

Letter I339. Signatory – Winfield Goulden

Response to Comment I339-1

From: Hamilton Goulden Sylvia <sylhamilton@yahoo.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Sun, Feb 19, 2006 11:39 AM
Subject: City's sewer system expansion

from: Winfield Goulden (address below)

Dear Sirs:

As a resident adjacent to Woodbridge Park, it is alarming and ludicrous to hear that this neighborhood park is being considered as a site for a tunnel shaft and possible air treatment facility for the Department of Public Works sewer project! This lovely little park serves a large area of residents who fill the park daily with children and families with no other nearby open areas. They have just remodeled and added new play equipment for youngsters. At 86 years old, I walk in this park every day, for health and pleasurable moments watching the activity happening there.

I339-1 The Oakwood School, which is adjacent to the park, is currently building and remodeling, and is already enough disturbance to the neighborhood.

There seems to be no logical reason why the Caltrans North Hollywood Maintenance Yard cannot be used. It is located at the eastern end of the block, which would disturb far less residents and not hinder use of our precious park.

It is simply beyond my comprehension why the park would be considered in the first place, especially with a viable alternative.

Thank you for your consideration and courtesy in this matter.

Sincerely,
Winfield Goulden
4317 Klump Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602
818 761-9392
sylhamilton@yahoo.com

Brings words and photos together (easily) with
PhotoMail - it's free and works with Yahoo! Mail.

Letter I340. Signatory – Ilyse Pallenberg

Response to Comment I340-1

From: Ilyse Pallenberg <ilyse@canyondesigngroup.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 1, 2006 3:15 PM
Subject: Against using Woodbridge Park

I340-1 [My name is Ilyse Pallenberg and I'm against using Woodbridge Park as the sight for the tunnel. My kids play at that park all the time and we would miss it terribly. It's vital open space within Studio City.

Sincerely,

Ilyse Pallenberg
11815 Laurel Hills Rd.
Studio City Ca 91604
818.508.8583

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I342. Signatory – Julie McGovern

Response to Comment I342-1

February 14, 2006

Jawahar P. Shah
City of Los Angeles
Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation
Wastewater Engineering Services Division
Media Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Dear Mr. Shah:

I'm writing to you to express my concerns, as a resident and a parent, on the Glendale-Burbank Integrated Sewer portion of the Integrated Resources Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). It will have a devastating effect on my home in Burbank's most historic area, the Rancho Neighborhood.

I strongly urge you to choose the GBIS SOUTH ALIGNMENT alternative over the NORTH for these very important reasons:

1. **Air Quality:** I have a 5-year old daughter and a 3-year old son -- the proposed permanent ATF (Air Treatment Facility) located in the Pollywog is on my very street -- just three blocks from my home. That means the foul odors, that can travel half a mile, WILL reach my property. Where will my children play? They can't stay inside all the time. What about the damaging effect on their young lungs?
 - a. Plus, the ATF odors combined with the Sewer Gas Emissions WILL exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District limit.
 - b. Also, the Shaft Sites, 60-foot wide and 120 feet deep is just 10 meters from the nearest residential home. That's closer than the legal distance allowed of 12 to 20 meters.
2. **Noise Pollution:** 3-years of construction noise, the level doubled by the 134 W. sound wall, will be unbearable. It will be the end of my children's naps! And, that's assuming there is no noisy night construction. Also, the 100 truck trips a day will ruin the peacefulness of our quiet family streets, making them very noisy and very, very dangerous for our children!
3. **The Parks:** The GBIS North Alignment will destroy three Parks!
 - a. The first, Bette Davis Park, the removal and destruction of various beautiful, old native trees.
 - b. The Second, The Pollywog: this is not "vacant" land, it is part of Griffith Park, and would have to be permanently closed. The Pollywog is a

Comment noted. Refer to responses to the City of Burbank's comment letter AJ1 regarding your concerns. Specifically, refer to response to comments AJ1-4 and AJ1-19 (recreation), AJ1-6 (air quality/odors), and AJ1-14 (noise/sound wall). As described in Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR, the staff recommended GBIS Alignment does not include a shaft site or ATF in the Rancho Burbank area.

I342-1

I342-1

Letter I342. Signatory – Julie McGovern

Page 2

beautiful nature spot used daily by residents to play, walk their dogs and exercise their horses. Horses have been a unique part of the Rancho area since the 1920's – we should do everything we can to preserve that.

- c. And lastly, the Buena Vista/Johnny Carson Park. This park is not only dedicated to the memory of legendary "Tonight Show" host Johnny Carson, it is also located just steps away from a private high school "Providencia". Students workout and play daily in that park! The park is also directly across the street from the very busy NBC Studios.

The construction filth, traffic noise and congestion will inconvenience thousands of people on a daily basis.

There is a reason that an ATF site has never been built in a residential neighborhood. Please, please say YES to the less populated South Alignment and respect the sanctity of Burbank's historical Rancho Neighborhood.

Thank you,



Julie McGovern
Rancho Resident & Very Concerned Parent
530 S. Reese Place
Burbank, CA 91506

Cc: Antonio Villaraigosa, Mayor
Michael D. Antonovich
Rodney Andersen, P.E.
Rita Robinson
Councilman Tom La Bonge
Councilman Greig Smith
Councilwoman Jan Perry
Councilman Eric Garcetti
Councilwoman Wendy Greuel

Letter I343. Signatory – Lisa Thomas

Response to Comment I343-1

From: Russ and Lisa <rnlthomas@adelphia.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 23, 2006 10:08 PM
Subject: Please save our park.

Dear Sir,

I am writing to express our dismay at the proposal to close our park and build a sewage system under it. I am a mother of 3 young children who crave the outdoors. This park is an oasis for them. The outdoor spaces around this big city of ours are so cramped and kids really need a place to run and use all their growing muscles. I can't say enough what an important part of their and my life this park is. I speak for so many families here. Please don't save this park for the kids and future leaders of our city. Please build the sewage system under the other proposed site.

I343-1

Sincerely,

Lisa Thomas
4318 Kraft Ave.
Studio City, CA 91604
818-753-8117

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I344. Signatory – Benjamin F. Beckler III

From: ben beckler <benbeckler@yahoo.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Sun, Feb 26, 2006 6:01 PM
Subject: Soth Alignment Opposition

Please find the attached opposition to the City of Los Angeles sewer alignmnet project

CC: Marsha Ramos <'mramos@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us'>, Jeff Van der Borght <'jvanderborght@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us'>, Tom Campbell <'tcampbell@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us'>, David Golonski <'dgolonski@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us'>

Response to Comment I344-1

Comment noted. Refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR for a detailed discussion of the GBIS alignments, including the staff recommended GBIS Alignment. In addition, refer to response to comment AJ31-2 for information on a suggested Los Angeles River alignment.

Response to Comment I344-2

A subsequent information notice was distributed on February 27, 2006 that extended the comment period to March 31, 2006. Refer to Sections 1.2 and 1.3 of this Final EIR for a summary of the public review period and interim activities associated with the Draft EIR.

To whom it may concern,

As a property owner in both the Cities of Burbank and Los Angeles, I am troubled by, and opposed to the City of Los Angeles's proposed last minute realignment to the South Alignment Plan. This proposed realignment is nothing more than Councilman Tom LaBonge's partisan attempt to protect residents and constituents of the City of Los Angeles.

I344-1

As an owner of properties at 4227 Lankershim Boulevard and 4140 National Ave. Burbank, I am directly and seriously impacted by either alignment of the South alignment proposal. I am opposed to both South alignment proposals.

Given the City of Los Angeles has unimpeded access from the Los Angeles zoo to the intersection of Vineland Ave and the 170 Hollywood Freeway via the Los Angeles River bed, it appears obvious that this route would afford the project the most direct route and create the least amount of negative impact to the City's of Burbank, Glendale and Los Angeles

I344-2

As a property owner I have not been afforded the proper opportunity to study, address, and comment on the original or revised South alignment proposal. At this time I request an extension of the EIR comment period in order to fully study and comment on the proposed project.

Benjamin F. Beckler III
Homeowner/Property Owner

4140 National Ave.,
Burbank, CA 91505

4227 Lankershim Blvd.
North Hollywood, Ca 91602

(818) 843-6998
(818) 421-1211
(818) 638-4556

Letter I345. Signatory – Alan Levy

Response to Comment I345-1

From: "Alan Levy" <amlevy@adelphia.net>
To: "Jawahar P. Shah" <jxshah@san.lacity.org>, "Adel Hagekhalil"
<ahhajeka@san.lacity.org>
Date: 2/9/2006 1:01:56 PM
Subject: SAVE WOODBRIDGE PARK

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

February 9, 2006

Honorable Antonio Villaraigosa

Mayor, City of Los Angeles

Los Angeles City Hall

200 North Spring Street, Room 303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mayor Villaraigosa,

We need your help! The Department of Public Works will commence tunneling beneath our neighborhood in approximately 2010 continuing the new sewer line connecting NorthEast Interceptor Sewer (phase 2) with upstream connections and a future upstream sewer (VSLIS) that will extend to the Tilman Water Reclamation Plant in Van Nuys.

I345-1

One of the locations under consideration for the tunneling shaft and subsequent closure is recently refurbished (at taxpayer expense) Woodbridge Park. This section of the project will take four years of tunneling to complete, running two shifts per day, six days a week. Studio City would lose one of its prime open spaces and there would be a significant negative impact on the surrounding residential community. The constant noise would be impossible to mitigate, home owners would be stung by reduced property values, there would be dangerous safety problems due to increased construction traffic, and most importantly, the Department of Public Works admits the construction could exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) threshold of significance for all criteria pollutants; and

Letter I345. Signatory – Alan Levy

Page 2

operation would exceed the threshold of significance of NOx and VOCs. There could also be significant odor impacts.

We also understand that as of today, a second location is under serious consideration. It is the nearby Caltrans Maintenance Station located on Moorpark Avenue near the 170 freeway. This site would have much less negative impact on local residents. We understand the importance of upgrading Los Angeles' sewer system and realize the shaft must, and will, be dug somewhere. But when one location, the Caltrans Maintenance Station makes so much more sense than the other, it is troubling that the two are even mentioned in the same discussion.

I345-1

Councilmember Greuel, the Studio City Residents Association, the Studio Neighborhood Council, and the Studio City Chamber of Commerce have all come out against the

closure of Woodbridge Park. A rally to save Woodbridge Park has been scheduled for Monday, February 20th, at 2 pm. Not only have concerned Studio City residents been asked to attend, but newspapers and TV news departments have been notified. We look forward to your assistance on this crucial local issue and hope you find the time in your busy schedule to attend.

Sincerely,

Alan Levy

Committee to Save Woodbridge Park

cc: Councilmember Wendy Greuel

Councilmember Tom Labonge

Norma Vega

Larry Frank

Jimmy Blackman

Cynthia Ruiz, President of Board of Public Works

3 (Individuals) – 363

**Integrated Resources Plan
Final Environmental Impact Report**

Letter I345. Signatory – Alan Levy

Page 3

cc: Councilmember Wendy Greuel
Councilmember Tom Labonge
Norma Vega
Larry Frank
Jimmy Blackman
Cynthia Ruiz, President of Board of Public Works
Rita L. Robinson, Director, Bureau of Sanitation
Jawahar P. Shah, Bureau of Sanitation
Adel Hagekhalil, Wastewater Engineering Services Division
Tony Lucente, SCRA President
Rafi Kuyumji, SCNC President
Bruce Neckels, SC Chamber President

Rita L. Robinson, Director, Bureau of Sanitation

Jawahar P. Shah, Bureau of Sanitation

Adel Hagekhalil, Wastewater Engineering Services Division

Tony Lucente, SCRA President

Rafi Kuyumji, SCNC President

Bruce Neckels, SC Chamber President

Letter I346. Signatory – Barbara DeLucia

Response to Comment I346-1

From: Babs or Leslye <dickens2@sbcglobal.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Jan 12, 2006 3:20 PM
Subject: Woodbridge Park Sewage Tunnel Project

To Whom It May Concern.

I work in the Studio City area and live in Sherman Oaks.

The proposed sewage tunneling project at the proposed site of Woodbridge Park is a very disappointing choice and poor use of taxpayer's money. Why are park and recreational facilities always the most expendable properties ~ especially in light of recent Prop K improvements.

I346-1 I am a frequent visitor to the Woodbridge Park and this news is deeply disturbing. This is a quiet, residential area.

I implore you, the Dept of Public Works/Bureau of Sanitation, to consider using the alternative site for this project, the CalTrans NoHo Maintenance Yard.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barbara DeLucia
14844 Dickens Street #302
Sherman Oaks, CA 91043
818-905-7901

Film Musicians Secondary Markets Fund

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I347. Signatory – Carol McElwain

Response to Comment I347-1

From: "Carol McElwain" <Carol@mwco.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 27, 2006 12:55 PM
Subject: No Sewer in Pollywog Field

Dear Sirs & Madams;

We board our mini horse in a backyard stable of a homeowner in the Burbank Rancho. Because her backyard is not large enough for an arena, we walk our horse to Pollywog Field for her turn-outs. While there we always encounter numerous other neighbors either turning-out their horses, or just taking their dogs for a walk in the park. Additionally, my daughter rides her other horse, which is boarded at the Silver Spur Stable, around the Equestrian Center perimeter and often rides over through Pollywog Field. She is not allowed to go up into the Griffith Park hills riding and needs the flatter terrain of Pollywog.

I347-1

We are opposed to any plans to use this "vacant property" for the proposed sewer project and wanted to be one more voice letting you know it is not an unused piece of land.

Thank you,
Carol McElwain
507 N Niagara Street
Burbank, CA 91505
(818) 419-4918

Refer to response to comments AJ1-4 and AJ1-6 regarding the potential environmental effects of the proposed shaft site and ATF at Valley Heart/Pollywog. In addition, the City has combined the two GBIS alignments to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), has selected this alignment as preferred, and is recommending it for approval. As described in Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR, the staff recommended GBIS Alignment does not include a shaft site or ATF at Valley Heart/Pollywog. Comment noted.

Letter I348. Signatory – Hal Shafer

Response to Comment I348-1

From: Beverly Ventriss <bventriss@pacbell.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 27, 2006 6:00 PM
Subject: Comments Re Sewer Project-South Alignment

We understand our infrastructure needs to be updated but we are against the proposed route of the South Alignment for the Glendale/Burbank sewer project--the Integrated Resources Plan (IRP) -- which would tunnel, as part of its route, under the scenic residential street of Valley Spring Lane in Toluca Lake.

Valley Spring Lane should never have been considered as a route for this project. As the name implies, a spring runs beneath it and the street is located close to the Los Angeles River resulting in very sandy, porous soil underneath the street. Valley Spring Lane is also in very close proximity to the lake (Toluca Lake) which also has extremely sandy soil at its bottom. All homes on the lake and street could be adversely affected by these geologically-sensitive conditions, creating significant ground settlement by the proposed tunneling under Valley Spring Lane - even with use of the most technologically-advanced equipment.

I348-1

The proposed project is major construction and could result in other significant impacts for our neighborhood in the areas of air quality (sewage odors and pollutants), noise, vibration, transportation and traffic issues. Our property values could plummet. This is a long-term project that will last for years.

We ask the City of Los Angeles, for reasons cited above, to reject the use of Valley Spring Lane as part of the route for the Glendale/Burbank sewer project (IRP) and to explore instead a route that would make more sense, utilizing commercial city streets instead of tunneling under densely populated residential neighborhoods.

Thank you.

Hal Shafer
BeverlyVentriss
10515 Valley Spring Lane
Toluca Lake, CA 91602

(818) 508-7326
Toluca Lake Homeowners Assoc.

Comment noted. Regarding concerns about the potential for settlement during construction of GBIS in the Toluca Lake area refer to response to comment O1. To further minimize the potential for settlement impacts, mitigation measure GEO-MM-2 has been modified in this Final EIR (refer to Section 2) to add a goal to further limit surface settlement to 0.50-inch along the tunnel alignment. Refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR for a detailed discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which is a combination of the two GBIS alignments analyzed in the Draft EIR. The City combined these alignments to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), has selected this alignment as preferred, and is recommending it for approval.

Letter I349. Signatory – Bert H. Deixler

Response to Comment I349-1

From: "Deixler, Bert H." <BDeixler@proskauer.com>
To: <irp-eir@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 23, 2006 5:50 PM
Subject: Woodbridge park

I349-1

The prospect that my City may excise the "lungs" of Studio City is almost too shocking to comprehend. The idea that Woodbridge Park, a mainstay of the community and a site used by young and old, would be used as a site for the routing of the Northeast Interceptor Sewer reflects bad judgment and the creation of a clear risk. There is no apparent benefit to justify the burden imposed upon the community. I urge the City to give no further consideration to this enormously bad idea.

Bert H. Deixler, Esq. | PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
2049 Century Park East | Suite 3200 | Los Angeles, CA 90067-3206
V: 310.284.5663 | F: 310.557.2193
bdeixler@proskauer.com | www.proskauer.com
<http://www.proskauer.com/index.html>

This message and its attachments are sent from a law firm and may contain information that is confidential and protected by privilege from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are prohibited from printing, copying, forwarding or saving them. Please delete the message and attachments without printing, copying, forwarding or saving them, and notify the sender immediately.

Letter I350. Signatory – Debbie and Jonathan Feldman

Response to Comment I350-1

From: "Debbie Feldman" <DebbieFeldman@sbcglobal.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 20, 2006 7:36 AM
Subject: re: tunnel project in Studio City

The Feldman Family
16587 Bosque Drive
Encino, CA 91436
(818)789-7716

2/20/06

TO:
Dept. of Public Works,
Bureau of Sanitation,
WESD,
2714 Media Center Dr.,
L.A. CA 90065;

To Whom this may Concern,

I350-1

The Los Angeles Department of Public Works is currently considering Woodbridge Park for the site of a tunnel shaft and possible air treatment facility for an upcoming sewer improvement project.

This would be extremely detrimental to our elementary school and the surrounding community. Not only would it close one of Studio City's prime open spaces for about four years, it would create safety problems due to increased construction traffic and environmental hazards in the form of air pollution and odors.

We STRONGLY OPPOSE the building of this site at the Woodbridge Park location

Letter I350. Signatory – Debbie and Jonathan Feldman
Page 2

in North Hollywood, and will be joining efforts of our children's elementary school Oakwood as well as a group composed of Councilmember Wendy Greuel's office, the Studio City Residents Association, the Studio City Neighborhood Council, the Park Beautification Board, and the Tujunga Merchants Association.

I350-1 Please consider another site for this project and help protect our school and our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Debbie and Jonathan Feldman

Letter I353. Signatory – Donna Schwarzbach

Response to Comment I353-1

From: <DSSchwar@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Fri, Feb 24, 2006 9:37 AM
Subject: Woodbridge Park proposal

February 24, 2006
Jawahar P. Shah
City of Los Angeles
Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation
Wastewater Engineering Services Division
2714 Media Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Dear Sir:

I am writing to oppose the proposed selection of Woodbridge Park in Studio City as a tunneling site as part of the Northeast Interceptor Sewer for the City of Los Angeles' Integrated Resources Plan, Facilitated Resources Plan. Woodbridge Park serves many functions: it is a recreational resource for many residents - both homeowners and apartment dwellers; it is a consistent destination point for many who live outside the immediate area, but are close enough to enjoy its amenities; it is the very recent recipient of a new play area for toddlers and a newly landscaped southern entrance - paid for with over \$200,000 in public bond funds; its visitors enjoy state-of-the-art play equipment from a renovation less than five years ago; it is one of the few parks

that also has open areas that are not in continuous use by large sports programs; and finally, because so many walk to this park, it has a positive impact

on the environment by reducing gas emissions from motor vehicles.

If this project were to go forward and the park chosen as the tunneling site, all of these functions would cease to exist for over four years. This is

a site surrounded by homes, a school, a day care center, and a church. All would suffer impacts that could not be sufficiently mitigated. These impacts

include: loss of recreation and open space; constant hauling of construction dirt along residential streets and a secondary highway which is already clogged with traffic; air, noise and visual pollution 24 hours per day; future

loss of the park in its current configuration; loss of physical education space

for Oakwood School which has an existing contract with the Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks for use of a section of the park during the

school year.

No one questions the need to improve our sewer system. But to destroy a heavily-used and well-loved neighborhood park next to a fifty-five year old neighborhood school is definitely not the right choice for a city that has just

released an audit showing the need for public parks. Please eliminate Woodbridge Park from your selection alternatives.

Sincerely,

Donna Schwarzbach
12160 Summit Place

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

I353-1

Beverly Hills, CA 90210

3 (Individuals) – 373

**Integrated Resources Plan
Final Environmental Impact Report**

Letter I355. Signatory – Feris M. Greenberger

Response to Comment I355-1

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

I355-1

From: <FerisG@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 27, 2006 6:03 PM
Subject: Opposition to proposed use of Woodbridge Park for sewer project

I write to state my strong opposition to the proposed use of Woodbridge Park as a site for a tunnel shaft and possible air treatment facility for an upcoming Department of Public Works sewer project. Such a use would squander a well-loved and much-used recreational facility. Not only that, it would do so needlessly because a better alternative is available. Another site that I understand is being considered, the Caltrans North Hollywood Maintenance Yard, would be the far better choice.

Thank you for considering my views.

Ms. Feris M. Greenberger
4420 Auckland Avenue
Toluca Lake, CA 91602-2403
(818) 980-8039

I am a member of both the Toluca Lake Homeowners Association and the Studio City Residents Association, but the views expressed here are my own.

Letter I356. Signatory – Faye Kobashigawa

Response to Comment I356-1

From: <FKOBASH@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 6, 2006 9:42 AM
Subject: Woodbridge Park

Dear Sirs:

I am a resident of the neighborhood adjacent to Woodbridge Park in Studio City and am very much opposed to the proposed use of the park as the site for a tunnel shaft and possible air treatment facility (sewer project). I have lived 2 doors down from the park for 23 years. My children grew up in the park, playing there every day of the week as do hundreds of young children in

I356-1 this area. The park is also used by Oakwood School for physical education which their students need every day. It is an absolutely beautiful neighborhood gathering place and it would be a shame to see it destroyed. There are very few parks like Woodbridge in our area -- small, safe and constantly utilized.

The alternate site of the Caltrans North Hollywood maintenance yard is so close to the park. It seems ideal for your proposed project site and would not have the same adverse impact on our neighborhood. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Faye Kobashigawa
4316 Elmer Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602
(818)422-2967

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I357. Signatory – Feza Akcasu

Response to Comment I357-1

From: <akcasu@sbcglobal.net>
To: <irp-eir@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 8, 2006 5:24 PM
Subject: GBIS alignment

Hello,

As a resident of Burbank, I oppose the northern alignment of the GBIS. It would impact our neighborhoods significantly and makes no sense when the southern alignment is an option.

I357-1

Please approve the southern alignment and help us maintain the integrity of our neighborhoods.

Thank you,

Feza Akcasu
251 N. Reese Pl.
Burbank, CA 91506
818.567.0768

Comment noted. For a discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR.

Letter I358. Signatory – Daryle Ann and Mark Giardino

Response to Comment I358-1

Comment noted. Regarding concerns about the potential for settlement during construction of GBIS in the Toluca Lake area refer to response to comment O1. As detailed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIR, the Project Alternatives are not expected to be growth-inducing because the Project would not result in the construction of new housing (directly or indirectly by removing existing obstacles to growth), but is a plan to respond to SCAGs projected growth. Refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR for a detailed discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which is a combination of the two GBIS alignments analyzed in the Draft EIR. The City combined these alignments to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), has selected this alignment as preferred, and is recommending it for approval.

I358-1

From: <DARYDAR@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Tue, Feb 28, 2006 6:20 AM
Subject: Sewer Project in Toluca Lake

To The "Powers that Be",
My husband and I are long, long time residents of Toluca Lake and we are very upset about this Sewer Project. We want to keep this project OUT of the NEIGHBORHOOD where it doesn't IMPACT or EFFECT our quality of life. That means not on Valley Spring Lane. I understand that it could be done by going down MAJOR streets. Why would you even think about doing it in a residential area??? Isn't it bad enough that all the charming old buildings in the area are being torn down and eye sores are being constructed at a shockingly alarming rate. If the area can't support the growth it should limit the growth instead of bow down to it.

Sincerely,
Daryle Ann and Mark Giardino
P.O. ox 2432,
Toluca Lake, CA 91612
e-mail Darydar@aol.com

We belong to the Toluca Estates Home Owners and the Toluca Lake Home owners Association.

Letter I359. Signatory – Brydon and Mary Baker

Response to Comment I359-1

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

From: "B. Baker" <beaumix@adelphia.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Tue, Jan 10, 2006 11:02 PM
Subject: Woodbridge Park Destruction

I359-1

I have heard that your plans are discussing ruining this small neighborhood park with much construction. In light of the fact that the city recently invested \$200000 in improvements that would be either destroyed or diminished by your actions, it seems almost criminally negligent to proceed, when an alternative sight is so closeby (the Caltrans parking lot). Please note my strong protest against any destruction of this park, and keep me informed.

Thank you,

Brydon Baker
Mary Baker
11161 Valley Spring Lane
Studio City, CA 91602
brydon3@msn.com
MaryMBaker@aol.com
818 505-8908

Letter I360. Signatory – Claudia Hartman

Response to Comment I360-1

From: "Hartman, Claudia L" <Claudia.L.Hartman@disney.com>
To: <IRP-EIRdsan.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 2, 2006 11:18 AM
Subject: Save Woodbridge Park!

Hello,

I360-1 Please do not demolish Woodbridge Park for a Public Works project. We live in the neighborhood and I have walked to this park every day with my daughter since she was born. She is two now. There are no other parks close-by to walk to and it would be sorely missed.

I urge you to find another location for the Pubic Works project.

Thank you very much!

Claudia Hartman
mother of Lily

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I361. Signatory – Amanda Vlastas

Response to Comment I361-1

From: Amanda <amanda@amandavlastas.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Sat, Feb 4, 2006 11:41 AM
Subject: Save Woodbridge Park

I361-1 [Please save Woodbridge Park!
It is a neighborhood landmark and provides joy and greenery for families and
kids in all of the surrounding neighborhoods and a break from the strip
malls and buildings.

Thanks you,

Amanda Vlastas
4150 Kraft Ave
Studio City, Ca 91604
818-763-7907
No organization

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding
concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I362. Signatory – Alex Shindich

Response to Comment I362-1

From: "Alex Shindich" <alex@shindich.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 27, 2006 11:39 PM
Subject: Draft EIR Comments

Attention: Jawahar P. Shah
City of Los Angeles
Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation
Wastewater Engineering Services Division

Dear Mr. Shah,

I am writing to you regarding the GBIS project proposal. As a resident of the Burbank Toluca Lake, I am extremely concerned about city's proposed plans of routing the public sewer through the Toluca Lake area. I am worried that this plan, if implemented, will adversely affect the quality of life for my family and our neighbors in the following areas:

- I362-1
1. Air quality - the sewer is likely to produce sewage odors and pollutants
 2. Ground settlements near homes and in the streets
 3. Noise and vibration, both during the construction and during the operation of the sewer
 4. Excessive traffic during the construction period
 5. A *HIGHLY* likely decline in property values

I urge the city council to reject the proposed modification to the original alignment plan that requires routing the sewer underneath the Toluca Lake area. This issue is of utmost importance to my family and to our neighbors and we are hoping for a resolution that will keep our community undisturbed. We believe that this modified alignment is a *LOOSE*-*LOOSE* proposition for Tolucaans!

Sincerely,
Alex Shindich
210 S. Rose St.
Burbank, CA 91505
(323) 788-4501

C.C. Mayor Jef Vander Borght
C.C. Mary Alvord, Burbank City Council
C.C. Councilmember Tom LaBonge
C.C. Toluca Lake Homeowner's Association

CC: <Tom.LaBondge@lacity.org>, <malvord@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us>, <jvanderborght@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us>

As described in Section 1.3 of the Draft EIR, one of the objectives of the IRP is to meet projected wastewater system needs of the City of Los Angeles and contract agencies (i.e., City of Burbank); thereby maintaining infrastructure required for quality of life of all individuals, including the residents of Toluca Lake. Therefore, the new sewer would be an improvement to the areas infrastructure. Regarding concerns about the potential for settlement during construction of GBIS in the Toluca Lake area refer to response to comment O1. Refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR for a detailed discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which is a combination of the two GBIS alignments analyzed in the Draft EIR. The City combined these alignments to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), has selected this alignment as preferred, and is recommending it for approval. Comment noted.

Letter I363. Signatory – Anne Davis

Response to Comment I363-1

From: <SOnealADav@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Sat, Feb 25, 2006 10:34 AM
Subject: Integrated Resources Plan - Sewer Tunnel Project through Burbank Rancho

I363-1

As a concerned resident of the Burbank Rancho area (Riverside Drive and Reese 91506), I was shocked when I first learned of the possibility of the North Alignment for the GBIS. Los Angeles, as one of America's great cities, is unique for its western character. To possibly despoil the Rancho, an equestrian neighborhood, when the southern alternative would have far lesser impact on residential and business areas seems imprudent at best.

When visitors from other parts of the US, or from abroad, first learn of the Rancho area and the Equestrian Center, they are delighted to find such an unique area as part of a major, modern city.

I think all residents of the greater Los Angeles area will be interested in preserving the character of this neighborhood.

Very truly yours,

Anne Davis
(818) 388-4890

Comment noted. For a discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR.

Letter I364. Signatory – Barbara Brabec and Geoff Hansen

Response to Comment I364-1

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

From: <Barge224@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 23, 2006 12:42 PM
Subject: Save Woodbridge Park

I364-1

We strongly object to Woodbridge Park being even considered for a sewage site. Woodbridge Park is one of the few green spaces in our community and has the only playground in our neighborhood. Please save our park!

Barbara Brabec & Geoff Hansen & Family
Homeowners in the neighborhood of Woodbridge Park;
also members of Studio City Residents Association
4333 Kraft Avenue
Studio City, CA 91604
818-985-0019

CC: <GeoffH1124@aol.com>

Letter I365. Signatory – Alison Gann

Response to Comment I365-1

From: Alison Hall Gann <agann@adelphia.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 2, 2006 1:30 AM
Subject: Woodbridge Park Tunnel

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I365-1 As a nearby neighbor of Woodbridge Park and as a parent of three active boys, I'm writing to express my fervent desire that you choose an alternative site for the proposed tunnel shaft and possible air treatment facility other than Woodbridge Park. It seems clear to me that a much less disruptive choice would be the nearby Caltrans North Hollywood Maintenance Yard.

In appreciation of your time and consideration,

Alison Gann
4373 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91604
818 752 2601

Letter I366. Signatory – Dick Arnold

Response to Comment I366-1

From: Jawahar Shah
To: Emeerto Cheng; Kioumars Pourkazemi
Date: 1/6/2006 2:00:28 PM
Subject: Fwd: NorthEast Interceptor Sewer -- Woodbridge Park, Studio City

Please include this in EIR comments list.
Thanx.

I366-1
>>> Dick Arnold <arnoldlaw@sbcglobal.net> 1/6/2006 12:52 PM >>>
I'm writing to support the use of the Caltrans Maintenance Station at Moorpark and the Hollywood Freeway for this facility (NorthEast Interceptor Sewer), and NOT the use of (and therefore the destruction of) Woodbridge Park. We have few enough parks in Studio City, and the park was just upgraded with \$200,000 of Prop K funds. How could all of this work and this public money be cast aside? This makes the "digging up streets for sewers two weeks after repaving them" pale in comparison! PLEASE let common sense prevail, and stay away from Woodbridge Park!

Thank you.

Dick Arnold

Letter I367. Signatory – Donna Cohen

Response to Comment I367-1

From: "Donna Cohen" <dc@donnacohen.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Sat, Feb 11, 2006 7:36 AM
Subject: I oppose the woodbridge project

I367-1

There has got to be a better place to build this facility. This park is too important the neighbors and the school. Please don't build this at the woodbridge park. There's got to be another place to build it

Thanks you

Donna Cohen

Oakwood Parent

Donna Cohen

mobile 818 406 7432

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I368. Signatory – Elsy Hedman

Response to Comment I368-1

From: Elsy Hedman <elsylendinglogic@yahoo.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 22, 2006 1:31 PM

I368-1

Hello, my name is Elsy Hedman and I am a resident at 10219 Valley Spring Lane, Toluca Lake, Ca 91602. I am writing to respectfully voice my opposition to the GBIS South alignment. This project will destroy the tranquil environment my neighbors and I enjoy, and will negatively impact our property value. It is bad enough that the city has not repaved our street which is in dire need of repair, and now they want to embark on a long term project which will create traffic, noise and air pollution, and ground settlement.

If you have any questions, I can be contacted at 818-623-0061. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Elsy Hedman

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Regarding concerns about the potential for settlement during construction of GBIS in the Toluca Lake area refer to response to comment O1. Refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR for a detailed discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which is a combination of the two GBIS alignments analyzed in the Draft EIR. The City combined these alignments to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), has selected this alignment as preferred, and is recommending it for approval. Comment noted.

Letter I369. Signatory – Adrienne Crow

Response to Comment I369-1

From: Adrienne Crow <aacinca@yahoo.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 1, 2006 3:39 PM
Subject: Save Woodbridge Park

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm writing to ask you to please build the tunnel shaft and possible air treatment facility in Studio City at the location currently occupied by the Caltrans North Hollywood Maintenance Yard, instead of destroying Woodbridge Park.

Because we all know that once construction begins in that park, it is gone forever. Let's not kid ourselves about that.

I369-1 This should be a no-brainer. There's a perfectly good site, which is already owned by the City. Why elect to wipe out a beautiful little park? We need more open green spaces, not less. (Especially those of us who do not own our own homes. We depend on the parks because we don't have our own yards.)

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Adrienne Crow
12059 Hoffman St. #108
Studio City, CA 91604
818-655-5497

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I370. Signatory – Hope and Rich de Michele

Response to Comment I370-1

From: Hope Schenk <hopesdm@yahoo.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Tue, Feb 28, 2006 3:03 PM
Subject: Alert!

To whom it may concern:
Re: Integrated Resources Plan (IRP)

My husband and I have been out of town and just returned to find out about the proposed sewer and fresh water line running through Toluca Lake.

I370-1

I want it known on the record that we are very much opposed to the construction and ask that you reroute it through a less occupied neighborhood.

Thank you,
Hope and Rich de Michele
10149 Toluca Lake Ave.
Toluca Lake
818/766-6551

Relax. Yahoo! Mail virus scanning helps detect nasty viruses!

Comment noted. For a discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR.

Letter I371. Signatory – Anne Kurtzman

Response to Comment I371-1

From: "Anne Kurtzman" <Anne.Kurtzman@dngla.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 1, 2006 2:06 PM
Subject: Woodbridge Park

I371-1 [Los Angeles contains less public park space than any other major city in the US -- please consider the alternate site at the eastern end of the block. Please help preserve Woodbridge Park -- we need the oxygen!!!!]

Anne Kurtzman
12222 Califa Street
North Hollywood, CA 91607
818-985-5583

Private Citizen

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I372. Signatory – Anthony B. Montapert

Response to Comment I372-1

From: "Anthony B. Montapert" <amontapert@adelphia.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Sat, Feb 18, 2006 2:57 PM
Subject: Fw: Proposed Tunneling Site

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

From: Anthony B. Montapert
To: IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org
Sent: Saturday, February 18, 2006 2:45 PM
Subject: Proposed Tunneling Site

I372-1

[As homeowners in the area for the last 35 years, we strongly oppose the proposed tunneling for the City's sewer system at our neighborhood park, Woodbridge Park.
We sincerely hope that increasing opposition to this damaging propopsal will be given careful consideration in any approved plans.

Mr. and Mrs. Anthony B. Montapert
11160 Valley Spring Place
Studio City, CA 91602
(818)414-9574
Homeowners

Letter I373. Signatory – Barnette Ricci

Response to Comment I373-1

From: Barnette Ricci <barnette.ricci@sbcglobal.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 27, 2006 4:10 PM
Subject: Oppostion to GBIS "hybrid" Alignment

I live on McFarlane Avenue in the Burbank area of Toluca Lake.

I oppose the proposed GBIS "hybrid" Alignment revised route that would impact Rose Avenue.

Rose Avenue is the ONLY access in and out of my street, as the opposite intersection, at Pass Avenue, was made into a cul-de-sac years ago.

Making Rose a construction zone will further impact the traffic, especially in our alleys which is very dangerous, as well as many other factors (noise, vibration, ground settlement, air quality) in our community.

The Olive Ave./Pass Ave. path is equally problematic.

I am FOR the original GBIS South Alignment proposal. Please reconsider.

Thank you.

Barnette Ricci
4126 McFarlane Ave.
Burbank, CA 91505

Comment noted. For a discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR.

I373-1

Letter I374. Signatory – Beth Hubbard

Response to Comment I374-1

From: Beth Hubbard <bghduke@mac.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Sun, Feb 12, 2006 8:51 AM
Subject: WOODBRIDGE PARK

To whom it may concern:

I am a parent who's children go to Oakwood School and also whose children use Woodbridge Park. I am completely against the use of this park for the site of a tunnel shaft and possible air treatment facility for an upcoming sewer improvement project.

This would be extremely detrimental to our elementary school and the surrounding community. Not only would it close one of Studio City's prime open spaces for about four years, it would create safety problems due to increased construction traffic and environmental hazards in the form of air pollution and odors.

I374-1

Our children of Los Angeles do not have enough park's as it is and it seems to me that if the City actually cares about it's children and cares about it's future then it would understand that this is a very bad move. I understand that you are also considering the Cal Trans site in the same area, it would seem to me that that would be much more conducive to a project like this and would spend less of our tax dollars making the appropriate physical transition into a tunnel site.

I strongly urge the city to pick another site and NOT TO TEAR DOWN A PLACE WHERE OUR CHILDREN CAN GO AND EXPERIENCE JOY. THIS WOULD BE DANGEROUS FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND TOTALLY DISRUPTIVE TO THE SURROUNDING AREA.

Thank you,

Beth Hubbard
A very concerned mother and citizen of Los Angeles

Letter I375. Signatory – Bonnie Cameron Wells

Response to Comment I375-1

Comment noted. For a discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR.

From: "Wells, Bonnie Cameron" <Bonnie.Cameron.Wells@latimes.com>
To: "'IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org'" <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Mon, Dec 12, 2005 9:43 AM
Subject: Please pursue South Alignment

Hello,
I live at 1812 W. Riverside Dr. in Burbank, 91506. I am writing to request that the city NOT pursue the North Alignment because it will significantly reduce our property values. The Rancho neighborhood of Burbank is a quiet area of families and beautiful horse-zoned properties. My neighbors and I will fight any attempt to pursue the sewer tunnel project through our neighborhood.

Thank you for your time.

Bonnie Cameron Wells
818-953-4963

I375-1

Letter I376. Signatory – Carole Suydam

Response to Comment I376-1

From: Carole Suydam <suydam_carole@lacoee.edu>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 2, 2006 10:14 AM
Subject: Proposed use of Woodbridge Park in Studio City for sewer/tunnel shaft/air treatment facility - NO NO NO

February 2, 2006

TO: Jawahar Shah, City of Los Angeles
Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation

EIR Comments for Woodbridge Park, Studio City using Park as a site for a tunnel shaft and possible air-treatment facility for upcoming Dept. of Public Works sewer project

Carole Suydam
11555 Landale St.
Studio City, CA 91602
(818) 980-9502

SCRA

This is a highly used neighborhood park only a few blocks from my house. I use this park frequently and there are lots of kids from the neighborhood that are always there. Plus, it's right next door to an elementary school. I don't think that the above use is appropriate, at all.

I376-1

In today's Los Angeles Times, there was a good article about how critical and vital to neighborhoods, are these small parks and that they are highly used by people living near-by. It would be a TERRIBLE DECISION to remove this park, or to reduce the amount of land used for park purposes by a sewer project. It would be more appropriate to use the staging area a few doors to the east, adjacent to the freeway, where there is no park use already going on.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Carole Suydam

Letter I377. Signatory – Cathy Dore

Response to Comment I377-1

From: <BugsPR@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 6, 2006 12:14 AM
Subject: SAVE WOODBRIDGE PARK

I377-1

As a longtime resident of Studio City and a mother of three small children, I am STRONGLY opposed to using Woodbridge Park as the site for a tunnel shaft and possible air treatment facility for an upcoming Department of Public Works sewer project.

I FULLY support the Park Advisory Board and Councilmember Wendy Greuel in their efforts to instead use the Caltrans North Hollywood Maintenance Yard, located on the eastern end of that block, as the site for the sewer project.

I want my voice heard on this issue and will do anything necessary to preserve the park and help to find an alternative solution for this issue.

Thank you,

Cathy Dore'
12521 Sarah Street
Studio City, CA 91604
818/753-0866

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I378. Signatory – Cathy Lewis-Dougherty

Response to Comment I378-1

Comment noted. For a discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR.

From: "cathy" <cathyld321@earthlink.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 9, 2006 1:16 PM
Subject: Woodbridge Park

I378-1 [Please save Woodbridge Park. We enjoy using it with our children.

Cathy Lewis-Dougherty
12610 Sarah St.
Studio City, CA 91604
818-761-6825
SCRA

Letter I379. Signatory – Christine Marshall

Response to Comment I379-1

From: "Chris Marshall" <cm4429@pacbell.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Sun, Feb 26, 2006 5:30 PM
Subject: New Sewer Project / Meeting of February 22, 2006

Mr. Shah or Ms. Pham:

Name: Christine Marshall / 4429 Mariota Avenue / Toluca Lake, CA 91602
Phone: 818-761-8981
Organization: Member of Toluca Lake Homeowners Association

Comments -- as requested from Toluca Lake Homeowners Meeting:

[I379-1] As a resident of Toluca Lake, my concerns from what I heard at said meeting with reference to the proposed sewer plan is the fact that both the north or south plan would cause untold disruption for the community. There was insufficient time for my question with reference to the thought of even using Woodbridge Park as a shaft site. This must have come from personnel without children in their families -- walk to park space is almost non-existent in this area and taking away the most viable play area for local children and grandchildren is unconscionable!!! Please remove Woodbridge Park from a site consideration and use the CalTrans yard. In addition, please consider other issues raised by attendees: (1) various residents are concerned about the effect on the soil on the south side of the freeway which was learned in the 1994 earthquake, and feel the area north of the 134 freeway would be more acceptable to 100 foot depth boring; (2) also, the City of Burbank appears to have lodged a good case so as to have the City skirt around their area with the many high-rise buildings and (3) the use of Riverside Drive would only add to the traffic that would jam other local streets as drivers try to avoid the crunch on the 134 during rush hours; and lastly (4) the lengthy time of this work will inconvenience business owners on Riverside Drive with the risk of closing their establishments for lack of customers and the entire community will suffer as a result of poor planning by the City for this project site location.

Please reconsider the use of our area for this project and find a viable alternate route for the new sewer upgrade.
Thank you.

Christine Marshall

The public comment period for the IRP Draft EIR was 120 days in length. CEQA requires a minimum of 45 days for public comment. The City's original comment period was 90 days to afford adequate time for public review of the Draft EIR. The public comment period was later extended an additional 32 days and public notice was issued to allow additional public comment on the Draft EIR. Section 1.2 of this Final EIR discusses in detail the public notice and meetings associated with the Draft EIR. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park. Regarding concerns about potential impacts during construction of GBIS in the Toluca Lake area refer to response to comment O1. In addition, refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR for a detailed discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which is a combination of the two GBIS alignments analyzed in the Draft EIR. The City combined these alignments to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), has selected this alignment as preferred, and is recommending it for approval. Comment noted.

Letter I380. Christopher DiMatteo

Response to Comment I380-1

From: Christopher DiMatteo <christopher@radioexpress.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 8, 2006 8:52 AM
Subject: Save Woodbridge Park in Studio City

TO:
Jawahar P. Shah
City of Los Angeles Dpt. of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation
Wastewater Engineering Services Division
2714 Media Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Regarding the proposed use of Woodbridge Park in Studio City as a site for a tunnel shaft and air treatment facility for an upcoming DWP sewer project.

I am a Studio City resident and Studio City Residents Association (SCRA) member. Like so many other SCRA members I oppose the use of Woodbridge Park for that project.

I380-1 The Caltrans North Hollywood Maintenance Yard, located on the eastern end of that block, is another site being considered. We support using that site as the only one that makes sense.

It is shocking and outrageous that you would even consider using a park for that proposed facility when there is the Caltrans NH Maintenance Yard right there. Parks are for people, maintenance yards are for industrial and civic facilities.

Thank you.

Christopher DiMatteo
Studio City

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I381. Signatory – Christopher Sabatino

Response to Comment I381-1

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

From: "Christopher Sabatino DC" <DocSab@adelphia.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 1, 2006 9:12 PM
Subject: Woodbridge park mistake

I381-1 [Please.....
Common sense would dictate that the Caltrans North Hollywood Maintenance Yard, located on the eastern end of the block , is a better site to use for a tunnel shaft and possible air treatment facility... instead of the pristine Woodbridge park... just 50 feet over. Please use the intelligence God gave us.
Thanx
Christopher Sabatino DC
818-679-8703

Letter I383. Signatory – Dave Rhoadarmer

Response to Comment I383-1

From: dave@rhoadarmer.com
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 1, 2006 1:50 PM
Subject: Woodbridge Park

I383-1 [Please do not do any major construction at the Woodbridge Park in Studio City.
I prefer any construction be done at the Caltrans North Hollywood Maintenance
Yard.

Dave Rhoadarmer
4444 Radford Ave.
Studio City, CA 91607
(818) 754-0393
fax: (818) 754-0393

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding
concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Letter I384. Signatory – David Jefferson

Response to Comment I384-1

From: <junction95@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Tue, Feb 28, 2006 5:44 AM
Subject: Please Keep Woodbridge Park

To the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works,

This note is another petition for the preservation of Woodbridge Park in Studio City. I would like to echo the sentiments of residents in the area that we would not like to see this park closed for the construction of a sewer line. While I understand the sewer line itself is a necessary and prudent implementation by the city, my understanding is that there is another alternative for placement of the line, namely a nearby maintenance yard used by Caltrans. I myself am the father of two young children, and my family has been a resident of Studio City for almost 4 years. In that short time, we have gotten much enjoyment from Woodbridge Park. I was very happy to see the recent construction of an additional play area for smaller children completed adjacent to the main play structure. That's a perfect example of the city meeting the needs of its community. We use the park frequently, and there are so many families in the area that benefit from this park - I really would consider it a tragedy if the city decided to remove this resource from the neighborhood, given that there is a viable alternative. I implore you to no longer consider establishing the sewer project through Woodbridge Park.

Thank you for your consideration,
David Jefferson
4256 Kraft Avenue
Studio City, CA 91604
818-761-0053

CC: <mrswheat2@aol.com>

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

I384-1

Letter I385. Signatory – Dawn Comer Jefferson

Response to Comment I385-1

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

From: <MRSWHEAT2@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 23, 2006 6:37 PM
Subject: (no subject)

I am absolutely AGAINST Woodbridge Park being used for sewage purposes.
Many of us moved into this neighborhood because of this beautiful park.
Please
put your sewer system somewhere else and save this park for the sake of the
children and families that enjoy it!

Dawn Comer Jefferson
4256 Kraft Avenue
Studio City, CA 91604
818-761-0053
Organization: Studio City Homeowner

Letter I386. Signatory – David McKinzie

Response to Comment I386-1

From: "David McKinzie" <dmckinzie@siennaresidential.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 1, 2006 2:39 PM
Subject: Sewer project location

I386-1 [I do NOT want any kind of sewer project at Woodbridge Park in Studio City.
It is well used by us and all of our neighbors and is small enough already.
I would support the location at the Caltrans Maintenance Yard next to the
170 freeway. Thank you.

David McKinzie
4040 Farmdale Avenue
Studio City, CA 91604
(818) 984-7065

Individual homeowner and SCRA Member

Letter I387. Signatory – David L. Nash

Response to Comment I387-1

From: "david and laura nash" <ldnash@earthlink.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Sat, Feb 4, 2006 3:02 PM
Subject: Proposed use of Woodbridge Park for a sewer tunnel shaft.

This comment is submitted by:

David Nash
4291 Klump Avenue, Studio City, Ca. 91602
818.516.4758.
Individual/Resident and User of Woodbridge Park

The idea of using Woodbridge Park for a tunnel shaft a possible air treatment facility while you do some sewer building is absolutely crazy. I was a member of the Local Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committee that decided how to spend the \$200,000 in Proposition K funds on Woodbridge Park and we now have a beautiful new toddler area. Since then an already highly utilized park has probably doubled it's daily usage.

I personally use the park everyday with my 3 year old.

I387-1 I really can even imagine the department thinking of using this site when the caltrans maintenance yard is available.

My honest opinion is that throwing in Woodbridge park at a possible site is just a bunch of smoke so that people don't complain when you use another nearby site like the Caltrans yard. If you are throwing up that kind of smoke it further leads me to believe that having it anywhere in the vicinity is probably dangerous for our children. So I think you should find a safe and suitable site away from children in the park and away from housing neighborhoods and away from schools like Oakwood. How about a commercial area like Lankershim?

I387-2 The park is out of the question.

Sincerely,

David L. Nash

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

Response to Comment I387-2

It should be noted that the maintenance yard is not under the ownership or jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles, but is owned and operated by the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); therefore, an alternative location for a shaft site and ATF needed to be evaluated in the event that the Caltrans site was not available. In addition, refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR for a discussion of the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR).

Letter I388. Signatory – Deborah Steele

Response to Comment I388-1

From: "Steele, Debbie" <Debbie.Steele@disney.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 1, 2006 1:55 PM
Subject: Opposition to Using Woodbridge Park for site of tunnel shaft and air treatment facility

From:

Deborah Steele
12060 Hoffman St.
Studio City, Ca. 91604
818-560-3483
Studio City Residents Association

I388-1

Please be advised that my family is very much against using Woodbridge Park as a site for a tunnel shaft and or air treatment facility for any upcoming Department of Public Works sewer project. This project could prove to be unhealthy and definitely unsightly to park goers and homeowners in the Woodbridge Park area. Please consider the Caltrans North Hollywood Maintenance Yard as an alternative location - it would make much more sense to use that site rather than a picturesque park setting near expensive homes to house this treatment facility.

Thank you,

Deborah Steele

Letter I391. Signatory – Frank Nicotero

Response to Comment I391-1

From: <Nicotero9@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 2, 2006 11:07 AM
Subject: Save our Woodbridge Park!

To whom it may concern,

I391-1 [Please do not select Woodbridge Park as a site for a tunnel shaft and possible air treatment facility. This park is too valuable to be ruined.
Please use the alternate site at the Caltrans North Hollywood Maintenance Yard.

Frank Nicotero
4339 Bakman Ave
Studio City, CA
91602

818 763-6576

3 (Individuals) – 407

Integrated Resources Plan
Final Environmental Impact Report

Letter I392. Signatory – Gary Lister

Response to Comment I392-1

From: Gary Lister <glister@nwe.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>, <jvanderborgh@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us>
Date: Tue, Feb 28, 2006 5:44 AM
Subject: Glendale/Burbank Sewer Interconnect

Gary Lister
4400 N. Clybourn Ave
Burbank, CA 91505
818-566-7300

I392-1

I just received today the letter regarding routing the Glendale/Burbank Sewer Interconnect down either Rose or Clybourn Street in Burbank. Since the last day for comments is today and the letter was received today I would very much like the time for comments to be extended until the end of March.

This proposal would have an extremely large impact on the residents of Burbank and Toluca Lake and deserves closer inspection.

Please contact me if necessary at the above number or at my office.

Respectfully,

Gary Lister

Gary Lister
The Studio Creative Advertising
818 295-8046 ofc
818 295-5001 fax

CC: Deirdre Lister <donahuelister@earthlink.net>

Comment noted. A subsequent information notice was distributed on February 27, 2006 that extended the comment period to March 31, 2006. Refer to Sections 1.2 and 1.3 of this Final EIR for a summary of the public review period and interim activities associated with the Draft EIR.

Letter I393. Signatory – Guy Weddington and Diane McCreary

Response to Comment I393-1

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.

From: <HUMMERS95@aol.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 8, 2006 8:29 AM
Subject: Woodbridge Park (Tunnel Site)

Jawahar P. Shah

We oppose the use of Woodbridge Park for the tunnel shaft site and possible air treatment facility for an upcoming Department of Public Works sewer project. This would be right behind a Private School and in the park that the residents in our area use. Why use the park property when you can use the Cal Trans Property next to the freeway. It makes more sense to use an already possible contaminated area than to contaminate a neighborhood Park that is used by the school adjacent and the neighborhood in the local area.

I393-1

Guy Weddington & Diane McCreary
Members of the Studio City Residents Association

cc: <greuel@council.lacity.org>

3 (Individuals) – 409

**Integrated Resources Plan
Final Environmental Impact Report**

Letter I394. Signatory – Harvey Barkan

Response to Comment I394-1

From: <HBanjoboy@cs.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 2, 2006 8:50 AM
Subject: Save Woodbridge Park

I am strongly opposed to the use of Woodbridge Park as a tunnel site for an upcoming proposed Department of Public Works sewer project. I live nearby in Studio City and feel the misuse of such a valuable neighborhood resource is simply inexcusable, particularly when there are alternatives. I recognize that the sewer project is valuable and needed, but so is Woodbridge Park valuable

I394-1 and needed to the community lifestyle and character. Please consider the entire picture of the situation, just as a doctor must consider the entire person when prescribing treatment and care and not think of the patient as simply a knee, heart, or muscle. Woodbridge Park is not just a place to conveniently put a tunnel--it is part of the entire Studio City character, and needed in tact!

Harvey Barkan
4165 Camellia Avenue
Studio City, CA 91604
(818) 763-0711
Member of the Studio City Residents Association

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment O21-1 regarding concerns related to use of Woodbridge Park.



4411 West Olive Avenue, Burbank, California 91505-4219 (818) 840-1700

March 20, 2006

Tom LaBonge
Councilman
200 N. Spring Street, Room 480
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. LaBonge:

Modern VideoFilm has just become aware of your proposal to re-route the Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer to a northern route that passes almost directly under our television post production facility located at 4411 W. Olive Ave. in Burbank.

We are concerned, the original southern route has easements in place and your proposed change to a northern route burdens us with a more expensive project that can cause problems with our business. This route change can potentially impact our ability to conduct our business. Ground vibration is a SIGNIFICANT issue at our location.

All of the businesses along your proposed route would be substantially impacted if we experience any of the problems encountered with the infamous subway project. Before any decision is made, protection of businesses along any proposed route has to be given top priority to protect the livelihood of our employees and community.

We need to see an analysis of the expected disruptions for our location along with the engineering data used to forecast seismic and noise issues.

We are willing to listen but re-routing the sewer to the northern alignment appears to be a poor choice that is more expensive and potentially adversely affects many businesses.

Sincerely,

Alan A. Hart
Executive Vice President, Engineering
Modern VideoFilm

AAH:ddc

cc: Jawahar P. Shaw✓

1701

Letter I398. Signatory – Alan Hart

Response to Comment I398-1

Comment noted. For information on the public outreach associated with the Draft EIR, refer to Section 1.2 of this Final EIR.

Response to Comment I398-2

Comment noted. The commenters concern that the City already has easements in place for the GBIS South Alignment and not the GBIS North Alignment is incorrect. The City of Los Angeles makes all reasonable efforts to site infrastructure projects within public rights-of-way (i.e., existing easements). In instances where using public right-of-way is not feasible, such as for engineering or operational reasons, infrastructure must be located beneath private property. As discussed in Section 3.12.3.2 of the Draft EIR, the GBIS alignment (either the North or South alignment) could require the acquisition of permanent underground easements from private parties. Although the potential exists for use of private property for the alignment, the overall objective is to minimize such easements. The above would also apply to the staff recommended GBIS Alignment. Refer to Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR for information on the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, including a discussion of potential impacts from vibration.

Response to Comment I398-3

Comment noted. As detailed in Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR, in an effort to minimize impacts to businesses, no aboveground construction is currently proposed for Pass Avenue.

Response to Comment I398-4

Refer to response to comment I398-2 above.

Response to Comment I398-5

The staff recommended GBIS Alignment would not be more expensive or affect adversely many more businesses. As described in Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR, the staff recommended GBIS Alignment was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR). Comment noted.

Mr. Jawahar P Shah,
EIR Coordinator, Bureau of Sanitation
2714 Media Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065
www.lacity-irp.org/Draft-EIR-Comments.htm
Fax: (323) 342-6210
Phone (323) 342-6253

Mr. Shah,

I want to take this opportunity to comment on the impact of the proposed sewer improvement project on my neighborhood. I understand that this comment will be included as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Report of the Integrated Resource Plan.

*
This is
my
Second
choice!
see
below

- I support a sewer alignment that follows "best engineering" practices.
- I support the "Hybrid Plan" that utilizes the North Alignment route from the CalTrans lot down Moorpark to Moorpark Way. Then up to Riverside Drive to Pass Ave. Then jogging diagonally down Pass Ave. and Barham Blvd. to Forest Lawn Drive and proceeding along the South Alignment to Griffith Park. This alternative equitably shares the burden of installation amongst all communities that will use the new sewer. I believe that this sewer alignment should follow primarily major thoroughfares and avoid smaller neighborhood streets. In the event that there is a problem with the tunneling, this would be the least disruptive to the community. Finally, I believe this alternative route essentially removes all shaft sites from populated areas and on to City or State owned land, reducing the overall cost of the project.
- I believe that this sewer improvement is a public necessity and that all communities who benefit from it should share equally in the burden of its construction.
- I do not believe that this sewer line should be dependent on any artificial or arbitrary political boundaries.

I want to thank you for your full consideration on this matter.
Sincerely,

Deborah May DelHoyo
(Signature)
Deborah MAY DelHoyo
(Print Name)
5 Toluca Estates Dr.
(Address)
Toluca Lake, CA 91602
(City) (State) (Zip Code)

*More to the point; I would like more
NAD on THE "LA. River Route." Why is this
not a feasible alternative??

1898

Letter I400. Signatory – Deborah DelHoyo

Response to Comment I400-1

Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR describes the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR). Refer to response to comment AJ31-2 regarding a suggested Los Angeles River route. Comment noted.

I400-1

From: Howard Alston <lakelinktwo@pacbell.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 31, 2006 3:00 PM
Subject: Sewer Storm line installed under Valley Spring Lane, Toluca Lake.

Date:
 March 31, 2006

To:
 Adel Hagekhalil, Division Manager
 Wastewater Engineering Services Division
 Bureau of Sanitation
 Department of Public Works

This e mail is to protest the sewer and storm drain line to be installed under Valley Spring Lane between Cahuenga Blvd and the Lakeside Golf Course in Toluca Lake. If you run the line down Valley Spring Lane once you reach Navajo Street the line will be 65 feet of less from the private lake known as Toluca Lake. We are concerned about any potential damage to this precious historical body of water. Toluca Lake was established in the 1930's as a natural lake being that it was the lowest point in the San Fernando Valley. The lake provides a refuge for migratory birds and enhances the beauty and property values of the entire area, not only the houses directly adjacent to the lake. As a separate issue we are concerned for potential damage to the Toluca Lake well that provides water for the lake.

We understand that there is a possibility that this line could run between Toluca Lake and the little lake on Clybourn Ave which separates Los Angeles from the City of Burbank. Running the line between the two lakes seems likely to damage one or both of the lakes. We are in protest of this proposal as well.

We are requesting that these lines be moved away from this area to avoid these potential damages to a valuable resource of the Toluca Lake neighborhood. Any such damage would be the liability of the City of Los Angeles and it could potentially be more cost effective for the City to avoid any litigation that could result from damage to the lake.

An alternate proposal has been suggested that these lines be run near or under the Los Angeles river (flood control) and we hardly endorse this proposal. Not only would it eliminate potential damage to the lake but also minimize the inconvenience of people living on Valley Spring Lane and others in this neighborhood.

You should also have received a letter of protest from the Toluca Lake Property Owners Association consisting of 34 homeowners of which I am the vice president. We appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely Yours,
 Howard and Marjorie Alston
 10033 Valley Spring Ln
 Toluca Lake Ca, 91602
 (818) 508-0088

Letter I401. Signatory – Howard and Marjorie Alston

Response to Comment I401-1

Comment noted. Regarding your concerns associated with the GBIS alignment in the Toluca Lake area refer to response to comment O1.

Response to Comment I401-2

Comment noted. Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR describes the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR).

Response to Comment I401-3

As discussed in the referenced responses associated with response to comments I401-1 and 401-2 above, no impact or damage is anticipated to occur to any of the Toluca Lake waterbodies. Comment noted.

Response to Comment I401-4

Comment noted. Refer to response to comment AJ31-2 regarding a suggested Los Angeles River route.

235

From: Steven Baer <slbaer@earthlink.net>
To: <Labonge@lacity.org>
Date: Tue, Mar 28, 2006 2:55 PM
Subject: Integrated Resources Project

Council Member LaBonge,

The two sewer alignments identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Report, for the Integrated Resources Project, cut through stable residential neighborhoods. Troubling and unacceptable to the people living there. Likewise, creating a "hybrid" alignment, by running this gigantic sewer line under other residential streets, such as Pass Avenue, Rose Street, Clybourn Avenue, or Forman Avenue--is equally troubling and unacceptable to the the people who live there. The neighborhood meetings and City Council meetings on this issue, have been filled up with the people who may have to live, 24 hours a day, in close proximity to the construction and/or permanent operation of this sewer. They have spoken eloquently and sincerely, of their serious concerns about potential health hazards to their families, and loss of property values for their homes. Great care must be taken to select sites and tunneling routes that will mitigate these potential negative consequences to our residential neighborhoods. THERE MUST BE A BETTER WAY to connect the L.A. Zoo site with the Woodbridge Park site.

The GBIS-South alignment runs adjacent to the Los Angeles River for much of the way, from the L.A. Zoo site, to the Barham shaft site. Why turn away from that alignment, into residential neighborhoods? By continuing along the river, west of Barham, and all the way to Wedington Park (and then up to Woodbridge Park), the impact to residents will be greatly mitigated. Much of that alignment would run either under the open space of a golf course, or under what is industrial property--the back-lot access road for Universal Studios. This is the best routing by far, and if this alignment would involve extra engineering costs, that seems a worthwhile tradeoff, to be able to mitigate the impacts to our residential neighborhoods.

Finally, I believe that it would be a great benefit to schedule a joint Los Angeles/Burbank public meeting on the Integrated Resources Project. Incomplete information, and political maneuvering have turned neighborhood against neighborhood. The open exchange of ideas, opinions, accurate facts, and feasible options--from engineers, responsible public officials, and concerned citizens--would help us all to find the common ground needed to proceed with this important project.

Thank you for any help you can provide in this matter.

Steven Baer.

CC: David Gordon <dgordon@ci.burbank.ca.us>, Jef Vander Borgh <jvanderborgh@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us>, Marsha Ramos <mramos@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us>, Dave Golonski <d golonski@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us>, "Jawahar P. Shah" <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>

Letter I402. Signatory – Steven Baer

Response to Comment I402-1

Comment noted. Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR describes the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR).

Response to Comment I402-2

Comment noted. As addressed in detail in Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR and response to comment AJ31-2, there are several issues as to why the GBIS alignments are as described.

Response to Comment I402-3

Comment noted. Refer to Section 1.3 of this Final EIR for a description of interim activities associated with the Draft EIR.

3/20/06

1910

Letter I403. Signatory – Steven Barr

Response to Comment I403-1

Comment noted. Refer to response to the City of Burbank comments - AJ1, AJ13, AJ22, AJ30, AJ31, AJ32, and AJ36. In addition, Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR describes the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR).

I403-1

Jawahar P. Shah
City Of Los Angeles
Public Works, Sanitation
Wastewater Engineering Services Division
2714 Media Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Dear Mr. Shah:

As a resident of the Burbank Rancho I'm writing to protest the proposed sewer project 'North' alignment as well as a protest against the most recent 'hybrid' alignment.

If you must build a new sewer it seems elegantly obvious that building it adjacent to, and under, one small corner of a huge park, a zoo, two graveyards and a golf course is far more logical than building near ANY residential neighborhood.

Please add my name to the list of people who live in Burbank FOR ONE REASON – the Equestrian district, the 'Rancho'.

My wife and I did not move here for the schools, but proximity to the Tonight Show.

We moved here so we could keep and ride horses.

The Pollywog, the trails, and the entire Equestrian is used by us AT LEAST 200 days a year. It is used exercise, but as an actual lifestyle.

An early morning ride is not a special event for us. I can just imagine the danger, the thrown and injured chaos that will ensue if you put noisy heavy equipment.

I have been watching Burbank city council meeting agree that the 'new' hybrid plan looks like it punishes Burbank residents who reside in mere million dollar homes, while it bends over backwards to mollify and coddle Toluca Lake residents in their 2-4 million dollar homes.

I urge you to count HEADS, not dollars, when deciding on where to locate your project.

Wherever the fewest living residents will be impacted is where you should build this new sewer line.(I doubt if the dead ones in the graveyards will make much of a fuss if it's a little noisy and smelly in their neck of the woods.)

Like....in an unpopulated area alongside a river and through a golf course – the south alignment.

Recd
3/30/06

Finally, if Burbank residents see their property values threatened I imagine they will band together and spend money hiring their own experts and attorneys, fighting and stalling every step of the way. I'm willing to dig very deep in my pocket to contribute to such a battle if it proves necessary.

I hope it does not.

Please, I urge you – use the SOUTH alignment, and try and keep even this route as far from homes as possible.

I403-1

Yours Truly,



Steven Barr
433 South Fairview St.
Burbank, CA 91505

CC – Burbank City Council

1856
03/25/06

Mr. Jawahar P. Shah
2714 Media Center Drive
Los Angeles, California
90065

Subject: Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer Project.

Dear Sir:

We would like to go on record as objectors to the Northern Alignment option for the proposed Interceptor Sewer Project as described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. We own residential rental property on Riverside Drive in Burbank that would be negatively impacted by the project if constructed along the Northern Alignment configuration. Aside from the obvious construction impacts of vibration, truck traffic, air pollution and noise we have the long term effects from the Vertical Access Vents on air quality (odors, aerosol particles, noxious volatiles and organic synthesis) to live with long after the construction is completed.

We feel there are more logical and expedient routes for the sewer alignment that would be less detrimental and hazardous to residential areas. We understand the future necessity for expanded sewer capacity and feel that additional route study with sensitivity and creativity will generate more suitable alignments for this project.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this Draft Environmental Report, we look forward to subsequent reports relative to this project.

I404-1

Sincerely,
John and Austina Wolcott
911 Grinnell Dr.
Burbank, Ca.91501

Letter I404. Signatory – Jim and Austina Wolcott

Response to Comment I404-1

Comment noted. It is assumed that the commenters' concern over the "Vertical Access Vents" is really a concern over the proposed air treatment facility (ATF) at Valley Heart. Persistent odor problems, as is experienced in the Rancho Burbank area, are addressed by installing ATFs. Section 3.4.3.2 of the Draft EIR analyzed the potential for the ATFs to cause air quality, odor and air toxics impacts. Refer to response to comments AJ1-7 and AJ1-8 for an additional discussion of air quality and odor impacts at Valley Heart. In addition, refer to response to comments AJ1-20 through AJ1-22 regarding traffic impacts and AJ1-13 through AJ1-16 and AJ1-19 for a discussion on noise/vibration. As detailed in Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR, the staff recommended GBIS Alignment does not include the Valley Heart Shaft Site.

From: <comacho@charter.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 31, 2006 8:46 PM
Subject: SEWER PROJECT COMMENT

Carolyn West
1621 Rancho Ave.
Glendale, CA 91201-2905
W(213) 897-1801
H(818) 500-8208

Support South Alignment - to run South Side of LA River

The other concepts would be very destructive of the Rancho Neighborhoods of Burbank and Glendale.

I407-1

Letter I407. Signatory – Carolyn West

Response to Comment I407-1

Comment noted. Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR describes the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR).

From: "Mary Lou Watkins" <ikylu@earthlink.net>
To: <IRP-eir@san.lacity.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 31, 2006 4:28 AM
Subject: NEIS 11 project (North East Interceptor Sewer, phase 11)

Dear Mr. Jabahar Shah,
I am a long time resident of Atwater Village and I strongly object to the city placing the NEIS 11 sewer exemption in Atwater Village.
The project expected to last about eighteen months will have an extremely negative affect on traffic moving through the village.
The traffic on Los Feliz (a main corridor from Hollywood into Glendale) is consistently congested from early morning well into the night. Construction will create a major gridlock nightmare. I also object, on the grounds it will create dust, and most of all pose a real danger because of the site's proximity to the trains which will run close to the proposed site.
I object on economic grounds. The city has land in Griffith Park, which they can use for free. The proposed site is on private land and will need to be bought and paid for. Also, and most important, people live and work in Atwater Village. The park is huge and free of residents. Park usage peaks on weekends, but the park is not heavily used during the week. There is no comparison between who would be the most inconvenienced.

Please reconsider this project, weighting the advantages of using park land for the sewer extension, versus impacting residents and travelers in an already very busy section of the city.

Thank you for your consideration in this most important matter.

I408-1

Mary Lou Watkins

Mary Lou Watkins
ikylu@earthlink.net
Why Wait? Move to EarthLink.

Letter I408. Signatory – Mary Lou Watkins

Response to Comment I408-1

As described in detail in Section 1.5.2.1 of this Final EIR, the NEIS II West Alignment is the staff recommended alignment. Comment noted.

Letter I410. Signatory – Barbara and Frank Ballou

Response to Comment I410-1

Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR describes the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR). As detailed in Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR, no construction is proposed on or under Rose Street. Comment noted.

I410-1

□ □

-----Original Message-----
From: Barbara Ballou [mailto:bbaileyballou@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2006 5:02 PM
To: mrmos@mail.ci.burbank.ca.us
Subject: Sewer Project

We have been receiving notices about a sewer project for the City of Los Angeles which is currently proposed to go through Burbank. It is our understanding that the project must be approved by the City of Burbank. We reside at 133 N. Valley Street, between Riverside Drive and National. Rose St is on one side of us and Clybourn is on the other. We object to the project going through this area of Burbank. We currently have a great deal of traffic on Riverside Drive. In the morning it is difficult to make a right turn onto Riverside Drive because of the traffic - a left turn is out of the question. From about 4pm on, the traffic is thick in the other direction. This traffic is from the office buildings and studios near us. The Platt project will add to this traffic. There is no alternative route for these people to use to get out of Burbank. Closing off any portion of Riverside Drive in this area doesn't let these people exit and will make for incredible traffic jams in an already congested area. Rose is used as a through street by traffic coming off Barham and Pass. The only safe way we have to get out of our neighborhood in the morning or the afternoon is by using Rose Street, because it has a signal. In addition, I am, handicapped and use a scooter for local getting around. That would be cut off for me because of not being able to use Rose or cross there. I can't imagine how I would even be able to cross the street or go to the cleaners. There are several elderly persons residing on our block whose ability to get around would be severely hampered by this construction. Using residential streets for this type of work for the convenience of Los Angeles is a great detriment to the residents in and around our block.

Barbara and Frank Ballou
133 N. Valley Street
818 840-0399

2/28/2006

From: "Gail Butler" <gail.butler@whitehousepost.com>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Mar 30, 2006 5:07 PM
Subject: Draft EIR comment - NO NORTH ALIGNMENT

Dear Mr. Shah and honored members of the Wastewater Division:

I live in the Burbank Rancho just above Riverside Drive. I have lived in this neighborhood since 1970. I am a homeowner. I am 39 years old with two children who live at home with me and my elderly mother.

The neighborhood is residential and has many children in the area as well as horses. I am VERY concerned and opposed to the additional traffic, noise and dust the NORTH alignment will impose on us residents in the area. In addition, it will pose a safety hazard to the many equestrian riders in the area as horses are easily spooked by large trucks and construction noise. It is simply too large scale a project for this small, tranquil community. And will go on far too many years to not have a detriment to our health, peace of mind, quality of life and property values.

I URGE you to CHOOSE the SOUTH ALIGNMENT for your sewer construction plans. The South alignment will have MUCH LESS impact on human beings and livestock. It is the only responsible decision to make for the community. You will be much appreciated and respected for it.

Thank you for your thorough consideration. I trust you will make the right decision for the citizens of the North Alignment area and NOT choose the North Alignment for your project.

Respectfully,
Gail A. Butler
545 S. Sparks St.
Burbank, CA 91506
818.843.3428
(no organization - private citizen)

Response to Comment I415-1

Comment noted. Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR describes the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR).

I415-1

259

From: Gerry Hans <gerry@raceready.com>
To: <IRP-eir@san.lacity.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 31, 2006 9:53 AM
Subject: Comment regarding NEIS Project

March 31, 2006

Mr. Shah,
City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation
Department of Public Works

Regarding the possible northern alignment of the NEIS II project through Atwater Village, particular attention needs to be given to traffic congestion issues. The Costco area becomes gridlocked every day, and is especially a problem during the Christmas holiday period. The future plan to use Alger Street as a second way for customers to exit that huge parking area must not be scrapped. It is unclear how this project may affect that plan. Also, any construction/hauling truck routing must be kept off of Los Feliz during day hours, if this site is chosen.

I417-1

Further, knowing the history of this area as a toxic waste site, I would expect that there are significant liability risks in re-exposing some of those hazards? The City should clearly be prepared to mitigate the loss from lawsuits, that will undoubtedly result from choosing this site.

I417-2

Thank you for considering these points.

Gerry Hans
Atwater stakeholder

Letter I417. Signatory – Gerry Hans

Response to Comment I417-1

As described in detail in Section 1.5.2.1 of this Final EIR, the NEIS II West Alignment is the staff recommended alignment. Comment noted.

Response to Comment I417-2

As described in Section 3.10.3.2 of the Draft EIR (and related revisions in Section 2 of this Final EIR), the NEIS II West Alignment would go through sedimentary rock that contains less water and is not within the contaminated area. As discussed in Section 1.5.2.1 of this Final EIR, the NEIS II West Alignment is the staff recommended alignment. Subsequently, concerns about the potential to encounter contaminated groundwater would be lessened. Comment noted.

From: "Ralph Herman" <rlaherman@earthlink.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Tue, Mar 28, 2006 8:40 PM
Subject: Missing GBIS Sewer Public Comment Letter

Mr. Shah,

Burbank Public Works Director Bonnie Teaford spoke to you last week about my missing Public Comment Letter for the GBIS project.

I mailed my original letter on February 12, 2006 and it still has not been posted on your "received list" on your website.

I left a voicemail on "Q's" line asking him to follow up on my missing letter, and as of today he has not returned my call.

Please include this electronic version of my original letter if your staff cannot find my original letter.

Thank you,

Ralph Herman
(818) 802-8516

Letter I419. Signatory – Ralph Herman

3 (Individuals) – 423

**Integrated Resources Plan
Final Environmental Impact Report**

February 12, 2006

Jawahar P. Shah
City of Los Angeles
Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation
Wastewater Engineering Services Division
2714 Media Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Dear Mr. Shah,

The Draft EIR for the Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer (GBIS) lists two alternative routes through the southern portion of Burbank.

I urge Los Angeles Public Works to choose the GBIS South Alignment, which would tunnel along the Forest Lawn Drive corridor.

Using the South Alignment would eliminate shaft sites adjacent to Burbank residential properties, since there are presently very few, if any, residential properties along the South Alignment between Barham Boulevard and the Los Angeles Zoo. The inferior GBIS North Alignment would have sewer shafts adjacent to large numbers of Burbank residential properties.

By choosing the South Alignment, 3 or more years of heavy construction would not impact the entire Burbank Rancho District. Noise, vibration and airborne particulates would also be eliminated in the houses adjacent to the proposed shaft sites in the Rancho District.

Dirt-hauling trucks in the South Alignment corridor can access State Route 134 directly from the Forest Lawn Drive interchange. North Alignment trucks would have to use residential streets and Riverside Drive. You should also be aware that within the Rancho District, Riverside Drive currently restricts large trucks.

Once the project is completed, the sewer shaft sites will emit gases and odors. By placing the shafts on the South Alignment, the pollutants will have a better opportunity to dissipate before crossing State Route 134 and reaching the Rancho District. The North Alignment will certainly increase pollution levels in the Rancho District.

Letter I419. Signatory – Ralph Herman

Page 2

Response to Comment I419-1

Comment noted. The City has combined the two GBIS alignments to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR), has selected this alignment as preferred, and is recommending it for approval (see Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR), which does not include construction or operation of GBIS at Valley Heart/Pollywog.

I419-1



In the early 1960's the Ventura Freeway was proposed to follow a "southern alignment" along the Forest Lawn Drive corridor, but Toluca Lake residents convinced highway officials to spare their golf course and use "the northern alignment" next to the Rancho District. Rancho District residents today must endure the noise and pollution from those decisions made almost half a century ago. We don't want the additional odors and pollution the North Alignment shafts would create.

I am certain that our elected Burbank officials, as well as Rancho District neighbors, and myself stand united against the GBIS North Alignment, and we will do whatever it takes to protect our Rancho neighborhood from these sewer shafts.

I urge the City of Los Angeles to reject the GBIS North Alignment and select the more environmentally sound GBIS South Alignment for your Final EIR.

Sincerely,

Ralph Herman
1141 Dincara Road
Burbank, CA 91506-3161

I419-1

256

From: "Ralph Herman" <rlaherman@earthlink.net>
To: <IRP-EIR@san.lacity.org>
Date: Thu, Mar 30, 2006 9:25 PM
Subject: Supplemental public comment on the GBIS hybrid alignment

March 31, 2006

Mr. Jawahar P. Shah
EIR Coordinator
Wastewater Engineering Services Division
2174 Media Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Dear Mr. Shah,

In my opinion, the proposed Glendale Burbank Interceptor Sewer (GBIS) "hybrid alignment" is an obvious attempt to avoid placing the western section of the GBIS "southern alignment" adjacent to the politically powerful LA Toluca Lake residents surrounding the Lakeside Country Club.

Since the "hybrid" has no supporting diagrams, charts and other materials in the current DEIR, I am certain it legally cannot be considered as a possible route.

Your Draft EIR does not contain any environmental studies along the "hybrid" route in the Burbank Toluca Lake district between your proposed GBIS "northern" and "southern" alignments, because a "hybrid alignment" footprint has not been selected.

How can the "hybrid alignment" route be weighed fairly against the other two alignments when there is no "hybrid" official study or report? And why are residents and businesses given only about a month to comment on the new "hybrid" proposal, when the initial GBIS proposals were given 90 days?

Therefore, unless complete engineering studies and documentation is made available in a supplemental draft EIR with a 90 day public comment period, the current GBIS "hybrid alignment" proposal must be removed from consideration in the Final EIR.

I am certain that if all three GBIS route proposals are weighed equally, GBIS "southern alignment" is the least environmentally damaging route for both Los Angeles and Burbank.

I420-1

Letter I420. Signatory – Ralph Herman

Response to Comment I420-1

Comment noted. Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR describes the staff recommended GBIS Alignment, which was chosen to reduce concerns about potential impacts associated with either GBIS alignment (as expressed in comments submitted on the Draft EIR).