

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No
I. The DEIR’s Alternatives Is Inadequate.....	8
A. Offsite Alternatives Must be Analyzed.....	8
B. The DEIR Cannot Rely on Project Objectives to Reject Alternatives.....	11
1. Overly Narrow Project Objectives Improperly Commit the City to a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change	11
2. The Proposed Project Does Not Meet Project Objectives	12
C. No Project Alternative Is Feasible	12
D. Alternative B Would Have Significant Adverse Impacts	12
E. The L.A. River Natural Park Alternative/Alternative D	13
1. The L.A. River Natural Park Alternative Would Provide Numerous Benefits.....	13
2. The L.A. River Natural Park Alternative Is Financially Feasible.....	15
3. When Project Impacts Are Properly Disclosed and the L.A. River Natural Park Alternative is Correctly Described, This Alternative Would Substantially Lessen Project Impacts.....	17
a. Description of Alternative.....	18
b. Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Aesthetic Impacts.....	20
c. Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Air Quality Impacts.....	21
d. Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Biological Impacts.....	22
e. Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Cultural Resource Impacts.....	23
f. Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Geology, Soils, and Seismicity Impacts.....	24
g. Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	25
h. Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts.....	26
i. Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Planning and Land Use Impacts.....	26

	j.	Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Noise Impacts.....	27
	k.	Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Parks and Recreation Impacts.....	27
	l.	Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Transportation Impacts.....	27
	m.	Analysis of L.A. River Natural Park Utilities Impacts.....	29
4.		The Los Angeles Natural Park Alternative Would Meet Project Objectives.....	29
II.		The EIR Fails to Disclose and Analyze the Project’s Impacts on the L.A. River Greenway Trail.....	30
III.		The Project Description is Misleading.	32
IV.		The DEIR Fails to Adequately and Accurately Analyze and Mitigate the Project’s Impacts.....	33
	A.	The DEIR Inadequately Analyzes the Project’s Significant Aesthetic Impacts.	33
		1. The DEIR’s Description of Existing Buildings is Misleading and Obscures the Project’s Significant Aesthetic Impact.	33
		2. The Massive Project Will Cause a Significant Change in the Site’s Visual Character.....	34
		3. The DEIR Fails to Disclose and Mitigate the Project’s Significant Aesthetic Impacts on Recreational Facilities, the Los Angeles River, and Views of the Hollywood Hills.....	36
	B.	The Project May Have Undisclosed Impacts on Biological Resources.....	38
		1. The Project’s Nighttime Lighting Could Adversely Impact Biological Resources Along the Los Angeles River Corridor.....	38
		2. The Biological Survey is Outdated and Excludes the Active Portions of the Project Site.	40
		3. The DEIR’s Disclosures and Analysis Regarding Tree Removal are Inadequate	41
	C.	Adverse Construction-related Air Quality Impacts are not Fully Disclosed or Mitigated.	42

D.	The DEIR Fails to Mitigate the Project’s Admitted Contributions to Greenhouse Gas Emissions.	45
E.	Land Use Would Be Negatively Impacted.....	47
1.	The DEIR Must Analyze the Project’s Consistency With Existing Plans and Zoning.	47
2.	The Project Would Be Inconsistent With Numerous Community Plan Policies Regarding Preservation of Park and Recreational Areas and Minimizing Impacts to the River.	47
3.	The Project Is Inconsistent with the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan.	48
4.	The DEIR Fails to Consider the Project’s Lack of Consistency With the Los Angeles River Master Plan and Los Angeles 2010 Bicycle Plan.....	51
5.	The Project is Inconsistent With SCAG Regional Policy.....	51
6.	The DEIR Fails to Analyze the Project’s Compatibility With the Adjacent Los Angeles River Greenway Trail and Habitat Restoration.....	52
F.	Public Services Would Be Impacted.....	52
1.	Fire Services	52
2.	School Services	52
G.	The Removal of 16 Tennis Courts Will Have Significant and Unmitigated Impacts on Recreation in Studio City.	53
H.	The Transportation/Traffic Analysis is Inadequate.	55
1.	The DEIR Relies on a Hypothetical Traffic Baseline.....	55
2.	The DEIR Fails to Analyze Potentially Significant Construction Traffic Impacts.	56
3.	Further Analysis is Required for Intersection of Whitsett	

	Avenue and Valleyheart Drive.....	56
4.	The DEIR Fails to Adequately Mitigate Pedestrian Access Impacts.	56
5.	Secondary Parking Impacts on Surrounding Neighborhoods Must Be Considered.	57
I.	The DEIR’s Analysis of Cultural Resources Fails to Provide Adequate Information Regarding the Project’s Impacts.	57
J.	The DEIR Fails to Provide Adequate Information Regarding the Project’s Geotechnical Impacts.	58
K.	The DEIR Improperly Defers Analysis and Mitigation of Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts.	59
	1. The DEIR Fails to Disclose Proposed Mitigation For Increased Runoff is Infeasible.....	59
	2. The DEIR Fails to Address Golf Course Runoff.	62
	3. The DEIR Fails to Analyze Runoff from Valleyheart Drive.	62
	4. The DEIR Fails to Adequately Analyze Cumulative Water Quality and Flooding Impacts.	62
L.	Water Supply Impacts.	63
	1. The DEIR Fails to Consider the Impacts of Dewatering on Water Supply.....	63
	2. The DEIR Fails to Consider Water and Wastewater Line Capacity.	63
	3. Construction Water Usage Must Be Assessed	64
M.	Noise Impacts are Inadequately Analyzed.	64
N.	The List of Related Projects Fails to Include Several Recently Proposed Cumulative Projects.....	66
O.	Project Design Features Are Mitigation Measures.....	66
	Conclusion.....	67