

3.0 CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS

OVERVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15088.5 states:

- (a) A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice of its availability... “significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:
 - (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
 - (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
 - (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.
 - (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.
- (b) Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in the adequate EIR.
- (c) If the revision is limited to a few chapters or portions of the EIR, the lead agency need only recirculate the chapters or portions that have been modified.
- (d) Recirculation of an EIR requires notice pursuant to Section 15087, and consultation pursuant to Section 15086.
- (e) A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record.

New information is “significant” if, as a result of the additional information, “the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect.”^{1, 2} Recirculation is not mandated when the new information merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes and insignificant modification to an adequate Draft EIR.³

¹ *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass’n v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.* 864 P.2d 502, 510 (1993) (*Laurel Heights II*)

² *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5(a)

³ *Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth v. City of Rancho Cordova*, 150 P.3d 709 (2007) (quoting *Laurel Heights II*, 864 P.2d at 510); see also *Marin Mun. Water Dist. v. KG Land California Corp.*, 235 Cal.App.3d 1652, 1667 (1991) (citing *Sutter Sensible Planning v. Board of Supervisors* 122 Cal.App.3d 813 (1981))

In response to public comments received, clarifications to text of the Draft EIR, as well as staff-initiated text changes have been made. Additional information has been identified in comments on the Draft EIR and responded to in **Section 2.0, Responses to Comments**, of this Final EIR. These changes made since publication of the Draft EIR do not substantially affect the analysis contained in the Draft EIR, do not result in a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the Draft EIR and do not change the conclusions in any way.

All of the public comments on the Draft EIR, as well as these Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR have been carefully reviewed to determine whether recirculation of the Draft EIR is required. All of the new information in these corrections and additions to the Draft EIR, in the comments, and in the responses to comments merely clarify or amplify or make insignificant modifications to an adequate Draft EIR. Therefore, the Draft EIR need not be recirculated prior to certification.

CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR

Changes to the Draft EIR are identified below by the corresponding Draft EIR section and subsection, if applicable, and the page number. Additions are in underline and deletions are shown in ~~striketrough~~ format.

Executive Summary

Page ES-7, Table ES-2 is revised as follows:

**Table ES-2
Proposed Landscaping and Plantings**

Feature	Area
On-grade landscaping	32,849 square feet
Tree canopy	48,492 square feet
Green walls	22,000 square feet
Total	103,341 square feet

Note: The City of Malibu only counts on-grade landscaping toward the landscaping total, therefore a variance is required.

The text below Table ES-2 is revised as follows:

The term "~~Landscaped~~ Landscaping Area" is not defined in the LCP. The definition of ~~Landscaped~~ Area in the city's Landscape Water Conservation Ordinance (9.22.020 Definitions), however, does include

walls and fences, which are part of the landscape design features of the project per (Section 9.22.090 (A)(12.)). The specific plan prepared for the proposed project ~~further interprets~~ establishes site-specific landscaping standards, including a list of permitted-functional landscape elements that can be counted toward the project's on-site percentage of landscaping, such as planter areas, tree canopy areas and green walls, which could be included in the calculations. Under the modified site-specific landscaping standards ~~this alternative interpretation~~, the project would provide greater Landscaped Area than required. ~~However, should the decision makers determine that a more traditional interpretation of the landscape requirement is more appropriate for the site, the project applicant has requested a variance from the required Landscaped Area standards.~~

Mitigation Measure 3.13-1 in Table ES-3 is revised as follows:

- 3.13-1:** The project applicant shall contribute its pro-rata share of the costs associated with the intersection improvements required at Pacific Coast Highway and Cross Creek Road, which are currently under review by the City of Malibu Planning Department (CDP No. 14-036). These intersection improvements shall consist of the construction of an additional westbound right-turn lane to provide additional right-turn capacity. **Figure 3.13-17, Traffic Mitigation Plan, Cross Creek Road & Pacific Coast Highway**, illustrates the design of the Cross Creek Road/Pacific Coast Highway intersection improvement. The pro-rata share of the improvement costs shall be determined by the City of Malibu prior to the issuance of building permits. The percentage fair-share contribution shall be calculated using the total trips generated by the proposed project divided by the total "new" traffic, which is the net increase in traffic volume from all proposed projects and growth. The cost of mitigation shall be calculated using verifiable cost estimates from reliable and recognized sources. The fair-share cost of mitigation shall be calculated using the following formula:

$$P=T/(TB-TE) \text{ where,}$$

P= Fair share of the project's impact

T= The vehicle trips generated by the project during the peak hour of the adjacent intersection/roadway facility in vehicles per hour

TB = The forecasted traffic volume on the impacted intersection/roadway facility for the analysis scenario (vph)

TE = The traffic volume existing on the impacted roadway facility (vph)

The City shall verify that all pro-rata funds have been received for the improvements prior to issuance of building permits. Additionally, the City shall verify that the improvements have been constructed prior to final Planning Department inspection.

Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 in Table ES-3 is revised as follows:

- 3.13-2:** The project applicant shall contribute its pro-rata share of the costs associated with roadway improvements at the intersection of Malibu Canyon Road and Pacific Coast Highway. The improvements shall consist of restriping the south leg of the intersection to include a left-turn lane, one through lane and one right-turn lane. In addition, the project applicant shall fund traffic signal improvements for the intersection consisting of installing a northbound right turn overlap phase to run concurrently with the westbound left turn phase. Prior to construction, all applicable permits shall be obtained from Caltrans. **Figure 3.13-18, Traffic Mitigation Plan, Malibu Canyon Road & Pacific Coast Highway**, illustrates the design of the Malibu Canyon Road and Pacific Coast Highway intersection improvements. The pro-rata share of the improvement costs shall be determined by the City of Malibu prior to the issuance of building permits. The percentage fair-share contribution shall be calculated using the total trips generated by the proposed project divided by the total "new" traffic, which is the net increase in traffic volume from all proposed projects and growth. The cost of mitigation shall be calculated using verifiable cost estimates from reliable and recognized sources. The fair-share cost of mitigation shall be calculated using the following formula:

$$P=T/(TB-TE) \text{ where,}$$

P= Fair share of the project's impact

T= The vehicle trips generated by the project during the peak hour of the adjacent intersection/roadway facility in vehicles per hour

TB = The forecasted traffic volume on the impacted intersection/roadway facility for the analysis scenario (vph)

TE = The traffic volume existing on the impacted roadway facility (vph)

The City shall verify that all pro-rata funds have been received for the improvements prior to the issuance of building permits. Additionally, the City shall verify that the improvements have been constructed prior to final Planning Department inspection.

Mitigation Measure 3.13-3 in Table ES-3 is revised as follows:

3.13-3: The project applicant shall fund the construction of dual eastbound left-turn lanes at the eastbound approach to the intersection of Pacific Coast Highway and Webb Way. Prior to construction, all applicable permits shall be obtained from Caltrans. **Figure 3.13-19, Traffic Mitigation Plan, Webb Way & Pacific Coast Highway**, illustrates the design of the Pacific Coast Highway intersection improvements. The pro-rata share of the improvement costs shall be determined by the City of Malibu prior to the issuance of building permits. The percentage fair-share contribution shall be calculated using the total trips generated by the proposed project divided by the total “new” traffic, which is the net increase in traffic volume from all proposed projects and growth. The cost of mitigation shall be calculated using verifiable cost estimates from reliable and recognized sources. The fair-share cost of mitigation shall be calculated using the following formula:

$P=T/(TB-TE)$ where,

P= Fair share of the project’s impact

T= The vehicle trips generated by the project during the peak hour of the adjacent intersection/roadway facility in vehicles per hour

TB = The forecasted traffic volume on the impacted intersection/roadway facility for the analysis scenario (vph)

TE = The traffic volume existing on the impacted roadway facility (vph)

The City shall verify that all pro-rata funds have been received for the improvements prior to issuance of building permits. Additionally, the City shall verify that the improvements have been constructed prior to final Planning Department inspection.

2.0 Project Description

The text under the subheading Measure R on page 2.0-8 is revised as follows:

This measure requires voter-approval of specific plans for commercial and commercial-residential projects over 20,000 square feet, and (2) allows formula retail businesses⁴ in tenant spaces between 1,400 square feet and 5,000 square feet in existing civic center shopping centers but imposes stricter requirements (including a 2,500-square-foot limit per business and a limit of 30 percent of shopping center’s tenants) on some such businesses in any new shopping center or existing ones outside the civic center.

The text on page 2.0-28 is revised as follows:

⁴ Formula retail is considered any type of retail sales activity and/or retail service activity conducted within a retail establishment which, along with 10 or more other existing, operational retail establishments located within the United States, is required to maintain two or more of the following features: Standardized array of merchandise or menu items; Standardized décor; Uniform apparel; Standardized signage, a servicemark, or a trademark; Standardized color scheme; or Standardized façade.

**Table 2.0-2
Proposed Landscaping and Plantings**

Feature	Area
On-grade landscaping	32,849 square feet
Tree canopy	48,492 square feet
Green walls	22,000 square feet
Total	103,341 square feet

Note: The City of Malibu only counts on-grade landscaping toward the on-site landscaping requirement, therefore a variance is required.

The applicant also proposes to install and maintain approximately 4,500 square feet of landscape in the City's right of way (ROW) contiguous to the property along Civic Center Way. This landscaping within the City's right of way is also not included in the code required landscaping area calculations.

The term "Landscape Area" is not defined in the LCP. The definition of Landscaped Area in the City's Landscape Water Conservation Ordinance (9.22.020 Definitions) however does include walls and fences which are part of the landscape design features of the project per (Section 9.22.090 (A)(12.) The Specific Plan prepared for the proposed project ~~further interprets~~ establishes site specific landscaping standards, including a list of permitted functional landscape elements that can be counted toward the project's on-site percentage of landscaping, such as planter areas, tree canopy areas and green walls which could be included in the landscaped area calculations. Under the modified site-specific landscaping standards, the project would provide greater Landscaped Area than required. ~~However, should the decision makers determine that a more traditional interpretation of the landscape requirement is more appropriate for the site, the project applicant has requested a variance from the required Landscaped Areas standards.~~

The following footnote is added to the bottom of page 2.0-28 as a footnote to the statement in the last paragraph regarding 50 foot diameter canopy coverage:

Open Space/Landscaping Plans Tree Canopy Diagram prepared by Goldman Firth Rossi Architects, December 2014.

The text on page 2.0-29 is revised as follows:

The project also proposes two play areas for children, a Kitchen Community Learning Garden, and several outdoor seating areas scattered throughout the project. ~~The overall feel of the project would be applicant's goal for the project is to create~~ a "park-like" setting, given the extensive tree canopy provided by through the planting of large-scale Sycamore trees, the green walls, and the on-grade planting areas.

The text on page 2.0-31 is revised as follows:

Specific Plan No. 15-001: In conformance with Measure R (Malibu Municipal Code Section 17.02.045), a Specific Plan has been prepared for the project. The Specific Plan also was prepared under the authority of Government Code Sections 65450-65457 and the State of California Guidelines for the preparation of Specific Plans. The City of Malibu Local Coastal Plan (LCP) requires that 40 percent of the gross lot area constitutes Landscaped Area, or, in this case, 102,467 square feet. The Specific Plan prepared for the proposed project establishes site-specific landscaping standards, including a list of functional landscaping elements that can be counted toward the percentage of on-site landscaping. The ground based planter area included in the Landscaped Area calculations totals 32,849 square feet. In addition, with the inclusion of additional functional landscaped areas (planter areas, tree canopy coverage and green walls) the total landscaping would equal 103,341 square feet, or 40.3 percent of the gross lot area.

Functional Landscaped Area:

<u>On-grade landscape:</u>	<u>32, 849 sf</u>
<u>Tree Canopy</u> <u>(outside on grade planters, open space and inside property lines):</u>	<u>48, 492 sf</u>
<u>Green Walls:</u>	<u>22, 000 sf</u>
Total:	<u>103, 341 sf</u>

sf = square feet

Source: Whole Foods and the Park, Project Info and Site Plan, Goldman Firth Rossi Architects Plan Submittal, December 2014.

Additionally, the project applicant proposes to install and maintain approximately 4,500 sf of landscape in the City's ROW contiguous to the property. This landscaping within the City's ROW has not been included in the code-required Landscaped Area calculation.

The text on page 2.0-32 has been revised as follows:

Variance (VAR) No. 10-028. A variance request to allow for the reduction in on-site landscaped areas was originally submitted as part of the proposed application materials. However, as described above, the Specific Plan proposes to establish site specific landscaping standards, including a list of functional landscaping elements that can be counted toward the percentage of on-site landscaping. The total area of on-site landscaping would comply with the proposed development standard. The originally requested variance is not supportable, nor is it now part of the project. The City of Malibu Local Coastal Plan (LCP) requires that 40 percent of the gross lot area constitute Landscaped Area, or, in this case, 102,467 square feet. The ground based planter area included in the Landscaped Area calculations totals 32,849 square feet and therefore a variance application has been submitted. However, with the inclusion of additional

~~functional landscaped areas (tree canopy coverage and green walls) the total landscaping would equal 103,341 square feet, or 40.3 percent of the gross lot area.~~

Functional Landscaped Area:

On-grade landscape:	32,849 sf
Tree Canopy (outside on-grade planters, open space and inside property lines):	48,492 sf
Green Walls:	<u>22,000 sf</u>
Total:	103,341 sf

~~sf = square feet~~

~~Source: Whole Foods and the Park, Variance Findings Reduction in Required Landscaped Area, Marny Randall, December 2014.~~

~~Additionally, the project applicant proposes to install and maintain approximately 4,500 sf of landscape in the City’s ROW contiguous to the property. This landscaping within the City’s ROW has not been included in the code required Landscaped Area calculation.~~

3.9 Land Use

The text on page 3.9-18 is revised as follows:

For clarification, because the MMC does not define “Landscaped Area,” the Specific Plan prepared for the proposed project ~~further interprets~~ establishes site specific landscaping standards, including a list of the permitted functional landscape elements that can be counted towards the project’s on-site percentage of landscaping, such as planter areas, tree canopies ~~areas~~, and green walls, ~~which could be included in the calculations~~. Under ~~alternative interpretation~~ the modified landscaping standards, the project would provide greater Landscaped Area than required. ~~However, should the decision makers determine that a more traditional interpretation of the landscape requirement is more appropriate for the site, a variance has been requested (Variance No. 10-028) for the reduced Landscaped Area.~~

The text on page 3.9-31 is revised as follows:

As the Specific Plan prepared for the proposed project demonstrates, following the granting of the requested discretionary approvals (Coastal Development Permit No. 10-022, Civic Center Specific Plan No. 15-001, General Plan Amendment No. 11-001, Zoning Map Amendment No. 11-001, Lot Merger No. 10-004, Conditional Use Permit No. 10-013, Site Plan Review No. 10-042, Site Plan Review No. 10-043, the Minor Modification request, ~~Variance No. 10-028~~, and Variance No. 10-029) the proposed project would be consistent with applicable land use plans and zoning for the project site, the cumulative impact of the proposed project along with pending and approved projects would be less than significant.

3.11.1 Fire Protection

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Conditions

Page 3.11.1-1, paragraph 1, sentences 3 and 4 are corrected and updated as follows:

The Department's operations are divided into nine operational Divisions, which are composed of 22 Battalions serving unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and ~~57~~ 58 ~~contract~~ cities (including the City of Malibu). In ~~2012~~ 2014, the LACFD responded to approximately ~~314,500~~ 339,019 incidents, including ~~about 7,650~~ 8,187 fire incidents.

Page 3.11.1-1, paragraph 2, sentence 3 is updated as follows:

In ~~2013-2014~~, these stations responded to ~~2,538~~ 2,419 incidents within the City of Malibu, including ~~47~~ 63 fire incidents.

3.13 Transportation and Traffic

Page 3.13-11, paragraph 2, under the heading of Intersection Operations is corrected as follows:

The Transportation Research Board's (TRB) 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) is the standard used for evaluating all types of LOS (e.g., signalized, unsignalized, freeway intersections). The V/C ratio and the average control delay are used to determine the intersection ~~the~~ LOS for signalized and unsignalized (e.g., stop sign controlled) intersections respectively.

Mitigation Measures 3.13-1, 3.13-2 and 3.13-3 are updated as follows:

- 3.13-1:** The project applicant shall contribute its pro-rata share of the costs associated with the intersection improvements required at Pacific Coast Highway and Cross Creek Road, which are currently underling review by the City of Malibu Planning Department (CDP No. 14-036). These intersection improvements shall consist of the construction of an additional westbound right-turn lane along Pacific Coast Highway and incremental roadway widening west and east of the Pacific Coast Highway/Cross Creek Road to provide additional right-turn capacity. **Figure 3.13-17, Traffic Mitigation Plan, Cross Creek Road & Pacific Coast Highway**, illustrates the design of the Cross Creek Road/Pacific Coast Highway intersection improvement. The pro-rata share of the improvement costs shall be determined by the City of Malibu prior to the issuance of building permits. The percentage fair-share contribution shall be calculated using the total trips generated by the proposed project divided by the total "new" traffic, which is the net increase in traffic volume from all proposed projects and growth. The cost of

mitigation shall be calculated using verifiable cost estimates from reliable and recognized sources. The fair-share cost of mitigation shall be calculated using the following formula:

$P=T/(TB-TE)$ where,

P= Fair share of the project's impact

T= The vehicle trips generated by the project during the peak hour of the adjacent intersection/roadway facility in vehicles per hour

TB = The forecasted traffic volume on the impacted intersection/roadway facility for the analysis scenario (vph)

TE = The traffic volume existing on the impacted roadway facility (vph)

The City shall verify that all pro-rata funds have been received for the improvements prior to issuance of building permits. Additionally, the City shall verify that the improvements have been constructed prior to final Planning Department inspection.

- 3.13-2:** The project applicant shall contribute its pro-rata share of the costs associated with roadway improvements at the intersection of Malibu Canyon Road and Pacific Coast Highway. The improvements shall consist of restriping the south leg of the intersection to include a left-turn lane, one through lane and one right-turn lane. In addition, the project applicant shall fund traffic signal improvements for the intersection consisting of installing a northbound right turn overlap phase to run concurrently with the westbound left turn phase. **Figure 3.13-18, Traffic Mitigation Plan, Malibu Canyon Road & Pacific Coast Highway**, illustrates the design of the Malibu Canyon Road and Pacific Coast Highway intersection improvements. The pro-rata share of the improvement costs shall be determined by the City of Malibu prior to the issuance of building permits. The percentage fair-share contribution shall be calculated using the total trips generated by the proposed project divided by the total "new" traffic, which is the net increase in traffic volume from all proposed projects and growth. The cost of mitigation shall be calculated using verifiable cost estimates from reliable and recognized sources. The fair-share cost of mitigation shall be calculated using the following formula:

$P=T/(TB-TE)$ where,

P= Fair share of the project's impact

T= The vehicle trips generated by the project during the peak hour of the adjacent intersection/roadway facility in vehicles per hour

TB = The forecasted traffic volume on the impacted intersection/roadway facility for the analysis scenario (vph).

TE = The traffic volume existing on the impacted roadway facility (vph).

The City shall verify that all pro-rata funds have been received for the improvements prior to issuance of building permits. Additionally, the City shall verify that the improvements have been constructed prior to final Planning Department inspection.

3.13-3: The project applicant shall fund the construction of dual eastbound left-turn lanes at the eastbound approach to the intersection of Pacific Coast Highway and Webb Way. Prior to construction, all applicable permits shall be obtained from Caltrans. **Figure 3.13-19, Traffic Mitigation Plan, Webb Way & Pacific Coast Highway**, illustrates the design of the Pacific Coast Highway intersection improvements. The pro-rata share of the improvement costs shall be determined by the City of Malibu prior to the issuance of building permits. The percentage fair-share contribution shall be calculated using the total trips generated by the proposed project divided by the total “new” traffic, which is the net increase in traffic volume from all proposed projects and growth. The cost of mitigation shall be calculated using verifiable cost estimates from reliable and recognized sources. The fair-share cost of mitigation shall be calculated using the following formula:

P=T/(TB-TE) where,

P= Fair share of the project’s impact

T= The vehicle trips generated by the project during the peak hour of the adjacent intersection/roadway facility in vehicles per hour

TB = The forecasted traffic volume on the impacted intersection/roadway facility for the analysis scenario (vph).

TE = The traffic volume existing on the impacted roadway facility (vph).

The City shall verify that all pro-rata funds have been received for the improvements prior to issuance of building permits. Additionally, the City shall verify that the improvements have been constructed prior to final Planning Department inspection.

Page 3.13-37, paragraph 1, under the heading of *Residual Impacts* is updated as follows:

It should be noted that the approved La Paz project is required to fully fund and physically construct improvements to the intersection of PCH/Cross Creek Road and PCH/Webb Way.

Page 3.13-37, paragraph 2, is updated as follows:

As shown in Table 3.13-8, Future (2017) Traffic Conditions With Project + Mitigation, and Table 3.13-

8(a), Future (2030) Traffic Conditions With Project + Mitigation below, the impact at the intersections of Malibu Canyon Road and Pacific Coast Highway and the intersection of Webb Way and Pacific Coast Highway would be mitigated with the implementation of **Mitigation Measure 3.13-2** and **Mitigation Measure 3.13-3**. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 3.13-1** would mitigate impacts at the intersection of Cross Creek Road and Pacific Coast Highway.

**Table 3.13-8
Future (2017) Traffic Conditions With Project + Mitigation**

No.	Intersection	Peak Hour	Without Project		With Project + Mitigation		
			V/C (Delay)	LOS	V/C (Delay)	LOS	Impact
2.	Malibu Canyon Rd Pacific Coast Hwy.	Weekday AM	0.773	C	0.776	C	+0.003
		Weekday PM	0.810	D	0.814	D	+0.004
		Saturday Mid-day	0.937	E	0.931	E	-0.005
6	Webb Way & Pacific Coast Hwy	Weekday AM	0.589	A	0.590	A	+0.001
		Weekday PM	0.843	D	0.802	D	-0.041
		Saturday Mid-day	0.891	D	0.830	D	+0.061
7	Cross Creek Road & Pacific Coast Hwy	Weekday AM	0.675	B	0.682	B	+0.007
		Weekday PM	0.976	E	0.887	D	-0.089
		Saturday Mid-day	1.011	F	0.911	E	-0.100

Note: All-Way Stop Control Delay in Seconds Per Vehicle.

Source: Overland Traffic Consultants, January 2015

Table 3.13-8(a)
Future (2030) Traffic Conditions With Project + Mitigation

<u>No.</u>	<u>Intersection</u>	<u>Peak Hour</u>	<u>Without Project</u>		<u>With Project + Mitigation</u>		
			<u>V/C (Delay)</u>	<u>LOS</u>	<u>V/C (Delay)</u>	<u>LOS</u>	<u>Impact</u>
2.	<u>Malibu Canyon Rd</u>	<u>Weekday AM</u>	<u>0.781</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>0.787</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>+ 0.006</u>
		<u>Weekday PM</u>	<u>0.822</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>0.810</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>- 0.012</u>
	<u>Saturday Mid-day</u>	<u>0.946</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>0.940</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>- 0.006</u>	
6	<u>Webb Way &</u>	<u>Weekday AM</u>	<u>0.594</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>0.595</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>+ 0.001</u>
		<u>Weekday PM</u>	<u>0.821</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>0.783</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>- 0.038</u>
	<u>Saturday Mid-day</u>	<u>0.899</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>0.838</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>- 0.061</u>	
7	<u>Cross Creek Road &</u>	<u>Weekday AM</u>	<u>0.681</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>0.688</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>+ 0.007</u>
		<u>Weekday PM</u>	<u>0.985</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>0.895</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>- 0.090</u>
	<u>Saturday Mid-day</u>	<u>1.021</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>0.919</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>- 0.102</u>	

Note: All-Way Stop Control Delay in Seconds Per Vehicle.

Source: Overland Traffic Consultants, January 2015

4.0 Alternatives

Page 4.0-31, the text at the top of page is revised as follows:

However, because the MMC does not define "Landscaped Area," the Specific Plan prepared for the proposed project proposes that functional landscape elements, such as planter areas, tree canopies and green walls, be included in the landscaping calculations. Under these circumstances, the project would provide greater Landscaped Area than required. ~~However, should the decision makers determine that a more traditional interpretation of the landscape requirement is more appropriate for the site, the proposed project would be deficient by 50,352 sf (Local Implementation Plan Section 3.8(A)(5)(b)), and a variance would be required.~~

Page 4.0-31, the last sentence of paragraph 2 is revised as follows:

Therefore, this alternative would provide 61,450 sf of landscaping/open space (including the children's parks, community garden, and public seating areas as proposed under the project), an increase over the proposed project, ~~but still deficient by approximately 41,017 sf.~~

Page 4.0-39, the past paragraph on the page is revised as follows:

Under the Two-Story Building Alternative, the project site would be developed with one one-story and two two-story buildings, surface parking, and landscaping/open scape improvements. Following the granting of the requested discretionary approvals as listed in Section 2.0, Project Description, ~~including a Variance to provide less than the 40 percent on site (and on grade) landscaping requirement,~~ there would be no impacts to land use and planning under the proposed project or this alternative. Impacts would be similar as compared to the proposed project.