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- Transcript of Public Comment Meeting on Draft EIR – August 13, 2009
- Transcript of Public Comment Meeting on Draft EIR – August 15, 2009

*Please refer to Appendix J for complete description of Public Notification Process.*
LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE

Facilities Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
Public Comment Meeting

Los Angeles Mission College
Main Campus Center
13356 Eldridge Avenue
Sylmar, California 91342
Thursday, August 13, 2009

ORIGINAL

REPORTED BY: GRACE A. VERHOEVEN
PARK AVENUE DEPOSITION SERVICE
CSR NO. 11419 (800) 447-3376
## INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karen Hoefel, Vice President of Administration, Mission College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev Vrat, URS Consultant</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia Ibranan, Leo A. Daly Consultant</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger Torres, URS EIR Project Manager</td>
<td>14, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Miller, URS Traffic Consultant</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Cortez, URS Public Outreach</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SYLMAR, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2009
7:05 P.M.

DR. KAREN HOEFEL,

DR. HOEFEL: Good evening. We're going to get
started, so if everybody would like to take a seat and
listen to our presentation.

We'd like to welcome you here to tonight's
public comment meeting on our Environmental Impact Report
for our 2009 Master Plan. On behalf of President Valles,
I would like to welcome you all here.

I am Karen Hoefel Vice President for
Administrative Services, and we will be presenting
tonight the college's 2009 Master Plan and the Draft
Environmental Impact Report.

We have our consultants here tonight too and our
experts, basically, to review with you the EIR process,
review and give you an overview of our proposed 2009
Master Plan. We will also give you a summary of the
Draft EIR and the comments that were made previously, and
then we will give you opportunities to make your comments
at the various stations at the end of the evening.

The purpose of the meeting tonight is to provide
the community a forum to make comments on the
environmental issues related to the Draft Environmental
Impact Report.

We're going to, hopefully, help you understand the CEQA process and how that works and the role it plays in the EIR. You'll also learn about our proposed 2009 Master Plan. I know most of you have heard this presentation before, so we're probably going to bore you with the same information.

You're going to hear the results of the Draft EIR, what the findings of the draft are, and then we will be looking forward to obtaining your comments as we move through the EIR process.

First of all, Dev Vrat is our EIR expert from URS, and Mia Ibranan from Leo A. Daly will be reviewing for you the master plan itself, and then we'll have David Miller talk to you about traffic, and Ginger will be reviewing the results of the Draft EIR, and then Annette will be going over the process that you'll follow to provide comments. So with that, I will turn this over to Dev.

DEV VRAT,

MR. VRAT: Thank you, Dr. Hoefel. My purpose here tonight is to explain the CEQA process, just give you an overview and show you where we are, it's kind of like a moving line, and where we're at in the process now.
I'd like to open it up by saying that California Environmental Quality Act is a law, and so this is like a legal proceeding. Some people have expressed concern that they're not able to speak or they want to have a rally, et cetera.

In a courtroom, you don't have that kind of process. This is a fact-based process. It's very important for us to collect facts, you know, in writing, factual information. It's actually called substantial evidence. The purpose of the CEQA process is to collect substantial evidence about the environmental impacts of proposed projects.

I am a CEQA expert, and I'm here to advise you. The most effective way that you can participate in the CEQA process is to provide us factual information in writing because that information will be included in the final EIR and presented to the decision-makers, and they are compelled to address it.

So I am advising you that it doesn't do any good to have outbursts or anything like that. Your most effective way of participating is to listen to our presentation so you understand the project, and then we're going to present a summary of the analysis.

There is no way that we can tell you everything that's in the EIR in this meeting tonight. So we're just
giving you kind of like an overview of it. We hope that will help you go back and look at the EIR, the issues that are important to you, and then give us written comments. So what we're looking for is written comments, and any kind of emotional outbursts are ineffective.

So now I'm going to run through the process. CEQA is about identifying and disclosing to the public and the decision-makers the environmental effects of proposed projects. That's all it's about, identifying impacts and telling the decision-makers, these are the environmental effects of the project you're about to consider.

It's also our job to listen to you and come up with ways to reduce those environmental effects. So you'll hear repeatedly tonight, Did we address the environmental effects? Are there ways to reduce the environmental effects? That is all that the California Environmental Quality Act is about. It's not about whether you like the project or don't like the project. That doesn't matter during the CEQA process.

The way it works is you start at the top, which is right up here, and you notify the public that you're about to undertake a project that has a potential for environmental effects. And you invite the public to come to the scoping meeting and, say, well, these are the
things we're worried about, and these are the things that we want you to study in the Draft EIR. And that was what we did I think it was back in April. So in April we had a similar hearing like this. The purpose of that hearing was to listen to you and understand what your concerns were.

Okay. So what we did after that is we went back and we have several offices full of scientists and the planner, the master planner, and we've been working on this thing for months now. And basically, what we've been doing is listening to your concerns and addressing them in the Draft EIR.

So hopefully, when you look at the Draft EIR, you will see that we listened to you and we tried to respond and adjust the project in response to your concerns, and we hope we've done a good job.

The purpose of this hearing, this meeting, is to present our findings to you, and it gives you an opportunity at the end of our presentation, you know, to either ask questions or just make comments tonight if you want. Every comment you make tonight, if you make it in writing, it will be published in the final EIR. If you don't do it in writing, it's never going to get captured. So it's very important that we get your comments in writing.
Then we will take all those comments and, again, we're going to go back to work. And if we miss anything, we're going to fix it. And we'll do the best job we possibly can, and we'll prepare what's called a final EIR. So after the 45-day public comment period -- this is where we are now -- we'll go back and we'll produce the final EIR.

In the final EIR, we will actually publish every single comment you make in writing, and we will provide a written response concerning how we address that comment in the final EIR. So you make a comment, we provide a response. So we absolutely listen to you on every single thing you say, if you say it in writing.

Then the final EIR will be brought to the Board of Trustees when they consider approval of the Master Plan. And so one of the things they will do is they will certify the EIR, and they will consider all the mitigation measures that we have developed with your help in the final EIR.

So that's how the CEQA process works. We involve the public, but we try to involve the public in a constructive manner because it is really like a legal proceeding; we need substantial evidence. So the best thing that you can do, and I said this at the scoping meeting and I'm saying it again tonight, we need factual
information from you. So this is your role tonight.

First of all, Mia is going to be presenting the master plan. Dr. Hoefel is correct, we did present the same master plan in the scoping meeting. So why are we doing this again? Because we just want to make sure that you understand what the plan is because that's the plan we're doing the environmental analysis on. So Mia is going to present the plan again to you because we want to make sure you really understand what the college wants to do.

Then the second thing is after Ginger presents the results -- I'm sorry, Ginger and David Miller, who is our traffic engineer, after they present the results of the EIR, that's just to provide a framework for you. Oh, the EIR said this, well, I thought it was going to say that. Okay. This is what the EIR says. If that raises some questions for you, that's great, that's the purpose of us telling you what the EIR says.

So you can either go around to our stations after the presentation, get a little clarification either about the project or about what the Draft EIR says, okay. And then we encourage you to make comments. And at the end of our presentation, we'll give you very specific directions to help you be effective.

And she'll tell you how you can make public
comments that are going to be effective for you. So we're here to help you. Whether you believe it or not, we're actually here to help you. CEQA is about encouraging public participation, and my job is to help you do it in an effective way.

So these are the questions you wanted answered. Does the EIR really identify the environmental impacts? We listened to you during the scoping meetings. We did our best to address your concerns. And when you go around the room and look at our boards, you'll see that the project has been adjusted based on the comments that we got during the scoping meetings.

And then you also gave us a lot of good ideas about mitigation measures, and we incorporated those ideas into the Draft EIR. So what you're going to see is some changes to the project that are based on the comments you gave us during those earlier scoping meetings.

And then what's going to happen between now and the final EIR is that same thing is going to happen again only it's going to be just a little more formal. Now when you give us comments, you will actually see those comments published in the final EIR, and we will provide written responses to your comments, and the decision-makers will have the benefit of that
environmental information when they consider approval of
the master plan.

So that's my quick overview of the CEQA process.
With that, I'll turn it over to Mia Ibranan. She changed
her name on me, she got married which I don't know how
anybody could get married while they're also working on
this master plan, but she was able to do it.

MIA IBRANAN,

MS. IBRANAN: Thank you, Dev. Good evening,
everybody. I just wanted to begin, first of all, by
acknowledging the fact that the 2007 Master Plan was,
indeed, approved two years ago by the L.A. Community
College District. And so since then, as you probably all
noticed, there are a lot of facilities that have been
planned for and constructed since then. And as a result,
there are several areas -- well, everything that you will
see in the aerial photo and the maps and diagrams,
everything has been approved with the exception of these
three areas, the first being along the wash, along
Eldridge, and across from the campus, across from Hubbard
Street.

These three same areas are, in fact, what
constitute the 2009 Master Plan and the first being the
Athletic Fields Complex, second being swing space, and
the third being improvements to the Eldridge streetscape.

The Athletic Fields Complex, as you might recall, the north parcel is owned by Mission College. The southern parcel is owned by the Army Corps of Engineers. And the college is currently under negotiations with the Army Corps to lease the property for approximately 25 years.

And there are several needs for the Athletic Fields, and some of them are, in fact, that the health and fitness programs are expanding. The college does lack outdoor athletic instructional areas, and their thriving athletics program lacks competition fields. So naturally, development of these fields would justify those needs.

The Athletic Fields Complex would include a men's baseball field, a women's softball field, and soccer field for both men and women. They would all be designed to NCAA rules and regulations. They would also be supported by the appropriate amenities that they would need, such as the batting cages and bull pens, et cetera.

It's important to note with a lot of the diagrams they are not the final design. That are often typographical of a condition that required a slight variation to the orientation of the fields, et cetera. So please note that this is not the final design, but it
is preliminary and conceptual.

The second area of development is for swing space, and that would be located across from the college across from Hubbard Street. And there are several needs for this area as well. As you may know, their academic programs are also expanding, and they require permanent facilities. And although those permanent facilities have been improved, they are still being constructed. And until they have a permanent location, they need temporary locations to reside in.

So a lot of the modular buildings that you see along Eldridge will be relocated to this area that will allow for their permanent location. The Services Services and Administration Building could then begin construction.

And so with that swing space development, the college would need to acquire this property. It's currently a commercial nursery. This property would allow, as I just mentioned, for all the bungalows to relocate to this area, and it would also provide some parking for students, visitors, sheriff station, and some disabled parking as well.

And in the future, it could also support the need -- fulfill the need for the College Programs and Activities Center which could be an approximately
20,000-square-foot building, single story, and provide some parking as well.

And the third area of improvement would occur along Eldridge Avenue. Once the east campus becomes fully operational and its facilities, a lot of students will continue to travel between the two campuses. And as many of you may know, this area has a lot of cracked sidewalks, the trees are uprooting. And there's poor lighting, so it does become desolate. It's going to be important to maintain the safety of the community and the students and faculty and staff of the college as they commute to and from both campuses.

And so here we just provided an illustration that depicts what it could potentially include. Again, it is preliminary and the enlarged plan here also describes what amenities could be included as well.

And again, they are all subject to change based on the final design. So thank you for bearing with that once again. And I will now turn it over to Ginger.

GINGER TORRES,

MS. TORRES: In this portion of the presentation, I'll summarize the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Potential impacts were evaluated against a series of thresholds of significance as determined by
the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

Potential impacts were evaluated against a series of thresholds of significance as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines. Impacts that were found to be above the threshold of significance were considered significant impacts. And impacts that were found to be below the threshold of significance as defined by CEQA were considered to be less than significant impacts or no impacts at all.

This Draft EIR evaluates direct impacts, indirect impacts, cumulative impacts, and irreversible impacts, and significant impacts related to all of those.

Chapter 3 of the EIR evaluated 15 environmental resource areas that could be potentially impacted by the master plan. The environmental impact analysis for each of the 15 resource areas included an analysis of the regulatory and environmental setting, significance criteria and thresholds, impact analysis itself, mitigation measures, and a description of the residual impact level after mitigation.

Under the EIR analysis, the following 11 areas shown here on the slide were found to have no significant impact or less than significant impacts with mitigation applied. Just a note to this slide that the April 2009 initial study determined that the proposed master plan
would not result in significant impacts to agricultural resources or population and housing and that those two resources were ruled out as insignificant or less than significant before the EIR was prepared.

However, the EIR analysis did identify four areas that would experience unavoidable significant impacts. And these are aesthetics, air quality, noise, and transportation and traffic.

The LACCD Board of Trustees is required to evaluate these significant impacts and determine whether the benefits of the 2009 Master Plan warrant approving the project despite these significant impacts. If so, a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be required. I will now discuss in detail each of the four areas that was found to have unavoidable and significant impacts. The first area is aesthetics, and significant impacts related to aesthetics were found to result from obstructed views of open space, field lighting, and inconsistencies with the Sylmar General Plan -- or the Sylmar Community Plan, I'm sorry.

Obstructed views from open space at the athletic fields site will result in domination of the landscape by buildings and fields until proposed screen plantings mature at the site. Increasing obstruction of views of open space would occur as these plantings mature. So
significant impacts resulting from night lighting would be reduced by the screen plantings but would not be rendered less than significant.

The 2009 would be inconsistent with the following policies of the Sylmar Community Plan. Policy 5-1.1, retention of passive and visual open space; Policy 6.2.1, compatibility with adjacent land uses and character at the nursery property and the athletic fields site.

Now, I'm going to run through some existing and visual simulations of the proposed project at the nursery property and the athletic fields. So here is an existing photo of the nursery property on the top and a visual simulation of the nursery property proposed modular building on the bottom. This is a view looking north. The next slide has a view of the same modular proposed conceptual plan looking southwest. And again, existing is on top and the simulation is on the bottom.

The next slide shows the proposed more permanent building on the nursery site once the nursery site is no longer needed for swing space. And this is a view looking north along Hubbard Street. And you can see the existing photo on the top and the conceptual visual simulation on the bottom. This slide is the same type of view but looking southwest of the more permanent building
at the nursery site.

These next slides show the proposed athletic fields area. Most of them will be taken from views from Mountain Glenn Terrace looking kind of southwest, western towards the site. And so these ones I want to remind you that before we had existing on the top and the proposed visual simulations on the bottom, but for the next slides we want to show a panoramic image, so the top slide is looking left, and the bottom slide is looking right. They're both existing. So the next slide will be proposed.

And these few slides that I'm going to go over now are all over here on the boards, the aesthetics station. So if you're interested in these slides, you can go and talk to the aesthetics resource specialist or Mia.

So the slide shows the proposed athletic fields along the Pacoima Wash. And you can see in the slides the proposed screening plantings that I was referring to earlier that will either obstruct the views or not obstruct the views depending on which phase of the project you're thinking of.

Athletic field lighting has been designed to minimize field light into direct light off the field rather than out into the atmosphere or into passerbyer's
eyes, that type of thing.

This is an aerial view of the proposed lighting designs. And you can see that we're proposing to use lighting that will direct the light only onto the field or for the most part only onto the field and not into the surrounding areas such as the wash or the golf course or residential areas. And there's more information about the lighting design on this slide show over here. So if you're interested in that, go ahead and travel over there.

This slide shows the existing night view of the athletic fields site from Mountain Glenn Terrace. So again, looking left and looking right, this is a panoramic. Imagine them side by side and not on top of each other.

This is a visual simulation of the night view, again, panoramic. You can see the Health Fitness and Athletics Building, and from there you can look over and see the proposed lighting. And in front of that, you can see that the lighting is partially shielded by the screen plantings that we are proposing as part of the project.

An analysis of solar reflectivity determined that PV rooftop panels on the proposed parking lot would not reflect light or glare into adjacent areas. And this was a particular area that we studied in response to
comments we got during the scoping period. So this is a
direct analysis related to addressing your comments and
concerns during the scoping period.

So on to air quality, significant impacts
related to air quality would result in exceedance of
construction thresholds for dust particles and exceedance
of greenhouse gas, significant thresholds due to
automobile use. Several mitigation measures were
incorporated into the EIR analysis in order to reduce
effects of dust particles. These include, but are not
limited to, the use of electric equipment when possible,
watering active sites during construction, reduction of
traffic speeds on unpaved roads, and scheduling
construction to off-peak hours when practical.

Mitigation measures to reduce greenhouse gas
emissions include, but are not limited to, car sharing
programs, public transit incentives, bicycle parking,
arranging telecommuting or flexible work programs for the
college, and trip reduction programs. All of these
mitigations and more are outlined in the EIR. So if
you're interested in reading them, go ahead and open up
the book.

Significant impacts from noise will result from
project construction noise exceeding city thresholds at
the nursery property and the athletic fields site.
Mitigation measures that we determined to reduce impacts to noise include the incorporation of noise control measures and planned specifications and estimate documents to reduce noise impacts. And this would include compliance with the City of L.A. noise levels and hours of operation.

And now I'd like to introduce David Miller our traffic planner to discuss impacts related to transportation and traffic.

DAVID MILLER,

MR. MILLER: Thanks, Ginger. For the Traffic and Transportation portion of the EIR, we analyzed 29 intersections and 11 roadway segments in this area to assess the impacts of the expansion of the nursery site and the expansion of the athletic fields site.

First of all, we found the need for several access and circulation improvements on the sites, in addition to parking, to facilitate access to the site and also the movement within them. We also found significant impacts at two intersections and two roadway segments.

I'd like to start with the roadway segments. In the case of the roadway segments, these impacts are from cumulative projects and ambient growth indicating they're the result of an increase from other projects that are
pending approval and development in the area, plus the ambient growth which the Los Angeles Department of Transportation makes us add into the analysis that's kind of a background thing, even though this is a pretty built-out area.

So the impacts of the roadway segments on Hubbard between Gladstone and Fenton and on Maclay between Gladstone and Fenton are not a result from the increase from this project but, rather, from all the other development that is projected between now and 2015.

And we actually calculated the percentage of growth from this project and found that it was contributing 1 percent of the growth to Hubbard and 5 percent to MacClay. That small percentage should not result in the impact to these segments.

Just to point out that this estimate is really conservative. To have these impacts in the future sounds bad, but it would take all of the projects, you know, that everyone has thought of getting approved and developed and the 2 percent of ambient growth to happen before they'd actually be realized.

In the case of the intersections, both of the impacts are caused by the addition of the new trips primarily related to the use of the athletic fields site. And these intersections are Harding and Maclay near the
athletic fields site and Maclay and the I-210 westbound ramps. Both would operate at Level of Service F in the P.M. peak hour under 2015 conditions.

Now, with Harding and Maclay, the college has proposed a signal at this intersection. And the analysis shows that would fully mitigate the impact. In addition, it would improve safety for vehicles and improve safety for pedestrians at that location. At MacClay and I-210 westbound ramps, however, there is no mitigation proposed, and that impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The college doesn't have authority to improve that interchange because it's owned and operated by Caltrans. Because Caltrans has no plans to improve that interchange, the college doesn't have a vehicle in which to participate to improve it. So the impact at that location remains significant and unavoidable. And I'll be over at the traffic station and will be happy to answer any questions at the end of this presentation and also to take your comments on this EIR. Thank you.

Ginger.

GINGER TORRES,

MS. TORRES: Thanks, David. The alternatives considered in the EIR include alternatives required by
CEQA, alternatives previously identified in the 2007 Master Plan EIR, alternatives suggested by the community, and other off-site alternatives.

The EIR evaluated a large number of alternatives to the 2009 Master Plan and removed them from further evaluation based on a variety of factors. Most of them that were moved would not meet the project's objectives and included other sites and reduced development alternatives.

The EIR evaluates feasible alternatives to the proposed 2009 Master Plan that would attain the basic objectives of the district and avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts of the 2009 Master Plan.

Alternative No. 1, No Project Alternative, was evaluated to be in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. And all of these alternatives, 1 through 5, are evaluated in Chapter 4 of the EIR to determine significance between each other, significant impacts of each one of them.

The environmentally superior alternative was found to be Alternative 3, No Athletic Fields Development, because of the reduced impacts to air, noise, and traffic.

There is a controversy, issues raised in response to the Notice of Preparation of the EIR, and
these directly come from the comments that we received during the scoping period in April and May of this year. And all of these areas of controversy have been addressed in the EIR that we’ve prepared.

Areas of controversy include traffic and parking impacts, encroachment into the nursery residential block, construction effects on adjacent residential area including dust, noise, vibration, and construction hours, public safety such as evacuation in case of an emergency, light and noise pollution from the athletic fields, change in visual character of the nursery property and the Pacoima Wash property, conversion of passive recreation area to an active recreation area at the athletic fields site, continuing transformation of Sylmar into a college town. The alternative would not further impact the surrounding community. And again, these issues are all addressed in mostly Chapter 3 of the EIR.

And now I'd like to turn it over to Annette, and she'll talk about the public comment opportunities at this meeting today and the next month or so. Thank you.

ANNETTE CORTEZ,

MS. CORTEZ: Well, this concludes our presentation tonight. We would like to give you some information on how you can write your comments and the type of comments
that we encourage you to submit.

The comments that we hope that you submit are specific to the environmental impacts of the proposed 2009 Master Plan. In addition, other comments would be specific ways to reduce environmental impacts. So if you have any ideas that would be mitigation measures, we want to hear those.

And as a side note, the Draft Environmental Impact Report is made available for your review in several places, one being the L.A. Mission College website, the L.A. Mission College Library and four other local public libraries. So please, feel free to review the document and provide comments.

We also have set up a couple of ways in which you can provide comments through the public comment period. The first is today is to visit one of our public comment stations. There's two in the back and one in the front for construction-related comments. There's forms that we provide for you to provide comments and answer the questions, or feel free to write us a letter or write your own comments and submit them.

The second one is also by visiting one of the six resource stations that we have set up today, and you can talk to our specialists, and they will note your comments on the flip charts. Or you can give a
verbal/oral comment to our court reporter, and that will
be recorded.

And the fourth way is that there's comment forms
made available on the website. So if you don't get one
today or you forgot to give us a comment, please go onto
the website and download the form. And those are both in
English and Spanish.

We will be accepting comments through
September 1st. And you can either mail it, fax it or
email it. And on the forms, we have the complete mailing
information, email or the fax number. So please, visit
our stations, and we thank you for being with us tonight.

(Whereupon, the presentation portion of the
public comment meeting was concluded at 7:45 P.M.
and no on-the-record public comments were made.)
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SYLMAR, CALIFORNIA; SATURDAY, AUGUST 15, 2009

10:10 A.M.

KAREN HOEFEL,

DR. HOEFEL: Good morning. I'd like to introduce myself. I'm Karen Hoefel, I'm the Vice President for Administrative Services here at Mission College. I'm here on behalf of the college and President Valles who is taking a very well-deserved vacation. So she wasn't able to be here this morning.

We appreciate you joining us this morning. This is the second of what we call public comment meetings that we are holding for our Environmental Impact Report which is supporting our new 2009 Master Plan.

We've got lots of experts here today to give you an overview of the plan and the purpose of this meeting and how you can participate and provide feedback to us for comment.

Our college project manager is Gateway Science and Engineering, and they have been very instrumental in our building projects, and they are instrumental in coordinating this meeting today.

You will hear from Mia Ibranan from Leo A. Daly who Leo A. Daly is our master plan consultant. And Mia will be able to give you an overview of the components of
the 2009 Master Plan that this EIR is supporting. URS Corporation is our EIR consultant and expert in the CEQA, the California Environmental Quality Act, requirements for the EIR.

And we also have some technical experts. David Miller is our transportation expert, and he will give you an overview of the traffic issues. And Ginger Torres is the EIR project manager, and she will be reviewing the results of the Draft EIR and the comments that we received and the analysis.

And then Annette Cortez, also from URS, will be giving you some closing instructions in terms of how you can participate in the process and provide feedback for us.

So the purpose of the meeting today and the EIR public comment meeting is to really provide the community an opportunity to make comments on the environmental issues that are related to our Draft EIR.

We hope to give you a better understanding of the California Environmental Quality Act. Dev Vrat from URS is the expert on that, and he will run you through that and the role of the EIR and the master plan process.

We're also going to give you an overview of our master plan. Many of you have probably been to these meetings before, so it's probably something that you
already heard.

As I said, Ginger will be giving you the results of our Draft EIR, and then we want you to give us feedback on the environmental impacts of our master plan as required by CEQA.

So with that, I'm going to turn this process over and this microphone over to Dev Vrat who is going to go over the process with you.

DEV VRAT,

MR. VRAT: Thank you very much, Dr. Hoefel. I'd like to start by explaining what is CEQA, what it is and how does it relate to approval of the master plan. So the law is the California Environmental Quality Act. It was passed back in 1970. And the purpose of the law is to inform the public and the decision-makers about the environmental consequences of their actions relative to approving projects. So the main purpose of CEQA is disclosure, it's to disclose environmental impacts.

The second purpose of it is to identify ways to reduce those environmental impacts and make those recommendations to the decision-makers. So when decision-makers consider approval of a project, they're informed about what the environmental impacts may be and they're also informed about possible ways to reduce those
environmental impacts.

So the only thing we're doing right now, we're not considering whether this is a good project or a bad project. We're trying to identify what would the environmental impacts be and are there ways that we can reduce the environmental impacts. That's all we're doing; that's what the EIR is about.

So the next thing I'm going to do is explain how we prepare an EIR and what is going to happen to that EIR. So back in April we produced a public notice. So we told the whole community that the college is considering this master plan, and we want the community to get involved in helping to identify the environmental impacts.

So we prepared an initial study which was a quick scan of what we thought the environmental impacts may be, and we put that on the website and we notified you that that document was available, and we had a meeting like this. I think we had a couple of meetings like this. And those are called "scoping meetings."

And the purpose of those meetings is for you to tell us what we should study in the EIR. So you did that and we got a lot of comments. And you can see all of your comments, we actually published them in Volume II of the Draft EIR. So you can see that we got your comments.
And we read all your comments. When we were preparing the EIR, we read your comments and tried to address all your comments and address your concerns. And you will see when Mia presents the project description, you will see that we changed the project to address some of your concerns, especially relating to visual lighting, et cetera.

And David Miller, he did a lot of traffic analysis based on the comments you made during the scoping. You know, you told him we’re concerned about this intersection, we’re concerned about this, and so he looked at those and he studied everything you said. And the Draft EIR attempts to address your concerns.

Okay. So now we’re at the stage here where we got the Draft EIR out, and it’s available at the public libraries and a bunch of other places, on the website, which is here. And Annette will explain at the end of this presentation how you can provide comments.

So now this is exactly where we are here. It's 45 days. So we're giving you, the public, a 45-day window in which you can review our EIR and let us know did we really, in fact, address the comments that you made on it. Okay.

And now you're going to see more information, and you'll have another opportunity to comment. So you
have 45 days to comment on the Draft EIR, and that closes September 1. So now you have until September 1 to give us your comments on the environmental impacts and the mitigation measures that are in the EIR.

What we're going to do after that is we're going to, again, go back and study all your comments, and we're going to adjust it again, basically, go around and around until we get it right.

We will prepare a final EIR. And the final EIR will have all your comments. It will have your comments and a comment-by-comment response. So we will respond to every single comment you make, and you will see our response published in the final EIR, not only you but the decision-makers.

So as you can see, what we're trying to do is to try to provide public participation in the preparation of the document, and we're trying to present all the information in written form to the decision-makers so when they consider the project, they will know what the environmental impacts are.

There's still -- even though there may be significant environmental impacts, when the project goes to the Board of Trustees, they may still approve the project. And Ginger will explain that when she talks about the significant impacts of the project.
So just because there's significant environmental impacts, that does not mean the plan can't be approved. It just means that the decision-makers need to say we know there's environmental impacts, but we believe the project is important to the community and the college, and there's other reasons why we want to approve the project anyway. So the EIR process does not result in denial of the project; it results in disclosure of environmental impacts.

And so at the final public hearing, prior to approving the project, the college will have to make a finding that they read the EIR, and they have to certify that it's been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. And once they certify the EIR, they are free to either approve or not approve the master plan.

So as Dr. Hoefel indicated, your role tonight is when Mia is presenting the master plan, pay attention and try to learn as much about the master plan as you can, especially the features that may affect you and that you're concerned about. That's why Mia is presenting it, to help you understand the master plan.

After Mia is done, Ginger will present the results of the Draft EIR. And during her presentation, I've asked her to point out places where we actually
changed the document or addressed some of your concerns so you will see that that scoping process, you were effective, you helped us, and the Draft EIR will reflect your concerns.

Now we have the Draft EIR. You get another chance, the ball is back in your court. You can look at the draft EIR and make an assessment, did we adequately look at those environmental impacts that you told us about. That's one area where comments would be helpful.

Another area is the mitigation measures we've identified. We tried to include the mitigation measures you suggested. If we missed any, let us know and we'll add them. If they make sense, we'll add them to the final EIR.

So that concludes my overview of the CEQA process, and now I'd like to turn it over to Mia Ibranan who will make a presentation of the master plan.

MIA IBRANAN,

MS. IBRANAN: Thank you, Dev. First, I'll say good morning. And I'd like to begin by acknowledging that the college's 2007 Master Plan was, in fact, approved two years ago by the L.A. Community College District Board of Trustees. And since then, a lot of you may have noticed, several of those facilities from that master plan have
been planned for and constructed throughout the campus
and even at the east campus.

So everything that you will be seeing in these
diagrams and maps have all been previously approved
except for these three areas here along the wash, the
second along Eldridge and across the college here and
Hubbard Street. And these three same areas are, in fact,
what constitute the master plan, the 2009 Master Plan,
which we will be approving.

The first one is for the development of an
Athletic Fields Complex. The second area of development
is for swing space, and the last area proposed for is for
improvements of Eldridge streetscape.

And for the Athletic Fields Complex, the
development is defined by the northern parcel which is
owned by the L.A. Community College District and Mission
College. The southern parcel is owned by the Army Corps
of Engineers. And the college is currently under
negotiations to lease this property for 25 years for the
development and use of athletic fields.

There are several reasons why this project is
important to the college, one of them being that the
health and fitness programs are expanding. Although the
Health, Fitness and Athletics Building is near
completion, it will provide a lot of the instructional
space it needs for these athletic academic programs, however, it does lack outdoor instructional areas. So these fields would, indeed, serve that need.

And also, the college has a thriving athletic program; however, they do lack competition fields. So a lot of the teams have to travel far away to have their games. So naturally, it would be a great advantage to locate them closer to the college.

The Athletic Fields Complex would include a men's baseball field, a woman's softball field, and a men and women's soccer field, all of which would be designed according to NCAA rules and regulations. These fields would be supported by several types of amenities, including all the storage space, concession stands, restrooms, et cetera.

And another important aspect of this project would be the improvement of the access road along the Pacoima Wash. And therefore, it would also be stabilizing the bank preventing the road from washing away in the future, particularly due to heavy rainfall which this area has experienced several times in the past.

It is also important to note that a lot of new features and amenities for the Athletic Fields Complex that are illustrated here are subject to change based on
final design. So what you are seeing is possibly what
the fields could look like, but it could possibly change.
However, all of these safety features would, in fact, be
included.

For the swing space development, it's another
area that the college campus needs in order for the 2007
Master Plan to be built out. There are several programs
and departments on the college campus that require
permanent facilities, and those permanent facilities
cannot be built until several of the modular buildings on
campus can be relocated temporarily. So this space here
would certainly serve that purpose.

And while they're being temporarily relocated
here, the permanent facilities on campus can be
constructed, and then the department would be temporarily
housed here and then be permanently moved into the
facilities.

When the swing space outlives its purpose, it
could then eventually be used for possibly another
facility that could be constructed and planned for the
college.

For development of the swing space, it would
require the college to acquire the parcel itself, and the
property would allow for the several modular buildings to
be located here and some parking would be provided for
the sheriff station, visitors, and disabled parking as well. And again, this would allow for several of the buildings previously approved in the 2007 Master Plan to begin construction.

And that future facility that could possibly be constructed might be a College Programs and Activities Center which would be a single-story facility possibly about 20,000 square feet. And again, some parking will be provided as well.

And the third area of development or improvement that the college is proposing to address is along Eldridge Street between Harding and Hubbard. And when the east campus becomes available with all the facilities fully constructed and developed and a majority of the students will obviously be attending classes on the main campus, this path would become the main commute, not only for the students, faculty, and staff, but for the community as well.

As many of you have probably experienced, as indicated in the picture to the right, a lot of the sidewalks are cracked and the trees are uprooting it, so it becomes a safety issue that the college would like to address and improve.

And the illustration up to the right here is a conceptual depiction of what those improvements could
include. And the enlarged plan here supports the
depiction by providing locations where some of those
features could, in fact, be placed.

And so that pretty much is the overview for the
2009 Master Plan. And with that, I'll turn it over to
Ginger Torres with URS.

GINGER TORRES,

MS. TORRES: Thanks, Mia. In this presentation, I'm
going to address the findings of the 2009 Master Plan
EIR. The Master Plan EIR evaluates the potential impacts
against a series of thresholds.

Impacts that were found to be above the
threshold of significance were found to be significant
impacts. And impacts that were found to be below the
threshold of significance, as defined by the California
Environmental Quality Act, were determined to be less
than significant or no impacts at all.

The Draft EIR evaluates impacts related to
direct, indirect, cumulative, growth inducing, and
irreversible impacts and tries to determine significant
impacts for each of those areas for about 15 different
environmental resource areas.

The environmental impact analysis analyzes for
each of those 15 resource areas. It goes through and
talks about the regulatory setting and environmental setting which sets up an impact analysis. It also describes significance criteria as outlined by CEQA, and we go through an impact analysis for each resource area and come up with a summary of impacts.

And once we find out what the impacts are, sometimes we describe mitigation measures that will reduce impact levels. And then at the end of the impact analysis, we summarize the residual impact after mitigation measures are applied. That's the background of the impact analysis approach that we took to this project.

Under the EIR analysis, the following 11 resource areas that are shown on the slide here were found to have no significant impacts or less than significant impacts with mitigation applied. Just as a side note to these resource areas shown here, we did evaluate impacts to agricultural resources and population and housing resources in the 2009 April initial study of this area. And those were determined to have no significant impacts on the project. So those didn't carry forward to the EIR analysis.

However, the EIR analysis did identify four areas that would experience unavoidable significant impacts. They are aesthetics, air quality, noise, and
transportation and traffic resources.

The LACCD Board of Trustees is required to consider significant impacts on these resources and determine whether or not the benefits of the 2009 Master Plan warrant approval of the significant impacts in their approval of the project. So if so, a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be necessary.

I'm now going to discuss in detail each of these four unavoidable significant impact areas. The first area is aesthetics, and significant impacts bound to result to aesthetics related to obstruction of views of open space and hillsides, field lighting and result in inconsistencies of the Sylmar Community Plan.

Obstruction of views from development of the athletic fields site would result in domination of the landscape by buildings and fields until the proposed screen plantings to screen -- as they grow tall enough to cover up those buildings and fields. However, as they grow taller, they obstruct the open space views of the fields. So that would be another obstruction. So they're either there or not there, but either way they're impacting the athletic fields views.

Significant effects related to field lighting would be reduced by proposed screen plantings; however, they would not be rendered insignificant.
And the 2009 Master Plan would be inconsistent with two policies of the Sylmar Community Plan. And these policies are Policy 5-1.1, retention of passive and visual open space of the athletic fields site, and Policy 6.2.1, compatibility with adjacent land uses and character at the nursery property and the athletic fields site.

Now, I'm going to run through some visual simulations and existing photos from the nursery property and athletic fields site. So this first slide is a visual simulation on the bottom and the existing photo of the nursery site.

The visual simulation shows the proposed modular buildings. This would be used for the temporary swing space, the college, and this is a view looking north. The next slide shows the same modular buildings looking south on the visual simulation on the bottom of the slide. And these are all conceptual drawings to show you the site there and kind of the way the buildings could look, but final design changes will be approved when the project is a little bit further along.

The next slide shows the proposed conceptual simulation of the more permanent building proposed for the site, the College Programs and Activities center. And again, this is a conceptual figuration. The top
slide, again, is existing, and the bottom slide is the visual simulation.

And this is the same College Programs and Activities Center looking southwest. Next slide. This slide shows the existing views of the athletic site from Mountain Glenn Terrace. I think this is looking northeast; southeast, yeah, southeast across the athletic fields.

And I want to point out that this is a panoramic slide. So the top slide is looking left, and the bottom is looking right. And if you want to see more of these slides of the athletic fields, we have boards set up over here that show the full panoramic image. You can get up and take a look at those after the presentation is over or during the presentation if you want.

So the next slide will show you a visual simulation of the same view that we just saw. And in the simulation you can see the proposed screen plantings that we planned along the border of the Pacoima Wash to help shield the project and to also help mitigate some environmental effects of the project.

Next slide, please. So the athletic fields lighting will be designed to minimize spill light and direct lighting directly onto the field. So this slide just shows that concept. Actually, behind me on my right
side we have a slide show that is all about lighting. So
if you're interested in that, go ahead and watch the
slide show after the presentations are over.

This slide shows an aerial view of the proposed
lighting design. And as you can see by the aerial view,
we're trying to design the lighting so that it's directed
directly onto the field, and it should not be located in
adjoining areas of the project, such as the Pacoima Wash
or the El Cariso Golf Course.

This shows the existing night view of the
athletic fields site from that same viewpoint we saw
before from Mountain Glenn Terrace. That's the southern
side; this is the northern parcel. And the next slide
will show the proposed visual simulation of the same
viewpoint. So you can see that the lights of the
athletic fields will be located beyond the screen
plantings, and the screen plantings in front will help
shield some of that lighting from the fields.

An analysis of solar reflectivity was determined
that the proposed photovoltaic rooftop panels on the
parking structures in the parking lot at the athletic
fields site would not reflect light or glare into
adjacent areas. So these two photos show the analysis
that was undergone by our lighting experts.

Significant impacts from air quality would
result from the exceedance of construction thresholds for
dust particles and exceedance of greenhouse gas
significance thresholds due to automobile use.

There are several mitigation measures
incorporated into the Master Plan EIR for air quality for
these two significant impacts to reduce them. The
mitigation measures incorporated into the master plan is
to reduce the impacts from dust, include but are not
limited to the use of electrical equipment when possible,
watering active construction sites, reduction of traffic
speeds on unpaved roads, and scheduling construction
traffic to off-peak hours when practical.

Mitigation measures incorporated into the Master
Plan EIR in order to reduce greenhouse gases include but
are not limited to car sharing programs, public transit
incentives, bicycle parking, designing telecommuting and
flexible work programs, and designing commuting trip
reduction plans.

So if you want a whole list of the mitigation
measures that were incorporated into the master plan, you
can refer to the executive summary. They're all in the
executive summary of the EIR, as well as fully-outlined
in Chapter 3 of the EIR.

Significant impacts related to noise result from
project construction noise exceeding city thresholds at
the nursery property and the athletic fields site. Mitigation measures that were incorporated into the EIR in order to reduce noise impacts include incorporation of noise control measures and plan specifications and estimate documents in order to reduce the noise impacts. And this includes compliance with the City of L.A. noise levels and hours of operation.

And next, I'd like to introduce David Miller who will give a summary of the impacts related to traffic and transportation.

DAVID MILLER,

MS. MILLER: Thanks, Ginger. For the transportation and traffic portion of the EIR, we analyzed 29 intersections both signalized and unsignalized in the area and 11 roadway segments to assess the impact of the expansion of the nursery site and use of the athletic fields.

And first of all, we found the need for several on-site access and circulation improvements at the nursery site and athletic fields to facilitate access to the sites and movement within them and also to provide adequate parking. And those are either designed into the EIR or are pointed out in the transportation portion of the EIR as mitigation.
We also found significant impacts to two intersections and two roadway segments in the area. Now, in the case of the roadway segments, we found that the impacts were from cumulative projects and ambient growth and not as a result of the increase from this EIR.

What that means is that when we look at all of the projects that are pending or that basically anybody has thought of that could possibly happen in about a 5-mile radius, and we tack on 2 percent ambient growth, just growth in the background that LADOT requires, we found that Hubbard between Gladstone and Fenton and Maclay between Gladstone and Fenton would have a significant impact.

But when we looked at the percentage of growth, this EIR is only adding 1 percent of that to Hubbard and 5 percent to MacClay. So the impact is from all the background traffic that we're projecting and not from this EIR. I'd like to point out that this is a very, very conservative projection. That is a lot of projects and a lot of growth that would have to occur in this very built-out area, and so it's probable that those impacts might never occur.

Now, in the case of the intersections, we found that both of the impacts are caused by this EIR from the addition of new trips, primarily related to the use of
the athletic fields. And these two intersections are Harding Street and Maclay, and Maclay and the I-210 westbound ramps. And they would operate at Levels of Service at P.M. peak hours in 2015. That's with all the background traffic, all the projects, and this project added on top.

Now, at Harding and Maclay, the college has proposed to signalize that intersection. And the analysis shows that signalizing the intersection would fully mitigate that impact. It would also improve safety for vehicles and for pedestrians using that area.

At Harding and the I-210 westbound ramps, however, there is no mitigation proposed. And that impact would remain significant and unavoidable. That interchange is owned and operated by Caltrans. So the college has no authority on its own to go and improve that interchange. Caltrans currently has no plans to improve the interchange, so the college doesn't have a vehicle in which to participate in its improvement. So again, that impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

And I'll be over at the traffic station afterwards, after the presentation. If you'd like to ask any questions, I'll be happy to take your comments as
well to address the Draft EIR.

With that, I'll give it back to Ginger.

GINGER TORRES,

MS. TORRES: Thank you, David. So alternatives, now we're going to go through some alternatives that were analyzed in the project EIR. The alternatives analyzed included a no project alternative, a no Army Corps of Engineers parcel alternative, a no athletic fields development alternative, a no nursery property development alternative, and a reduced development alternative.

The environmentally superior alternative was determined to be the no athletic fields development alternative because it had the lowest amount of significant impacts to the project, and it reduced impacts related to air, noise, and I think biology. It's air, noise and traffic, I'm sorry.

So all of these alternatives were analyzed in a comparative analysis in Chapter 4 of the EIR. So if you're interested in how these compare against each other, refer to Chapter 4 of the EIR.

The EIR evaluated all of these alternatives and reduced them based on a screening analysis that was applied to when they had alternatives that would not meet
the project objectives. So the alternatives that were eliminated included some of the other sites under these development alternatives considered.

Areas of controversy were areas identified during the public scoping period, and all of these areas we directly addressed in the EIR analysis. And these came directly from comments that we got in April and May of this year during the scoping period, during these meetings through letters.

So we took those and we compiled them into different issue areas, and these were the major issue areas that we addressed in response to your comments. And these areas included traffic and parking impacts, encroachment into the nursery residential block, construction effects on adjacent residential areas from dust, noise, vibration, and construction hours, public safety evacuation in case of a catastrophic event, light and noise pollution from the athletic fields, a change in visual character of the nursery property and the Pacoima Wash property, conversion of passive recreation area to an active recreation area, continued transformation of Sylmar into a college town, and the last one is alternative sites that would not further impact the surrounding community.

Again, I want to stress that these are all areas
that we addressed in the EIR in direct response to
comments that we received during the scoping period.

I'm going to introduce Annette Cortez to
talk about the public comment opportunities today.
Thanks.

ANNETTE CORTEZ,

MS. CORTEZ: This concludes the presentation for this
morning, and we are now ready to hear your comments. The
kind of comments that would be useful at this phase of
the project are comments directly related to the
environmental impacts of the 2009 Master Plan would have
on the community and also comments that are specific to
reducing environmental impacts. Any mitigation measures
that you might think of that would be useful for the
project, we want to hear from you.

Also, I want to make a note that the Draft
Environmental Impact Report is available online. It's
also available here at the library and at four local
community libraries. So please feel free to stop by the
locations and review the report before September 1st if
you believe you might have some comments.

Our next slide will give you options on how you
can submit your comments. This morning you can visit one
of our three comment stations. There's two in the back
and one here in the front for construction comments.

At each station we have forms with a couple of
questions which you can use to respond to those questions
or give us any other comments that you might have. On
that form, also, there's a mailing address, a fax number
and an email address. That form is also available in
English and Spanish on the L.A. Mission website.

Another option is to visit one of the six
resource stations that are set up around the room to
speak to our specialists in each area. We have flip
charts there where we will be noting down your comments,
and those will also be part of the record.

Or you can provide your oral comments to Grace.
She's our court reporter who is keeping track of
everything that is said today. So if you want to just
come over and talk to her, please give her your name and
your address and she will note everything in the
transcripts.

Again, the fourth one is that the forms are
available online. So feel free to download those if you
remember any other comments before September 1st.

The last item listed is the address. So it's
the L.A. Mission College address. And the comments need
to be addressed to Nick Quintanilla, and we have the fax
number and an email. And if you'd like to receive a copy
of this information, just go to one of the comment
stations and all of the forms have it listed.

At this time we encourage you to come by our
stations, talk to our specialists, and we thank you for
being here this morning.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

MARY ANNE DIB,

MS. DIBS: My complaint is that the dust is so
incredible. I get my car washed; the very next day it's
got a film of dirt on it, on all my vehicles. They need
to put up a new awning on the fence. It's so
ghetto-looking the way it is.

They need to widen the street because of the
congestion of traffic. We have 317 homes right there
that uses that street, figure every street has got two
cars. We have Fenton Avenue School, Harding School that
has 1st to 6th grade plus the teachers. They use Harding
and Eldridge.

Then the 500 parking spaces in the college, now
the athletic fields, you're going to have, like, close to
2,000 cars coming there on Harding and Eldridge all times
of the day.

Now, if I park a car in front of my house and
park a car across the street from my house, you can only
get one car through; two cars cannot go through. So that
strip needs to be widened. Mary Anne Dib, D-i-b, 12901
Harding Street.

ALICE VALENZUELA,

MS. VALENZUELA: Alice Valenzuela, I live across the
street from the college, 12923 Harding Street. The
college is this way, but I live in the middle. There's
no sidewalk, you know, across the street, and ours is
picked up real bad, too.

My worry is when the smaller kids are walking,
they can walk on the sidewalk about a third of a block,
maybe less, and the rest they'd have to go into the
street. It is not very safe to me in any way.

That's my complaint. The rest of the
complaints, they never did anything about it. But what
are you going to do? Okay. So that's what really
concerns me is we need the space for the sidewalk, okay.

And that's all. You know, the dust and all
that, well, I've had already for a couple of years. So a
little more dust wouldn't worry me no more, okay.

And maybe they can look at the sidewalk on my
side where it's picked up. I don't know what is wrong.
It could be the tree, I don't know, okay.
So that's about all I have for today. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the public comment meeting was concluded at 12:00 P.M.)
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  

I, Grace A. Verhoeven, a Certified Shorthand 
Reporter within the County of Los Angeles, State of 
California, do hereby certify: 

That the said hearing was taken down by me in 
shorthand at the time and place therein stated and was 
thereafter reduced to print by Computer-Aided 
Transcription under my direction; 

I further certify that I am not of counsel or 
attorney for any of the parties hereto or in any way 
interested in the event of this cause and that I am not 
related to any of the parties thereto. 

Witness my hand this 21st day of 

August, 2009 

GRACE A. VERHOEVEN 
CSR NO. 11419 

PARK AVENUE DEPOSITION SERVICE