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II. Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR

This section of the Final EIR provides changes to the Draft EIR that have been made to clarify, correct, or add to the environmental impact analysis for the Forest Lawn Memorial-Park–Hollywood Hills Master Plan Project. Such changes are a result of public and agency comments received in response to the Draft EIR and/or new information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR. The changes described in this section do not result in any new or increased significant environmental impacts. This section is divided into two parts: Section II.A, General Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, and Section II.B, Corrections and Additions to Draft EIR Sections and Appendices.

A. General Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR

In response to comments received regarding the Draft EIR as well as to clarify and correct text in the Draft EIR, the Draft EIR has been revised to reflect the following general changes.

1. Clarification of Tower Features

In Draft EIR Sections I, Introduction/Summary; II, Project Description; IV.A, Aesthetics; IV.E, Geology and Soils; and IV.H, Land Use, as a general correction, all references to “bell tower” shall be deleted. This term shall instead be referred to as “tower feature.” In addition, throughout the Draft EIR, the proposed tower feature shall specify a height of “90 feet” not “100 feet.”

B. Corrections and Additions to Draft EIR Sections and Appendices

Additional changes have been made to the Draft EIR based on comments and/or new information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR. Such changes to the Draft EIR are indicated in this section under the appropriate Draft EIR
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Section or appendix heading. Deletions are shown with strikethrough and additions are shown with underline.

I. Executive Summary

Section I, Executive Summary, of this Final EIR reflects all changes made to the Executive Summary provided in the Draft EIR as well as the general corrections provided above. In addition to typographical errors, corrections and additions include the following:

- Correction to indicate that the Project includes a request for an alternative compliance measure pursuant to the public benefit provisions of the zoning code (and not a variance) for the structures that exceed the height limitations imposed by the zoning code;

- Clarification within the discussion of the Environmentally Superior Alternative that the alternatives analysis evaluates alternatives that would reduce overall development to examine whether the less than significant impacts associated with the Project could be further reduced;

- Clarification that any proposed crematory would have to demonstrate compliance with health-based performance standards that ensure the crematory would have a less than significant health risk based on SCAQMD significance thresholds;

- Modifications to the noise analysis to clarify the continued use of nighttime hauling;

- Modifications to the hydrology analysis to reflect updates to the hydrology study; and

- Minor clarifications in the wording regarding the cumulative analyses.

II. Project Description

Refer to the general corrections provided in Section II.A, General Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR.

Volume I, Section II, Project Description, Page II-12, add the following new third paragraph to subsection E.1, Project Characteristics, Scale and Massing:

As depicted on the Conceptual Site Plan, Figure II-6 on page II-14, the proposed Project also includes a natural setting-inspired woodlands path along the outer Sennett Creek tree canopy within the Project Site. This path would provide access to low scale mausoleums and cremation interments in a natural setting. The
path and associated interment areas would be designed in consultation with the Project biologist to complement the natural setting while preserving significant natural features in the landscape, including wetlands, streams, mature trees, rock outcrops, steep slopes and other biological and visual resources along the margins of the Sennett Creek system. The approximately 8-foot-wide path would be composed of a decomposed granite surface. The path would be located on both the south and north sides of Sennett Creek and would incorporate an existing and two new foot bridges. Mausoleum facilities would be located variously as generally depicted on the conceptual site plan adjacent to the path, for an additional width of 10 to 20 feet as appropriate without significant environmental impacts to the resources present.

III. General Description of Environmental Setting

No corrections and additions have been made to Section III, General Description of Environmental Setting, of the Draft EIR.

IV. Environmental Impact Analysis

IV.A. Aesthetics

Other than the general corrections provided in Section II.A, General Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, no additional specific corrections or additions have been made to Section IV. A, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR.

IV.B.1 Air Quality

Volume I, Section IV.B.1, Air Quality, Page IV.B-26, modify the second paragraph as follows:

A crematory is proposed as a potential component of the Project, although operation of the crematory is only anticipated to occur, if at all, after completion of grading activities. Operational emissions from the crematory would be dependent on the specifications of the burners used for combustion as well as the processing rate. The operational emissions associated with the crematory would include toxic air contaminants which are regulated under SCAQMD Rule 1401. Therefore, any proposed crematory would have to demonstrate compliance with health-based performance standards that ensure the crematory would have a less than significant health risk based on SCAQMD significance thresholds. Any—Any proposed crematory would be required to implement Toxic Best Available Control Technology.
(T-BACT) (e.g., afterburner) as part of pre-construction permit review if needed for compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1401. Nevertheless, it is anticipated that the operation of the proposed crematory would be similar in size and scope to a crematory currently operated at the Forest Lawn facility in Glendale, California, and would include similar SCAQMD permit conditions.¹ Forest Lawn has operated a crematory at the Glendale facility for approximately 95 years. In summary, prior to operation, the proposed crematory would have to obtain an operating permit from SCAQMD, and, if necessary, the operating permit would include conditions that ensure health risk standards are not exceeded. In other words, the crematory will not be permitted to operate unless health risk impacts would be below SCAQMD’s significance thresholds.

Volume I, Section IV.B.1, Air Quality, Page IV.B-27, modify the first full paragraph as follows:

With regard to cumulative air quality impacts, according to SCAQMD, recommend that a project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts should be assessed utilizing the same significance criteria as those for project-specific impacts (i.e., if an individual project exceeds the SCAQMD’s recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts, then the project would also result in a cumulatively considerable net increase). Impacts from construction activities would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project’s construction emissions would be not be cumulatively less than significant considerable. Similarly, the operational emissions associated with the Project would not exceed the recommended thresholds and would not be cumulatively significant considerable.

¹ The most recent SCAQMD permit for the Glendale facility, Permit No. F98742, issued on August 28, 2008, includes the following conditions: “1. Operation of this equipment shall be conducted in accordance with all data and specifications submitted with the application under which this permit is issued unless otherwise noted below. 2. This equipment shall be properly maintained and kept in good operating condition at all times. 3. This equipment shall be used to cremate only human remains. 4. The secondary chamber shall be used throughout the burning period. 5. A temperature monitoring and recording device shall be installed to measure and record the temperature in the secondary chamber. 6. A temperature of not less than 1500 degrees Fahrenheit shall be maintained in the secondary chamber throughout the burning period. 7. Not more than 374 cases of human remains shall be cremated by the equipment at this facility in any one month. 8. Records shall be maintained to demonstrate compliance with conditions nos. 6 and 7. These records shall be kept on file for at least two years and shall be made available to district personnel upon request.”
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IV.B.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Volume I, Section IV.B.2, Air Quality, Page IV.B-45, modify the second paragraph as follows: The Project’s operational emissions are relatively minor for a commercial project. According to the SCAQMD Draft GHG Guidance Document,² commercial projects emitting less than 3,000 MTCO₂e/yr are would be considered less than significant.³ The Project would emit approximately half this draft threshold (1,609 MTCO₂e/yr, or 54 percent of the draft threshold). Although the draft SCAQMD Staff Draft GHG Guidance Document has not been finalized, the Project’s low operational GHG emissions are relevant to in relation to the draft thresholds is supportive of the overall significance determination.

Volume I, Section IV.B.2, Air Quality, Page IV.B-48, modify the first full paragraph as follows:

The Project implements Project Design Features that reduce GHG emissions 33 percent below legal and regulatory standards, which demonstrates consistency with the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, also known as Assembly Bill (AB) 32. Moreover, numerous governmental policies and programs will indirectly reduce actual Project’s GHG emissions even further then presented in this analysis. The Project is a centrally located development meeting existing and expected demand, which supports GHG reduction goals of reducing vehicle miles traveled by encouraging infill development. The Project results in relatively minimal GHG emissions for a commercial project. The Project is consistent with AB 32, the CARB Scoping Plan, the SCAQMD Draft GHG Guidance Document, the Attorney General Fact Sheet, the 2006 Climate Action Team Report, and the Green LA Plan. Accordingly, the Project’s GHG emissions represent a less than significant impact on the environment and would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

³ The SCAQMD Draft GHG Guidance Document also states that a commercial project below the 3,000 MTCO₂e/yr threshold must meet certain unspecified GHG reduction standards. The Project Design Features substantially reduce the Project’s GHG emissions below legal and regulatory requirements.
IV.C. Biological Resources

Figure IV.C-3 on page IV.C-21 of Volume I of the Draft EIR is adequate. Nonetheless, in response to public comments, additional information has been added to this graphic as Figure IV.C-3A as shown on page II-7.

Volume I, Section IV.C, Biological Resources, Page IV.C-37, revise as follows:

(3) Potential Regulatory Status Plant Species Impacts

Three regulatory status plant species or subspecies (Catalina mariposa lily, ocellated Humboldt lily, and Southern California black walnut) are confirmed present on the Project Site. Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the removal of approximately 65 individual Catalina mariposa lilies, 12 individual ocellated Humboldt lilies, and 144 Southern California black walnut trees. Under the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide significance threshold, the potential impacts to these three plant species would be considered significant prior to mitigation. However, implementation of the mitigation measures provided below, including Mitigation Measures C-1, C-2, and C-4 through C-7 would reduce all impacts to regulatory status plant species to a less than significant level.

Volume I, Section IV.C.3.b.(5)(a) and (b), Biological Resources, page IV.C-38, modify as follows:

(5) Potential Resource Agency Jurisdictional Impacts

(a) Army Corps of Engineers “Waters of the U.S.”

The proposed Project has the potential to permanently impact 2.37-2.26 acres of “waters” on the Project Site, consisting of 1.73-1.62 acres of non-wetland “waters” and 0.64 acre of wetland “waters.” These potential impacts would be considered significant prior to mitigation. Most of the impacts that would occur in connection with Project implementation would be associated with tributary drainages to Sennett Creek and Drainage L. Though Sennett Creek itself would be largely left intact, the proposed Project includes a culvert crossing in Sennett Creek similar in design to existing crossings. Approximately 0.05 acre of Corps jurisdictional wetland “waters” (a subset of the 2.37-2.26-acre total) would be impacted by the proposed culvert crossing. Implementation of the proposed mitigation program below, including Mitigation Measures C-1, C-4 through C-6, C-8, C-15 through C-17, and C-21 would reduce the impacts to “waters” to a less than significant level. A copy of the Application for Department of the Army Permit for the Project submitted to the
Army Corps of Engineers in November 2010 is attached within Appendix C to this Draft EIR.

(b) California Department of Fish and Game “Streambeds”

The proposed Project has the potential to permanently impact 7.94–7.83 acres of CDFG “streambeds.” The permanent loss of 7.94–7.83 acres of “streambeds” would be a potentially significant impact prior to mitigation. Most of the impacts that would occur in connection with Project implementation would be associated with tributary drainages to Sennett Creek and Drainage L. Though Sennett Creek would be largely left intact, as noted above, the proposed Project includes a culvert crossing in Sennett Creek similar in design to existing crossings. Approximately 0.33 acre of CDFG jurisdictional “streambeds” (a subset of the 7.94–7.83-acre total) would be impacted by the proposed culvert crossing. Implementation of the proposed mitigation program below, including Mitigation Measures C-1, C-4 through C-6, C-8, C-15 through C-17, and C-21 would reduce the impacts to streambeds to a less-than-significant level.

Volume I, Section IV.C.6.i. and j, Biological Resources, page IV.C-57, modify as follows:

i. Army Corps of Engineers “Waters of the U.S.”

As discussed above, the proposed Project has the potential to permanently impact 2.37–2.26 acres of “waters” on the Project Site, consisting of 1.73–1.62 acres of non-wetland “waters” and 0.64 acre of wetland “waters.” The proposed Project includes a culvert crossing in Sennett Creek similar in design to existing crossings. Approximately 0.05 acre of Corps jurisdictional wetland “waters” (a subset of the 2.37–2.26 acre total) would be impacted by the proposed culvert crossing. Mitigation Measure C-1, which provides for the conservation of on-site natural habitat areas; Mitigation Measures C-4 and C-5, which provide for the creation, restoration, and conservation of riparian habitat on-site; Mitigation Measure C-6, which provides for a five-year habitat improvement and monitoring program; and Mitigation Measure C-8, which requires the creation, restoration, and/or enhancement of “waters” and in consultation with the Corps, would mitigate all impacts related to the loss of 2.37–2.26 acres of “waters”. In addition, Mitigation Measures C-15, C-16 and C-17, which provide for fencing at the interface of Project development areas and conserved natural areas and limit the use of invasive plants, would also mitigate impacts to jurisdictional areas. Furthermore, pursuant to Mitigation Measure C-21, the Project would obtain all necessary permits from the Army Corps, as applicable. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to “waters” to a less-than-significant level.
j. **California Department of Fish and Game “Streambeds”**

The proposed Project has the potential to permanently impact 7.94—7.83 acres of CDFG “streambeds.” In addition, approximately 0.33 acre of CDFG jurisdictional “streambeds” would be impacted by the proposed culvert crossing. Mitigation Measure C-1, which provides for the conservation of on-site natural habitat areas; Mitigation Measures C-4 and C-5, which provide for the creation, restoration, and conservation of riparian habitat on-site; Mitigation Measure C-6, which provides for a five-year habitat improvement and monitoring program; and Mitigation Measure C-8, which requires the creation, restoration, and/or enhancement of “streambeds” in consultation with CDFG, would mitigate all impacts related to the loss of 7.94–7.83 acres of “streambeds.” In addition, Mitigation Measures C-15, C-16 and C-17, which provide for fencing at the interface of Project development areas and conserved natural areas and limit the use of invasive plants, would also mitigate impacts to jurisdictional areas. Furthermore, pursuant to Mitigation Measure C-21, the Project would obtain all necessary permits from CDFG, as applicable. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to “streambeds” to a less-than-significant level.

**IV.D.1 Cultural Resources—Historic Resources**

No corrections and additions have been made to Section IV.D.1, Cultural Resources—Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR.

**IV.D.2 Cultural Resources—Archaeological and Paleontological Resources**

No corrections and additions have been made to Section IV.D.2, Cultural Resources—Archaeological and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR.

**IV.E. Geology/Soils**

No corrections and additions have been made to Section IV.E, Geology/Soils, of the Draft EIR.

**IV.F Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset**

No corrections and additions have been made to Section IV.F, Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset of the Draft EIR.
IV.G. Hydrology/Water Quality

A supplemental hydrology analysis has been prepared and is included as Appendix FEIR-B. In response to this supplemental analysis, Volume I, Section IV.G. Hydrology/Water Quality, subsection (3)(a) Operational Impacts, Hydrologic Volumes (Runoff), has been modified as follows:

(3) Operational Impacts

(a) Hydrologic Volumes (Runoff)

The proposed Project’s grading operations would not change the total area of Drainage Area A. As such, Drainage Area A, of which all stormwater flows into Drainage Line L, would continue to encompass approximately 480–160 acres. Following implementation of the proposed Project, Drainage Area A would produce a 50-year burned flow rate of approximately 336.5–315 cubic feet per second (cfs). The “burned flow rate” measures the stormwater flow rates of a drainage area that has experienced a fire event. Fire events tend to accelerate stormwater flows because they reduce the overall amount of vegetation in an area and destabilize soils. To accommodate this stormwater flow, three debris basins would be provided within this area. The debris basin volumes provided for the lower, middle, and upper reaches of Drainage L are 2.3 acre-feet, 2.0 acre-feet, and 5.7 acre-feet, respectively. The required basin volumes are 1.7 acre-feet, 1.7 acre-feet, and 4.6 acre-feet, respectively. The upper basin is designed to handle both debris and detention. Since the allowable peak discharge within this area is approximately 1.4 cfs per acre, the maximum flow rate allowed downstream into the Los Angeles River is approximately 252 cfs. Thus, approximately 84 cfs would be detained in the upper basin. The combined debris and detention basin is contingent upon City approval.

While the majority of stormwater flows in Drainage Area A would pass through one of the Project’s proposed debris basins, a small portion of the stormwater flows would directly enter Drainage L. As such, these flows would still contain debris that would otherwise be removed by one the proposed debris basins. When stormwater flows contain debris, it increases the overall total volume of the stormwater flows. Stormwater flows containing debris are known as “bulk flows.” The total burned and bulked flow rate for Drainage Area A would be approximately 369-328 cfs.

Similar to Drainage Area A, the proposed Project’s grading operations would not change the total area of Drainage Area B. As such, Drainage Area B would continue to encompass approximately 700 acres. Following implementation of the
proposed Project, Drainage Area B would and produce a 50-year burned flow rate of approximately 1,066–1,080 cfs. As mentioned above, all stormwater in Drainage Area B flows into Sennett Creek. Riprap would be provided at outlet points within Drainage Area B where stormwater enters Sennett Creek to reduce the water velocities from the proposed outlets. To accommodate stormwater flows in Drainage Area B, six debris basins are proposed (Basin J, Basin I, Basin H, Basin F, Basin D, and Basin B), which are located along the southern Project boundary to collect debris from the hillside south of the Project Site. The basin volumes required respectively are 0.8, 1.0, 5.5, 2.6, 3.9, and 0.3 acre-feet. The use of elevated inlets and/or de silting inlets may be allowed for this area and is contingent upon City approval.

As with Drainage Area A, a portion of the stormwater flows in Drainage Area B would not pass through one of the Project’s proposed debris basins before entering Sennett Creek and would therefore still contain debris. The additional flows generated from the areas tributary to Sennett Creek (located towards the east) have been calculated as bulk flows, since no debris basins were provided for these areas. The 50-year burned and bulked flow rate for Areas B is approximately 1,237–1,570 cfs.

The proposed Project would upgrade 17 storm drain systems (68 segments) within the Project Site. Storm drains would be sized with sufficient hydraulic capacity to accommodate the design hydrology and would be installed under private roadways within the Memorial Park for ease of maintenance. Further, as mentioned above, the proposed Project would also include the development of debris basins in Drainage Areas A and B to retain debris and reduce the overall total volume of stormwater flows. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure G-13 below, the new on-site storm drain system and debris basins would be maintained and operated by Forest Lawn Memorial-Park Association upon completion of construction.

These 17 existing storm drain systems were analyzed to determine if their capacity would be sufficient to accommodate the proposed Project’s stormwater flows. Based on post-development hydrology calculations, the design runoff would be managed so as not to exceed the recommended and allowable runoff flows determined by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. Please refer to Appendix G, Hydrology Analysis, for detailed calculations of the proposed Project’s calculated drainage capacities FEIR Appendix B for the Supplemental Hydrology Update prepared by Hunsaker & Associates. Therefore,

---

4 Alteration of outlets to the Los Angeles River may require a Los Angeles County Flood Control permit.
Project impacts related to surface water runoff and flooding would be less than significant.

**IV.H. Land Use Planning**

Other than the general corrections provided in Section II.A, General Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, no additional specific corrections or additions have been made to Section IV.H, Land Use Planning, of the Draft EIR.

**IV.I. Noise**

Volume 1, Section IV.I, Noise, page IV.I-25, subsection 3.c.(1), Project Generated Noise, revise the second paragraph as follows:

In addition to on-site construction noise, haul and delivery trucks would access the Project Site for export. As described above, the haul routes that would be used by haul and delivery trucks during construction and operation would access the Project Site from Forest Lawn Drive and also access the SR 134 Freeway directly from Forest Lawn Drive. (See Project Design Feature J.2.) The westernmost access to the Project Site from Forest Lawn Drive would not be used. There are no noise sensitive receptors (i.e., e.g., residential uses) along this haul route between the Project Site and the freeway. In addition, truck movements would generate noise levels of up to 76 dBA at 50 feet from the roadway (FTA 2006). This noise level would be temporary as the trucks pass by and would diminish rapidly as the trucks travel away from the receptors. In addition, the residential uses located further to the north of the Project Site are also shielded from the haul routes by the existing sound wall along the north side of the SR-134 freeway. A supplemental noise analysis, attached as Appendix FEIR-C to this Final EIR, was prepared to analyze nighttime hauling, since the hauling of excavated soil from the Project Site in connection with the Project would occur primarily during the late-evening to early-morning period pursuant to Project Design Feature J.1. The estimated noise levels associated with nighttime hauling activities under the Project would not exceed the significance threshold (i.e., would not exceed the ambient noise level at a noise sensitive use by 5 dBA). Therefore, significant noise impacts would not result from off-site construction haul and delivery trucks.

Volume 1, Section IV.I, Noise, page IV.I-28 revise as follows:
(3) Construction Blasting Impacts

In addition to the conventional excavation process that requires using heavy earth moving equipment, controlled blasting would be required in areas of non-rippable rock. Blasting utilizes explosives to break the rock formation. When a blast is detonated, part of the energy is consumed in breaking up and moving the rock. The remaining energy is dissipated in the form of seismic waves expanding rapidly outward from the blast area, either through the ground (as vibrations) or through the air (referred to as air overpressure or an airblast). The vibration and airblast generated by blasting are typically of short-duration (i.e., less than a few seconds). An illustration of the areas within the site where controlled blasting may occur is provided in Figure IV.I-2 on page IV.I-30. It is anticipated that there would be one controlled blasting event per day for approximately 50 days during proposed construction. This maximum total of 50 controlled blasting events would occur over the course of the Project’s approximate 15-year grading period. The Project does not propose 50 consecutive days of controlled blasting; rather, controlled blasting events would occur intermittently throughout the 15-year grading period as non-rippable rock is encountered during the excavation process.

Volume 1, Section IV.I, Noise, page IV.I-20, add the following Project Design Feature after PDFI-1:

**Project Design Feature I-2 Construction Blasting Features in Central and West Areas:** The maximum charge weight for blasting activities within the Central and West Areas shall not exceed 165 pounds per delay.

IV.J. Traffic, Circulation and Parking

Volume I, Section IV.J, Traffic, Circulation and Parking, page IV.J-9, change heading “c. Project Impacts” to “d. Project Impacts” and add heading “c. Project Design Features” with the following text below:

**Project Design Feature J.1 Prohibit Hauling of Soil During Peak Traffic Hours:** The hauling of excavated soil from the Project Site in connection with the Project shall occur primarily during the late-evening to early-morning period (between the hours of

---
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7:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M.). Small amounts (i.e., approximately 2,500 cubic yards or less) may be hauled during daytime hours; however, hauling shall not occur during the A.M. or P.M. traffic peak periods.

Project Design Feature J.2  Haul Routes: The haul routes to be used by haul and delivery trucks during construction and operation of the Project shall use the SR-134 Freeway via the on- and off-ramps for Forest Lawn Drive and access the Project Site from Forest Lawn Drive.

Project Design Feature J.3  Construction Vehicle Parking: Forest Lawn Drive shall not be used for Project construction vehicle parking or staging.

IV.K.1 Public Utilities—Wastewater

No corrections or additions have been made to Section IV.K.1, Public Utilities—Wastewater, of the Draft EIR.

IV.K.2 Public Utilities—Water

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume I, Section IV.K.2, Public Utilities—Water, page IV.K-15, second paragraph as follows:

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) provides potable water to the City of Los Angeles and is responsible for ensuring that water demand within the City is met and that State and federal water quality standards are achieved. The City’s water supplies are primarily derived from the four following sources: (1) the Eastern Sierra Nevada Mountains via the Los Angeles Aqueduct (LAA) system; (2) local groundwater basins; (3) purchases from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD); and (4) recycled water. In addition, water storage is essential for the LADWP to supply water during high demand conditions and provide for firefighting and emergencies. The City water system has 408-114 tanks and reservoirs ranging in size from 10 thousand to 60 billion gallons with a total capacity of 109 billion gallons. Water is distributed through a network of over 7,200 miles of water mains ranging from 4 inches to 120 inches in diameter. Because of the size and range in elevation (0 to 2,400 feet), the system has been divided into 402-126 pressure zones, with almost 90 booster pumping stations to provide water service at higher elevations. Water supplies for the LADWP, listed by source (including storage and transfer), are depicted in Table IV.K-2 on page IV.K-16. A detailed discussion of each of these sources and the potential challenges facing each of the sources can be found in the text immediately below.
In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2, Public—Water, first paragraph under Heading (1) Los Angeles Aqueduct (LAA) on pages IV.K-15 and IV.K-16 as follows:

The LAA collects and conveys runoff from snowmelt in the Eastern Sierra Nevada Mountains, where the City holds water rights, to the City of Los Angeles. Secondarily, LAA water supplies are supplemented by groundwater pumping in the Owens Valley, which can fluctuate year-to-year due to varying hydrological conditions. A detailed discussion of the quantity of groundwater extracted from the Owens Valley is found immediately below. In recent years, the LAA supplies have been less than historically normal because of environmental obligations to restore Mono Lake and mitigate dust from Owens Lake. In 2009, the Los Angeles Aqueduct system supplied approximately 24-47 percent, or approximately 437,084,251,126 acre-feet (AF) per year of the City’s water supplies. Average deliveries from the LAA system have been approximately 239,100-208,900 AF of water annually over the last five fiscal years. LADWP projects that the average annual LAA delivery is expected to be between approximately 200,000 AF to 230,000 AF.

In response to comments received from LADWP, replace Table IV.K-2 within Volume 1, Section IV.K.2, Public Utilities—Water, page IV.K-16 with the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Los Angeles Aqueduct</th>
<th>Local Groundwater</th>
<th>MWD Water</th>
<th>Recycled Change</th>
<th>Transfer, Spread, Spill, &amp; Storage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>255,136</td>
<td>85,156</td>
<td>341,772</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>681,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>266,480</td>
<td>80,241</td>
<td>302,594</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>-1,994</td>
<td>652,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>179,237</td>
<td>85,153</td>
<td>401,303</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>-1,405</td>
<td>669,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>251,340</td>
<td>86,341</td>
<td>317,774</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>654,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>203,190</td>
<td>75,696</td>
<td>392,603</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>-2,958</td>
<td>676,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>376,394</td>
<td>57,623</td>
<td>184,192</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>616,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>380,235</td>
<td>67,299</td>
<td>189,975</td>
<td>3,893</td>
<td>-1,336</td>
<td>642,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>127,392</td>
<td>88,041</td>
<td>438,344</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>656,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>148,407</td>
<td>64,604</td>
<td>430,959</td>
<td>7,048</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>649,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>137,261</td>
<td>66,998</td>
<td>357,005</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>565,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>251,126</td>
<td>67,250</td>
<td>208,264</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>-938</td>
<td>534,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2, Public Services—Water, first and second paragraph under Heading (2) Groundwater on pages IV.K-16 and I.K-17 as follows:
The LADWP extracts groundwater from various locations throughout the Owens Valley and four local groundwater basins. The LADWP appropriates groundwater from its lands in the Owens Valley and in Los Angeles, as part of its long-term groundwater management plan. In addition to rights in the Owens Valley, the LADWP holds adjudicated extraction rights in the following four local groundwater basins: (1) San Fernando; (2) Sylmar; (3) Central; and (4) West Coast. The LADWP currently exercises its adjudicated extraction rights in three of these four groundwater basins; the San Fernando, Sylmar, and Central Basins. In 2009-2010, local groundwater provided approximately 13 percent of the City’s potable (domestic) water supply.

The Owens Valley, which is located on the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, encompasses approximately 3,300 square miles of drainage area. Table IV.K-3b on page IV.K-18 shows the latest extractions by LADWP from Owens Valley. As shown therein, LADWP extracted 68,149–65,425 AF of groundwater in the 2008-2009–2010 runoff year (April 1 through March 31).

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2 Public—Water, last paragraph on Page IV.K-17 as follows:

As shown in Table IV.K-3a, from the 2008 to 2009 to 2010 water year (October through September), LADWP extracted 53,023–59,958 AF from the San Fernando Basin, 868,2,544 AF from the Sylmar Basin, and 11,817–11,135 AF from the Central Basin. LADWP plans to continue production from its groundwater basins in the coming years to offset reductions in imported water supplies. Extraction from the basins will, however, be limited by water quality and overdraft protection. Both LADWP and DWR have programs in place to monitor wells to prevent overdrafting. LADWP’s groundwater pumping practice is based on a “safe yield” operation. The objective, over a period of years, is to extract an amount of groundwater equal to the native and imported water that recharges the basin.

In response to comments received from LADWP, replace Table IV.K-3 on page IV.K-18 of Volume I, Section IV.K.2, Public Services with Tables IV.K.3a and IV.K.3b as follows:
II. Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR

Table IV.K.3a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Year (Oct–Sep)</th>
<th>San Fernando</th>
<th>Sylmar</th>
<th>Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004–2005</td>
<td>49,065</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>13,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–2006</td>
<td>38,042</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>13,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>76,251</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>13,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2008</td>
<td>50,009</td>
<td>2,997</td>
<td>10,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>52,896</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>11,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2010</td>
<td>59,958</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>11,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV.K.3b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Runoff Year (Apr–Mar)</th>
<th>Owens Valley (AFY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>73,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>81,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>87,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td>85,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–06</td>
<td>56,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–07</td>
<td>58,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–08</td>
<td>60,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–09</td>
<td>68,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–10</td>
<td>65,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2 Public—Water, first paragraph under Heading (3) Metropolitan Water District Supplies on Page IV.K-18 as follows:

The MWD generally supplies the remainder of the City’s water demand not supplied by the LAA and groundwater extraction. The MWD supplies approximately 53 percent of the City’s water supplies in an average year, although that number rose decreased to 63.40 percent in 2009 2010. The amount of water obtained from these sources varies from year to year, and is primarily dependent on weather conditions and demand. As shown in Table IV.K-2 on page IV.K-16 above, the MWD accounted for 354,789–208,789 AF of the 2009-2010 LADWP water supply.

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2 Public—Water, second paragraph on page IV.K-19 as follows:
As discussed therein, MWD plans to meet the long-term needs of its member-agencies through water transfer programs, outdoor conservation measures, and development of additional local resources (e.g., recycling, brackish water desalination, and seawater desalination). In addition, the MWD has approximately 5.0 million AF capacity available in surface and groundwater storage accounts (including Diamond Valley Lake near Hemet), with approximately 1.08 million AF currently in that storage. In addition, the MWD has more than 5.0 million AF of storage capacity available in reservoirs and banking/transfer programs, with approximately 1.676 million AF currently in that storage and approximately 626 thousand AF in emergency storage.

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2 Public—Water, first paragraph on Page IV.K-23 as follows:

On December 1, 2009, the DWR announced an initial 2010 SWP allocation of 5 percent of total contracted water deliveries to the SWP contractors. Five percent is the lowest initial allocation percentage since the SWP began delivering water in 1967. The initial allocation figure reflects the low carryover storage levels in the state’s major reservoirs, ongoing drought conditions and federally mandated environmental restrictions on water deliveries from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to protect endangered fish species. However, the initial allocation is a very conservative estimate of what DWP expects it can deliver, and historically the initial allocation increased during the year as supply conditions improved.

On November 22, 2010, the DWR announced an initial 2011 SWP allocation of 25 percent of total contracted water deliveries to the SWP contractors. The initial allocation figure reflects the low carryover storage levels in the state’s major reservoirs, ongoing drought conditions and federally mandated environmental restrictions on water deliveries from the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta to protect endangered fish species. However, the initial allocation is a very conservative estimate of what DWP expects it can deliver, and historically the initial allocation has increased during the year as supply conditions improved.

On March 15, 2011, the DWR announced that its 2011 SWP allocation would increase to 70 percent of total contracted water deliveries to the SWP contractors. The allocation figure reflects the recent precipitation conditions, existing storage in SWP conservation reservoirs, SWP operational constraints such as the conditions of the recent Biological Opinions for delta smelt and salmonids and the longfin smelt incidental take permit, and 2011 projected contractor demands. DWR may revise allocations if warranted by the year’s developing hydrologic and water supply conditions.
In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2 Public—Water, first paragraph under Heading (4) Recycled Water on Page IV.K-23 as follows:

(4) Recycled Water

The LADWP is continuing its water recycling efforts to reduce further the demand on imported water. Currently, according to the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, almost 65,000 AFY of the City’s wastewater is recycled. Approximately 1,950 AFY of recycled water is used for municipal and industrial purposes; 28,000 AFY of recycled water is used for environmental enhancement and recreation in the Sepulveda Basin; and approximately 34,000 AFY of reclaimed water is sold to the West Basin Municipal Water District, which then provides further treatment to meet demands within its service area.

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2 Public—Water, first paragraph under Heading (1) State Level on Page IV.K-27 as follows:

(1) State Level

(a) California Urban Water Management Planning Act

In accordance with the State of California Urban Water Management Act of 1984, all urban water suppliers that provide municipal and industrial water to more than 3,000 customers, or supply more than 3,000 AFY of water, are required to prepare and adopt an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The LADWP, which provides over 700,000 water service connections, most recently updated its UWMP in December 2005. The next UWMP Update is scheduled for completion by December 31, 2010. The 2010 UWMP was submitted to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and subsequently accepted by the DWR in September, 2011.

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2 Public—Water, second paragraph on Page IV.K-34 as follows:

(b) LADWP’s Securing L.A.’s Water Supply

In May 2008, the City of LADWP—Los Angeles published a Water Supply Action Plan, “Securing L.A.’s Water Supply,” which provides a blueprint for creating sustainable sources of water for the future of Los Angeles through the year 2030. It is an aggressive multi-pronged approach that relies on a set of both short-term and
long-term strategies to secure the City’s water future. The Plan includes: investments in state-of-the-art technology; a combination of rebates and incentives; the installation of smart sprinklers, efficient washers and urinals; and long-term measures such as expansion of water recycling and investment in cleaning up the local groundwater supply. The premise of the Water Supply Action Plan is that the City will meet all new demand for water (about 100,000 acre-feet per year) through a combination of water conservation and water recycling. Specifically, by the year 2019, half of all new demand will be filled by a six-fold increase in recycled water supplies, and by 2030 the other half will be met through increased conservation efforts. In total, the City anticipates that the plan will conserve or recycle 32.6 billion gallons of water a year.

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2 Public—Water, second paragraph on Page IV.K-35 as follows:

Moreover, LAMC Sections 122.00–122.10 (Water Closet, Urinal and Showerhead Regulations) reduces water consumption by requiring new buildings to include water conservation fixtures (such as ultra low flush toilets, urinals, taps, and showerheads) and plumbing fixtures that reduce water loss from leakage in order to obtain City building permits. In addition, there are provisions requiring xeriscaping (i.e., the use of low-maintenance, drought-resistant plants).

LAMC Sections 125.00 through 125.07 (Water Efficiency Requirements for New Development and Renovation of Existing Buildings) impose water efficiency requirements for the construction of new buildings and the installation of new plumbing fixtures in existing buildings in the City. The provisions reduce water consumption by requiring new buildings to include conservation fixtures and plumbing fixtures that reduce water use and water loss from leakage. Such fixtures include high efficiency toilets and urinals, low-flow showerheads, and the installation of Energy Star–rated dishwashers.

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2 Public—Water, third paragraph on Page IV.K-35 as follows:

Additionally, in response to recent water supply shortages, the City has recently begun enforcement of prohibited water uses as defined in the City’s Emergency Water Conservation Plan Ordinance (Chapter XIII, Article I, LAMC Sections 121.00–121.13-121.00-121.11). The ordinance sets forth six different phases of water conservation, which shall be implemented based on water conditions. In determining which phase of water conservation shall be implemented, LADWP will monitor and evaluate the projected water supply and demand by its customers on a monthly basis, and will recommend to the Mayor and City Council
the extent of the conservation required. The Mayor will, in turn, independently evaluate such recommendation and notify the Council of the Mayor’s determination as to the particular phase of water conservation that should be implemented.

In response to comments received from LADWP, revise Volume 1, Section IV.K.2 Public—Water, third paragraph on Page IV.K-39 as follows:

Nevertheless, due to statewide drought conditions, the LADWP recommends conservation provisions per LAMC Sections 125.00–125.07 requiring that water should be conserved at all times, because efficient use of water allows increased water for use in dry years and makes water available for beneficial environmental uses. As such, the proposed Project would include the installation of recommended water conservation features, such as low-flow toilets, and urinals in all restroom areas. In addition, the use of recycled water for landscape irrigation would continue under the proposed Project. As such, irrigation required for the Project’s new landscaped areas would not increase the on-site demand for domestic water supplies.

**IV.K.3 Public Utilities—Energy**

No corrections and additions have been made to Section IV.K.3, Public Utilities—Energy, of the Draft EIR.

**IV.K.4 Public Utilities—Solid Waste**

No corrections and additions have been made to Section IV.K.4, Public Utilities—Solid Waste, of the Draft EIR.

**IV.L. Public Services—Fire Protection**

No corrections and additions have been made to Section IV.L, Public Services—Fire Protection, of the Draft EIR.

**V. Alternatives**

Volume I, Section VI, Alternatives, page VI-7, add the following new last paragraph:

As with the proposed Project, each of the alternatives also includes a natural setting-inspired woodlands path along the outer Sennett Creek tree canopy within the Project Site to provide access to low scale mausoleums and cremation
interments in a natural setting. The path and associated interment areas would be designed in consultation with the Project biologist to complement the natural setting while preserving significant natural features in the landscape. The approximately 8-foot-wide path would be composed of a decomposed granite surface. The path would be located on both the south and north sides of Sennett Creek and would incorporate an existing and two new foot bridges. Mausoleum facilities would be located variously as generally depicted on the conceptual site plan for each alternative adjacent to the path, for an additional width of 10 to 20 feet as appropriate without significant environmental impacts to the resources present.

Volume 1, Section VI, Alternatives, subsection 2, Alternatives Considered and Rejected, on page VI-2, modify the Alternative Site discussion as follows:

**Alternative Site.** The Project proposes the expansion of an existing developed cemetery within its current boundaries. The Forest Lawn Memorial-Park–Hollywood Hills property encompasses approximately 444 acres situated to the south of Forest Lawn Drive in the City of Los Angeles. The majority of the Project Site is permitted as a cemetery pursuant to a CUP issued by the City in 1948, and approximately 30 acres are permitted for cemetery use pursuant to subsequent CUPs issued by the City. Approximately 4.5 acres are not currently permitted by CUP for cemetery use. Currently, approximately 230 acres (approximately half of the existing property) has been developed for cemetery uses. The proposed Project would develop additional interment sites and cemetery-related facilities within the Applicant’s existing property. The utilization and development of adjacent contiguous undeveloped portions of the existing cemetery property would enable the Applicant to utilize the existing mortuary, as well as the existing utility and roadway infrastructure and personnel that is already in place serving the existing cemetery. Also, much of the population the Memorial-Park serves is within a 15-mile radius of the existing Memorial-Park, and families tend to prefer to bury their loved ones in proximity to their homes and in proximity to burial sites of other family members. In addition, as detailed in Appendix K to this Draft EIR, there are several barriers to developing a new memorial park elsewhere, and particularly within the Memorial-Park’s service area, including land availability constraints. Specifically, there are few, if any, available parcels of land large enough for development of new cemeteries in the San Fernando Valley area.
II. Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR

Volume 1, Section VI, Alternatives, subsection 4, Overview of Alternatives to the Proposed Project, modify the second paragraph on page VI-5 as follows:

Analysis of the alternatives is also influenced by design principles relating to cemetery development. For example, in general, the maximum ground slope for regular cemetery ground internment areas is designed to be 20 percent or less to provide a safe walking surface for visitors, particularly elderly persons and people with disabilities, and casket bearers as well as safe access for internment and maintenance equipment and crews in all weather conditions. Generally, the minimum ground slope for regular cemetery ground internment spaces is also designed to be greater than 2 percent to provide adequate drainage of turf areas. Slopes of roadways are generally 10 percent or less to allow safe ingress and egress to parked vehicles by visitors, particularly elderly persons and people with disabilities, and to safely move caskets to and from funeral coaches. In addition, parallel and interconnected roadway patterns are needed to provide alternate routes around funeral services and allow for uncongested arrival and departure of vehicles for funeral services without the need to execute u-turns.

Volume 1, Section VI, Alternatives, replace Table IV-1 on page VI-8 with the following:
### Table VI-1
Overview of Grading, Acreage, Interment Spaces, and Jurisdictional Areas by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Acreage</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cut (cubic yards)</td>
<td>1,728,000</td>
<td>1,740,000</td>
<td>1,675,000</td>
<td>1,685,000</td>
<td>1,192,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fill (cubic yards)</td>
<td>1,015,000</td>
<td>978,000</td>
<td>869,000</td>
<td>847,000</td>
<td>581,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockpile/Net Export Amount (cubic yards)</td>
<td>713,000</td>
<td>762,000</td>
<td>806,000</td>
<td>868,000</td>
<td>611,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Acreage</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>403106</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusable Acreage</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2926</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developable Acreage</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8993</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Acreage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Interment Spaces</td>
<td>91,464</td>
<td>88,568</td>
<td>86,887</td>
<td>87,447</td>
<td>63,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Interment Spaces</td>
<td>108,150</td>
<td>105,930</td>
<td>102,630</td>
<td>101,040</td>
<td>85,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td>199,614</td>
<td>194,498</td>
<td>189,517</td>
<td>188,487</td>
<td>149,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Jurisdiction “Waters of the U.S.” On-Site (acres)</td>
<td>2.372.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.961.95</td>
<td>4.761.65</td>
<td>4.541.40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on CDFG-Designated “Streambeds” On-Site (acres)</td>
<td>7.947.83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.466.35</td>
<td>4.854.74</td>
<td>4.153.75</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Under the No Project Alternative ongoing operational activities and interim projects would continue. Forest Lawn would continue to build out small areas of the Memorial-Park incrementally and add on to existing wall crypts, columbaria, and garden areas as additional burial spaces are needed as permitted under the existing CUPs. However, the No Project Alternative would not include any development within potentially jurisdictional areas of the Project Site that would require discretionary approvals.
- In addition to these interment spaces, approximately 7,000 built spaces and additional ground spaces would also be developed within existing developed areas of the cemetery.
- Based on modifications to further reduce impacts that would be implemented if Alternative 4 is adopted, as described in Section VI.D.

Source: Forest Lawn Memorial Park Association, 2010-2011.

Volume 1, Section VI.B.1.c, Alternative 2 Environmental Impact Analysis, Biological Resources, page VI-23, modify as follows:

### c. Biological Resources

With the preservation of some of the drainages on the Project Site, particularly the biologically valuable Drainages D and D1, Alternative 2 would affect fewer of the biological resources on the Project Site. Alternative 2 would impact 2.96 - 1.95 acres of jurisdictional “waters of the U.S.,” on-site, which is less than the 2.37 - 2.26 acres on-site that would be affected under the proposed Project; 6.46 - 6.35 acres of CDFG-designated “streambeds,” on-site, which is less than the 7.94 - 7.83...
acres on-site that would be affected under the proposed Project; and 67.06 acres of vegetation communities, which is 3.36 acres less than the natural vegetation communities affected by the proposed Project. Alternative 2 would impact 665 protected trees, which is less than the 835 protected trees that would be impacted by the proposed Project. With implementation of the mitigation applicable to the proposed Project, impacts to biological resources under Alternative 2 would be reduced to a less than significant level, and would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project.

Volume 1, Section VI.C.1.c, Alternative 3 Environmental Impact Analysis, Biological Resources, page VI-34, modify as follows:

c. Biological Resources

With the preservation of some of the drainages on the Project Site, particularly the biologically valuable Drainages D, D1, F and F1, Alternative 3 would affect fewer of the biological resources on the Project Site. Alternative 3 would impact 4.76-1.65 acres of jurisdictional “waters of the U.S.,” on-site, which is less than the 2.37-2.26 acres on-site that would be affected under the proposed Project; 4.85-4.74 acres of CDFG-designated “streambeds,” on-site, which is less than the 7.94-7.83 acres on-site that would be affected under the proposed Project; and 59.54 acres of vegetation communities, which is 10.88 acres less than the natural vegetation communities affected by the proposed Project. Alternative 3 would impact 381 protected trees, which is less than the 835 protected trees that would be impacted by the proposed Project. With implementation of the mitigation applicable to the proposed Project, impacts to biological resources under Alternative 3 would be reduced to a less than significant level, and would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project.

Volume 1, Section VI.D, Alternative 4, pages VI-40-41, add the following new second paragraph and modify the following paragraphs as follows:

Were Alternative 4 to be adopted, the proposed crossing of Sennett Creek would be relocated to a disturbed area as an additional measure to further reduce impacts to natural area. The relocated proposed crossing would reduce the amount of fill in Sennett Creek and further avoid impacts to the downstream portion of Drainage D. In addition, the Sennett Creek culvert crossing length would be reduced by approximately 150 feet. The soft-bottomed culvert would therefore have substantially more daytime light and be more conducive to animal movement for higher awareness organisms. Also, as an additional measure in the event Alternative 4 is adopted, the bridge crossing at Drainage D would be narrowed as compared to the other alternatives in order to reduce effects to mature oaks,
II. Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR

sycamores, and walnuts in the drainage. Further, in the event Alternative 4 is adopted, Drainage F would be almost entirely avoided with the use of an arched culvert crossing (and the elimination of proposed cemetery development shown in the proposed Project and other alternatives in the drainage). The placement of a soft-bottomed arched culvert that would replace existing underground storm drains would improve connectivity in Drainage F, both hydrologically and ecologically, over the existing condition. In addition, Alternative 4 would be modified to avoid the construction of several debris basins, which would further maintain the natural flow conditions on the Project Site.

With these modifications, Alternative 4 would result in approximately 403-106 acres of usable acreage and approximately 89-93 acres of developable acreage (as compared to approximately 110 acres of usable acreage and approximately 94 acres of developable acreage under the proposed Project). As modified, Alternative 4 would provide approximately 4,000 fewer built spaces than the proposed Project and approximately 7,000–1,100 fewer ground spaces. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would include the construction of approximately 22,500 square feet of floor area for new structures (including such structures as a new church and reception-related uses, administrative space, and a crematory). Alternative 4 would include approximately 1,029,000 square feet of non-occupied floor area (for such uses as burial garden structures, wall crypts and columbaria), which is a decrease of approximately 71,000 square feet as compared to the proposed Project. Alternative 4 would result in approximately 2.5 million cubic yards of grading, or a reduction of approximately 241,000–223,000 cubic yards of grading when compared with the proposed Project. Alternative 4 would require a net export during grading of approximately 868,000–850,000 cubic yards, which is an increase of approximately 137,000 cubic yards as compared to the proposed Project. It is estimated that construction of the new structures would occur over an approximately 40-year period from 2011 to 2050. In addition, this Alternative would also require up to 400,000 cubic yards of soil to be exported in connection with grave preparation over this period, as with the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, the sale of interment sites is expected to occur beyond the year 2050.

The Conceptual Site Plan illustrating conceptual development upon the completion of Alternative 4, with the additional modifications described above, is depicted in Figure VI-3 on page VI-42.

(1) Scale and Massing

Similar to the proposed Project, the architectural scale and massing of the proposed structures would be compatible with the existing structures and development on the Project Site.
II. Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR

(2) Proposed Grading and Stockpiling Plan

Similar to the proposed Project, the grading plan under Alternative 4 is proposed to be divided into three grading areas and three phases (i.e., Phases 1, 2, and 3). As summarized in Table VI-1 on page VI-8, the proposed improvements under Alternative 4 would affect approximately 133 acres, with approximately 403.106 acres of net usable area.

Volume 1, Section VI.D, Alternative 4, page VI-42, replace Figure VI-3 with Figure VI-3 on page II-28 reflecting the modifications described above.

Volume 1, Section VI.D, Alternative 4, pages VI-41 and VI-43, modify paragraph subsection (3) as follows:

(3) Landscaping

The buildout of Alternative 4 would include approximately 89–93 acres of developable area and would include built property and ground property including lawns, ground cover, trees and garden areas. Similar to the existing landscaped areas within the developed portions of the Project Site, the landscape plan for Alternative 4 would tie into the City’s water reclamation line and would use reclaimed water for irrigation.

Volume 1, Section VI.D.1.c, Alternative 4 Environmental Impact Analysis, Biological Resources, page VI-45, modify as follows:

c. Biological Resources

With the preservation of many of the drainages on the Project Site, particularly the biologically valuable Drainages D, D1, F, F1, and H, Alternative 4 would affect fewer of the biological resources on the Project Site. With the modifications described above, Alternative 4 would impact 1.54–1.40 acres of jurisdictional “waters of the U.S.,” on-site, which is less than the 2.37–2.26 acres on-site that would be affected under the proposed Project; 4.15–3.75 acres of CDFG-designated “streambeds,” on-site, which is less than the 7.94–7.83 acres that would be affected under the proposed Project; and 57.51–57.65 acres of vegetation communities, which is 12.91–12.53 acres less than the natural vegetation communities affected by the proposed Project. As modified, Alternative 4 would impact 339–307 protected trees, which is less than the 835 protected trees that would be impacted by the proposed Project. With implementation of the mitigation applicable to the proposed Project, as well as the additional measures described
Figure VI-3
Alternative 4
Reduced Project with Preservation of Drainages D, D1, F, F1, and H (Revised)

Source: Forest Lawn Memorial Park Association, 2011.
above, impacts to biological resources under Alternative 4 would be reduced to a
less than significant level, and would be reduced when compared to the proposed
Project.

Volume 1, Section VI.D.3, Alternative 4, page VI-50, modify as follows:

3. Assessment of Achieving the Project Objectives

Alternative 4 would provide a lesser amount of new cemetery development
and approximately 41,100-5,100 fewer interment spaces (a six-3 percent reduction
in interment spaces) when compared with the Project. Thus, the Project objectives
to help meet the demand for interments for the region through 2050 and beyond, to
provide various types of interment spaces and mortuary facilities to meet the needs
a broad array of ethnic and socio-economic groups, to provide space to
accommodate multiple funeral services simultaneously, to provide sufficient ground
property, and to provide areas for additional historical and inspirational works of art
would be met to a lesser degree than the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 4
would fail to match the proposed Project’s ability to meet the projected future
demand identified for the memorial park facilities and the regional demand for burial
space.

Volume 1, Section VI.E.1.c, Alternative 5 Environmental Impact Analysis, Biological
Resources, page VI-45, modify as follows:

c. Biological Resources

With the preservation of nearly all of the drainages on the Project Site,
particularly the biologically valuable Drainages D, D1, F, F1, and H, Alternative 5
would affect fewer of the biological resources on the Project Site. Alternative 5
would not impact any jurisdictional “waters of the U.S.,” thus avoiding the 2.37-2.26
acres on-site that would be affected under the proposed Project. In addition;
Alternative 5 would impact 0.37 acres of CDFG-designated “streambeds,” which is
less than 7.94-7.83 acres on-site that would be affected under the proposed
Project; and 36.75 acres of vegetation communities, which is 33.67 acres less than
the natural vegetation communities affected by the proposed Project. Alternative 5
would impact 77 protected trees, which is less than the 835 protected trees that
would be impacted by the proposed Project. With implementation of the mitigation
measures that are applicable to the proposed Project, impacts to biological
resources under Alternative 5 would be reduced to a less than significant level.
Such impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project.
VI. Other Environmental Considerations

No corrections and additions have been made to Section VI, Other Environmental Considerations, of the Draft EIR.

VII. References

No corrections and additions have been made to Section VII, References, of the Draft EIR.

VIII. List of Preparers

No corrections and additions have been made to Section VIII, List of Preparers, of the Draft EIR.

IX. Acronyms and Abbreviations

No corrections and additions have been made to Section IX, Acronyms and Abbreviations, of the Draft EIR.

Appendices


Volume V, Appendix H, Noise Worksheets, add the October 2011 Forest Lawn Memorial-Park Hollywood Hills Nighttime Hauling Noise Analysis from AES, attached as Appendix FEIR-C to this Final EIR.

No corrections and additions have been made to the remaining appendices of the Draft EIR.