

**ERRATA TO  
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
EMBASSY SUITES HOTEL PROJECT**

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS  
THE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING BOARD  
June 12, 2002 Meeting**

The following items respond to comments raised by the Environmental Planning Board (EPB) at the June 12, 2002 EPB hearing, regarding the Glendale Embassy Suites Final EIR. The comments are in bold, followed by the responses.

**1. Is the larger 412-room hotel shown in traffic report a relevant alternative for purposes of CEQA?**

EPB asked the relevance of the 412-room alternative described in the Appendix B of the Draft EIR (Korve Engineering Traffic Report). This information regarding a larger hotel was presented in the traffic analysis to compare to a previous proposal for the project site and is not a CEQA alternative to eliminate or reduce significant impacts of the proposed project. The body of the main text of the Draft EIR evaluates a smaller hotel (222 rooms) to reduce impacts as required by CEQA.

**2. The traffic volumes are inconsistent.**

EPB raised the concern that traffic volumes for Burchett (between Pacific and Central) presented in the Final EIR differ from Table 10 of the Traffic Analysis (Appendix B of the Draft EIR). After review, the volumes of Table 10 are the correct volumes. As discussed at the EPB meeting, since the volumes already exceed the City's threshold for significance on a neighborhood street without the addition of project-related traffic, the issue becomes whether the incremental increase attributed to the traffic is a substantial or significant change. For Burchett Street the traffic growth attributed to the project is expected to be approximately 4%. The land uses currently located along Burchett Street between Pacific Avenue and Central Avenue are predominately multi-family dwellings. Multi-family dwellings experience high fluctuations in traffic volumes due to a continual variation in the number of vacancies or individuals occupying the available units at a given time. The total expected project-related traffic, approximately four percent of daily traffic (136 daily vehicles), will essentially be undetectable in the natural fluctuations associated with these types of land uses. As a result, the incremental change was not considered to be a significant change and no adverse impacts are anticipated.

**3. Construction Parking**

The EPB was concerned about the parking for workers during construction. To prevent workers from parking in private lots and residential streets, mitigation measure **CN1** is added and shall read:

**CN1** No construction worker parking shall be permitted within 500 feet of the nearest point of the project site except within designated areas. **The contractor shall be responsible for informing subcontractors and construction workers of this requirement, and if necessary, for hiring a security guard to enforce these parking provisions. Contractor shall be responsible for all costs associated with enforcement of this mitigation measure**

**4. Street Sweeping**

The EPB requested clarification of mitigation measure **AQ2**. In order to clarify **AQ2**, it has been edited and shall now read (deleted text is shown ~~stricken through~~ and new text is shown in **bold**):

**AQ2** **Street Sweeping.** Utilize street sweeping equipment on ~~all adjacent~~ **a regular and frequent basis as determined by the Public Works Inspector on all** streets used by haul trucks or vehicles that have been on-site.

**5. Haul Routes**

The EPB requested clarification of the approval of the haul routes discussed in mitigation measure **N3**. In order to clarify this, **N3** has been edited and shall now read (deleted text is shown ~~stricken through~~ and new text is shown in **bold**):

**N3** Proposed haul truck routes shall be laid out **and approved by the Traffic and Transportation Administrator** to avoid residential areas (i.e. Burchett Avenue) to the extent feasible.