

Attachment B

The Final EIR was delivered to City Council under separate cover on Tuesday, May 3. The Errata to the final EIR is included here in this packet. If you need an additional copy of the EIR, please call Ariel Socarras at 744-7101.

ERRATA TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ROSE BOWL STADIUM RENOVATION Project

SCH # 2004101073
MAY 9, 2005

Page 8-26, text should be added before Pages 3.12-96 to 3.12-100, Table 3.12-15 edits, as follows:

Page 3.12-53, Table 3.12-11 edits

Table 3.21-11 Weekend Project Trip Generation Summary (from 52,000 to 75,000 Attendance) Weekend Special Event [2]

Page 8-39, Figure 3.12-32, the sentence should read, "The traffic count on Arroyo Boulevard should be changed from 2,250 to 3,180."

Page 9-125, last sentence of Response to Comment PHER-80, "relations" should read "related."

Page 9-450, last sentence of Response to Comment TAC-88, "After approval of the Project" should read, "Should the Project be approved."

Page 10-3, Impact 3.1-1, the following sentence is added in column two:

"MM 3.4-4 also applies to this impact."

Page 10-5, Impact 3.1-5, the following sentence is added in column two:

"MM 3.4-4 also applies to this impact."

The following mitigation measure is added to Page 3.4-33 of the EIR. Also, Page 10-12, Table 10-1, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix, the following mitigation measure is added:

MM 3.4-4 The design of the project shall be modified as shown on Attachment C of the staff report presented to the City Council on May 9, 2005 and as described in the Errata to the Final EIR dated May 9, 2005.

The following text should be incorporated into the Final EIR and made part of the public record for this action:

DISCUSSION OF DESIGN MITIGATION

In response to public comments and comments made at commission meetings, further modification to the design, now the Design Mitigation, was developed to preserve the majority of the character-defining features on the north side of the Rose Bowl, thereby providing a greater opportunity to retain the stadium's National Historic Landmark designation, while also meeting the objectives of the NFL. This mitigation would preserve views to character-defining features that comprise the exterior of the south and north (approximately 50%) of the Rose Bowl. The new structures along the north and south sides would be physically separated and visually differentiated from the historic structure, and would be a long-term reversible condition.

The Design Mitigation captures modified elements of two alternatives discussed in the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project (Project) and the Alternate Design Alternative. It includes the heavier profile structure for club suites similar to the Proposed Project on the west side, which was already altered by the construction of the Press Box. It includes a slimmer profile for three levels of club suites similar to the Alternate Design Alternative on the east side, which would be built on freestanding supports that minimize direct alteration to the Rose Bowl structure. On the east side, the Arroyo stone landscaped berms and retaining walls would be removed during construction, and would be replaced in a location that would extend further east than their original location to conceal concessions and restrooms. On the north side, the Design Mitigation would feature a removable, temporary seating structure. A permanent concourse would be constructed at the rim/Horizon level of the stadium. The large scoreboard proposed for the north rim of the Stadium would no longer be included in the design. Instead, the historic north scoreboard would remain. New scoreboards that would be smaller than that scoreboard proposed for the north rim, would be divided between the east and west sides adjacent to the luxury suite structures. The elimination of the proposed scoreboard on the north rim would provide more visibility to the mountains north of the stadium. The Design Mitigation includes construction of some new one-story concession and restroom facilities on the ground level along the northern perimeter of the Rose Bowl property. The proposed changes to the south side would be similar to that proposed both for the Proposed Project and the Alternate Design Alternative. All other building elements would be similar to the Proposed Project, and the square footage of the facility components would also be similar to the Proposed Project. The Design Mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project, will reduce the total seating capacity of the stadium to 65,000, with the ability to add up to 10,000 additional seats for special events for a maximum of 75,000 seats. Therefore, the Project will still provide for upgrades to building systems, will add egress opportunities to enhance safety at the stadium, and will increase the distance between seats to provide a more comfortable experience for Rose Bowl Stadium patrons.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS OF DESIGN MITIGATION

The EIR found that implementation of the Proposed Project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Land Use, Noise, Recreation, and Transportation/Traffic. The impacts of the Design Mitigation are analyzed below and evaluated as to whether any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Proposed Project can be avoided with this Alternative. Further, impacts in these and

other issue areas are analyzed to determine whether the Design Mitigation would or would not result in new significant impacts or increase the level of significance of already identified impacts.

Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Implementation of the Project would have a substantial adverse impact on the visual character of the Rose Bowl from both the interior and the exterior of the stadium. It would demolish or alter contributing elements of the Rose Bowl resulting in alteration of the bowl's shape and character-defining features as seen from the Arroyo. Further, the addition of the new structures on the exterior of the stadium would obstruct views from within the bowl along the north edge to the east side of the stadium where treetops and mountain ridgelines are visible.

The Design Mitigation would reduce the impacts on the visual character of the stadium by providing a design that is more open and less massive than the design of the Proposed Project and which would result in less obstruction of views from the interior of the stadium. The landscaped berm on the north end would be preserved, and the berm on the east side would be removed but then replaced abutting the outside of the new support structure. Thus, the east side would retain more of the original appearance of the stadium with replacement of the berm and landscaping. The new structures would be placed on open supports and would not be directly attached to the rim of the stadium, and the appearance of the new bowl would be less massive than the Proposed Project design. On the north side, the temporary seating may be entirely removed when not needed. When needed, the structural frame would be slipped into subsurface sheaths that are hidden in the berms. The concourse would remain as a permanent structure at the Horizon level. These design changes would help preserve the open character of the Rose Bowl on the north side. In this way, current exterior views to the north side of the Rose Bowl would be relatively unchanged when the temporary seating is not installed, as the concourse would be level with the rim. With the Design Mitigation, there would be no new scoreboard above the north rim of the stadium, although the historic north scoreboard would remain in place. New scoreboards would be placed one on the east and the other on the west sides of the stadium, preserving the view northward. Views to the underside of the stadium at the north side would be unobstructed. The perimeter concession buildings would be low profile, would replace existing concessions, and would not introduce an incompatible design or plan to the Rose Bowl grounds. Thus, the visual character of the stadium would be altered to a lesser extent than the Proposed Project, views of the stadium would be improved, and the stadium viewing experience would be improved through elimination of new scoreboards on the north side, and a more open outer structure. Aesthetic impacts on the north side would be reduced to less than significant with the Design Mitigation. It would lessen the effects of the Project on the east side, but not to a level less than significant. The impacts to Aesthetics on the south side and west side would be the same as the Project.

Air Quality

Site preparation and construction activities would create temporary air quality impacts that are unavoidable with construction. The increase to 25 major events would increase the number of times the daily air quality operational emission thresholds are exceeded.

The Design Mitigation would not change or worsen the severity of any of the significance conclusions stated in the EIR, as a similar amount of construction would occur and the same traffic air quality impacts as the Proposed Project. Impacts to Air Quality would remain significant and unavoidable and would not be reduced by the Design Mitigation.

Cultural Resources

Implementation of the Proposed Project would substantially and irrevocably alter character-defining features of the Rose Bowl and change the historic fabric of the stadium. It would also jeopardize the National Historic Landmark status of the stadium.

The Design Mitigation was developed to lessen the extent of demolition and alteration of important character-defining features of the Rose Bowl than the Project. The Design Mitigation is the same as the Project along the west side, which has already been altered by construction of the press box structure. The Design Mitigation would preserve views to character-defining features that comprise the exterior of the south and north sides of the Rose Bowl. On the east side, the Arroyo stone landscaped berm and retaining walls would be removed during construction, but when reconstructed, would extend further east than their original location to conceal concessions and restrooms. The new structure along the east side would be physically separated and visually differentiated from the historic structure. On the north and east side, an additional row of vomitoria would be added for access to the concessions and restrooms.

West Side: On the west side, the Project design has little additional impact because the existing press box had already substantially altered the Rose Bowl structure, the Arroyo stone berms and retaining walls, and views toward the west side of the Rose Bowl. Also on the west side, a second row of vomitoria would be introduced. This would affect the overall symmetry of the placement of vomitoria, but it would be in proportion to the vertical scale of the new club suites. The effect on the remaining important character-defining features on the west side would be the same for the Design Mitigation and the Project.

North Side: On the north side, the temporary seating and concourse may be entirely removed when not needed, thereby preserving the even rim and open character of the Rose Bowl. When needed, the structural frame would be slipped into subsurface sheaths that are hidden in the berms. In this way, current exterior views to the north side of the Rose Bowl would be essentially unchanged when the temporary seating and concourse is not installed. With the Design Mitigation, there would be no new scoreboard above the north rim of the stadium. The historic north scoreboard would remain in place. Views to the underside of the stadium at the north side would be unobstructed. The perimeter concession buildings would be low profile, would replace existing concessions, and would not introduce an incompatible design or plan to the Rose Bowl grounds. The significant effect on the important character-defining features on the north side that would result from the Project would be mitigated to less than significant for the Design Mitigation.

East Side: On the east side, three levels of club suites would be built on freestanding supports that minimize direct alteration of the Rose Bowl structure itself. The club suites would be physically separated from the stadium structure, the separation would be clearly visible to spectators within the stadium and to observers outside the stadium, and would clearly demonstrate that the new construction is not part of the historic structure. An

additional row of vomitoria would be constructed to access concealed concessions and restrooms, and this would affect Myron Hunt's original design; but it would be symmetrical with the second row of vomitoria proposed along the west side and not different from the proposed Project. This would be a significant effect, but it may be acceptable if it is designed and executed properly. The Administration Building would be demolished, but this effect would also be the same as the proposed Project. The landscaped Arroyo Stone berms and retaining walls would have to be removed during construction. They would be photographed, labeled, and stored so that they can be replaced in a similar configuration to conceal the concessions and restrooms. The berms and retaining walls would not be restored to their original location and design because they would extend further east than their original configuration. Relocation of the berms and retaining walls would also displace the tunnel portals from their original location. While the removal and replacement of historic materials for repair or adaptive reuse may meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the redesign of these elements in a substantially different location and configuration would not meet the Standards. The replacement design could be consistent with Myron Hunt's original design and intent, but it would be a reinterpretation with original materials, not a restoration. It is unlikely the National Park Service would approve the extensive redesign of the Arroyo Stone berms and retaining walls. However, the reuse of the original materials and attempt to be consistent with Hunt's original design and intent would have far less effect on the overall historic character of the east side of the Rose Bowl than the Project would have. The effect on the important character-defining features on the east side that would result from the Project would be mitigated by the Design Mitigation, but not to a level of less than significant.

Perimeter: Along the perimeter of the Rose Bowl property, the Design Mitigation includes construction of new one-story concession and restroom facilities on the ground level. These would replace the existing units, and form a more organized, symmetrical grouping. The outside of the concession buildings would include a landscaped berm and retaining wall, to increase their compatibility with the natural features in the Arroyo, and to retain the visual predominance of the Rose Bowl. The replacement of perimeter concession buildings would not have a significant effect on the important character-defining features of the Rose Bowl.

Based on this analysis, if the Design Mitigation were constructed, it would lessen the effects of the Project on the north side to less than significant. It would lessen the effects of the Project on the east side, but not to a level less than significant. The effects on the south side and west side would be the same as the Project. There would not be a significant effect on the perimeter. Because of the extensive changes at the west and east sides, however, the Rose Bowl would be unlikely to retain its National Historic Landmark status. This finding, however, can only be made by the National Park Service.

The Design Mitigation would reduce impacts to some character-defining features of the stadium as outlined in the table below.

SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES OF THE ROSE BOWL		
CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURE	PROPOSED Project	DESIGN MITIGATION
Neon Rose Bowl Sign	No Change	No Change
South Forecourt	Acceptable Alteration	Acceptable Alteration
Bridges into Bowl	No Change	No Change
Forecourt concrete bridges and retaining walls	No Change	No Change
Bowl reconstruction; elliptical plan and section - south end	Acceptable Alteration	Acceptable Alteration
South-End enlargement	Acceptable Alteration	Acceptable Alteration
Tunnels 15-22 - West Side	Visual Obstruction	Visual Obstruction
Dressing Room in Tunnel 15A	Acceptable Alteration	Acceptable Alteration
Arroyo stone berm retaining wall - West Side	Demolition	Demolition
Bowl reconstruction, elliptical curvature in plan and section - West Side	Substantial Alteration	Substantial Alteration
Tunnel 23 - West Side	Visual Obstruction	Visual Obstruction
Tunnels 8-14 - North End	Visual Obstruction	No Change
Arroyo stone berm retaining walls and landscaping - North End	Demolition	Acceptable Alteration
View of San Gabriel Mountains over the North Rim	Visual Obstruction	No Change
Scoreboard at North End with tile roof	Demolition	No Change
View to underside of Bowl - North End	Visual Obstruction	Acceptable Alteration
Bowl reconstruction elliptical curvature in plan and section - North End	Visual Obstruction	Acceptable Alteration
North End of Bowl seating enlargement	Substantial Alteration	Acceptable Alteration
Dressing Rooms in Tunnel 7A	Acceptable Alteration	Acceptable Alteration
Arroyo stone berm retaining walls and landscaping; retaining wall added on sloping sides; roses planter on berms - East Side	Demolition	Demolition
Bowl reconstruction, elliptical in plan and section - East Side	Substantial Alteration	Substantial Alteration
Tunnels 1-7 - East Side	Visual Obstruction	Visual Obstruction
Tunnels 28 - East Side	Visual Obstruction	Visual Obstruction
Administration Building	Demolition	Demolition
Woven wire fence and gate at perimeter	Demolition	Demolition

SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES OF THE ROSE BOWL		
CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURE	PROPOSED Project	DESIGN MITIGATION
Ticket Booths	Demolition	Demolition
Toilet in parking lot	Demolition	Demolition
South Scoreboard – Interior	No Change	No Change
North Scoreboard – Interior	Demolition	No Change
Seating and Vomitoria configuration – Interior	Potential Substantial Alteration	Potential Substantial Alteration but less
Bowl reconstruction; elliptical in plan and section – Interior	Substantial Alteration	Substantial Alteration but less
Field, original configuration – interior	Acceptable Alteration	Acceptable Alteration
South End enlargement – Interior	Acceptable Alteration	Acceptable Alteration

Key to summary terms:

Demolition: Physically demolishes or destroys “in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historical Resources (character-defining features of the Rose Bowl).

Substantial Alteration: Materially alters in an adverse manner the character-defining features of the Rose Bowl.

Visual Obstruction: Changes the immediate surroundings of the character-defining features of the Rose Bowl such that important views are obstructed.

Acceptable Alteration: Alterations to Character-defining features of the Rose Bowl are minor or follow the Secretary’s Standards.

No Change: No change from the existing condition of the character-defining features of the Rose Bowl

Geology and Soils

No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the EIR for the Proposed Project with respect to Geology and Soils. The Design Mitigation would require a similar amount of excavation, and would not change or worsen the severity of any of the significance conclusions stated in the EIR, which would remain less than significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the EIR for the Proposed Project with respect to Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The Design Mitigation would not change the circumstances with respect to construction or operation of the Project, and would, therefore, not change or worsen the severity of any of the significance conclusions stated in the EIR, which would remain less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the EIR for the Proposed Project with respect to Hydrology and Water Quality. The Design Mitigation would not change the circumstances with respect to construction or operation of the Project, and would, therefore,

not change or worsen the severity of any of the significance conclusions stated in the EIR, which would remain less than significant.

Land Use

During events, the Project would adversely affect adjacent neighborhoods on more days due to the increased number of major events. Reduced seating in the Bowl and improved parking/transit options could partially offset some of these impacts. The additional building area in the Arroyo and increase in the frequency of use of the stadium would increase the intensity of development in the immediate area.

The Design Mitigation would not result in changes in intensity of development through the additional building area or frequency of use of the stadium. The Design Mitigation would not change or worsen the severity of any of the significance conclusions stated in the EIR, which would remain significant and unavoidable with respect to land use intensification or adverse effects on adjacent neighborhoods.

Noise

Adjacent residential neighborhoods will be exposed to temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels more frequently as a result of additional events. The increased number of events will also create increases in local traffic volumes and cause a periodic increase in off-site roadway noise levels on more days. However, actual ambient noise levels may be reduced depending on stadium capacity and parking availability, which will result in fewer vehicles.

It is not anticipated that the Design Mitigation would significantly change the acoustics of the stadium. Increased noise from stadium events and increased traffic would still occur at similar levels as identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Design Mitigation would not change or worsen the severity of any of the significance conclusions stated in the EIR.

Recreation

With more events, the Project would interfere with or prohibit use of existing recreational facilities in the Central Arroyo on more days. Master scheduling and coordination of events will help mitigate these impacts. Brookside Park would be retained for casual park and picnic use, even during events and some parking in Area I would be used for Kidspace and RBAC users. However, soccer fields would not be available in Area H.

The Design Mitigation would not change or worsen the severity of any of the significance conclusions stated in the EIR, and impacts to recreation due to restricted access to recreational amenities in the Arroyo would remain significant and unavoidable. The Design Mitigation would not reduce the level of significance of this impact.

Transportation/Traffic

Although the total seating capacity would drop by 17,500 for the Proposed Project (92,500 to 75,000), the EIR used a conservative methodology that evaluated a potential increase in attendees. The current baseline was set at the typical attendance of current events, 52,000, rather than the actual stadium capacity of 92,000. This current baseline was then compared to the most intense proposed use of 75,000, resulting in analysis of a net increase of 23,000 per event. In addition, 13 new events were analyzed as a change from 0 to 75,000 attendees.

The EIR found that the increased number of events would result in adverse impacts on traffic and circulation during weekday and weekend activities. Off-site parking at the Parsons complex during weekday evenings would result in significant impacts on traffic and circulation at intersections in the vicinity (anticipated to be approximately two per year).

The Design Mitigation would not change or worsen the severity of any of the significance conclusions stated in the EIR. Maximum seating capacity would remain at 75,000, and the number of events would remain the same. Therefore, impacts to traffic due to restricted access to recreational amenities in the Arroyo would remain significant and unavoidable. The Design Mitigation would not reduce the level of significance of this impact.