction activities would not impede with on- and off-site access and circulation for emergency vehicles and services during the construction phase. Construction of the proposed project is not anticipated to require a substantial number of workers, since construction workers' presence on-site would be limited to their respective specialty and construction phase. Construction workers would be served by existing facilities on-site, including restrooms. Construction workers would be required to adhere to District policies regarding security and would be served by the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department should an emergency situation arise.

R47-3 The commenter asks if the intent of the proposed project is to allow for football games at the high school. The commenter requests that the GUSD Board look at Saint Francis Football Field lighting to see the level of lighting the neighborhood would be subject to. As discussed in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of the DEIR, objectives of the proposed project include enhancing opportunities for after-school athletic and extracurricular

2. Response to Comments

activities and allowing home football games on campus. The DEIR analyzes the proposed project's lighting-related impacts in Chapter 5.1, *Aesthetics*. The DEIR implements Mitigation Measure AE-1 to reduce lighting impacts on the surrounding community; however, the DEIR acknowledges that lighting impacts remain significant and unavoidable. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.

- R47-4 The commenter discusses their opposition to the proposed project. The commenter states that the disclosure of “significant and unavoidable impacts” are buried under Environmental Determination. The environmental conclusions of significant and unavoidable impacts are not buried. The commenter is referring to the “Environmental Determination” section in the Notice of Availability and not the DEIR. Throughout the DEIR, including the executive summary and each environmental topic chapter, the proposed project's impacts are clearly stated.

The commenter asks how the Board can support a project that would have negative impacts on a community already burdened by insufficient parking and illegal parking; create spectator noise, trash, and personal and property safety hazards; and flood the neighborhood with lighting. The commenter asks how the Board balances the benefits of the proposed project with the detriment of the community. The District will consider all comments and recommendations as part of its decision-making for this project. If the District decides to adopt the EIR and approve the project, it will also be required to adopt “Findings” and a “Statement of Overriding Considerations.” CEQA requires decision-makers to balance the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[a]). CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Such reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the FEIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 [b]).

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R48 – Emily Johnston (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Field Project



R48

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Field Project

1 message

Emily Johnston <emilyj7591@gmail.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 8:28 AM

Good morning,

I am writing in regards to the proposed stadium project at Crescenta Valley High School as a longtime resident and neighbor in the community. I am hoping this letter and the others written with genuine concern are received and regarded with the attention and seriousness they warrant. | R48-1

Sent from my iPhone

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwIV81m0d-JKpR1Sw9fRX5xM2dHUhXUmhHcF1Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&permth...> 1/1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R48. Response to Comments from Emily Johnston, received March 8, 2021.

R48-1 The commenter states that they are a longtime resident and neighbor in the community. The commenter requests that letters received on the project are regarded with attention and seriousness. All comments received during the public comment period have been responded to in this Final EIR and will be provided to the District Board of Education for review when considering whether to approve the project.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R49 – Beth Johnston (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Field Project



R49

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Field Project

1 message

Beth Johnston <ejohnst3@gmail.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 6:29 AM

Good morning,

Thank you for the opportunity to write in regards to the proposed field project at Crescenta Valley High School. After reviewing the Environmental Impact Report, I have concerns about the project moving forward as is.

As stated, there is no possible mitigation for the issues caused by the proposed lights, increase in foot traffic or parking, no security plan, and most worrisome of all, no mitigation possible for the increase in noise levels.

In past meetings and discussions regarding this project, GUSD leadership assured the neighboring community that these valid concerns would be addressed and examined through the impact report. The study has indeed validated these very real, tangible concerns, and I await the equally real and tangible solutions that will ensure the safety of our community.

I can understand the need to expand facilities as a school body's requirements change. I support creating a positive environment for students, and I can also see that compromise is needed in this situation. In thinking about this project, I found myself recalling how the CV High band practices holiday music early in the morning during the Fall. I have never seen this as too intrusive, even if I don't want to be woken up that early. I understand that this is a shared space, and at times we must compromise so that both sides may be successful. In this spirit, I expect the same respect in regards to creating a plan that considers the living spaces for the school's neighbors.

I look forward to reading your response to my concerns, and respectfully request a confirmation that you have received my email and have read its contents. Most of all, I appreciate your commitment to implementing a solution that is suitable not only for the school, but also for the residents of the surrounding community.

Best,

Elizabeth Johnston
(818) 425-5315

R49-1

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R49. Response to Comments from Beth Johnston, received March 8, 2021.

R49-1 The commenter states that they have concerns about the project as currently proposed. The commenter states that there is not possible mitigation for lights, increased foot traffic and parking, no security plan, and noise. The commenter requests solutions for these impacts. The commenter supports creating a positive environment for students and understands the need to compromise. The commenter requests that the District creates a plan that considers the school's neighbors.

Lighting is addressed in Chapter 5.1, *Aesthetics*, of the DEIR. The DEIR incorporates Mitigation Measure AE-1 to reduce lighting impacts (as revised in this FEIR), and the proposed project's lighting impacts are determined to be significant and unavoidable. Foot traffic and parking are in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, of the DEIR. The DEIR incorporates Mitigation Measure T-1 to address parking impacts, and the proposed project's parking impacts are determined to be significant and unavoidable. Public safety is addressed in DEIR Chapter 5.9, *Public Services*, which has been updated as part of this FEIR. Noise is addressed in Chapter 5.8, *Noise*. The DEIR outlines mitigation measures for noise (N-1 and N-2). N-2 includes preparing a noise control plan. With implementation of Mitigation Measure N-2, noise impacts related to the period operation-related noise would be significant and unavoidable. The commenter does not address specific issues within these topic areas, and as shown, these issues are addressed in the DEIR, and mitigation measures are incorporated where necessary. Nevertheless, the DEIR acknowledges that impacts related to light, parking, and operational noise would be significant and unavoidable. The comment does not propose additional mitigation measures nor does the comment address the adequacy of existing mitigation measures. Therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R50 – Richard Denzin (1 page)

3/8/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Resident Comment: Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project



R50

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Resident Comment: Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project

1 message

richard denzin <outlook_52F2F8A9B9AB418B@outlook.com> To:
"cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 10:57 AM

Name: Richard Denzin

Phone: (714) 340-9430

Contact: Rhapuna@yahoo.com

As a resident of the 2800 block of Community Avenue, I am not in favor of the proposed changes to the Crescenta Valley High School (CVHS) track and field. Specifically, the addition of lights and the public address system with significantly reduce the quality of use and fiscal value of my house. Additionally, the hours of operations will result continuous in traffic and parking issues for residents.

R50-1

Since I purchased my home in 1988, I have the size of the school increase: more classrooms, more students. The elementary school has added additional classrooms. All this results in more traffic (automobile+foot traffic). The area around CVHS needs a break. Adding more incentive to come to the area will not help. The proposed usage time will make traffic and noise a seven-day-a-week 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM reality. It seems like my neighborhood is sacrificed for the people who do not live here.

R50-2

Besides the traffic specific concerns include:

- The lights will shine in my windows – rented lights in the past have demonstrated that; The PA system
- will be loud – how often will it be used;
- The lights will be on very day of the week;
- Where will I park my car – if I leave the spot in front of the house someone will park there every day of the week; and Additional trash and
- general wear and tear on the neighborhood-policing the additional trash is already a requirement for living in the neighborhood.

R50-3

R50-4

R50-5

R50-6

R50-7

I do not understand why the school district cannot continue to use a district-wide stadium for football games. It is cost effective use of facilities. How much more bonded indebtedness do we need for CVHS. Who is going to pay for this project? In this time of getting back to in-person teaching, the GUSD should spend its funds on teaching, not lights and grandstands.

R50-8

I am considering selling.

Sincerely,

R. Denzin

Community Avenue

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/ALGkd0zHwiV81m0d-JKpR1Swn9FRX5xM2dHUhXUmhHcF1Y6AqJp/u/0?ik=20e58c0cb6&view=pt&search=all&pemth...> 1/2

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R50. Response to Comments from Richard Denzin, received March 8, 2021.

- R50-1 The commenter states their opposition to the proposed project. The commenter states that the lighting and public address system would reduce the use and fiscal value of their house. Additionally, the commenter states that the hours of operations of the proposed project would result in continuous traffic and parking issues for the residents. Although economic and social effects of the project may be included in the EIR, evidence of social or economic impacts that do not contribute to or are not caused by physical impacts on the environment are beyond the scope of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines 15131, PRC 21082.2(2)). Transportation and parking are addressed in DEIR Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.
- R50-2 The commenter states that they have seen the high school along with the elementary school increase in size and student population, which adds more automobile traffic and foot traffic. The commenter states that the community needs a break. The commenter states that the proposed project's hours of operation would make traffic and noise a seven-day-a-week, all-day reality. The proposed project's impacts related to transportation are addressed in DEIR Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*, which discusses that the proposed project would increase vehicle and pedestrian traffic during athletic events. The proposed project would incorporate Mitigation Measure T-1, which addresses traffic management. The proposed project's impacts related to noise are addressed in DEIR Chapter 5.8, *Noise*. The proposed hours of operation are 7:00 am to 10:00 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 10:00 pm on Saturday, not seven days per week as stated in the comment. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.
- R50-3 The commenter raises concerns about lights shining through his windows and indicates that lights rented in the past demonstrate this. The proposed lighting system to be installed would use high-efficiency, directed LED lights that can be controlled and reduce spill more than current temporary lights that are used. The proposed project would incorporate Mitigation Measure AE-1, which reduces light impacts. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.
- R50-4 The commenter states that the PA system will be loud. The commenter asks how often the PA system will be used. The PA system may be used during the hours of operation of the sports field, which is presented in Table 3-2 of the DEIR. Refer to response R50-2, which states hours of operation. The proposed project's impacts related to noise is addressed in DEIR Chapter 5.8, *Noise*. The DEIR incorporates two mitigation measures (N-1 and N-2) that would reduce noise impacts. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.
- R50-5 The commenter incorrectly states that lights will be on every day of the week. As discussed under response R50-2, the proposed project's lighting would be used as needed up until

2. Response to Comments

10:00 pm Monday through Saturday, with frequency of use depending on the sports in season at a particular time.

- R50-6 The commenter raises concerns about availability of street parking and asks where they will park their car. The proposed project's impacts related to transportation are addressed in DEIR Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*, which acknowledges that parking-related impacts would be significant and unavoidable. No specific comments about the adequacy of the DEIR are provided. No further response is warranted.
- R50-7 The commenter raises concerns about trash and wear and tear on the neighborhood and states that the neighborhood currently manages the trash in the neighborhood. The public nuisance described by the comment would be responded to in accordance with applicable District practices and policies, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would respond to reports of illegal activities on public rights-of-way. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no changes to the EIR are warranted.
- R50-8 The commenter raises questions about the need and the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project, and states that money should be allocated to teaching. Although economic and social effect of the project may be included in the EIR, evidence of social or economic impacts that do not contribute to or are not caused by physical impacts on the environment are beyond the scope of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines 15131, PRC 21082.2(2)). This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and further response is not warranted.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R51 – Lynda Bayly (1 page)

3/9/2021

Glendale Unified School District Mail - Fwd: Field upgrade



R51

Diana Espiritu <despiritu@gusd.net>

Fwd: Field upgrade

1 message

Public Info <publicinfo@gusd.net>

Tue, Mar 9, 2021 at 8:38 AM

To: Hagop Kassabian <hkassabian@gusd.net>

Cc: Diana Espiritu <despiritu@gusd.net>

Good morning,

FYI this was received in our Public Information email.

Thank you.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Lynda Bayly <linkerbayly@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 5:51 PM

Subject: Field upgrade

To: <publicinfo@gusd.net>

R51-1

I have lived in my home for 40 years and this project will be a horrible nightmare for homeowners in and around the school campus. Traffic is bad enough during regular school days. I believe you should have parking addressed before going forward. Lynda Bayly 2863 Prospect.

Sent from my iPhone

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R51. Response to Comments from Lynda Bayly, received March 9, 2021.

R51-1 The commenter states that they have been a resident of the area for 40 years and expresses an objection to the proposed project. The commenter states that traffic is bad during regular school days and requests that parking be addressed. The DEIR analyzes the proposed project's transportation and parking impacts in Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*. The comment does not address the adequacy of analysis contained the DEIR. Therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R52 – Brianna Johnston (Page 1 of 2)



R52

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Stadium Proposal

1 message

Brianna Johnston <bjohnston176@gmail.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 7:37 PM

To the kind folks that are attempting to build the stadium: Don't.

This is an official opposition statement to the proposal for a stadium at Crescenta Valley High School.

It has come to my attention that a stadium proposal has been brought into fruition for Crescenta Valley High School. As someone that was raised and lived in the surrounding neighborhood for twenty-five plus years and still frequents this neighborhood often, it baffles me that a group of people that have not lived here as long as myself or family (currently) seem to think you deserve some say in what should be built in our neighborhood. Since you don't live in the neighborhood and have absolutely no clue what the ramifications of this proposal are let me kindly spell them out for you.

R52-1

For starters, pat yourselves on the back for attempting to sneak some terrible proposal through during a global pandemic. You deserve a gold star for that insensitivity right there. Taking advantage of people not being able to safely congregate in constructive forums against this – good for you.

So let's dive into why it's a firm NO to the grandiose gladiator arena!

It benefits whom exactly?

Definitely NOT the following:

R52-2

- The quaint and charming surrounding neighborhood – current and future residents – since there are no plans in place to mitigate for future issues such as safety, noise, cleanup, parking traffic control and field usage – you got to love that uncertainty; and of course
- Crescenta Valley High School and its programs (i.e. Sports Programs)- I hope no person actually thinks this one is true and if you did...well don't be naive because any revenue made will go towards maintenance and upkeep not improving or funding your programs.

You most certainly will not make a profit off of it even if you think you can rent it out for other causes and associations. Oh you didn't think I bought the "well the football team needs it" did you? I didn't and I know that is the guise you want people to buy into it.

R52-3

The fact remains, GUSD and CVHS face budgetary strains and that leads me to think you expect the surrounding neighborhood to literally pick up the trash and just deal with any and all possible repercussions that have been completely overlooked in this stadium notion. There is no plan in place to deal with any issues facing our neighborhood. None.

The only time I've seen a group larger than 3,442 people congregate at CVHS was for the 4th of July carnival, which has since been relocated up to the elementary school due to the wildly expensive turf field installation. And even then that was a well-organized event that went over hours, had lingering

R52-4

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R52 – Brianna Johnston (Page 2 of 2)

trash, and required neighborhood assistance because people in general are terrible with respect to other people and their property. Homes surrounding are not massive trash cans or open to vandalism.

R52-4
con't

The look of it all is really not great for this poorly designed arena. What are you trying to ensure no one can go to bed until 10PM? And even if an event goes past 10PM what then? I thought wearing sunglasses at night wasn't cool...it's not.

R52-5

You need to address the noise level since this goiter of a structure is for the football team that apparently draws at least 3,442 to all of their games...that noise won't get washed out by the freeway sorry. Nope. Not a thing. Especially exciting ones and then what happens when the game(s) go into overtime after say 10PM? Is there a remote we can magically use to adjust crowd noise or drunk people? Is there going to be a light dimmer issued so our retinas don't burn up at night?

R52-6

R52-7

Let's touch on parking which is an unresolved problem. It's an issue even now without this potential massive eyesore at CVHS. I don't want to contemplate more deadly driving coming into the neighborhood from teens trying to prove something.

R52-8

Speaking of which, where are these 3,442 people going to park? Sure as all heck not on the surrounding streets. We don't need anyone blocking driveways. That is a major YOU problem and requires a solution. I didn't realize you were looking to emulate a Trader Joe's parking setup or lack thereof.

All of these concerns and issues I have mentioned require solutions. Without solutions, this stadium will have a very negative and real impact. It will cause people to leave and not move into our neighborhood thus affecting the surrounding ecosystem as a whole.

Now I am a realist and know fully well I won't get any answers or a response most likely. Because to you, it's just a stadium. You may use it while your child is in high school, however for those living in the neighborhood currently and for more than four years, it will be the perpetual thorn in their side.

R52-9

I am fully amenable to constructive solutions. So please feel free to respond.

Thank you for your time. Stay safe.

Best,

Brianna Johnston
(818) 314-1365

2. Response to Comments

R52. Response to Comments from Brianna Johnston, received March 8, 2021.

R52-1 This comment serves as an introduction to the comment letter and states their opposition to the proposed project. The commenter states their discontent about the CEQA process occurring during COVID. A public, in-person scoping meeting was held on March 5, 2020, at the CVHS Auditorium. Due to COVID restrictions, the subsequent public meeting during the public review period were held virtually on February 17, 2021. During the public review period (January 21, 2021, to March 8, 2021), public comments were accepted in various formats, including letters, emails, voicemails, and verbal comments during the public meeting. All comments received during the public comment period have been responded to in this Final EIR. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.

R52-2 The commenter states that the proposed project does not benefit the surrounding community, including current and future residents. The commenter incorrectly states that there are no plans to mitigate issues including safety, noise, cleanup, parking traffic control and field usage. These issues are addressed in the DEIR, and mitigation measures are added where necessary to reduce impacts to the extent feasible.

Public safety is addressed in Chapter 5.9, *Public Services*, of the DEIR, which has been updated as part of this FEIR. The DEIR evaluated the impacts of noise in Chapter 5.8, *Noise*. The DEIR evaluated the impacts of parking in Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*. Regarding field usage, the DEIR analyzes the operational impacts of the proposed project (which includes field usage) throughout the DEIR.

The initial study for the proposed project (DEIR Appendix A) determined that the proposed project would generate solid waste typical of sport fields, and such solid waste would be disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. CVHS currently provides and will continue to provide trash cans along Ramsdell Avenue and will provide trash receptacles on-site for trash disposal.

Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the DEIR, where necessary, to mitigate the issues raised by commenter. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. Because no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.

R52-3 The commenter states that the proposed project would not benefit the CVHS nor its programs. The commenter speculates on the District's and High School's financial reasons for the proposed project. The commenter states that due to the District's and school's budgetary strains, the surrounding community would be required to pick up trash associated with the project and deal with repercussions of the project. Economic and funding sources are not the subject of the DEIR. The commenter reiterates that there are no plans to address issues facing the neighborhood. Refer to response R52-2, above, for

2. Response to Comments

a discussion of each topic area of concern raised by the commenter. Because no specific comments about the DEIR are provided, no further response is warranted.

- R52-4 The commenter states that they have only seen a group larger than 3,442 people at the high school during the Fourth of July and states that this event has since been relocated to the elementary school. The commenter states that the event went over hours, had lingering trash, and resulted in vandalism. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.
- R52-5 The commenter expresses concern about the nighttime use of the proposed project. The proposed project would add new football uses at the existing sport field; all other events that currently exist on-site would remain unchanged. There is current lighting used on the field for nighttime events, and the proposed lighting would upgrade existing lighting to allow for more directionality and control that would limit spillover lighting on adjacent properties. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.
- R52-6 The commenter states that noise from spectators would not be washed out by the freeway. The DEIR determined that spectator-related noise (Impact 5.8-2) would be significant and unavoidable after the incorporation of Mitigation Measure N-2. Consistent with the discussion in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, the proposed project would operate up to 10:00 pm. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of this topic have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." No specific comments are provided, and no further response is warranted.
- R52-7 The commenter raises concerns about nighttime lighting and asks if there would be a light dimmer. Chapter 5.1, *Aesthetics*, of the DEIR analyses the proposed project's impact to light and glare. The proposed project would incorporate Mitigation Measure AE-1, which requires that all lighting be shielded and directed downward onto the athletic fields to minimize potential light escape and/or spillover onto adjacent properties. Additionally, as discussed in response R3-7, above, Mitigation Measure AE-1 has been modified in this FEIR to provide a voicemail phone number for neighbors to call in the event lights remain on past 10:00 pm or to report any (non-emergency) incidents related to use of the field for large events. The District will manage and respond to all calls received. The DEIR acknowledges that the proposed project's impacts on light and glare would be significant and unavoidable. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

- R52-8 The commenter expresses concern about existing parking limitations and asks where people will park with the proposed project. Parking is analyzed in Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*, of the DEIR. The proposed project would incorporate Mitigation Measure T-1, which would require the implementation of a traffic control plan, which would help identify and manage parking locations. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.
- R52-9 This comment provides a conclusion to the comment letter. The commenter states that the concerns about the proposed project require solutions and states that the proposed project would cause residents to move away and prevent new people from moving in, disrupting the ecosystem of the community. The commenter emphasizes their disapproval for the proposed project, and states that it will be a perpetual problem for the neighborhood. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R53 – Monserrat De Lira (Page 1 of 2)



R53

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Notice of availability of Environmental Impact Report

1 message

monserrat de lira <monserratlira@yahoo.com>
To: "cvhsfield@gusd.net" <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Tue, Mar 9, 2021 at 1:10 AM

NAME: Monserrat De Lira
EMAIL: monserratlira@yahoo.com
PHONE: (951)444 1710

I live on Altura Avenue and this project is definitely a concern for me, my family and many of my neighbors. We have lived on the east side of Altura for more than 10 years and since then we have been experiencing multiple problems even without the proposed addition. Now with the addition, it will compound those problems. When the school has had big events in the past, it is the people who live around the school that really suffer the consequences, not the school staff, students, nor visitors.

R53-1

1) People have parked on our driveway and blocked our only way of access and egress. We have called the police on multiple occasions and unfortunately we do not get the response from the authorities. When confronting the offenders, they threaten us or insist that it is just a minute and doesn't matter.

R53-2

2) Our street does not have any sidewalks and I have seen people driving more than 40mph down our block just to turn around at the end and speed back down the street. Some of these speeders are parents whose child is late to school or a game. This presents a danger to any pedestrians walking on the street.

R53-3

3) Vandalism and trash. There have been 2 occasions that my car has been opened when parked on our street. With the increase in non-local individuals, this will result in an increase of having more break-ins into not only our cars but also our properties.

R53-4

There are not any trash cans on our block and daily we have trash (to include alcohol containers) left on the street and our property. I leave my trash can on the street to encourage people to throw trash away, but I have received fines from the county for violating the ordinance of trash cans only on pick-up days. During big events the trash is a constant problem.

R53-5

4) Our street does not have a crosswalk and there would be a lot of pedestrian traffic crossing at the intersection of La Crescenta and Altura.

R53-6

5) For people who lives less than 1000 ft from the freeway the added noise from the field will be in competition with the freeway. There is no barrier that eliminates the problem. The noise reduction is very hard to really archive. The noise that is generated will be low frequency which is very difficult for a barrier to intercept. It takes something very robust to keep out the low frequencies. The periodic high pitches generated during events will not even be reduced with a robust wall. Definitely, the construction of the properties around the school are not built for this level of noise at all. In order to really reduce the sound, every property should have at least a sound transmission loss (STL) of 67 when in reality the houses are built for a STL of only 34 or less.

R53-7

6) Musco Lighting will minimize the effect of light spillage; however, it will not get it below to acceptable levels. In addition, adding some other type of light baffles or shields for mitigating the glare and light spillage.

R53-8

7) The parking study that was done indicated that the entire area for several blocks would be red, even after the mitigations that were mentioned. This study did not take into account recent changes in regulations regarding accessory dwelling units (ADUs). Many of the neighbors have been implementing ADUs which increases the residential density of the area beyond what the study indicated. With the new ADUs, the parking is required for residents and the events with have a larger

R53-9

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R53 – Monserrat De Lira (Page 2 of 2)

impact than initially reported. In addition, what is the plan for the handling the parking given that all the mitigations still do not get the parking situation down to an acceptable level according to the report?

R53-9
con't

We would love to support our local children and the school, but in a way that is considerate to those that live here full time and in a way that is cooperative with the local community. If the environmental report states that the issues cannot be lowered to an acceptable level even after mitigations have been put in place, how can the district continue and disregard the acceptable levels. We want the school district to work with us and find a solution. We do not want another sneaky disregard for the community similar to what they did at the elementary school when building the equivalent of a 3-story building (due to elevation change) looking into the back yards of our neighbors. Instead of changing meetings and being sneaky about the building approval, they could have come up with a plan like placing that building on the other side of the property and it would have been the same size, but been equivalent of a 1-story building. We want the district to work with us, not against us and the district needs to earn its trust back.

R53-10

Thank you,
Monserrat

2. Response to Comments

R53. Response to Comments from Monserrat De Lira, received March 9, 2021.

- R53-1 This comment serves as an introduction to the comment letter. The commenter indicates that they live on Altura Avenue and expresses concern about the project. The commenter states that they currently experience multiple problems and the proposed project would compound the problems. The commenter states that the surrounding residents suffer from big events at the school. No specific comments about the DEIR are provided, and no further response is warranted.
- R53-2 The commenter indicates that people park on their driveway, blocking their access to/from their house. The commenter has called the police and confronted the offenders. The public nuisance described by the comment would be responded to in accordance with applicable District practices and policies, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would respond to reports of illegal activities on public rights-of-way. The project description in the FEIR has been revised to prohibit general pedestrian access on the east side of the campus near the terminus of Altura Avenue (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the Draft EIR*). District will install an 8-foot fence at the northeast end of the track and field and will lock the existing turnstile from use. Campus access from this location would be limited to an emergency gate for fire/paramedic uses and District vehicles only, which would prohibit pedestrian access from this location and limit pedestrian and vehicle activity along Altura Avenue east of the campus. The DEIR has been updated to reflect pedestrian closure at the northeast end of the track and field (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the DEIR*). The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no changes to the EIR are warranted.
- R53-3 The commenter discusses concerns of pedestrian safety on their street due to vehicles speeding down the road. Access points for events at the facility will include Ramsdell Avenue, Archway Drive, and Prospect Avenue. Roadway segments with sidewalks and without sidewalks on routes to these entrance points will be pedestrian routes for those that park farther away and walk to the facility, or for those that walk from home to the facility. These roadways are used by pedestrians under existing conditions, and by school students as well when school is in session. This use will continue when evening events occur at the project facility. The District does not plan on improving the conditions on local residential roadways as part of the proposed project. Additionally, the proposed project incorporates Mitigation Measure T-1, which provides for the preparation of an event traffic control plan, which would guide vehicles and pedestrians during sporting events at the proposed project and ensure public safety. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and no changes to the EIR are warranted.
- R53-4 The commenter indicates that their car has been broken into on two occasions and states that the increase of nonlocal persons would increase break-ins to cars and properties. The illegal activities on public rights-of-way and with private property would be responded to

2. Response to Comments

by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no changes to the EIR are warranted.

R53-5 The commenter indicates that there are no trash cans on their block and states that trash is frequently littered on the street and private property. The District provides trash cans along Ramsdell Avenue fronting the school and on the campus. The commenter expresses concern regarding trash from past and current operations. The public nuisance described by the comment would be responded to in accordance with applicable District practices and policies, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would respond to reports of illegal activities on public rights-of-way. In addition, the District provides security guards onsite during events and games, including private security and at least one law enforcement officer, and will continue to do so as part of the proposed project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, and no changes to the EIR are warranted.

R53-6 The commenter states that their street does not have crosswalks and that the intersection of La Crescenta and Altura would be hazardous due to the project's additional pedestrian traffic. Additionally, as described above, the closure of pedestrian access at that end of the campus on Altura Avenue would be closed, and therefore pedestrian traffic should be reduced. Pedestrian routes to and from the campus were reviewed as part of the traffic study, including the presence of striped and signed crosswalks and/or signalized crossing locations at intersections on major roadways. No lack of crosswalks or controlled locations was identified.

R53-7 The commenter states that no barrier will eliminate the project operational noise impact identified in the DEIR. This is consistent with the findings of the DEIR for operational noise during full-capacity events. The DEIR finds that project operational noise related to events at the field would remain significant and unavoidable even with all feasible mitigation implemented. Per Mitigation Measure N-2, the District would be required to retain an acoustical consultant during the final design of the PA system to reduce noise impacts to the degree feasible through measures that may include but are not limited to a sound wall along the property line to the east and recommendations for the final location of speakers/light poles. Prior to the first sports field event, the PA system contractor will perform a system check to verify that spill-over noise is minimized in the adjacent community. The commenter states that the surrounding residences should have a sound transmission loss (STL) of 67 but that the residences are built to STL 34. No evidence is provided for this comment, and it is not clear how the commenter determined these purported sound ratings. No changes to the EIR are warranted.

R53-8 The commenter states that Musco Lighting technology would minimize the effect of light spillage and states that it would not reduce light spillage to acceptable levels. The commenter requests some other type of light baffles or shields to mitigate light and glare spillage. To clarify, as discussed in Section 3.3, *Project Characteristics*, the proposed project

2. Response to Comments

incorporates 1,430-watt Musco TLC-LED-1500 lamps equipped with external glare control visors. Chapter 5.1, *Aesthetics*, of the DEIR addressed the proposed project's light and glare impacts and incorporated Mitigation Measure AE-1, which requires that all lighting be shielded and directed downward onto the athletic fields to minimize potential light escape and/or spillover onto adjacent properties. The mitigation measure incorporates shielding; however, as discussed in DEIR Chapter 5.1, *Aesthetics*, light and glare impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable. This issue is adequately addressed in the DEIR, and no changes are warranted.

- R53-9 The commenter states that the parking study did not account for recent regulatory changes that allow for accessory dwelling units, which many neighbors have implemented and which increases residential parking demand. The commenter states that parking will be a larger impact than initially reported. The commenter asks how parking will be handled given that mitigation did not reduce its impact. The commenter is correct that the proposed project's impacts on parking were determined to be significant and unavoidable. The DEIR identified Mitigation Measure T-1, which would require the implementation of an event traffic control plan for large events; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The event traffic control plan will identify available parking in off-street areas that can be secured and/or leased by the District during capacity events. It has also been modified as part of this FEIR to include consideration of the use of shuttles if off-site lots are employed during events. If it is feasible to secure additional off-street parking supplies, such as at the Community Life Church, as recommended in the parking analysis, the on-street parking demand and associated effects, including vehicles traveling to and from on-street parking areas, could be reduced. The DEIR properly discloses the proposed project's impact on parking, and no changes to the DEIR are warranted.
- R53-10 This comment serves as a conclusion to the comment letter and reiterates their disapproval for the project. Comments received on the DEIR have been reviewed by the District as part of the decision-making process for the proposed project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R54 – Emily Johnston (1 page)



R54

CVHS Field <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Field Project

1 message

Emily Johnston <emilyj7591@gmail.com>
To: cvhsfield@gusd.net

Tue, Mar 9, 2021 at 10:56 AM

Good morning,

I am writing in regards to the proposed stadium project at Crescenta Valley High School as a longtime resident and neighbor in the community. I am hoping this letter and the others written with genuine concern are received and regarded with the attention and seriousness they warrant.

R54-1

This proposed stadium upgrade is flashy and exciting, a new jewel for the community's kids to play sports on while parents cheer on the sidelines. No more trudging to glendale(what a commute) for those home games. A year ago, there was a meeting at CVHS in regards to this project and while in attendance I heard many pros from the students and parents, and many cons from the neighbors and community. The Environmental Impact Report was meant to investigate those concerns and propose mitigating solutions for the primary concerns listed as follows: light pollution, noise pollution, parking, security, and trash. Having read the EIR it is plain to see that those concerns have been pushed aside and deemed an opportunity cost low enough to be acceptable. This lack of action regarding genuine community concern is unsurprising albeit disappointing.

As it stands the district and high school does not adequately address the parking and security concerns of the community in regards to school activity at the field so it stands they would bulldoze past reasonable opposition to a major stadium upgrade with zero parking plans and no security or concern for the noise and light pollution that will inevitable impact the local residents.

R54-2

I know already that the ship has sailed and the board will go forward with this plan at the expense of the neighborhood and our quality of life. I hope this letter and others like it will serve as a record for the future when these concerns all come to a head and liability is in question. Thank you for receiving these concerns and reminding average citizens that even at a local level, government has no problem wasting tax dollars on superfluous projects and ignoring reasonable opposition from concerned neighbors in the process.

R54-3

Thanks in advance for the blocked driveway,

Emily Johnston
8184381922

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R54. Response to Comments from Emily Johnston, received March 9, 2021.

- R54-1 The commenter states that they are a longtime resident and attended the public meeting for the project. The commenter states that the EIR pushed aside community concerns regarding light pollution, noise pollution, parking, security, and trash. These issues are addressed in the DEIR, and there are specific mitigation measures that address these issues. The DEIR evaluated the impacts of light and glare in Chapter 5.1, *Aesthetics*. The DEIR evaluated the impacts of noise in Chapter 5.8, *Noise*. The DEIR evaluated the impacts of parking in Chapter 5.10, *Transportation*. Public safety is addressed in Chapter 5.9, *Public Services*, which has been updated as part of this FEIR. The initial study for the proposed project (Appendix A to the DEIR) determined that the proposed project would generate solid waste typical of sport fields, and such solid waste would be disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. CVHS currently and will continue to provide trash cans along Ramsdell Avenue and will provide trash receptacles on-site for trash disposal. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated." Because no specific comments are provided, no further response is warranted.
- R54-2 The commenter states that the district and high school did not adequately address parking and security concerns related to school activity on the field and ignored opposition to the project, with no plans for parking and security and no concern for noise and light pollution impacts on local residents. As discussed under response A54-1, parking, public safety, noise, and lighting have been evaluated in the DEIR. No specific comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of these topics have been provided by the commenter. No further response is warranted.
- R54-3 The commenter provides concluding remarks about the District not addressing community concerns and misusing tax dollars. All comments received during the public comment period have been responded to in this Final EIR and will be provided to the District Board of Education for review when considering whether to approve the project.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R55 – Christine Rodriguez (Page 1 of 1)

Subject: CVHS field
To: <cvhsfield@gusd.net>

Good morning,
My family and I live on Prospect Ave (close to CVHS). I'm emailing you to voice my support for the proposed CVHS stadium. This will be something great for our community!! It will give our teens something to do close to home on the weekends. Some of my neighbors are negative and are loudly voicing their opposition. However, I want to inform you that most of those I have spoken to are very supportive! :) Thank you for your work on this project. I look forward to catching a game there in the future.

R55-1

--
Best,
Christine Rodriguez
(818) 422-6965

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R55. Response to Comments from Christine Rodriguez, received March 15, 2021.

R55-1 The commenter expresses their support for the proposed project. No further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

LETTER R56 - Claudia McCollum (Page 1 of 1)

R56

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **claudia mccollum** <mccollumclaudia@hotmail.com>

Date: Wed, Mar 31, 2021 at 11:25 AM

Subject: CVHS stadium project

To: ssahakian@gusd.net <ssahakian@gusd.net>, sdickinson@gusd.net <sdickinson@gusd.net>, nahabedian@gusd.net <nahabedian@gusd.net>, agharpetian@gusd.net <agharpetian@gusd.net>, gkrikorian@gusd.net <gkrikorian@gusd.net>

To GUSD board members,

I would like to let the GUSD board know that approving this plan will be a mistake. The DEIR says the parking, lighting, and sound issues are unavoidable. The parking solution of using street will require, at a minimum, 40 blocks of street parking that is not reasonable (given 1000 cars, 40 cars per block, half of those used by residents. This will be a nightmare for our community.

You board members knowing these issues should vote against the project.

GUSD might end up with future lawsuits if this goes through. Safety for pedestrians, players and neighbors is a big concern. Our streets don't have lights or sidewalks which makes it unsafe for football fans and neighbors. I personally will make sure that when problems arise, which it will be a matter of time you, the GUSD board will be held responsible!

We the neighbors are making you aware of the problems and if you ignore the issues and go through with this. It will be your fault; any future problems this project brings will be on you.

The fight that happened at Hoover, and the media attention it got will be nothing compare to having 2 teams (opponents) in a small community with no parking designations sharing the same entrance and space.

I hope you think it through and vote against the project.

Thank you

Claudia McCollum

Sent from my iPhone

--

Steve Dickinson

Stephen Dickinson

Chief Business and Financial Officer

Glendale Unified School District

Office: 818-241-3111 ext. 1271

223 N. Jackson Street

Glendale, CA 91206

NOTICE: This email and any attachments are confidential and privileged. This document may contain confidential business or personal information or information covered under the Privacy Act, 5 USC 552(a), and/or the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (PL 104-191) and its various implementing regulations and must be protected in accordance with those provisions. Healthcare information is personal and sensitive and must be treated accordingly. If this correspondence contains healthcare information it is being provided to you after appropriate authorization from the patient or under circumstances that don't require patient authorization. You, the recipient, are obligated to maintain it in a safe, secure and confidential manner. Redisclosure without additional patient consent or as permitted by law is prohibited. Unauthorized redisclosure or failure to maintain confidentiality subjects you to application of appropriate sanction. If you have received this correspondence in error, please reply to the sender at once, and destroy the correspondence and any copies you may have made.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

2. Response to Comments

R56. Response to Comments from Claudia McCollum, received March 31, 2021.

R56-1 The commenter provides a general list of the topics found to be significant and unavoidable in the DEIR (light, noise, and parking). The commenter expresses their disapproval of the proposed project's parking impact. The proposed project's impact on street parking is adequately analyzed and disclosed in the DEIR. The District will implement mitigation measure T-1, which would reduce the proposed project's parking impacts. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and no further response is warranted.

R56-2 The commenter expresses concern regarding pedestrian safety and states that streets do not have streetlights nor sidewalks, which makes it unsafe for players, attendees, and neighbors. Access points for events at the facility will include Ramsdell Avenue, Archway Drive, and Prospect Avenue. The project description in the FEIR has been revised to prohibit general pedestrian access on the east side of the campus near the terminus of Altura Avenue (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the Draft EIR*). District will install an 8-foot fence at the northeast end of the track and field and will lock the existing turnstile from use. Campus access from this location would be limited to an emergency gate for fire/paramedic uses and District vehicles only, which would prohibit pedestrian access from this location and limit pedestrian and vehicle activity along Altura Avenue east of the campus. The DEIR has been updated to reflect pedestrian closure at the northeast end of the track and field (see Chapter 3, *Revisions to the DEIR*).

Roadway segments with sidewalks and without sidewalks on routes to these entrance points will be pedestrian routes for those that park farther away and walk to the facility, or for those that walk from home to the facility. These roadways are used by pedestrians under existing conditions, and by school students as well when school is in session. This use will continue when evening events occur at the project facility. The District does not plan on improving the conditions on local residential roadways as part of the proposed project. The proposed project incorporates Mitigation Measure T-1, which provides for the preparation of an event traffic control plan, which would guide vehicles and pedestrians during sporting events at the proposed project and ensure public safety. The comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and no changes to the EIR are warranted.

R56-3 This comment provides a conclusion to the comment letter. The commenter expresses their disapproval of the proposed project and urges the District to vote no. All comments received during the public comment period have been responded to in this Final EIR and will be provided to the District Board of Education for review when considering whether to approve the project. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR and no further response is warranted.

2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section contains revisions to the DEIR based upon (1) additional or revised information required to prepare a response to a specific comment; (2) applicable updated information that was not available at the time of DEIR publication; and/or (3) typographical errors. This section also includes additional mitigation measures to fully respond to commenter concerns as well as provide additional clarification to mitigation requirements in the DEIR. The provision of these additional mitigation measures does not alter any impact significance conclusions as disclosed in the DEIR. Changes made to the DEIR are identified here in ~~strikeout text~~ to indicate deletions and in double underlined text to signify additions.

3.2 DEIR REVISIONS IN RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

The following text has been revised in response to comments received on the DEIR.

Page 1-4, Section 1-4, *Project Summary*, is hereby modified based on comments received.

The proposed project would redevelop the area north of the existing track and field and south of the tennis courts to install permanent bleachers and new field lighting for the existing track and field. Additional improvements would include a restroom and storage/maintenance buildings, a team room, and a concession stand. The proposed project includes the development of new bleachers with 3,442 seats. All 3,442 seats would be along the northeastern portion of the existing field. The bleachers would be aluminum and galvanized steel construction with concrete foundations. In addition, the project would include the installation and operation of four 100-foot-tall light poles along the perimeter of the running track. The project would also include a 540-square-foot concession stand along the northern perimeter of the project site and a 2,254-square-foot home team room along the southeastern perimeter of the project site. The proposed project would make use of existing street and on-site parking, as well as utilizing available parking at the La Crescenta Elementary School campus. No change in site ~~access or~~ parking would occur. As part of the project, an 8-foot fence would be installed at the northeast end of the track and field and the existing turnstile would be locked and not used. Campus access at this location would be limited to an emergency gate for fire/paramedic uses and District vehicle access only. The school's use of the proposed field would be from 7:00 am to 10:00 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 10:00 pm on Saturday. Table 1-1, Proposed Athletic Field Improvements, provides details for each component of the proposed project.

3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

Page 3-9, Section 3.3.1, *Proposed Field Improvements*, is hereby modified based on comments received.

The proposed project would redevelop the area south of the tennis courts and north of the existing track and field to install permanent bleachers and new field lighting around the existing track and field. Additional improvements would include a restroom and storage/maintenance buildings, a team room, and a concession stand. The proposed project would make use of existing street and on-site parking. No change in site access or parking would occur. As part of the project, an 8-foot fence would be installed at the northeast end of the track and field and the existing turnstile would be locked and not used. Campus access at this location would be limited to an emergency gate for fire/paramedic uses and District vehicle access only. This would prohibit pedestrian access to events at the track and field, with the intent to limit pedestrian and vehicular activity along Altura Avenue east of the campus. This would discourage use of that end of campus for anything except emergencies. Games and events would utilize the existing primary Ramsdell Avenue entrance as well as other campus entrance points only. The proposed field lighting is necessary for evening use on both weeknights and weekends because varsity games are currently held at Glendale High School, approximately seven miles to the south of the project site. The school's use of the proposed field would be from 7:00 am to 10:00 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 10:00 pm on Saturday.

Mitigation Measure AE-1 is hereby modified based on comments received. This mitigation measure is on DEIR page 1-7, Table 1-2, *Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation*, and page 5.1-30, Section 5.1.6, *Mitigation Measures*.

- AE-1 The Glendale Unified School District shall minimize the effects of new sources of nighttime lighting by incorporating the following measures into project design and operation:
- All lighting shall be shielded and directed downward onto the athletic fields to minimize potential light escape and/or spillover onto adjacent properties.
 - The new athletic field lights shall be shall shut off automatically at 10:00 p.m. A voicemail phone number and contact information will be posted on the school website and made available to neighbors that can be used in the event lights remain on past 10:00 pm, or to report any (non-emergency) incidents related to use of the field for large events. The District will manage and respond to all calls received.
-

Page 5.9-5, Section 5.9.2.1, *Environmental Setting*, is hereby modified based on comments received.

Existing Conditions

Law enforcement service in the unincorporated community of La Crescenta-Montrose is provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD). The closest police station to the project site is the Crescenta Valley Sheriff's Station at 4554 Briggs Avenue, 0.7-mile northeast of the project site. The District coordinates with LASD for events held on campus through the School Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Agreement for Special Events By and Between the County of Los Angeles and the District.

3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

Page 5.9-6, Section 5.9.2.1, *Environmental Setting*, is hereby modified based on comments received.

The Crescenta Valley Sheriff's Station currently employs 63 sworn personnel and 28 civilian employees. Sworn personnel include 1 captain, 1 operations lieutenant, 3 lieutenants/watch commanders, 1 operations sergeant, 14 sergeants, 4 watch deputies, 4 field training officers, and 35 deputies (LASD 2020). LASD has established an optimal service response time of 10 minutes or less for emergency response incidents (a crime in progress and a life or death situation), 20 minutes or less for priority response incidents (a crime or incident in progress but not a life or death situation), and 60 minutes or less for routine response incidents (a crime that has already occurred and is not a life or death situation). In 2018-2019, LASD had an average response time of ~~3.5~~ 3.2 minutes (Los Angeles 2019).

Page 5.9-7, Section 5.9.2-3, *Environmental Impacts*, Impact 5.9-2 is hereby modified based on comments received.

The proposed project consists of the redevelopment of existing track and field at Crescenta Valley HS to install permanent bleachers and new field lighting. Additional improvements would include a restroom and storage/maintenance buildings, a team room, and a concession stand. The proposed improvements would result in additional usage of the project site during organized events or practices, which are currently held at Glendale High School 7 miles south of the project site. Due to the nature of the facilities proposed, there is potential that such conditions would potentially increase the need for sheriff protection services, alter response times, or adversely affect the department's ability to provide service to the site using existing equipment and personnel.

LASD has an average response time of 3.5 minutes, and the Crescenta Valley Sheriff Station currently has 63 sworn personnel and 28 civilian employees. The proposed project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on police services. Currently, there are no existing deficiencies in the level of police service provided to the area including and surrounding the project site. Additionally, as stated in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, the District will implement an event traffic control plan to direct traffic flow and ensure public safety during major sporting events. With the implementation of the management plan, the proposed project would not result in adverse road conditions that would interfere with LASD operations during an event of emergency or disaster. The proposed project would not have a significant impact on the ability to maintain adequate level of police protection service to the area.

~~Additionally,~~ The proposed project would allow for home varsity football games to be held at Crescenta Valley HS and during major sporting events, the number of ~~traffic~~ vehicles and pedestrians would increase at the project site. However, the District would continue to coordinate with LASD for events held on campus through the School Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Agreement for Special Events By and Between the County of Los Angeles and the District, to ensure there is sufficient law enforcement to meet the needs of individual events. Additionally, as stated in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, the District would implement an event traffic control plan with school safety traffic control personnel stationed at the intersections to help improve traffic flow and ensure public safety during peak travel times to and from major sporting events held at Crescenta Valley HS. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect the LASD's ability to provide adequate

3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

service and would not require new or expanded police facilities that could result in adverse environmental impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than Significant.

Mitigation Measure T-1 is hereby modified based on comments received. This mitigation measure appears on DEIR page 1-13, Table 1-2, *Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation*, and page 5.10-17, Section 5.10.6, *Mitigation Measures*.

T-1 Prior to any ground disturbing activities, the District shall prepare an event traffic control plan. The plan shall be implemented during major sporting events held at CVHS (e.g., where near-full or full capacity is anticipated, such as at varsity or championship football games). The plan shall require that, immediately prior to each major sporting event, documentation of all available off-street parking supplies and temporary signage be placed at appropriate, pre-determined locations along local streets in the vicinity of available event parking areas. The plan shall also determine additional parking spaces at nearby vacant or underutilized parking lots and require that District school safety traffic control personnel be available to direct event traffic to and from available designated parking areas. Additionally, the plan shall consider the provision of a shuttle service in the event that off-site parking lots are available and used for individual events (this would vary on an event-by-event basis). The traffic officers shall be stationed at the intersections to help improve traffic flow and ensure public safety during peak travel times to and from major sporting events held at CVHS. All temporary directional signage shall be removed by traffic control personnel following each major stadium event.