

 Fwd: amended comments for CF12-0303

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Thu, Mar 22, 2012 at 2:21 PM

To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>, Kevin Keller <kevin.keller@lacity.org>

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

From: James O'Sullivan <jamesos@aol.com>

Date: Thu, Mar 22, 2012 at 2:07 PM

Subject: amended comments for CF12-0303

To: sharon.gin@lacity.org

Cc: meveloff@gmail.com

March 22, 2012

James O'Sullivan

Mike Eveloff

Fix The City

Sharon Gin

Legislative Assistant

Office of the City Clerk

200 N. Spring Street, 3rd Floor

or via email to:

sharon.gin@lacity.org

phone: 213-978-1074

Re. "Hollywood Community Plan, Council File 12-0303"

Dear Ms. Gin


Please include this amended statement (from OUR 3/21/2012). They are the same, I have just copied the stories on this issue rather than provide links to the stories. With time most of the links will disappear, leaving a hole in our record.

These remarks are for CF 12-0303, Hollywood Community Plan Update.

In light of the recent revelations concerning the misreporting of LAFD response time statistics, we respectfully request that you withdraw the Hollywood Community Plan, re-evaluate the Public Safety section and recirculate the EIR.

Jim

James O'Sullivan
213.840.0246 - Cell

 Letter_to_City_on_Hollywood_Plan,_COMBINED_PLUM.doc.pdf
412K

March 22, 2012

James O'Sullivan
Mike Eveloff
Fix The City

Sharon Gin
Legislative Assistant
Office of the City Clerk
200 N. Spring Street, 3rd Floor
or via email to:
sharon.gin@lacity.org
phone: 213-978-1074

Re. "Hollywood Community Plan, Council File 12-0303"

Dear Ms. Gin

Please include this amended statement (from my 3/21/2012). They are the same, I have just copied the stories on this issue rather than provide links to the stories. With time most of the links will disappear, leaving a hole in our record.

These remarks are for CF 12-0303, Hollywood Community Plan Update.
In light of the recent revelations concerning the misreporting of LAFD response time statistics, we respectfully request that you withdraw the Hollywood Community Plan, re-evaluate the Public Safety section and recirculate the EIR.

LAFD Deployment Plan Under Fire

Does LAFD's new deployment plan lead to longer response times?

By [Robert Kovacik](#) and [John Simerson](#)

| Sunday, Mar 4, 2012 | Updated 11:50 AM PDT

[View Comments \(0\)](#)

|

KNBC-TV

Monica Mocaer remembers losing her home and almost her father.

"My dad was screaming, 'I'm on fire. I'm on fire,'" she said. "And I hugged him and his skin came off in my arms."

Jack Mocaer, 53, has spent weeks in the Intensive Care Unit at the Grossman Burn Center after 60 percent of his body was burned in the fire, sparked in the early morning of Jan. 12.

The Mocaers called 911 and waited.

"I just stood there watching it get worse and worse," Monica said.

he closest fire station, 105, is barely two miles from the Mocaer's home. But that morning, the station was empty -- one of its two companies eliminated by budget cuts. The one remaining was already out on another emergency call.

"The company that should have been in that district would have gotten there in four minutes," said LAFD Captain John Rojas.

But the [incident report](#) showed Captain Rojas and the team from Station 106 arrived on scene in nine minutes.

"Could we have made a difference?" Rojas said. "We'll never know."

The goal of any fire department is to respond to an emergency in five minutes or less, 90 percent of the time, according to the National Fire Protection Association.

Why five minutes?

"In EMS, you are talking about clinical death after five minutes," said former LAFD Commissioner Tom Curry. "On structure fires, now you have roof collapse. And in brush fires, the first five minutes is more important than the next five hours."

The city of L.A.'s pressing financial needs have meant a new deployment plan for the LAFD. Four ambulances and 18 fire companies are now shut down for good, including the Mocaers' local engine company 105.

"The fire chief people came over and told us it took way too long and gave us his apology," Monica said.

Even before the new deployment plan took effect last July, the department was meeting the five minute goal only 63 percent of the time, according to documents obtained by NBC 4.

Since then, the goal is slipping farther away. Five-minute response time is now less than 60 percent.

Instead of the five minute goal, records show the LAFD responds on average in seven minutes and 24 seconds, 90 percent of the time.

"That means somewhere in the array, if you look closely enough, there are ten and twelve minute responses, which is unacceptable," Curry said.

Between July and November 2011, the longest response time happened on Sept. 20, when first responders arrived to South Hillcrest Drive in a little over 44 minutes, [according to documents](#).

L.A. firefighters may be called to an emergency and now have no choice but to leave their backyard unprotected.

"Ever since the deployment, I am not only fearing for the people who work for me," Rojas said. "I am fearing for the people of Los Angeles."

As for Jack Mocaear, he's facing months of rehabilitation while his family wonders just how much those few minutes would have mattered.

Follow NBCLA for the latest LA news, events and entertainment: Twitter: [@NBCLA](#) // Facebook: [NBCLA](#)

EXCLUSIVE: Glitches in LAFD Alert System

First responders are not getting some notifications

By [Beverly White](#) and [Terra Spencer](#)

| Monday, Mar 12, 2012 | Updated 1:13 PM PDT

First responders for LA City Fire are not getting all of the emergency notifications meant for them, fire officials told NBC 4 exclusively. One of their alert systems is failing from time to time.

LA city firefighters take emergency calls at the busiest dispatch center west of the Mississippi. But when dispatch moved into a modern facility ten days ago, a troubling problem sprang up.

"We have experienced intermittent problems with the network reporting system, where the call goes from the 911 dispatcher to the fire stations," said Captain Jaime Moore, city fire spokesman. "It's an intermittent problem where they're not getting their audio alarm."

System redundancies prevent the glitch from compromising 911 response times, Moore said. But the firefighter's union is not so sure.

"Just about every day this past week we've been on what's called radio-watch," said Pat McOsker, president of the United Firefighters of Los Angeles City. "The dispatchers works so hard, working double-shifts basically, scrambling to get the word to us."

The union leader blames budget cuts for the glitch and says he has anecdotal evidence about the dangers.

"You know, it's heartbreaking when you show up and somebody has lost four fingers," McOsker said. "What they say is, 'What took you guys so long? We were calling for twenty minutes.'"

Still, they all agree this off-again, on-again problem cannot be ignored. Firefighters are encouraging taxpayers hound their legislators for the \$5 million it will take to fix the problems.

Fire officials, meanwhile, said they will have technicians working on the glitch over the weekend.

"The fire chief and the mayor are both well aware that this is a priority," Moore said. "It's a 20-year-old system, there are newer systems that would make this more reliable."

Follow NBCLA for the latest LA news, events and entertainment: Twitter: [@NBCLA](#) // Facebook: [NBCLA](#)

L.A. council members call for accurate Fire Department figures

Last year, the council made cuts to Fire Department units based on data that overstated the department's performance. But new figures show actual response times were lower.

By Kate Linthicum, Robert J. Lopez and David Zahniser, Los Angeles Times

March 13, 2012

The Los Angeles City Council made deep cuts to the Fire Department last year after being presented with data that overstated how quickly rescuers arrived at the scene of citizen calls for help.

In presentations made by fire officials to council members as they considered reducing fire engines and ambulances at more than one-fifth of the city's stations, the department said first responders arrived at the scene of a medical emergency within five minutes nearly 80% of the time. Similar statistics were also included in a Fire Commission report to Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa.

But those figures inaccurately portrayed department performance, according to new numbers released by the department last week. The new statistics show that medical rescuers actually arrived on scene within five minutes only 64% of the time in 2008 and hit that mark even less in the following two years.

The department's statistician said he could not explain the discrepancy between the new numbers and the numbers in the Fire Commission report.

Last week, the Fire Department acknowledged that for years it provided lawmakers with misleading statistics that showed firefighters were on scene in less than five minutes roughly 80% of the time. They said they had used the wrong formula to calculate those reports.

Some City Council members said Monday they were disturbed about voting on the cuts based on inaccurate information. Councilwoman Jan Perry said that neither the Fire Department nor the mayor's office, which called for the budget reductions, informed her that response time numbers were not properly calculated.

"We were the ones casting the vote," said Perry, who is running for mayor. "If someone was aware that we were basing a vote on erroneous information, it would have been their responsibility to tell the council that."

Perry said she wanted an "unbiased third-party audit" of the department's response times, going back to at least 2010.

Councilman Dennis Zine, chairman of the council's auditing committee, said he planned to probe the department's statistics.

"We need to get honest numbers," Zine said. "If they're not being honest and credible that creates a huge problem. Fudging numbers is not acceptable at all."

Fire officials told The Times the department had traditionally used a six-minute time frame to calculate response statistics — even though their reports used a five-minute time frame. The department also only counted responses to the most critical emergencies, which also improved the performance figures.

Two years ago, officials began adjusting their calculations to bring them in line with the widely accepted five-minute standard of the National Fire Protection Assn., which says departments should hit that goal 90% of the time.

One community activist who opposed the budget cuts and who has studied the response times in Los Angeles, said it was troubling that flawed data appeared to have been used in decision-making. He said it was symptomatic of a larger City Hall problem. "Statistics are put forward to accomplish a goal, and nobody is held accountable," he said.

The issue surfaced last week after mayoral candidate Austin Beutner wrote an online column criticizing Perry and Councilman Eric Garcetti for approving Fire Department cuts. Citing agency reports, Beutner complained about a steep increase in response times.

But after his attack — and a Times inquiry — the department pushed back, saying Beutner had mixed the old and new response time statistics.

Villaraigosa's office said the change in the department data was not misleading but simply reflects changes in the formula for assessing response times. A spokesman for the mayor said Villaraigosa was not informed of the changes until over the weekend.

Across the country, departments use different metrics to assess how well they respond to medical emergencies.

Fire officials elsewhere say meeting the five-minute response goal is difficult, but possible with vigilant monitoring of calls and units in the field. In San Francisco, officials rely in part on "dynamically deployed" ambulances that are moved from station to station throughout the day depending on call volume.

"We have people looking at that constantly," said Mindy Talmadge, spokeswoman for the San Francisco Fire Department. So far this year, she said, the city's first responders have arrived on the scene in emergency medical calls within four minutes and 52 seconds 90% of the time.

The L.A. Fire Department also hopes to use statistics to better allocate resources, officials say. Chief Brian Cummings said he planned to move several fire crews around the city based on data analysis.

Cummings, who was promoted to chief last year, was a main architect of the 2011 redeployment. The department said the plan would save nearly \$200 million over three years.

The first cuts to the department came in 2009, when the cash-strapped city began a program of rotating ambulance and fire truck closures. Within months, the department acknowledged that critical minutes were lost in several emergency medical calls, including one in which rescuers took more than 10 minutes to arrive at a Bel-Air home where a 3-year-old boy had drowned in a swimming pool.

"Every minute that you add to a response to a heart attack, or the beginning of a fire, that could actually be a life and death issue," Councilman Paul Koretz said of the cuts. He said the city needs to know "the real, perfectly accurate numbers."

"It's very disconcerting that the numbers on which we base significant life and death policy decisions...are flawed."

Lawmakers say that with a \$220-million budget shortfall, it's unlikely the Fire Department will recoup any emergency units this year. But the issue could be kept alive in the mayor's race, in which several contenders are vying to replace Villaraigosa.

City Controller Wendy Greuel, one mayoral candidate, said her office plans to investigate the response times and look at the effects of the cuts.

"It is clear that there was a misrepresentation," she said. "If standards changed, if numbers changed, the public should be informed of that, as well as leadership."

kate.linthicum@latimes.com

robert.lopez@latimes.com

david.zahniser@latimes.com

Los Angeles Times staff writer Ben Welsh contributed to this report.

L.A. Fire Department troubles are a Beutner mayoral campaign theme

Tue Mar 20 2012 1:19 AM

Putting the growing controversy over Fire Department response times at the center of his Los Angeles mayoral campaign, candidate Austin Beutner on Monday called for a citizens task force to look into delays in emergency response and into what he sees as mismanagement of the department.

In an online column that he said would be published on the Huffington Post website Monday night, Beutner criticized the department's performance in the wake of budget cuts and lambasted three of his leading opponents for not properly scrutinizing how cuts would hurt the city.

He complained that firetrucks and ambulances are not equipped with GPS technology and said that instead of moving its dispatch center into a new facility last month, the department should have spent money on better equipment.

As The Times reported Sunday, the department's dispatch system has been plagued with problems since the Feb. 28 move. According to firefighters, in recent weeks some or all of the notifications that alert stations to emergencies have failed at times, leading to delayed responses to several medical calls and fires, including a South Los Angeles blaze in which two people died. The department has flown in experts to help fix the problem.

Beutner, a former investment banker who served for more than a year as Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa's "jobs czar," first raised the issue of response times nearly two weeks ago, when [he wrote in a column](#) that the cuts have sent response times for medical emergencies soaring.

The department refuted his claim by admitting an embarrassing fact: Beutner was comparing conflicting sets of statistics put out by officials.

For years, the department put out data that said rescuers arrived at medical emergencies within five minutes more than 80% of the time. But it had actually been using a six-minute time frame. LAFD statistician Capt. Mark Woolf said corrected data generated by a new computer system showed that in 2008, the department in fact hit the five-minute goal only 64% of the time and that by last year, the number had fallen to about 60%.

Beutner said any increase in response times is cause for concern. In his column Monday, he also complained about disproportionately long responses in certain parts of the city, including Porter Ranch and Encino. He cited a graph of response times at each of the city's 106 stations that was included in a department report to the Board of Fire Commissioners in November.

Fire Commission President Genethia Hudley-Hayes said the same graph also gave commissioners pause. When the commission asked fire officials to explain why there were spikes in response times in certain geographic areas, the officials said they were not statistically significant because they were based on data from only the first three months of a new deployment plan enacted because of the cuts, she said.

Hudley-Hayes said the issue may come up at the commission's meeting Tuesday morning, when Fire Chief Brian Cummings will answer questions about response times and problems with the dispatch system.

A spokesman for the mayor, who has the authority to assemble a task force, said an audit of fire response times is already being conducted by the city controller.

-- Kate Linthicum at Los Angeles City Hall

Injured and ailing people wait as dispatch problems slow LAFD

By Kate Linthicum and Robert J. Lopez, Los Angeles Times

Sat Mar 17 2012 9:08 PM

When the machine swallowed her hand, slicing off one finger and mangling the rest, Tania Wafer's co-workers tried frantically to stop the bleeding as a supervisor dialed 911.

Hang on, they told her as she slid in and out of consciousness on the floor of the printing plant. The ambulance will come soon.

It didn't. Wafer waited nearly 45 minutes for Los Angeles Fire Department paramedics to arrive because of ongoing problems with the agency's emergency dispatch system.

The dismemberment occurred March 7, when a brief equipment failure left dispatchers unable to alert fire stations. At a firehouse in Harbor Gateway near Torrance, just a mile from the bleeding woman, the alarms never rang, according to firefighters.

"I was in horrible, horrible pain," said Wafer, 36, who was later told by a doctor that too much time had elapsed to reattach her finger.

Wafer's case is one of several recent Fire Department dispatching problems compiled by The Times. The city Fire Commission has allocated emergency funds for technical experts who are trying to fix the glitches in a system crucial to tens of thousands of emergency responses each month.

Fire Chief Brian Cummings and Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa say that the city is safe and that rescuers will come when called. At a news conference last week, Cummings said the system is working properly "99% of the time." And during the March 7 system breakdown, just two calls out of 1,000 were missed and no one died in either of those cases, he said.

But firefighters in the field say recurring problems have delayed responses to other emergencies in recent days, including a March 2 fire in South Los Angeles in which two people died.

The system problems have created confusion at station houses and have forced dispatchers to rely on antiquated backup plans, firefighters say. Bob Ashley, a dispatcher who has been with the department for 25 years, said that after several computer crashes in recent weeks, he and his colleagues tracked the availability of fire engines and ambulances with a peg board and golf tees.

The instability of the dispatch system, which officials blame on aging equipment and a move to a new building late last month, has prompted Villaraigosa to order a full review of the operation.

The technical failures are adding to questions about the department's performance and transparency after The Times disclosed that for years, fire officials published statistics showing rescuers were responding to medical emergencies faster than they actually were.

Those numbers were included in reports that lawmakers considered when making deep cuts in emergency services last year. Several City Council members are now calling for audits of department data and probes of the public safety cutbacks.

Fire Commission President Genethia Hudley-Hayes complained that she learned that dispatch problems had affected emergency responses only last week, after reading about the news conference Cummings held.

The chief's failure to tell the commission about the gravity of the problems was "a horrible breach of what should have happened," she said. The commission will address response time statistics and equipment troubles at a meeting on Tuesday.

When the dispatch system works properly, fire stations are alerted by flashing lights, followed by an alarm that sounds over loudspeakers and a digitized voice that announces which personnel and units are needed, as well as the location and nature of the emergency. Station phones and bells also ring.

But at times, some or all of the notifications have failed, causing firefighters to waste precious seconds figuring out the location and type of emergency and who needs to respond, according to records and interviews. As a backup, fire stations have been ordered periodically to go on "radio watch." That requires firefighters to monitor radio calls involving numerous stations for any incidents requiring their station to respond.

The night before the March 2 fire in South Los Angeles, firefighters at the nearest station to the scene said they went to sleep after receiving a department notice that radio watch had been canceled. According to the notice, a copy of which was obtained by *The Times*, firefighters were advised that the system's voice notification "was intermittent and cannot be relied upon." But in the event of an emergency, crews were assured, station lights would blink, bells would sound and dispatch phones would ring.

Shortly before 6 a.m., the lights flashed at Station 14, but the alarms were silent. Firefighters woke in confusion, not sure whether they had an emergency. "Everybody was kind of staring at each other," said Freddy Purcell, a 23-year department veteran who was on duty.

Purcell slid down a fire pole as a Teletype machine printed the address of the fire on East Vernon Avenue, less than a mile away.

One firefighter tried to use the station's loudspeaker to alert the rest of the crew. It wasn't working either, so he ran upstairs and roused crew members.

By Kate Linthicum and Robert J. Lopez, Los Angeles Times

Sat Mar 17 2012 9:08 PM

Purcell and his partner rushed to the fire in their ambulance, arriving before other units. But they had no equipment to fight the flames that were tearing through the building.

The first firetruck — from another station — arrived more than seven minutes after the initial alarm, seconds before the engine from Station 14, according to dispatch records and interviews. The department's goal is to be on fire scenes within five minutes 90% of the time. Even the slightest delays can mean the difference between life and death, officials say.

As firefighters shot water on the blaze, a woman appeared in a window. She was jerking desperately at a row of iron security bars, trying to break free.

"She was still alive when we pulled her out," Purcell recalled.

The woman was pronounced dead at a nearby hospital. The next day, fire crews found a second body — a man's — in the ashes. Firefighters suspect arson, and the coroner's office said the woman's death is being investigated as a homicide.

Those who battled the blaze, in a vacant building where transients sometimes stayed, said they will never know whether they could have saved the victims. But without the confusion caused by the malfunctioning alarm system, the fire engine from Station 14 could have been on the scene a couple of minutes sooner, according to firefighters at the station.

"We were delayed because of the dispatch," said Greg Ikeda, a Station 14 firefighter. "It was not normal. That's all I have to say."

A week later, the alarms failed to sound at Fire Station 87 in the San Fernando Valley, according to a captain on duty, who said his crew lost about a minute getting to a fire that engulfed two condominiums.

Although no one was injured in that incident, "a minute is a long time if you're a victim in a fire," said Capt. Jeff Dapper, who was awakened by flashing lights and hustled to the Teletype machine to find out about the emergency.

On March 7, the day of the major system breakdown, an elderly man in San Pedro dialed 911 and said he was having trouble breathing, according to a Fire Department source who asked not to be named for fear of retaliation. At nearby Fire Station 101, firefighters were alerted to the emergency, but the computer on their truck transmitted only a partial address, sending them to a trailer park near the waterfront, the source said. The ambulance raced through the park with its sirens blaring, looking for the victim's home, but returned to the station when they couldn't find him.

It took nearly an hour — and another 911 call from the victim — before he was finally found and taken to a hospital, the source said. The department declined to provide information on the incident, or others included in this report, but the San Pedro patient survived, according to the department source.

On that same morning, Wafer's hand got snagged in a binding machine at the printing plant.

As her co-workers gathered around, they wondered what was taking rescuers so long. Even her husband, who was asleep at the couple's Wilmington home when he got the call, managed to get to the plant before paramedics.

Fire Department medics learned of Wafer's crisis only after a plant worker eventually tracked down a phone number for the local firehouse and called directly. In the ambulance on the way to the hospital, the paramedics apologized to Wafer for not coming sooner.

"I waited so, so long," said Wafer, a mother of four. "I could have stayed there dying, waiting for them."

kate.linthicum@latimes.com

robert.lopez@latimes.com

Politics lights a fire under L.A. Fire Department

By Kate Linthicum, Los Angeles Times

Fri Mar 9 2012 10:39 PM

A Los Angeles mayoral candidate took an early campaign swipe at his leading opponents this week and inadvertently exposed the city Fire Department for publishing misleading performance data.

Top brass at the Los Angeles Fire Department on Friday admitted that for years the agency put out data that made it appear that firefighters were arriving at the scene of emergencies faster than they actually were.

The dust-up began Thursday, when candidate Austin Beutner complained in an online Huffington Post column that recent Fire Department budget cuts have sent response times for medical emergencies soaring. Beutner laid the blame on the City Council members who approved the cuts, singling out mayoral rivals Eric Garcetti and Jan Perry. He also criticized another opponent, City Controller Wendy Greuel, for failing to scrutinize the impact of the cuts.

Relying on Fire Department reports presented to lawmakers, Beutner said that in 2008 the department responded to medical emergencies within five minutes 86% of the time. After the cuts, the department last year met that standard just 59% of the time, he said.

Following Beutner's critique — and a Times inquiry — the department made an awkward admission: Data showing it did so well in the past was simply wrong.

Federal guidelines call for first responders to arrive on scene in under five minutes 90% of the time. But a former department statistician counted all responses within six minutes, officials explained, which improved the record. Retired Captain Billy Wells, who crunched the data with a hand calculator, said he followed the department's long tradition of using a six-minute response standard.

Wells' successor, Capt. Mark Woolf, said he reluctantly continued using the flawed formula for a time because he didn't want to be blamed for a sudden drop in department performance. "I didn't want to touch that [extra] minute because I knew the data would take a dump," he said.

Corrected data generated by a new computer system shows that in 2008, the department actually hit the five-minute goal only 64% of the time, officials said. By last year, that number had fallen to about 60%.

The statistics snafu comes as the department is facing increased scrutiny over how budget reductions have affected service.

Fire Chief Brian Cummings said his department's performance is pretty good, given the 16% reduction to its budget in recent years, which has led to the elimination of fire trucks or ambulances at about one-fourth of the city's 106 fire stations. The average response time citywide has increased only several seconds, he said. "I need the public to be reassured that we're going to get there and get there in a timely matter," Cummings said.

Others disagree. The head of the firefighters union has complained that his members are being run ragged. And he says there has been a rise in "collisions," when units struggle to respond to simultaneous emergencies in the same station area. That's what happened in January, when a man trapped inside a burning house in the San Fernando Valley suffered severe burns after it took firefighters nine minutes to arrive on scene, said Pat McOsker, the president of United Firefighters of Los Angeles. A fire truck from the nearest station was out on another call, he said, and the back-up truck there had been eliminated because of the cutbacks.

McOsker says a promise from the fire chief to shift some trucks and ambulances around the city next month isn't enough. "The way to solve this problem is to reopen resources, not to reshuffle the deck," he said. "We're not giving people the best chance to survive these things."

He also pointed to problems with aging dispatch equipment that has been malfunctioning. Officials say they've been forced to rely on a backup system. The department recently opened a new bond-financed dispatch center, but hasn't had the money to upgrade its equipment.

While Beutner criticized the service reductions in his recent column, he failed to mention Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, who prepares the city budget and who called for Fire Department cuts. Beutner was Villaraigosa's "jobs czar" in 2010, the year before the mayor said the department must make cuts that analysts said would save the city nearly \$200 million.

"This was the mayor's office's plan and Beutner was first deputy mayor when it was created," said Yusef Robb, a spokesman for Garcetti, the main target of Beutner's attack. He said Garcetti helped save 318 staff positions in the Fire Department that the mayor sought to permanently eliminate.

Councilman Mitchell Englander, who joined the council after the cuts, said the department has been "decimated" in recent years and needs more money. He said he is working with the department to focus on collecting more accurate and useful data.

kate.linthicum@latimes.com

Los Angeles Times Staff Writer Ben Welsh contributed to this report.

L.A. Fire Department's smoke and mirrors on response time

The Fire Commission needs to ask officials tough questions on how performance results were calculated and how to improve them in tough financial times.

By Steve Lopez

March 21, 2012

Maybe I was beginning to suffer from smoke inhalation. All I know is that I started feeling faint at Tuesday's meeting of the Los Angeles Fire Commission right around the time LAFD Fire Chief Brian Cummings attempted, yet again, to explain mysterious discrepancies regarding emergency response times.

You'd have been dizzy too, hearing about metrics, deployment models, projections and changing formulas.

I knew 20 minutes into the meeting that if I fainted and fell over backward, and someone called 911, no one in the room could say for sure how long the projected or actual response might take or what formula would be used to compute it.

FOR THE RECORD:

Genethia Hudley-Hayes: Steve Lopez's column in the March 21 Section A gave an incorrect name for the president of the L.A. city fire commission. She is Genethia Hudley-Hayes, not Genethia Hudson-Hayes.

I did learn at the meeting that when you call 911 for a fire or medical emergency, the call goes to the LAPD first. Typically, said an assistant chief, it might take 30 seconds for the call to get bounced over to the Fire Department (the LAPD tells me this can take a full 60 seconds). And it can take an additional 90 seconds for the fire dispatchers to determine exactly what's going on and send the call to the right fire station.

FOR THE RECORD:

LAFD response times: In the March 21 Section A, a column about Los Angeles Fire Department response times misspelled the last name of the president of the city Fire Commission. She is Genethia Hudley-Hayes, not Hudson-Hayes. —

After that, it can take 60 more seconds for a unit to roll.

So we're already up to as much as 31/2 minutes from the time of the call until the time they start their engines, and even longer if the call is made on a cellphone. And the whole point of discussing response times is that if you're not breathing, you could be brain-dead in four to six minutes.

As The Times has reported, LAFD officials have admitted they used a six-minute response standard in calculating how well they performed, even as city officials were led to believe a five-minute standard was being used.

It's still not clear to me why that happened. But it is clear that budget cuts were made on

the basis of the brighter outlook, and City Council members are demanding an investigation and an explanation.

And then Tuesday, Cummings served up an explanation I hadn't heard yet. He said the department was using projected data instead of real data.

Are you still with me?

If so, then we're both lost.

Cummings said a computer model had projected that the department responded to medical emergencies within five minutes 79% of the time in 2008, and that after budget cuts, the figure would drop to 77%.

But those, he said, were just projections.

In fact, the department responded within five minutes only 64% of the time a few years ago, and now the number is around 60%, which, if it's true, falls about 30% short of the standard many departments shoot for.

"The story changes every time he opens his mouth," said Pat McOsker, president of the firefighters union.

Genethia Hudson-Hayes, president of the Fire Commission, didn't seem too upset about having been misled by Cummings and his crazy algebra, but then, it wasn't even clear that she felt misled. She said the slower responses are obviously related to manpower and resource cuts.

"The bottom line is, we're thin. And we need more money," she said.

Really?

I thought one of the other commissioners might step up to the plate, but instead Commissioner Andrew Friedman made a rambling speech that touched on his 15 grandchildren, cookies, his native Hungary, and his steadfast belief that Los Angeles is the next best thing to heaven.

What we need is commissioners who don't give the chief a pass, acting more like lap dogs than watchdogs. It seemed all the commission wanted to do was state for the record that it didn't intentionally mislead the City Council. It didn't seem to have any inclination to call Cummings on the carpet, which is what I would have done. Not just for the way he tells time, but for the deployment plan he's put in place.

Not that this is an easy job. Los Angeles poses many challenges for a Fire Department, given the hundreds of square miles, the winds, the density, the high-rises, the brush, the traffic, the medically uninsured who wait until it's bad and then dial 911.

You can't do it on the cheap, and in fact, mayoral candidate Austin Beutner is passing around a Fire Department report from last November that suggests response times were horrible in some neighborhoods last year after new budget cuts were implemented.

Pat Pope of the Porter Ranch Neighborhood Council isn't surprised. He said he didn't like what he heard last spring when Cummings visited the neighborhood to explain how the department would try to keep them covered despite cutting back on equipment and staffing.

"I don't think he said this was good, he just said this was better than rolling brownouts," said Pope, referring to the previous budget-cutting model.

But Pope, a retired telephone company employee, said he believes public safety is at greater risk in Porter Ranch in the last few months with the loss of a hook and ladder truck, an ambulance and an engine company.

"There are no paramedics north of the 118 now between the 405 and the city limits to the west," he said.

Of course more money would help, but while the Fire Commission waits for millions to fall from the sky, we need to look at more than response times.

Is better technology available for both dispatch and fleet deployment?

Can we get residents to stop bothering the Fire Department with stubbed toes, burnt toast and backyard snakes?

And more than 80% of all calls are for medical problems, yet the department is still built to fight fires. That means that lumbering, gas-guzzling big rigs with large crews often go racing through the city as the first responders. Are there ways to retool?

First and foremost, though, where's Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, and can he please explain what his fire chief is talking about?

steve.lopez@latimes.com

Fire Department-Disclosure

Date: 03-20-2012 7:07 PM - Word Count: 412

Fire Department-Disclosure

LOS ANGELES (CNS) - Citing a federal medical privacy law, the Los Angeles Fire Department announced today it would no longer provide the public with basic information about fires, medical calls, traffic accidents or other

emergencies it responds to.

LAFD public information officers contacted by City News Service today about various fire calls -- including a vehicle shearing a fire hydrant in North Hills and a collision between a food truck and a car in downtown Los Angeles that sent two people to hospitals -- said they were not permitted to provide any information, including the locations of the crashes. In the case of the downtown collision, a spokesman refused to even confirm a wreck had occurred, even though footage of the crash had already been shown on at least one television news station.

The policy apparently took effect Sunday, when the LAFD began omitting the addresses from media alerts it circulates about fires or other incidents to which crews are dispatched. For example, a media alert issued Saturday by the LAFD specified that fire crews had responded to a fire at 936 W. 49th St. By Sunday, the department's media alert about a reported fire in a three-story apartment complex included no address or general location of the blaze.

LAFD Chief Brian L. Cummings issued a statement late today saying the department -- which has been under fire in recent weeks over its reporting of response times -- was following orders issued by the office of City Attorney Carmen Trutanich, a candidate for county district attorney.

City Attorney's Office officials could not be reached for immediate comment.

Cummings said the department is subject to the Federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, commonly known as HIPAA, "and is only permitted to release Protected Health Information for the purposes of treatment, billing and operations under the HIPAA Privacy Rule, without the patient's permission."

"The department is currently seeking written advice from the city attorney relative to the release of incident-specific PHI to a variety of internal and external sources including elected officials, commissions, the media and associated stakeholders," Cummings said. "The city attorney has preliminarily opined that the department should immediately cease the practice of releasing PHI to any source not specifically authorized under the Privacy Rule's treatment, billing and operations exemption.

"I realize that this practice will significantly impact the manner in which the department provides updates and notifications to a wide variety of stakeholders," he said.

CNS-03-20-2012 19:07

Mayor Villaraigosa Orders LAFD to End Media Blackout

"I am directing you to immediately resume releasing information," the mayor said in a letter to the chief

By [Jonathan Gonzalez](#), [Jason Kandel](#) and [Gordon Tokumatsu](#)

| Thursday, Mar 22, 2012 | Updated 5:44 AM PDT

[View Comments \(0\)](#)

|

[Email](#)

|

[Print](#)

Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa ordered the Los Angeles Fire Department to end its media blackout, one day after fire officials said they would stop releasing public information about emergency calls, traffic accidents and fires they respond to. Gordon Tokumatsu reports.

Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa on Wednesday ordered the Los Angeles Fire Department to stop withholding basic information about emergencies one day after the department announced it would impose a media blackout.

Citing the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, a federal medical privacy law, the department announced Tuesday that it would no longer provide the public with basic information about fires, traffic accidents or other emergencies it responds to.

Document: [Mayor's Full Letter to LAFD Chief Brian Cummings \(PDF\)](#)

"In the absence of a written legal opinion giving your department guidance, I believe it is our duty to provide information to the media and the public," Villaraigosa wrote in a letter to LAFD Fire Chief Brian Cummings. "I am directing you to immediately resume releasing information."

The department has not responded to the letter.

A finger-pointing game was sparked between the mayor's office and the City Attorney Wednesday over who was responsible for the media blackout of emergency information.

On one end, the LA City Council had designated the LAFD as a "hybrid" health provider under HIPAA, according to the [department's Tuesday announcement](#).

That means the LAFD is not required to release Protected Health Information, unless it is for the purposes of treatment, billing or operations, citing increased civil and criminal penalties if it does, Cummings said.

On the other end, the LAFD was also told by the city attorney's office to stop releasing PHI to any source not authorized under the act.

"The City Attorney has preliminarily opined that the department should immediately cease the practice of releasing PHI," Cummings said. "I realize that this practice will significantly impact the manner in which the Department provides updates ... to a wide variety of stakeholders."

City Attorney Carmen Trutanich said his office only advised the fire chief and the mayor but would never order them to not disclose public information.

"We did not advise a blanket prohibition on the release of public information," said a city attorney spokesman. "The policy of our office is not to order media blackouts."

But Villaraigosa believes it's Trutanich's responsibility to figure out the legality of the blackout.

"I'm going to ask the city attorney to revisit that issue," Villaraigosa said.

NBC4 Legal Analyst Royal Oakes said he doesn't believe the department should be considered a hybrid health care provider, since it is not a "quasi-arm of a hospital."

"It's one thing to protect the names of patients ... but this is a real overreaction to that HIPAA law," Oakes said.

The media blackout was imposed weeks after the LAFD had been scrutinized for slow response times.

Villaraigosa was asked whether he believed the [media coverage over the response times](#) and budget issues was responsible for the short-lived black out.

"No. I don't think so," he said.

Sincerely:
James O'Sullivan
Mike Eveloff
Fix The City

December 5, 2011

James O'Sullivan
Michael Eveloff
Fix The City

Los Angeles Planning Commission
City Hall Council Chambers- Room 340
200 N. SPRING STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
Attention: James.K.Williams@lacity.org

RE: CPC-2005-6082-CPU, CEQA: ENV-2005-2158-EIR
Related Case: CPC-1997-43-CPU

Dear Commissioners,

We would like to highlight several fatal flaws in the proposed Hollywood Community Plan Update (HCP) Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

While the growth-inducing policies contained in the HCP are certainly a matter of opinion, our comments do not address the policy aspects of the HCP. Rather, we focus on the insufficiencies of the environmental review provided in the FEIR.

The FEIR flaws can be roughly summarized as follows:

1. Improper Mitigations

The FEIR relies on mitigations which are unfunded, contingent on third party actions or are simply not mitigation in that they encourage an action rather than take an action. This is the same class of issue that caused the original General Plan Framework to be rejected by the courts. (TIMP unfunded and depended on third parties).

2. Mitigation Phases Inconsistent

Many mitigations are designated to occur and be monitored in the "pre-construction" phase of the HCP – namely pre-implementation. Many of those mitigations would appear to be essential to the FEIR's conclusions of reduced impact over the long term.

3. Baseline Issues

The FEIR uses an out-of-date and irrelevant baseline year of 2005. This date is before the economic meltdown and before the City was forced to make substantial and material cuts to virtually all public services, including first-responder services. The FEIR also fails to take into account the newly-disclosed deficiencies in infrastructure of the City, including streets, water, power, sewers, and sidewalks. (Including deferred maintenance which LADWP deemed "unsustainable.")

4. Inconsistency With The General Plan

The General Plan Framework Element contains clear mandatory direction to the City on how Community Plan Updates are to proceed. It states:

“The Department of City Planning shall periodically review the need to either revise or update the citywide elements, including the Citywide General Plan Framework Element, and the Community Plans. The results of this periodic review, when conducted, shall be reported to the City Planning Commission, the City Council, and the Mayor through the Annual Growth Report. The Annual Growth Report shall recommend which citywide element or Community Plans should be amended and why. These recommendations shall be based on an evaluation of changing circumstances, trends, and other information provided by the Department of City Planning’s monitoring system...”

The City has failed to report on the periodic review in its Annual Report as that report has not even been attempted since 2001. This alone is a violation of policy 3.3.2 which forms the key mitigation for the General Plan.

Had the City, as required, properly implemented its mitigation and monitoring as mandated by the General Plan FEIR, the HCP FEIR would have had access to the latest information instead of out-of-date information. It would also have had access to trends for that data. The General Plan states:

“This monitoring system shall be kept up to date by City staff through inputs from the applicable departments within the City of Los Angeles.”

A Community Plan that does not result from the process mandated in the General Plan is inconsistent with the General Plan.

5. Monitoring Deficiencies

The monitoring program provided is flawed. It does not provide frequency, funding, metrics to be used and most importantly mitigating action to be taken based on the monitoring. Given the City’s complete failure to implement the mitigation and monitoring program for its General Plan, no reasonable assumption can be made that monitoring will be done by the City absent a clearly defined and transparent process.

6. Reliance On Development Impact Fees

The HCP and FEIR state that some form of impact fee may be employed to provide funding for many of the mitigations. Aside from being contingent on future actions therefore wholly speculative, several key issues exist with regard to impact fees which may prevent their implementation and therefore use as a mitigation. They are:

Environmental Justice.

A key issue with a development impact fee to fund enhanced local services is that it implies that areas with development/resources would receive extra/enhanced public services. This seems inherently discriminatory. Use of a development impact fee to pay for key services such as first-responder services has the potential to create multiple classes of City services based on the relative wealth of an area. This type of resource allocation would also appear to be

inconsistent with LAFD and LAPD policy of allocating resources based on need instead of economic status.

Conflict with Proposition 218

Per documents on the State website

(<http://ceres.ca.gov/planning/financing/chap4.html>), reliance on impact fees appears to be misguided. The document states in part:

- *Proposition 218 has amended the State Constitution to state that "property related" fees and all standby charges may be imposed only upon voter approval.*
- *Proposition 218 prohibits levying property related fees to pay for general governmental services, such as police, fire, ambulance, or library service which are available to the public at large;*

7. Flawed Study Area

As a result of the interrelated nature of core City services such as first-responder services, any guarantee of coverage levels in one Community Plan area necessarily decreases availability to other areas of the City. Absent a funding mechanism for Citywide core services, impacts on Citywide availability of core services resulting from increased growth in the HCP area should have been studied. (Note RA92 was 'pre-deployed' to Station 41 in the HCP area during the evenings on October 29, 30 and 31, 2011. This deprived the Station 92 service area of LAFD transport capability due to a presumed need eight miles away in the HCP area. It also proves not only the interrelated nature of core services but also speaks to the current threat to core services).

The flawed nature of the FEIR renders each of its conclusions baseless and without merit. Per State CEQA guidance a Statement of Overriding Consideration must be based on substantial evidence which it defines as follows:

- *Substantial evidence includes facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinions supported by facts.*
- *Substantial evidence is not argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, evidence which is clearly inaccurate or erroneous, or evidence of social or economic impacts which do not contribute to or are not caused by physical impacts on the environment.*

The "facts" used by the FEIR are out-of-date and are not as specified in the General Plan Framework. Speculation abounds throughout the FEIR and its mitigations.

For each of the reasons listed above, there can be no properly grounded Statement of Overriding Consideration and certainly no basis for approval of the FEIR.

The attached document details many of the flaws listed above. We urge the City to reject this flawed document, repair it, and recirculate it prior to considering it for approval. Any other action is not only “municipal malpractice,” but it invites prompt legal action.

Area	Description
BASELINE	<p>Underlying study is flawed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FEIR states that it uses a 2005 baseline, but then fails to compare the baseline conditions to baseline+project. Instead, the FEIR compares the baseline to projected 2030 data with and without the project. This analysis is impermissible. <p>A 2005 baseline is flawed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of a six year old baseline is not acceptable and does not reflect actual baseline conditions. <p>The EIR failed to study new information of substantial importance The EIR failed to study new information of substantial importance, specifically the deteriorating financial condition of the City and marked decreases in numerous public services. (See CEQA Guidelines Section 15162).</p>
TIMP	<p>No basis for mitigating effect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIMP relies on Regional Improvement Plans/LRTP which are speculative. The TIMP relies on funding to implement ATSAC/ATCS. The TIMP relies on the concept that “traffic signal upgrades will be proposed as a mitigation ...for development.” The existence of development is speculative. That mitigations will be suggested provide no certainty of implementation. The TIMP relies on funding for special traffic operations. The TIMP parking restriction section contains speculative elements. Transit Improvements are speculative and discretionary in the TIMP and cannot be relied upon for mitigation. Public Transportation relied on by the TIMP involves third parties and contains speculative and discretionary language and cannot be relied upon for mitigation. The TIMP relies on non-motorized transportation plans which have not received environmental clearance. The TIMP relies on third-party TDM strategies and contains speculative and contingent language. <p>Contingent mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIMP is comprised of “<i>recommended policies to improve mobility and access in Hollywood.</i>” No mitigating effect can be assumed from discretionary policies and recommendations. The City has made this argument in recent litigation. <p>Contingent mitigation The TIMP contains the following mitigation measure:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Implement development review procedures to ensure that the applicable Mobility policies of the Hollywood Community Plan are applied and implemented by individual development projects when they are considered for approval in the plan area.”</i></p> <p>The City has not made a “clear commitment” to take any mitigating action nor have they identified the specific</p>

	<p>monitoring that will occur as required by CEQA.</p> <p>Contingent Mitigation/TIMP is unfunded as is therefore speculative The TIMP admits it is unfunded. It states:</p> <p>4.2.7 Funding <i>The City typically relies on existing local and regional funding programs and the private sector to implement transportation policies and programs such as those in the TIMP. In order to develop a new source of funding that would assess part of the costs of transportation improvements to new developments through a development impact fee program, the City would need to conduct a nexus study that clearly establishes the nexus between the trips generated by new development and the costs associated with the transportation improvements required to reduce the impacts of those developments."</i></p> <p>Mitigations that are dependent on third parties or on future potential fees are impermissible. Any reliance on the TIMP for mitigation is flawed (Cite Hillside Federation)</p>
<p>MONITORING</p>	<p>Undefined Impacts/No Funding No new funding source has been identified for the cost of monitoring. The City has an operating deficit. By definition, if funding is shifted to monitoring the Hollywood Plan, resources will be diminished elsewhere. Those impacts have not been studied.</p> <p>Monitoring Process Undefined The method, frequency and mechanisms for monitoring must be disclosed so that the public can understand and access the monitoring data. CEQA requires that each public agency adopt objectives, criteria, and specific procedures to administer its responsibilities under the Act and the CEQA Guidelines (Section 21082).</p> <p>The GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH provides the following in its document titled: "Tracking CEQA Mitigation Measures Under AB3180:</p> <p><i>"Monitoring" can be described as a continuous, ongoing process of project oversight. Monitoring, rather than simply reporting, is suited to projects with complex mitigation measures, such as wetlands restoration or archeological protection, which may exceed the expertise of the local agency to oversee, which are expected to be implemented over a period of time, or which require careful implementation to assure compliance.</i></p> <p><i>A program for monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures should contain at least the following components:</i></p> <p><i>(1) A list of the mitigation measures or revisions and related conditions of approval which have been adopted for the project by the agency.</i></p> <p><i>(2) A schedule for regularly checking on the project's compliance with the mitigation measures or project revisions and related conditions of approval, including progress toward meeting specified standards, if any. The program</i></p>

may set out the stages of the project at which each mitigation measure must be implemented (*Christward Ministry v. County of San Diego* (1993) 13 Cal.App.4th 31, 49).

(3) A means of recording compliance at the time of each check.

(4) A statement assigning responsibility for monitoring implementation of the mitigation measures and related conditions of approval to specific persons or agencies, public or private.

(5) If monitoring duties are contracted to private individuals or firms, provisions for ensuring that monitoring reflects the independent judgment of the public agency. Such provisions might include requiring the submittal of regular progress reports to the agency, establishing a mechanism for appealing actions of the contractor to the agency for decision, or selection of the contractor by the agency (as opposed to solely by the applicant). Regardless of whether monitoring is performed by the agency or a contractor, the agency retains the ultimate legal responsibility for satisfying the requirements of section 21081.6.

(6) Provisions for funding monitoring activities, including the imposition of fees.

(7) Provisions for responding to a failure to comply with any required mitigation measure (including conditions of approval). This might include "stop work" authority, permit revocation proceedings, or civil enforcement procedures. This can also include administrative appeal procedures. "

The City Does Not Properly Monitor Mitigations. Assumptions That It Can Are Flawed

Any assumption that the City can properly administer a proper mitigation monitoring, reporting and enforcement program is without merit.

Controller Laura Chick stated the following in a March 23, 2009 report to the City Council:

"Ever since the mid 1990s when I was a City Councilmember. I wondered what actually happened with the conditions we imposed when approving development projects. The City often sets requirements to shape and improve a project, promote safety and mitigate negative impacts to communities.

*Now as Controller, I have circled back to answer the question: "**Who ensures that the requirements attached to these developments are followed,?**" **The answer is: "No one."** We are actually often relying on voluntary compliance by the developers. My report found that, in general, there is no single Department in charge of development projects from beginning to end. The Planning Department is indeed the lead agency in imposing conditions. However other Departments, such as Building and Safety, can add or change conditions without including the Planning Department. The Planning Department's new data management system was intended to be a central database that tracked conditions for approval. However, this is not the cure-all it was intended. Instead we have ended up with three stand-alone systems that are neither integrated nor coordinated. Further, a new computer system alone won't solve the problems in the current development process, unless accompanied by key changes in our business processes. It is clear some significant changes must be made here. If projects are*

approved with conditions attached, is it not in the City's best interest to ensure those conditions are met? Certainly that is what the public expects."

The monitoring plan does not specify a frequency for monitoring.

The monitoring plan does not specify the metrics that will be used during monitoring, the thresholds that will trigger a mitigating action or what mitigating action will be taken once the thresholds are exceeded.

MITIGATION/GENERAL

The GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH provides the following in its document titled: "Tracking CEQA Mitigation Measures Under AB3180:

"Here are some suggestions for preparing mitigation measures:

(1) Certainty: Avoid using the words "may" or "should" when the intent is to direct some required action. "Will" or "shall" are much better. Avoid measures that are conditioned on feasibility (i.e., required "where feasible") rather than applied directly or at a specified stage in the project.

Measures should be written in clear declaratory language. Specify what is required to be done, how is to be done, when it must be done, and who is responsible for ensuring its completion.

(2) Performance: Include specific minimum, measurable performance standards in all quantitative measures, and if possible, contingency plans if the performance standards are not met.

(3) Authority: CEQA does not provide independent authority to carry out mitigation (Section 21004). Measures which are not based on some other authority (i.e., zoning code, tree preservation ordinance, development agreement, impact fee ordinance, subdivision ordinance, etc.) are unenforceable. Monitoring or reporting on their implementation would clearly be problematic.

(4) Continuity and Consistency: To the extent possible, integrate measures with existing policy and regulatory systems, and inspection or review schedules. Where the mitigation measures are regulatory in nature, for example, design them as conditions of approval within the context of the zoning, subdivision, or other ordinances. Further, mitigation measures must take applicable general plan and specific plan policies into account and not conflict with those policies.

(5) Feasibility: Above all, measures must be feasible to undertake and complete. Avoid the trap of imposing mitigation measures that are based upon future activities of uncertain outcome. For example, the court in Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296 overturned the county's negative declaration for a motel project because the county required a study of potential sewage disposal methods rather than actions which would mitigate sewage impacts. A measure that did not mitigate the impact could not be the basis for a finding that impacts were mitigated. "

The Plan MMRP lists numerous mitigations as occurring during the "pre-construction" phase of the Plan. The City must

	<p>clarify the mitigation and monitoring period for any mitigation which implies ongoing mitigation after plan implementation.</p> <p>There is extreme conflict between the answers provided to the public in response to DEIR comments and the final MMRP. In numerous cases, the DEIR responses indicate a reliance on a mitigation that has been removed from the MMRP. This can only lead to confusion on the part of the public as to what mitigations will actually exist.</p>
CONTINGENT MITIGATION	<p>Mitigations which rely on discretionary policies are not mitigation as the outcome and mitigating impacts cannot be determined.</p> <p>Mitigations which are dependent on future discretionary approvals are contingent by definition and cannot be used as mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation which is dependent on adoption of future legislation, programs or policies is not mitigation as the contents, impact and implementation is not a certainty.</p> <p>A mitigation measure that recommends a future study without identification of when the study would occur or what the outcomes could lead to would be impermissible under CEQA (deferred mitigation).</p>
NOT MITIGATION	<p>Mitigations which only refer to promoting an action, encouraging an action/behavior, seeking review of an action or reporting on an action without mandating specific triggers, thresholds and mitigating actions cannot be relied on for mitigation as promotion and encouragement are not mitigation. Further, the level of mitigation is subjective and cannot be determined.</p>
UNFUNDED MITIGATION	<p>Mitigations which are unfunded and/or contingent on grants or discretionary funds from third parties cannot be used as mitigation (cite Hillside)</p>
RELIANCE ON CURRENT LOS	<p>Any reliance on the current level of service for any City-provided service is unfounded. The City has repeatedly cut back services including fire protection and others. Absent a balanced City budget, the FEIR cannot rely or depend on current service levels in its analysis unless it identifies specific funding sources to guarantee a level of service.</p>

<p>LAND USE</p> <p>The Proposed plan uses a strategy for targeted growth that also reduces traffic congestion and improves air quality. These multiple objectives are addressed by encouraging mixed-use development along commercial corridors well served by public transit. To make the height districts in Hollywood’s commercial areas consistent with those in other community plans, the Proposed Plan includes removing the development limitations that were imposed by the 1988 Plan.</p> <p>UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement the Urban Design Policies, Guidelines, and Standards included in the Proposed Plan. 2. Implement Specific Plans and/or Community Design Overlay (CDO) Districts to address proposed development standards. 3. Implement Transit Oriented Districts (TODs) and/or Pedestrian Oriented Districts (PODs) to mitigate the impacts of increased residential and commercial intensity where appropriate. 4. The City shall ensure that review of individual discretionary projects shall address aesthetic concerns as appropriate to minimize site-specific aesthetic impacts, including impacts to views, scenic resources, lighting, and shading. 	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No funding is identified to implement the mitigations. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mitigations listed depend on speculative ordinances and/or plans including development of Specific Plans, CDOs and TODs. • The Plan lists policies as optional. Optional policies provide no certainty and cannot be relied upon for mitigation. <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring the review of aesthetic concerns does not ensure that the concerns will be mitigation. <p>See master comment: TIMP</p>
---	--	--

Population, Employment and Housing	There would be no significant impact and mitigation measures are not required. The Proposed Plan includes policies and zoning controls to address any potential impacts.	See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no funding source specified for the Plan policies and zoning controls. No mitigating impact can be assumed. See master comment: Contingent Mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no certainty which policies and zoning controls the City will choose to implement. Any assumption of mitigating effect which is dependent on discretionary policies is flawed. See master comment: Not Mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed policies contain conditional statements and often refer to goals, not specific measureable and objective criteria. See master comment: TIMP
---	--	--

<p>PUBLIC SERVICES Fire Protection Services</p>	<p>1. "Identify areas of the Hollywood CPA with deficient fire protection facilities and/or services and prioritize the order in which the areas should be upgraded to established fire protection standards to ensure acceptable fire protection at all times."</p>	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no funding source identified for the study listed in the mitigation. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed mitigation measure is dependent on the design and implementation of a future undisclosed study. <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of areas with deficient fire service does not mitigate deficient fire service. It merely identifies it.
	<p>2. "Continue to require, in coordination with the Fire Department, adequate fire service capacity prior to the approval of proposed developments in areas currently located outside of the service areas or capability of existing city fire stations."</p>	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no funding source identified for the study listed in the mitigation. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mitigation assumes that no statement of overriding consideration will be provided for future project approvals. • The mitigation assumes that the fire department will restrict personnel and equipment funded by CPA projects to the CPA area. This is contrary to LAFD policy which manages resources across the entire City based on call volume. <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <p>No basis for assuming implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City has a poor track record of ensuring adequate fire protection for new development. This is further exacerbated by recent budget cuts and service cutbacks.
	<p>3. "Promote continued mutual assistance agreements with neighboring cities, the County of Los Angeles, and other applicable agencies for the provision of fire protection services</p>	<p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting an action does not guarantee that the action will take place. No mitigation can

	to the residents of the Hollywood CPA.”	<p>be assumed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed mitigation depends on third parties not under the control of the City.
	4. Implement the Hollywood Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program (TIMP) contained in Section 4.5 of the DEIR (Transportation) to improve traffic conditions thereby improving fire and life safety in the community.	<p>See master comment: TIMP</p> <p>See master comment: Baseline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City’s new deployment plan represents new material information. The baseline data used for fire service does not reflect the current deployment plan of the LAFD. <p>Undefined Impacts/Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As demonstrated by the recent planned redeployment of RA92 to Station 41 for four nights in October 2011, the Hollywood Plan Area clearly does not have sufficient resources to handle its own needs and the City does not have the ability to allocate “surplus” resources. Instead resources are taken from other areas of the City. The FEIR fails to study the wider city-wide impacts of the Plan. The TIMP cannot be used to mitigate traffic impacting fire/ems service sourced from outside the Plan area.
PUBLIC SERVICES POLICE PROTECTION	1. Hire and deploy additional police officers and civilian personnel to accommodate growth or development generated by the implementation of the Proposed Plan pursuant to LAPD hiring and deployment procedures.	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City does not have sufficient funding for its current police department. Assuming an increase in police service is without merit. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation depends on unknown and unknowable future hiring and deployment procedures. <p>See master comment: Reliance on Current LOS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation assumes that the current LOS of the LAPD can be maintained. Given the City’s budget problems, this is an unsupported conclusion.

	<p>2. Expand and/or upgrade existing police protection equipment and/or facilities in areas of the CPA that do not receive adequate police protection services.</p>	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funding source is identified for the mitigation. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The definition of “adequate” is not provided. The mitigation assumes that the police department will restrict personnel and equipment funded by CPA projects to the CPA area. This is contrary to LAPD policy which manages resources across the entire City based on call volume..
	<p>3. Pursue State, Federal and other nonconventional funding sources to expand the number of sworn police officers.</p>	<p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation is dependent on unspecified and uncertain funding sources. No mitigating effect can be assumed. <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pursuit of an action does not guarantee that the action will occur. No mitigating effect can be assumed.
	<p>4. Promote the establishment of police facilities that provide police protection at a neighborhood level.</p>	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funding source is provided for establishing new facilities. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation is dependent on undefined polices and metrics. <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Promoting” an action does not guarantee the action. No mitigating effect can be assumed.
	<p>5. Implement the Hollywood Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program (TIMP) contained in Section 4.5 of the DEIR (Transportation), to improve traffic conditions thereby improving police response times in the community.</p>	<p>See master comment: TIMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIMP cannot be used to mitigate traffic impacting police service sourced from outside the Plan area. <p>See master comment: Baseline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FEIR does not revise its impact assessment

		given the new prisoner release demands placed on the police department.
UTILITIES -WATER	<p>1. As part of review of individual projects, the Planning Department shall work with LADWP to ensure appropriate expansion, upgrade and/or improvement of the local water distribution system within the CPA as may be necessary to accommodate anticipated growth.</p> <p>2. Individual projects that are consistent with the UWMP, undertake a Water Supply Analysis as required by State Law and/or comply with recommendations as appropriate identified on a site by site basis by the Department of Water and Power will be considered to not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to this potential cumulatively significant impact unless project specific impacts are found to be significant.</p>	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funding source for the Planning Department is identified. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation is dependent on the policies and budget of the LADWP. No mitigating effect can be assumed. <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Working with LADWP” does not ensure a mitigating action. No mitigating effect can be assumed. <p>See master comment: Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No monitoring process is clearly identified.
UTILITIES- ELECTRICITY	<p>1. Promote energy conservation and efficiency to the maximum extent that are cost effective and practical.</p>	<p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The condition language “to the maximum extent that are cost effective and practical” renders the mitigation wholly uncertain. No mitigating effect can be assumed. <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Promoting” an action does not guarantee the action. No mitigating effect can be assumed. <p>See master comment: Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No process for monitoring the promoting efforts is defined.
	<p>2. Encourage and provide incentives for the development and use of alternative sources of energy.</p>	<p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Encouraging” an action does not guarantee the action. No mitigating effect can be assumed.
	<p>3. Adopt and implement a program to provide technical assistance and incentives to property owners and developers on building design and/or the use of energy-efficient systems in new residential, commercial and</p>	<p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation depends on an undefined program that is both undefined and not funded. No mitigating effect can be assumed.

	industrial developments to exceed existing State of California Energy Code standards	
	4. Promote the responsible use of natural resources in consonance with City environmental policies	<p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Promoting” an action does not guarantee the action. No mitigating effect can be assumed.
	5. Expand, upgrade or improve local distribution lines and facilities within the community plan area whenever necessary to accommodate increased demand for energy.	<p>See master comment: Reliance on Current LOS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mitigation relies on the current level of water availability. <p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No funding is provided to expand service. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mitigation depends on the undefined term “whenever necessary.” Absent defined thresholds and metrics the mitigation language is meaningless. No mitigating effect can be assumed.
<p>WASTEWATER</p> <p>With the implementation of the proposed plan, the Hollywood CPA would generate approximately 5.8% of the wastewater generated Citywide in 2020. This is an increase of 0.2% over the existing 2005 levels. This percentage of increase would not be considered to be significant.</p>	1. Continue to implement existing water conservation measures, including ultra low flush installation and, school educational, public information, and residential programs, and develop new ones as needed.	<p>See master comment: Baseline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan’s use of a six year old baseline renders the conclusions inoperable.
	2. Adopt a comprehensive water reuse ordinance that will establish, among other things, goals on reuse of reclaimed water	<p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mitigation depends on an undefined future ordinance. • An ordinance that establishes goals does not ensure success in achieving the goals. <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Establishing.. goals” does not guarantee mitigation.
	3. Establish water reuse demonstration and research programs and implement educational programs among consumers to increase the level of acceptance of reclaimed water.	<p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <p>The mitigation depends on the establishment of a future unfunded and undefined program.</p>

		<p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation provides for demonstration, research and education, not mitigating action.
	4. Provide incentives for the development of new markets and uses for reclaimed water.	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation No funding source is provided for the incentives.</p> <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation is dependent on the development of an incentive program. There is no assurance of the effectiveness of the incentives. <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing incentives does not guarantee that the incentives will be sufficient to alter consumer behavior.
	5. Rehabilitate existing sewers in poor structural condition and construct relief sewers to accommodate growth whenever necessary.	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no funding provided for the mitigation or even the determination of which sewers are in poor condition. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation contains the condition statement “whenever necessary” which renders the mitigation language meaningless absent specific thresholds and metrics. <p>See master comment: Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No monitoring frequency or metrics are provided.
	6. Expand or upgrade existing local sewers in the community plan area to accommodate increased wastewater flow whenever necessary.	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no funding provided for the mitigation. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation contains the condition statement “whenever necessary” which renders the mitigation language meaningless absent specific thresholds and metrics.

		<p>See master comment: Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No monitoring frequency or metrics are provided.
<p>SOLID WASTER</p> <p>The Proposed Plan land uses would result in the generation of up to 2,745,927 lbs. of solid waste per day. This level of solid waste generation amounts to 13.73% of the 2006 Citywide generation rate of 20,000,000 lbs. per day. Therefore, with the implementation of the Proposed Plan, the Hollywood CPA would generate 13.73% of the solid waste generated Citywide (using the 2006 Citywide generation data). This is an increase of 2.16% over the existing 2005 levels. This is a significant adverse impact.</p>	<p>1. Implement the Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan to maximize source reduction and materials recovery and minimize the amount of solid waste requiring disposal with the goal of leading the City to achieve zero waste by 2025.</p>	<p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p>
	<p>2. Encourage and provide incentives for the processing and marketing of recyclable items.</p>	<p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p>
	<p>3. Accelerate on-going efforts to provide alternative solid waste treatment processes and the expansion of existing landfills and establishment of new sites.</p>	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation.</p>
<p>TRANSPORTATION</p> <p>The Proposed Plan compared to 2005 conditions would result in an unavoidable significant adverse transportation impact. The percentage of links at LOS E or F would increase significantly and the weighted V/C ratio would increase from 0.939 to 1.000. There would also be increases in vehicle miles</p>	<p>In order to provide an additional source of funding for transportation improvements, beyond the local and regional funds typically available to the City of Los Angeles, it is recommended that a nexus study be conducted to determine the transportation impact of development accommodated by the 2030 Proposed Plan, estimate the cost of implementing the transportation mitigation measures recommended by the Hollywood Community Plan</p> <p>Update, and develop a means of allocating the cost of such measures to individual development</p>	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: TIMP</p> <p>See master comment: Monitoring</p> <p>See master comment: Baseline</p>

<p>travelled (VMT) and vehicle hours travelled (VHT) in 2030 compared to 2005 conditions.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan would result in similar impacts as compared to 2030 conditions under the Existing Plan. ratio would increase from 0.939 to 1.000. There would also be increases in vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and vehicle hours travelled (VHT) in 2030 compared to 2005 conditions.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan would result in similar impacts as compared to 2030 conditions under the Existing Plan.</p>	<p>projects. Community Plan as compared to 2005 conditions. The percentage of roadway segments projected to operate at LOS E or F would be increased, as would the weighted V/C ratio in Hollywood. Total vehicle miles of travel and vehicle hours of travel also would be significantly increased.</p>	
<p>AIR QUALITY</p> <p>Implementation of the Plan could incrementally provide new sources of regional air emissions but they would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan.</p> <p>Construction of development projects that would be allowed under implementation of the Proposed Plan would result in substantial criteria pollutant emissions.</p> <p>Increased development allowed under the Proposed Plan would significantly increase criteria pollutant emissions in the area.</p> <p>Motor vehicle trips generated by the Proposed Plan would affect carbon monoxide concentrations at intersections in the area, however, on-going emission controls would offset any impacts.</p>	<p>The City, as a condition of approval of all discretionary projects, shall require contractors building projects within the Hollywood CPA to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) use properly tuned and maintained equipment. Contractors shall enforce the idling limit of five minutes as set forth in the California Code of Regulations ii) use diesel-fueled construction equipment to be retrofitted with after treatment products (e.g. engine catalysts) to the extent they are readily available and feasible iii) use heavy duty diesel-fueled equipment that uses low NOx diesel fuel to the extent it is readily available and feasible iv) use construction equipment that uses low polluting fuels (i.e. compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and unleaded gasoline) to the extent available and feasible v) maintain construction equipment in good operating condition to minimize air pollutants. vi) use building materials, paints, sealants, mechanical equipment, and other materials that yield low air pollutants and are nontoxic. vii) Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow. viii) Provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on-and off-site. ix) Reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or 	<p>See master comment: Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mechanism is set forth for assuring compliance with each mitigation. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no basis to assume that traffic flow can be improved via signal synchronization.

<p>Implementation of the Proposed Plan could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollution concentrations in excess of the established LST.</p> <p>Implementation of the Proposed Plan could expose sensitive receptors to elevated health risks from exposure to airborne toxic air contaminants.</p> <p>Implementation of the Proposed Plan would result in increased Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that would contribute significantly to global climate change.</p>	<p>sensitive receptor areas.</p> <p>x) Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity including resolution of issues related to PM10 generation.</p> <p>xi) Improve traffic flow by signal synchronization, and ensure that all vehicles and equipment will be properly tuned and maintained according to manufacturers' specifications.</p> <p>xii) Use coatings and solvents with a VOC content lower than that required under AQMD Rule 1113.</p> <p>xiii) Construct or build with materials that do not require painting.</p> <p>xiv) Require the use of pre-painted construction materials.</p> <p>xv) Require the use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export).</p> <p>xvi) During project construction, all internal combustion engines/construction, equipment operating on the project site shall meet EPA-Certified Tier 2 emissions standards, or higher according to the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Project Start, to December 31, 2011: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet Tier 2 offroad emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with the BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 2 or Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet Tier 3 offroad emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Post-January 1, 2015: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards, where available. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices</p>	
---	---	--

	<p>certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.</p> <p>A copy of each unit's certified tier specification, BACT documentation, and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.</p> <p>Encourage construction contractors to apply for AQMD "SOON" funds. Incentives could be provided for those construction contractors who apply for AQMD "SOON" funds. The "SOON" program provides funds to accelerate clean up of off-road diesel vehicles, such as heavy-duty construction equipment. More information on this program can be found at the following website: http://www.aqmd.gov/tao/implementation/soonprogram.htm.</p> <p>xvii) Other measures as applicable on a project by project basis and as may be recommended by SCAQMD on their web site or elsewhere: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/MMintro.html.</p>	
	<p>2. The City, as a condition of approval for all discretionary projects, shall require developers to implement applicable GHG reduction measures in project design and comply with regulatory targets.</p> <p>3. In the event that future projects under the Community Plan cover areas greater than 5 acres, appropriate analysis and modeling would be required for CO, NOx, PM10 and PM2.5.</p> <p>4. Require health risk assessments to be conducted for discretionary residential projects located within 500 feet of the 101 Freeway. Mitigation measures shall be required as necessary to reduce health risk (for indoor and outdoor uses) to an acceptable level. These health risk assessments shall be circulated to SCAQMD for review and comment.</p> <p>5. In order to comply with the California Air Resources Board</p>	<p>See master comment: Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mechanism is set forth for assuring compliance with each mitigation.

Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (June 2005) and achieve an acceptable interior air quality level for sensitive receptors, appropriate measures, shall be incorporated into project building design. The appropriate measures shall include one of the following methods:

- a. The project applicant shall retain a qualified air quality consultant to prepare a health risk assessment (HRA) in accordance with the California Air Resources Board and the Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment requirements to determine the exposure of project residents/occupants/users to stationary air quality pollutants prior to issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit. The HRA shall be submitted to the Lead Agency for review and approval. The applicant or implementation agency shall implement the approved HRA recommendations, if any. If the HRA concludes that the air quality risks from nearby sources are at or below acceptable levels, then additional measures are not required.
- b. The applicant shall implement the following features that have been found to reduce the air quality risk to sensitive receptors and shall be included in the project construction plans. These shall be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division and the Building Services Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit and ongoing.
- c. Do not locate sensitive receptors near distribution center's entry and exit points.
- d. Do not locate sensitive receptors in the same building as a perchloroethylene dry cleaning facility.
- e. Maintain a 50' buffer from a typical gas dispensing facility (under 3.6 million gallons of gas per year).
- f. Install, operate and maintain in good working order a central heating and ventilation (HV) system or other air take system in the building, or in each individual residential unit, that meets the efficiency standard of the MERV 13. The HV system shall include the following features: Installation of a high efficiency filter and/or carbon filter-to-filter particulates and other chemical matter from entering the building. Either HEPA filters or ASHRAE 85% supply filters shall be used.
- g. Retain a qualified HV consultant or HERS rater during

	<p>the design phase of the project to locate the HV system based on exposure modeling from the mobile and/or stationary pollutant sources.</p> <p>h. Maintain positive pressure within the building.</p> <p>i. Achieve a performance standard of at least one air exchange per hour of fresh outside filtered air.</p> <p>j. Achieve a performance standard of at least 4 air exchanges per hour of recirculation</p> <p>k. Achieve a performance standard of .25 air exchanges per hour of in unfiltered infiltration if the building is not positively pressurized.</p> <p>l. Project applicant shall maintain, repair and/or replace HV system or prepare an Operation and Maintenance Manual for the HV system and the filter. The manual shall include the operating instructions and maintenance and replacement schedule. This manual shall be included in the CC&R's for residential projects and distributed to the building maintenance staff. In addition, the applicant shall prepare a separate Homeowners Manual. The manual shall contain the operating instructions and maintenance and replacement schedule for the HV system and the filters. It shall also include a disclosure to the buyers of the air quality analysis findings.</p>	
<p>NOISE</p> <p>The Proposed Plan would result in significantly increased noise levels during construction activities. The Proposed Plan could expose people and/or structures to significant ground-borne vibration levels.</p> <p>Some land uses included in the Proposed Plan could generate noise that could affect sensitive receptors; project specific review and mitigation as appropriate should reduce this impact to less than significance.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-route truck traffic away from residential streets, if possible. If no alternatives are available, route truck traffic on streets with the fewest residences. 2. Site equipment on construction lots as far away from noise-sensitive sites as possible. 3. When construction activities are located in close proximity to noise-sensitive sites, construct noise barriers, such as temporary walls or piles of excavated material between activities and noise sensitive uses. 4. Avoid use of impact pile drivers where possible in noise-sensitive areas. Drilled piles or the use of a sonic vibratory pile driver are quieter alternatives where geological conditions permit their use. Use noise shrouds when necessary to reduce noise of pile drilling/driving. 5. Use construction equipment with mufflers that comply with manufacturers' requirements. 6. Consider potential vibration impacts to older (historic) 	<p>See master comment: Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mechanism is set forth for assuring compliance with each mitigation. <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Avoiding" use of a piece of equipment is not analogous to prohibiting use. <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mitigation contains the condition statement "whenever necessary" which renders the mitigation language meaningless absent specific thresholds and metrics. • "Considering" impacts does not equate to avoiding impacts.

<p>Increased traffic in the Plan area could significantly increase noise levels at sensitive receptors. The Proposed Plan could result in cumulatively considerable periodic and/or temporary noise levels above levels existing without the project.</p>	<p>buildings in Hollywood as part of the approval process. 7. Commercial rooftop discretionary uses within 500 feet of residentially zoned areas shall be subject to noise analyses; mitigation shall be required to ensure that noise levels in residential areas will not result in a significant impact. 8. For all newly proposed entertainment venues requiring discretionary approval, noise abatement plans shall be required as conditions of approval.</p>	
<p>Public Utilities: Public Libraries</p> <p>“There would be no significant impact and mitigation measures are not required. The Proposed Hollywood Community Plan includes policies that help mitigate potential significant adverse impact.”</p> <p>FROM DEIR <u>Implementation of the Proposed Plan without additional library facilities, with its concomitant population increases, would worsen existing deficiencies in library services in the community.</u></p> <p><u>IMPACT ASSESSMENT</u> <u>Threshold of Significance</u> <u>Based on the 2007 Branch Facilities Plan's guidelines, the size of branch libraries, which generally serve a two-mile radius, are based on the size of the resident population. In general, the recommended sizes are 12,500 square foot facilities for communities with less than 45,000 population and 14,500 square foot facilities for communities with more</u></p>	<p>Relevant Policies of the Proposed Community Plan CF.5.20: Maintain adequate library facilities and services that meet the needs of residents and businesses. CF.5.21: Implement the Los Angeles Public Library Strategic Plan. CF.5.22: Support construction of new libraries and the retention, rehabilitation and expansion of existing library sites as required to meet the changing needs of the community. CF.5.23: Study the development of a funding system to finance the construction of new branch libraries or the expansion and maintenance of existing facilities, the acquisition of equipment, books and other material. CF.5.24: Encourage flexibility in siting libraries in commercial centers, office buildings, pedestrian-oriented areas, community and regional centers, transit stations, on mixed-use boulevards, and similarly accessible facilities. CF.5.25: Continue to support joint-use opportunities when the City of Los Angeles Library Department and decision-makers review and approve new library sites. CF.5.26: Establish a volunteer program in the operation and maintenance of branch libraries. CF.5.27: Expand non-traditional library services, such as book mobiles and other book sharing strategies, where permanent facilities are not available or adequate. CF.5.28: Encourage Wi-Fi networks as an alternative means of providing public access to information. CF.5.29: Encourage safe and well-maintained pedestrian and bicycle access to library facilities.</p>	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation See master comment: Contingent Mitigation See master comment: Not Mitigation See master comment: Monitoring See master comment: Baseline See master comment: Reliance on Current LOS</p>

<p><u>than 45,000 population, with regional branches being up to 20,000 square feet. In addition, it is recommended that when a community reaches a population of 90,000, an additional branch library should be considered for that area.</u></p> <p><u>The State of California standard for public libraries requires 0.5 square foot of library space and two volumes of permanent collection per resident.</u></p> <p><u>Exacerbating the failure to meet either or both of these guidelines and standards would result in an adverse impact on the availability of library services.</u></p>		
<p>PUBLIC UTILITIES</p> <p>Public Parks:</p> <p>The Proposed Hollywood Community Plan incorporates programs and policies that help mitigate potential significant adverse impacts.</p> <p>In addition to these programs and policies, the following mitigation policies are proposed:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop City or private funding programs for the acquisition and construction of new Community and Neighborhood recreation and park facilities. 2. Prioritize the implementation of recreation and park projects in parts of the CPA with the greatest existing deficiencies. 3. Establish joint-use agreements with the Los Angeles Unified School District and other public and private entities that could contribute to the availability of recreational opportunities in the CPA. 4. Monitor appropriate recreation and park statistics and compare with population projections and demand to identify the existing and future recreation and park needs of the Hollywood CPA. 5. The City shall ensure that individual discretionary projects within the Hollywood Planning Area comply with the Los Angeles Municipal Code with respect to provision of open space and recreational facilities. Compliance with this measure shall be sufficient to mitigate project-specific and cumulative impacts to Parks and Recreation. 	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: Not Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: Monitoring</p> <p>See master comment: Baseline</p> <p>See master comment: Reliance on Current LOS</p>
<p>Public Schools:</p> <p>The Proposed Plan would result in a</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop plans to address issues relating to siting and the joint use of facilities. To this end, identify strategies for the 	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation</p> <p>See master comment: Contingent Mitigation</p>

<p>student population of 32,862 in the Hollywood CPA in 2030, as compared to 29,052 students in 2005. Student enrollments have been below operating capacities in previous years. It is assumed that there will continue to exist a percentage of the student population who do not attend the public schools in the area. Therefore, it is anticipated that the existing operating capacity of the public schools have sufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in student population under the Proposed Plan through 2030.</p> <p>However, should the projected increase in the student population in the Hollywood CPA during the planning period not be accommodated by the public school system, then, there would be a significant adverse impact and steps would need to be taken to mitigate this impact.</p>	<p>expansion of the school facilities, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Siting of schools and other community facilities (libraries, parks, etc.) within transit stations, centers or mixed-use areas so that they can complement each other and make the most use of the land provided for these services; b. Locating middle schools and high schools close to transit stations and key centers, where possible, so that students can use the transit system to get to and from school; c. Encouraging private redevelopment of existing schools sites in the immediate vicinity of transit station and centers so that the existing site (a low intensity site) would be replaced by a high intensity mixed-use development that would incorporate school facilities. <p>2. Work cooperatively with LAUSD and other entities to facilitate construction of schools where necessary to accommodate increased student population.</p> <p>3. The City shall ensure that prior to issuance of a building permit, project developers shall pay to LAUSD the prevailing State Department of Education Development Fee to the extent allowed by State law. School fees exacted from residential and commercial uses would help fund necessary school service and facilities improvements to accommodate anticipated population and school enrollment within the LAUSD service</p>	<p>See master comment: Not Mitigation See master comment: Monitoring See master comment: Baseline See master comment: Reliance on Current LOS</p>
<p>Geology and Soils</p>	<p>The incremental additional seismic risks to the population and impacts associated with the implementation of the Proposed Plan would be minimal and do not represent a significant change from current levels of risk.</p> <p>Compliance with applicable Building Code requirements and standard conditions of approval would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>See master comment: Monitoring</p>
<p>Safety/Risk of Upset The Proposed Plan land use designation changes would result in approximately 281.16 acres (1.84% of the CPA) being</p>	<p>As part of the review of individual projects, the City shall ensure that all pertinent safety/mitigation standards in the City’s Building Code, Fire Code and Planning and Zoning Code are met, the City shall prohibit the construction of any building where there is potential for methane gas hazards; and for</p>	<p>See master comment: Unfunded Mitigation See master comment: Monitoring</p>

<p>designated as Industrial, a decrease of 10.99 acres, with a corresponding reduction of 0.08% in the area of the total CPA being designated for industrial land use. The Proposed Plan would not encourage a large increase in population immediately adjacent to oil or gas contamination, or adjacent to an industrial facility containing acutely hazardous materials.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan includes design guidelines for new industrial developments when they are located adjacent to residentially-zoned neighborhoods to mitigate impacts from the storage of hazardous materials.</p> <p>While the Proposed Plan may encourage greater redevelopment of older potentially contaminated sites, there are strict regulations in place to control how potentially contaminated materials are to be handled and disposed of.</p>	<p>instances where there is significant methane gas detected, the developer must immediately notify the City's Building and Safety Department and the Southern California Air Quality Management District.</p> <p>2. As part of the discretionary review of individual projects, the City will require mitigation measures prior to approval of residential or public facility projects within 1,000 feet of a designated hazardous site/condition. These measures should address considerations of setbacks and buffers, barriers, risk of upset plans and safety evacuation plans.</p>	
---	--	--

Relevant case law:

- (Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations v. City of Los Angeles (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 1252, 1255.)
- (DeVita v. Napa (1995) 9 Cal.4th 763, 773.) A general plan is the "constitution for future development."
- (deBottari v. City Council (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 1204, 1213.) Since all land use approvals must be consistent with the general plan, it has "the force of law."
- (Lincoln Place Tenants Assn. v. City of Los Angeles (2005) 130 Cal.App.4th 1491, 1508 (Lincoln Place).) Mitigating conditions are not mere expressions of hope.
- (Scott v. Common Council of San Bernardino (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 684, 697.) A public agency may not fail to perform a mandatory duty based upon budgetary shortfalls.
- Sunnyvale West Neighborhood Ass'n. v. City of Sunnyvale City Council (2010) 190 Cal.App.4th 1351 (holding that the use of hypothetical, future conditions as the environmental baseline results in illusory comparisons and misleading the public, thereby contravening CEQA's intent).
- Citizens Committee to Save Our Village v. City of Claremont (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1170. "Speculation and conjecture" regarding a project's potential environmental impacts do not amount to substantial evidence, even when presented by an expert.

- Madera Oversight Coalition, Inc. v. County of Madera (Sept. 13,2011, F059153) _Cal.App.4th_ lead agencies do not have the discretion to adopt a baseline that uses conditions predicted to occur on a date subsequent to the certification of the EIR

Sincerely:

James O'Sullivan

Michael Eveloff

Fix The City

Cc: Michael J. LoGrande, Director

Eva Yuan-McDaniel, Deputy Director

Alan Bell, AICP ,Deputy Director

Ken Bernstein, AICP

Kevin Keller, AICP

Mary Richardson, Staff

Antonio R. Villaraigosa, Mayor

Tom LaBonge Council District 4

Eric Garcetti Council District 13

Paul Koretz Council District 5