4.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, this section describes a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project or project location that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project, and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. This section also evaluates the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to the project. Rather, it must consider (CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6) a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. If an alternative is clearly environmentally superior to the proposed project, it is to be designated as such. CEQA also requires that a “No Project” alternative be evaluated and compared to the proposed project. If the alternative with the least environmental impact is the “No Project” Alternative, then the environmentally superior alternative must be chosen among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e) (2)).

According to the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process. The EIR should also briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. A lead agency may use various factors and other considerations to remove an alternative from detailed considerations in an EIR. Such factors include, but are not limited to: failure of the alternative to meet most of the basic project objectives, inability of the alternative to avoid significant environmental impacts, and infeasibility. Each of these factors is discussed below.

4.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Los Angeles Mission College Master Plan sets forth the broad goal to update aging buildings and expand educational and support facilities at the Los Angeles Mission College in order to accommodate a projected increase in students while preserving the suburban atmosphere of the college campus. Objectives identified in support of the project goal are listed in section 2.3.

4.2 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT TO BE AVOIDED

Significant impacts after mitigation identified by this EIR include impacts to aesthetics, section 3.1; air quality, section 3.2; and traffic, section 3.13. Aesthetic impacts include obscuring a scenic vista of the San Gabriel Mountains and degradation of the existing visual character of the site. Air quality impacts include construction-related exhaust emissions and operational-related commuter vehicle emissions. Traffic impacts include impacts to roadway segments and intersections. As discussed in section 3, these impacts cannot be reduced to less than significant levels.
4.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Alternatives to the project that were considered were collected from several sources. These sources included alternatives identified previously in the 2005 Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan Draft EIR, alternatives recently suggested by community members, and off-site alternatives derived from research conducted in support of the current Master Plan.

4.3.1 Alternatives Identified Previously

Alternatives were identified in the 2005 Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan and Public Recreation Improvement Program. This EIR was not certified, but has provided several alternatives to be considered and reviewed. These alternatives include:

- Alternative 1 - Expanding eastward into the El Cariso Golf Course,
- Alternative 2 - Expanding into the neighboring residential community,
- Alternative 3 - Developing the LACCD/ LAMC parcel adjacent to the Pacoima Wash,
- Alternative 4 - Reduced Build-Out within Existing Campus,
- Alternative 5 - Full Build-Out within Existing Campus;
- Alternative 6 - Full Build-Out with Golf Course and Park Improvements.
- Alternative 7 - Develop Off Campus Centers

4.3.2 Alternatives Suggested by Community

Through the scoping meeting process, the public has had an opportunity to submit ideas for alternatives to the proposed project. Community members have identified several offsite alternatives to the Harding Street site. All potential sites presented by the public are reviewed and considered. Alternative sites suggested by community members include:

- Alternative 8 - Residential vacant parcel at 13407 W Foothill Blvd. (1.32 acres),
- Alternative 9 - Residential vacant parcel at 13270 W Harding St. (2.57 acres),
- Alternative 10 - Residential vacant parcel immediately east of Santiago Estates in Sylmar (no address available, 32 acres),
- Alternative 11 - Vacant parcel to the northeast of Santiago Estates in Sylmar (no address available, 19 acres),
Alternative 12 - Vacant parcel adjacent to, and to the north of, the parcel mentioned above (no address available, 514 acres).

Alternative 13 - Olive View-UCLA Medical Center on Olive View Drive in Sylmar (186 acres)

4.3.3 Other Offsite Alternatives

A search was conducted of additional potential sites that could minimize impacts on adjoining neighborhoods and meet project objectives. The goal of this search was to identify sites near LAMC that could accommodate a reasonable portion of projected growth. The first step in the search was to develop screening criteria to ensure that alternatives were identified that would enable project objectives to be met. The following site selection screening criteria were used:

- Located within the Community of Sylmar, the City of San Fernando, or within a 3 mile radius of the LAMC campus (maximum radius to serve local community)
- Vacant parcel (avoids potentially infeasible condemnation and demolition constraints)
- Over five acres in area (technical feasibility limit of the minimum area needed to support an offsite facility, considering the needs for constructing more than one building, and accommodating sufficient parking, walkways, and infrastructure).
- Located in an urbanized area with access to public infrastructure (i.e., not in rural areas)

Using the Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor internet-based property search tool, all property within the Community of Sylmar, the City of San Fernando, and property within a 3 mile radius of the LAMC campus was scanned and screened according to the screening criteria. The property search tool identified different property types, including vacant property, by color and if sales activity has occurred on that parcel within the last two years. One alternative site was found that meets the above screening criteria:

- Alternative 13 - Vacant parcel north of Terra Vista Way at Pierce St. (no address available, 15 acres)

4.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

Alternatives that were considered but rejected include:

Alternative 1 – Expanding eastward into the El Cariso Golf Course: This alternative would have altered operations of the golf course and play would have been interrupted during construction. This alternative also would have resulted in access and parking conflicts between the golf course patrons and students. For these reasons, Alternative 1
was considered operationally infeasible and, therefore, not carried forward for detailed analysis.¹

Alternative 2 – Expanding into the neighboring residential community: This alternative was determined to be infeasible and cost-prohibitive considering the number of residents that would need to be relocated, and the intensity of demolition activities that would occur. This alternative would also result in additional safety concerns and logistical problems. For these reasons, Alternative 2 was rejected and not carried forward for detailed analysis.²

Alternative 3 – Developing the LACCD/LAMC parcel adjacent to the Pacoima Wash: This alternative was considered infeasible due the distance of the parcel from the LAMC campus and technical, environmental, and institutional problems associated with development near the wash.

A detailed description of the above three alternatives and the reasons for their rejection are described in the 2005 Los Angeles Community College District - *Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan and Public Recreation Improvement Program* (2005 Draft EIR), which is hereby incorporated by reference.

Alternative 5 – Full Build-Out within Existing Campus: This alternative would involve full development within the existing LAMC campus boundaries without regard to cost, size, or height limitations. Development on the LAMC Campus would consist of the addition of 379,192 gsf of building space (five new structures) for a total of 668,897 gsf.³ All the buildings planned under the proposed project would be constructed with the exception of Parking Structure B. In order to accommodate the increase in building floor space needed without having to physically expand beyond the campus boundaries, these new buildings would be between two and four stories in height and would each house more than one program. Parking Structure A would be increased to six levels to accommodate the parking spaces that would have been provided by Parking Structure B under the project. The proposed Arroyo feature would also be constructed as part of this alternative, but would be limited to LAMC Main Campus. This alternative would accommodate a student enrollment of 15,000 students by 2015, similar to the proposed project.⁴ This alternative would not meet the objective of maximizing use of available vacant land. Because its buildings would be of larger size, its impacts would be greater than those of the Compressed Plan alternative, which is carried forward for analysis below. For this reason, Alternative 5 was not carried forward for detailed analysis.

² Ibid.
³ The total (668,897 gsf) includes previously approved projects under build-out of the 1983 Master Plan.
Alternative 6 – Full Build-Out with Golf Course and Park Improvements: This alternative would entail the physical expansion of the LAMC campus into the County Park. The same number, type, and configuration of buildings would occur as under the proposed project, with the addition of the integration of the Arroyo feature. The County Park area would be acquired by the District/LAMC through a real property exchange with the County of Los Angeles. In return, District/LAMC-owned land in would be transferred to the County for park improvements and enhancements. The District/LAMC would enter into a lease agreement with the USACE to utilize its parcel for park-related improvements. This alternative was the proposed project in the 2005 Draft EIR. However, the difficulties in making legal arrangements for the required transfers proved to be insurmountable, rendering this alternative institutionally and legally infeasible. For this reason, Alternative 6 is rejected and not carried forward for detailed analysis.

Alternative 8 – Residential vacant parcel at 13407 W Foothill Blvd.: This alternative is rejected due to its operational infeasibility because it does not meet a minimum size of five acres, even when combined with Alternative 9, which located is approximately a block away. Developing a smaller remote campus center at this site would be similar to the Offsite Campus Center alternative, which is evaluated in detail below.

Alternative 9 – Residential vacant parcel at 13270 W Harding St. is also rejected due to its operational infeasibility because it does not meet a minimum size of five acres, even when combined with the Alternative 8 parcel which is located approximately a block away. Developing a smaller remote campus center at these two sites would be similar to the Offsite Campus Center alternative, which is evaluated in detail below.

Alternative 10 – Residential vacant parcel immediately east of Santiago Estates in Sylmar: This alternative is rejected because it doesn’t substantially meet project objectives or the screening criteria. The parcel is not located in an urbanized area and does not have access to public infrastructure. The parcel does not avoid the significant aesthetic impact of the degradation of existing visual character. The existing visual character is a mountainous area in this case. Furthermore, this alternative would exacerbate the project’s significant traffic impacts.

Alternative 11 – Vacant parcel to the northeast of Santiago Estates in Sylmar: This alternative is rejected because it doesn’t substantially meet project objectives or the screening criteria. The parcel is not located in an urbanized area and does not have access to public infrastructure. The parcel does not avoid the significant aesthetic impact of the degradation of existing visual character. The existing visual character is a mountainous area in this case. Furthermore, this alternative would exacerbate the project’s significant traffic impacts.

Alternative 12 – Vacant parcel adjacent to, and to the north of, the parcel mentioned above: This alternative is rejected because it doesn’t substantially meet the project objectives or the screening criteria. The parcel is not located in an urbanized area and does not have access to public infrastructure. The parcel does not avoid the significant
aesthetic impact of the degradation of existing visual character. The existing visual character is a mountainous area in this case. Furthermore, this alternative would exacerbate the project’s significant traffic impacts.

Alternative 13 – Olive View UCLA Medical Center: This alternative is rejected because it doesn’t meet the project objective of utilizing available vacant land and does not avoid the project’s significant aesthetic impact on existing visual character. The existing visual character is a mountainous area in this area and therefore impacts would be as great or greater than those of the proposed project.

4.5 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

Through the above screening process, a reasonable range of alternatives was selected for further analysis. This range of alternatives was selected to consider the possibilities of restricting development on the existing site, developing another site, and accommodating increased demand in ways other than at a central campus location. A variety of options within these categories were considered during the planning process. In addition to the No Project Alternative, the following alternatives were found to meet most of the project objectives and to have the potential to reduce at least one significant environmental effect of the project:

- Alternative 1 – No Project
- Alternative 2 – Compressed Plan at LAMC
- Alternative 3 – Add New Site at Terra Vista
- Alternative 4 – Expand Remote Campus Centers
- Alternative 5 – Reduced Build-Out within Existing Campus

4.5.1 No Project

Under the No Project Alternative a new campus development program would not proceed. The State CEQA Guidelines state that the No Project Alternative should gauge what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. Thus, under Alternative 1 (No Project), build-out of the previously approved 1983 Master Plan would occur. The 1983 Master Plan allows construction of approximately 290,000 gsf. The existing LAMC main campus consists of approximately 230,000 gsf of permanent and temporary building space, of which approximately 30,000 gsf is attributable to temporary structures. Therefore, under Alternative 1, new construction of approximately 90,000 gsf of permanent building space would be developed. The District has already approved four construction projects for build-out of the 1983 Master Plan. These construction projects consist of a permanent Child

---

5 URS consulted with LAMC (Dr. Karen Hoeffel) and Gateway Science and Engineering (Proposition A and AA Program Managers) to discuss the feasibility of the project alternatives.
Development Center, Plant Facilities, parking structure (Parking Structure A), and a surface parking lot.  

Under this alternative, the campus would continue to operate in a manner similar to present conditions. All improvements, upgrades, or renovations to take place would be consistent with the approved 1983 Master Plan and the funding stipulations of Propositions A and AA. Student enrollment would potentially increase to up to 10,700 students.

4.5.2 Compressed Plan

The Compressed Plan would accommodate the necessary growth on the existing 22.5 acre site. The eight needed buildings and parking spaces would be provided within the existing campus boundaries. This would be accomplished by adding more buildings to the site, adding additional parking underground, and adding height to some buildings by increasing floors from two stories to three stories (see Figure 4-1). The additional costs of this plan would likely delay its implementation compared to the proposed project.

Under the Compressed Plan, the new plant facilities would need to be constructed before other programs to provide space for the additional buildings by removing the temporary plant facilities. Additional parking may be provided by extending the new garage and two levels of below grade parking under the northeast section of the plan. Since growth would be limited to the existing campus area, and there is not a lot of vacant space available on the campus, under this option in order to provide the additional building area needed, some changes to existing buildings would have to be made. The existing Campus Services Building would either be demolished and replaced with a new building, or added on to and expanded. This new (or altered) building would be called the Campus/Student Services Building and would be two stories. The total building area to be constructed under the Compressed Plan Alternative would be 140,604 gsf (including the soon to be constructed Child Development Center) and the total number of parking stalls to be constructed would be 2221 (including Parking Structure A, which is currently under construction). After all construction proposed under the Compressed Plan is completed, Los Angeles Mission College would have 560,100 gsf of building area and 2221 parking spaces.

Construction would take longer than the proposed project due to the constrained work areas. An enrollment of up to 15,000 students would be accommodated.

---

Figure 4-1: Compressed Plan Alternative
4.5.3 Terra-Vista (New) Site

This alternative is an example of considering a portion of future development at a site other than at the LAMC campus. With this example, some development would occur at a site located at the intersection of Terra Vista Street and Pierce Street in the community of Sunland/Tujunga/Shadow Hills/Lake View Terrace/East La Tuna Canyon. This site is on a hillside, and would require extensive grading prior to development. The south-east distance of this site from the existing LAMC Campus is approximately 2.5 miles and the driving distance is approximately 4 miles (see Figure 4-2). This new site has an approximate land area of 15 acres and is zoned Residential/Estate (RE) (see Figure 4-3).

Under this alternative, a portion of the campus growth would be accommodated by locating a few of the proposed buildings on the Terra Vista Site. Table 4-1 below provides details of the buildings proposed at the Terra Vista site and the LAMC Campus.

4.5.4 Remote Campus Centers

The Remote Campus Centers alternative would implement the proposed LAMC programs within one or more of the three off-campus centers that serve LAMC. These off-campus centers are located at:

1. Cultural Arts Center, 13000 Sayre Street (1 mile from main campus)
2. Physical Education Building, 12843 Foothill Boulevard, Suite B, Sylmar (2.2 miles from main campus)
3. Maclay Annex, 436 N. Maclay Avenue, San Fernando (2.9 miles from campus)
4. Maclay Annex, 436 N. Maclay Avenue, San Fernando (2.9 miles from campus)
Figure 4-2 Driving Distance from LAMC to Terra Vista Site
Figure 4-3  Terra Vista Site
Table 4-1: Proposed Buildings – New Site Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Project</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Building Area and/or Total Parking Stalls</th>
<th>Building Footprint</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health, P.E. and Fitness Center Turnaround</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88,000 gsf with temporary surface parking for 100 cars</td>
<td>53,013 gsf</td>
<td>LAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Studies with Bookstore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72,000 gsf</td>
<td>36,034 gsf</td>
<td>Terra Vista Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38,000 gsf</td>
<td>19,028 gsf</td>
<td>LAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,000 gsf</td>
<td>26,000 gsf</td>
<td>LAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure B2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>370 parking stalls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39,000 gsf</td>
<td>84,014 gsf</td>
<td>LAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure B1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>650 parking stalls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Terra Vista Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Building 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30,000 each</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Terra Vista Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Building 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30,000 each</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>LAMC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development of this alternative would require students with multiple classes to travel between the campus centers. This alternative is similar to Alternative 8 considered in the 2005 Draft EIR.⁷

4.5.5 Reduced Build-out Within Existing Campus

This Reduced Build-out Within Existing Campus alternative would reduce overall development and enrollment relative to the proposed project by restricting all development within the existing LAMC campus boundaries to a moderate level. Moderate development on the LAMC Campus would consist of the addition of 218,702 gsf of building space (five structures) for a total of 508,407 gsf.³ Parking Structure B and the Health, P.E., and Fitness Center considered under the proposed project would be eliminated, and Education Building Nos. 5 and 6 would be reduced from 57,000 gsf to approximately 20,000 gsf each. The average height of the buildings would be two stories. Enrollment would be limited to approximately 13,000 students. This alternative was also considered in the 2005 Draft EIR.⁹

4.6 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

The discussion below compares the environmental impacts of each of the alternatives with those of the proposed project. The comparative analysis is followed by a general discussion of the degree to which the underlying purpose and basic project objectives would be attained by the alternative.

4.6.1 No Project Alternative

4.6.1.1 Aesthetics

Under the No Project Alternative, the remaining projects approved under the previous Master Plan would be implemented, but development activities associated with the proposed project would not take place. Reducing future development of the existing LAMC campus would reduce the less than significant effects on the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings that would be caused by the project. Avoiding construction at Harding Street would avoid the project’s significant impacts on hillside views. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Aesthetics.

4.6.1.2 Air Quality

Under the No Project Alternative, emissions from grading and construction activities associated with the previously approved projects could cause SCAQMD construction emission thresholds for ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 to be exceeded. These significant impacts would occur over a shorter time period than those from the proposed project since fewer facilities would be built. In addition, the No Project Alternative would result in a lower enrollment number, thereby reducing significant operational emissions from the project. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Air Quality.

4.6.1.3 Biological Resources

Under the No Project Alternative, the additional grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project would not occur. Potential additional impacts resulting from loss of habitat for native plant and animal species would not occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Biological Resources.

4.6.1.4 Cultural Resources

Since there are no potentially historic structures within the proposed project site, historic impacts from this alternative would be the same as the project’s in that no potential impacts to historic structures would occur. The No Project Alternative would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to undiscovered onsite archaeological or paleontological resources at the Harding Street site, since no physical alteration (i.e. grading) at that site would occur under this alternative. Since it is more likely that no direct archaeological or paleontological impacts would occur, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Cultural Resources.
4.6.1.5 Energy Conservation and Sustainability

The No Project Alternative would increase the use of energy resources as the remaining approved facilities are added. Since more increased energy use would occur with the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Energy Conservation and Sustainability.

4.6.1.6 Geology and Soils

Since, under the No Project Alternative, there would be fewer additional structures on-site that could potentially pose additional hazards, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Geology and Soils.

4.6.1.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the No Project Alternative, the College would still likely experience an increase in student attendance, which would create a denser student population in a smaller space compared to the project. This would potentially pose an adverse impact in regards to the ability of the campus to evacuate students should a seismic event occur during campus hours. The need to accommodate a larger study body within a smaller space, could pose emergency evacuation risks to the community. However, no new risks would occur resulting from hazardous materials that may be on-site during construction activities. Since no new development would be undertaken which would lead to increased risks regarding hazardous materials relative to existing conditions, but could pose an additional impact with regards to student and faculty evacuation during a seismic event or other hazardous event, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

4.6.1.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the No Project Alternative, short term impacts to water quality associated with grading, excavation, construction activities, and project operation would not occur, since development of the proposed project would not occur. The quality and quantity of storm water and urban runoff would not change appreciably from existing conditions, except as a result of construction of facilities already approved, so impacts would be similar to the project in relation to Water Quality. However, project proposed improvements to the storm drain would not occur and the existing storm water drainage deficiency would not be addressed. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Hydrology.

4.6.1.9 Land Use and Planning

The No Project Alternative would not result in any new development on the project site and such would not require any zoning changes or amendments. The existing level of consistency with the Sylmar Community Plan and the City of Los Angeles Zoning Code would remain. However, this alternative would not achieve the land use related goals and
objectives of the LAMC Master Plan. Since this Alternative would not require any zone changes, but also would not meet any of the College objectives, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Land Use and Planning.

4.6.1.10 Noise

Under the No Project Alternative, no new land uses would be developed and no nearby sensitive receptors would be subjected to construction related noise except as a result of already approved campus projects. The increase in noise from stationary and mobile noise sources expected from the project would not occur and ambient noise levels would not increase under this alternative. The Harding Street area would remain unaffected. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Noise.

4.6.1.11 Public Services and Utilities

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no increase in demand for public services and utilities, since no new land uses would be developed within the project site. Water and wastewater impacts would remain the same since existing uses utilize these facilities. Solid waste would be assumed to be generated and consumed at current rates. However, student enrollment at the college may still occur, which would increase the generation and consumption of solid waste and water use. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would be neither superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Public Services and Utilities.

4.6.1.12 Recreation

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no increase in utilization of local parks. However, since the proposed project would also not increase the use of local parks, this alternative would be neither superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Recreation.

4.6.1.13 Transportation and Circulation

The No Project Alternative would not include the development of the Harding Street property and therefore no additional traffic would be added to the local roadways in the Harding Street area. The No Project Alternative would create less traffic near the LAMC campus than the project due to the lower amount of building space resulting in approximately 4,300 fewer students. However, these students would need to travel farther to reach other campuses. This alternative would not affect the levels of service or function of the local traffic system. However, project proposed improvements to the existing roadways that currently experience a high degree of congestion, would not occur and the existing roadway and signal deficiency would not be addressed. In addition, future student enrollment may increase regardless of increased development of the campus. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Transportation and Circulation.
4.6.1.14 Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

Because no proposed facilities would be improved, the No Project Alternative would not achieve the following project objectives:

Objective a. The primary objective to create a high quality, innovative and attractive physical college environment to promote academic excellence and service in the Mission College community, region and State for a projected enrollment of 15,000 students. Leading edge facilities, including buildings, classrooms, and laboratories, will support a strong comprehensive academic setting, provide technology opportunities, and encourage workforce development making Mission College a premier learning environment.

Objective b. Maximize the educational benefits of available public funds, including Proposition A and AA, by efficiently developing new educational facilities and improving and reinforcing existing structures at Los Angeles Mission College.

Objective c. Organize and develop land use activities within the campus to strengthen academic, cultural and social interaction and to create a strong sense of place that supports the academic and social life of the college.

Objective d. Maintain flexibility in use of spaces and buildings and design for future growth and expansion to keep pace with the growing population in the Sylmar and Northeast San Fernando Valley area by providing local facilities capable of delivering quality higher education and technical training.

Objective e. To the extent practicable, design and locate buildings and facilities consistent with the policies, goals, and objectives of the City of Los Angeles General Plan and the Sylmar Community Plan, implement a site layout and architectural design that is compatible with adjacent land uses and the existing community character, and preserve, enhance and restore the natural environment at the campus.

Objective f. Maximize use of available vacant and under-utilized lands in proximity to the LAMC campus for the development of education opportunities available to the public.

Objective g. Strengthen physical connections and campus activities that serve the surrounding community as well as promote academic excellence, technical aptitude, and job growth by providing a comprehensive college experience, diverse educational programs and superior campus facilities available to all Sylmar and Northeast San Fernando Valley area residents.
4.6.2 Compressed Plan Alternative

4.6.2.1 Aesthetics

Under the Compressed Plan Alternative, the potential for impacts at the campus would be greater than for the proposed project, since more intense construction and development activities would occur at the existing campus. Since greater heights, loss of open space, and massing would be required, new significant impacts are expected. This alternative would avoid the significant aesthetic impact of the project that would result after the Harding Street facilities are built. Therefore, the Compressed Plan Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Aesthetics.

4.6.2.2 Air Quality

This alternative would accommodate the same enrollment numbers as the proposed project, thereby resulting similar significant operational air quality impacts. Significant construction emissions associated with this alternative would be more than those of the proposed project because of the additional duration and overlapping of activities required to construct similar sized buildings in a smaller space. Therefore, the Compressed Plan Alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Air Quality.

4.6.2.3 Biological Resources

Under the Compressed Plan Alternative, grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project would not occur on vacant parcels of land. Potential less than significant impacts resulting from loss of habitat for native plant and animal species would not be anticipated to occur at the same likelihood as the proposed project. Therefore, the Compressed Plan Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Biological Resources.

4.6.2.4 Cultural Resources

The main LAMC campus has been extensively graded, which limits the probability of archaeological resources remaining intact. Since there are no potentially historic structures within the proposed project site, this alternative would not impact historic structures. However, under this alternative, excavation at greater depths than the proposed project on the LAMC Campus may occur, which could cause direct or indirect impacts to undiscovered onsite paleontological resources of the Fernando Formation. Since the possibility of finding cultural resources at the Harding Street site is unknown, and this alternative poses a potential impact to paleontological resources, the Compressed Plan Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Cultural Resources.
4.6.2.5 Energy Conservation and Sustainability

The Compressed Plan Alternative would result in similar impacts to energy resources as those of the proposed project. Therefore, the Compressed Plan Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Energy Conservation and Sustainability.

4.6.2.6 Geology and Soils

Since similar facilities would be built with this alternative in the same seismically active geographical region as the proposed project, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Geology and Soils.

4.6.2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Compressed Plan Alternative, grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project would not occur on any undeveloped parcels of land. Potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are unknown at Harding Street. However, hazards could increase as a result of construction of all future development within the confined space of the campus. Therefore, the Compressed Plan Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

4.6.2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Development of this alternative would result in appropriate drainage control and thereby would compensate for any increases in storm water runoff volumes that would be associated with an increase in impervious surfaces. Development of this alternative would also incorporate source and treatment control BMPs such that any potential impact associated with pollutant loads would be the same as those of the proposed project. Under this alternative, LAMC would still need to comply with the Construction General Permit. Compliance with this permit would entail implementing construction erosion and sediment control measures, compliance with approved local plans and ordinances, as well as non-storm water management controls. Since violations of water quality standards would be minimized, impacts to water quality from construction and operation activities associated with these alternatives would be the same as those from the proposed project. Therefore, the Compressed Plan Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Hydrology and Water Quality.

4.6.2.9 Land Use and Planning

The Compressed Plan Alternative would not result in any new development on any lands outside of the existing LAMC campus. This alternative would not require any zoning changes or amendments. Therefore, this alternative would not pose potential impacts to additional lands in the community. Like the project, this alternative would not result in conflicts with goals or policies of the LAMC Master Plan and would remain consistent
with the Sylmar Community Plan, and the City of Los Angeles Zoning Code. Therefore, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Land Use and Planning.

4.6.2.10 Noise

Construction and operational noise under this alternative would be increased but would be limited to the immediate area around the existing campus. Mitigation measures would reduce construction noise impacts to a less than significant level. The Harding Street area of the project would be unaffected, therefore the project’s less than significant construction noise impacts in that area would be avoided. This alternative would result in a reduction of the project’s mobile source noise levels associated with vehicle traffic and truck deliveries since development activities would be condensed into one area, thereby lessening the amount of area impacted by noise. As a result, the Compressed Plan Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Noise.

4.6.2.11 Public Services and Utilities

Since student enrollment would be the same, this alternative would not result in a reduction in demand for water and wastewater services and landfill disposal capacity compared to the proposed project. Potential impacts would still result related to water supply and wastewater collection and treatment, and mitigation measures would be required to reduced impacts to a less than significant level. Since, potential impacts resulting from the Compressed Plan are comparable to those under the proposed project, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Public Services and Utilities.

4.6.2.12 Recreation

Under the Compressed Plan Alternative, there would be no increase in utilization of local parks. However, since the proposed project would also not increase the use of local parks, this alternative would be neither superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Recreation.

4.6.2.13 Transportation and Circulation

This alternative would create more traffic than the project due to the concentration of growth at the main campus. The majority of all traffic coming and going to the campus would be distributed to Hubbard Street. Preliminary analysis shows that this distribution would result in a significant degradation of intersections along Hubbard Street. Due to physical constraints, available mitigations measures are limited and some of these impacts would be unavoidable. Furthermore, due to this concentration, traffic and parking in and around the school would worsen, resulting in negative impacts to the surrounding communities. Therefore, the Compressed Plan would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Transportation and Circulation.
4.6.2.14 Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

The Compressed Plan Alternative would not achieve the following project objectives:

Objective b: Maximize the educational benefits of available public funds, including Proposition A and AA, by efficiently developing new educational facilities and improving and reinforcing existing structures at Los Angeles Mission College. (Reason: construction costs and schedules would substantially increase.)

Objective e: To the extent practicable, design and locate buildings and facilities consistent with the policies, goals, and objectives of the City of Los Angeles General Plan and the Sylmar Community Plan, implement a site layout and architectural design that is compatible with adjacent land uses and the existing community character, and preserve, enhance and restore the natural environment at the campus. (Reason: site layout would be greatly cramped and no natural campus environmental improvements could be made).

Objective f: Maximize use of available vacant and under-utilized lands in proximity to the LAMC campus for the development of education opportunities available to the public. (Reason: no vacant lands would be utilized.)

4.6.3 Terra-Vista (New) Site

4.6.3.1 Aesthetics

The Terra Vista Alternative would result in impacts to a scenic vista and degradation of the existing visual character of the Terra Vista site and its surroundings. The introduction of new structures to the existing Terra Vista site could obstruct and substantially impact the scenic view of the mountains in that location. Thus the Terra Vista Alternative impacts would have similar impacts as the Harding Street site relating to aesthetics, and would be neither superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Aesthetics.

4.6.3.2 Air Quality

The Terra Vista Alternative would result in an increase over the proposed project in operational emissions because of the additional mobile source emissions associated with student travel between the main campus and the offsite facilities. This alternative would have construction related air quality impacts similar to or more than those of the proposed project due to the need to build new structures, facilities and infrastructure on a vacant parcel. Therefore, the Terra Vista Alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Air Quality.
4.6.3.3 Biological Resources

Similar to the proposed project, the Terra-Vista alternative would involve grading and construction activities on an undeveloped parcel of land. Potential impacts resulting from loss of habitat for native plant and animal species would be anticipated to occur at the same likelihood as the proposed project. Therefore, the Terra Vista Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Biological Resources.

4.6.3.4 Cultural Resources

The Terra Vista Alternative would result in excavation and construction activities in previously undisturbed areas. As a result, direct or indirect impacts to undiscovered onsite archaeological and paleontological resources may occur under this alternative. This alternative poses a similar level of impact to the proposed project, in that there is a potential for archaeological and paleontological resources to exist and be disturbed under this alternative. Therefore, the Terra Vista Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Cultural Resources.

4.6.3.5 Energy Conservation and Sustainability

The Terra Vista Alternative would result in no significant impacts to energy conservation and sustainability. Similar to the proposed project, the structures that would be built on the Terra Vista Alternative would be subject to LEED certification and required to exceed Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards by 20%. Therefore, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Energy Conservation and Sustainability.

4.6.3.6 Geology and Soils

This site is situated entirely within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Additionally, the site contains historic ground rupture along the Tujunga segment of the San Fernando fault which resulted from the 1971 Sylmar earthquake (CGS and Barrows, 1975). A site specific fault hazard investigation would be required to determine the width of the fault zone cutting across the site and structural setbacks from the active fault would be determined based on that investigation. Ultimately, structural setbacks would limit the “usable” acreage and design of any potential development on the site and additional surface rupture is a significant hazard given the proximity to the mapped active fault. This site is situated within a mapped earthquake-induced landslide hazard zone as delineated by the California Geological Survey’s Seismic Hazards Zonation Program. The low hills situated within the northern half of the site are composed of the Tertiary-age Modelo Formation consisting of shale and siltstone and is recognized as being landslide prone. Based on the topographic relief of the proposed site, grading would likely be required. Due to the potential instability of the Modelo Formation and proximity to a known seismic source, a site specific geotechnical investigation would be required to assess slope stability and engineering design of potential earthwork and site development.
The potential for significant geological hazards under this alternative would be greater than the proposed project. Therefore, the Terra Vista Alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Geology and Soils.

4.6.3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative includes a 15 acre parcel of land that has not been cleared by a Phase I Site Assessment. Since an investigation of historical uses at the site has not been conducted, the potential for encountering surface or subsurface contamination during construction is unknown. Since the potential for significant hazardous materials/hazardous waste impacts exists under this alternative, the Terra Vista Alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

4.6.3.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the assumption that the Terra Vista and Harding Street properties experience similar rainfall and have similar land use runoff properties, the site at Terra Vista Street would generate greater runoff volume and peak flows because it is roughly 5 acres larger than the Harding Street site. New drainage facilities and BMPs would have to be sized to handle a larger volume and flow rate than would the project. Development of this alternative would require appropriate drainage control to compensate for any increases in storm water runoff volumes that would be associated with an increase in impervious surfaces.

Development of this alternative would incorporate source and treatment control BMPs such that potential impacts associated with pollutant loads would be similar to those of the proposed project. Under this alternative, LAMC would still need to comply with the Construction General Permit. Compliance with this permit would entail implementing construction erosion and sediment control measures, compliance with approved local plans and ordinances, as well as non-storm water management controls. Since violations of water quality standards would be minimized, impacts to water quality from construction and operation activities associated with these alternatives would be similar to those of the proposed project. Moreover, the Main Campus as well as the Terra Vista site would also have to comply with the requirements set forth in the LARWQCB’s proposed non-traditional small MS4 Permit. Under this permit, LAMC would be required to implement BMPs associated with a number of storm water pollution prevention control measures that would reduce the risk of water quality degradation to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, water quality impacts associated with this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project. Since hydrology impacts would be greater, the Terra Vista Alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Hydrology and Water Quality.
4.6.3.9 Land Use and Planning

The Terra Vista Alternative would result in similar impacts to land use and planning as the proposed project. The Terra Vista site is on the edge of suburban development in the Community of Sylmar, and adjacent to the San Gabriel Mountain foothills, so development on this site alternative would not divide an established community. Like the proposed project, the site would be developed considering local land use plans, policies and zoning regulations. The Terra Vista Alternative would not conflict with a Habitat Conservation Plan. The Terra Vista Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Land Use and Planning.

4.6.3.10 Noise

Under this alternative, the increase in construction and operations noise would be greater because the baseline ambient noise level at Terra Vista is likely lower than that of Harding Street. Thus, this alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Noise.

4.6.3.11 Public Services and Utilities

Since the student enrollment projections remain the same under this alternative as compared to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a reduction in demand for water and wastewater services and landfill disposal capacity compared to the proposed project. Potential impacts would still result related to water supply and wastewater collection and treatment, and mitigation measures would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Since potential impacts at Terra Vista are comparable to those under the proposed project, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Public Services and Utilities.

4.6.3.12 Recreation

Under the Terra Vista Alternative, there would be no increase in utilization of local parks. Since the proposed project would also not increase the use of local parks, this alternative would be neither superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Recreation.

4.6.3.13 Transportation and Circulation

This alternative would create approximately the same amount of traffic as the project, but would result in greater traffic impacts due to its location. The new site is located between a residential community and mountainous terrain at a driving distance of approximately 4 miles from LAMC. There are no major roadway facilities serving this site. Furthermore, there are no major facilities that users can choose to travel between the I-210 freeway and the site. This would produce significant unavoidable impacts on the neighborhoods between the site and the I-210 freeway. Under this alternative, the additional VMT due to the greater distance between the two campus parcels as compared to the proposed project
would result in greater significant environmental impacts. Therefore, the Terra Vista Alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Transportation and Circulation.

4.6.3.14 Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

c. Organize and develop land use activities within the campus to strengthen academic, cultural and social interaction and to create a strong sense of place that supports the academic and social life of the college. (Reason: remote site would reduce sense of place.)

d. Maintain flexibility in use of spaces and buildings and design for future growth and expansion to keep pace with the growing population in the Sylmar and Northeast San Fernando Valley area by providing local facilities capable of delivering quality higher education and technical training. (Reason: non-local site would reduce flexibility.)

g. Strengthen physical connections and campus activities that serve the surrounding community as well as promote academic excellence, technical aptitude, and job growth by providing a comprehensive college experience, diverse educational programs and superior campus facilities available to all Sylmar and Northeast San Fernando Valley area residents. (Reason: remote location would reduce connections to broad community.)

4.6.4 Remote Campus Centers Plan

4.6.4.1 Aesthetics

Under the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative, no physical changes would occur on the main campus or on any of the three remote campuses. Since no buildings or other facilities would be added, open space on the existing campus would be preserved, which would improve the aesthetic appearance of the campus in comparison with the proposed project. Also, since no buildings or facilities would be constructed under this alternative, no view sheds would be diminished, and the significant impact at Harding Street would be avoided. Therefore, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Aesthetics.

4.6.4.2 Air Quality

Under the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative, emissions from grading and construction activities associated with the previously approved projects could cause SCAQMD construction emission thresholds for ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 to be exceeded. These significant impacts would occur over a shorter time period than those from the proposed project since fewer facilities would be built. Therefore, this alternative would have less adverse impacts to Air Quality resulting from project construction. Air quality impacts relating to the operation of the campus would be more under this alternative since the same number of students would have to travel a greater distance by
automobile from these remote centers to the main campus. Therefore, the Terra Vista Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Air Quality.

4.6.4.3 Biological Resources

Under the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative, grading and construction activities would be limited to previously approved projects. For this reason, potential impacts resulting from loss of habitat for native plant and animal species are not anticipated to occur under this alternative. Since the resulting impacts would be less adverse compared to impacts resulting from the proposed project, the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Biological Resources.

4.6.4.4 Cultural Resources

Under the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative, direct or indirect impacts to undiscovered onsite archaeological or paleontological resources would not occur since no physical alternation (i.e. grading) would occur under this alternative other than from previously approved projects. Since no buildings or facilities would be constructed or altered there would be no impact to potentially historic structures on or near the main campus and the three remote campuses. Since the impacts that would occur would be less adverse compared to the proposed project, the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Cultural Resources.

4.6.4.5 Energy Conservation and Sustainability

Under the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative, there would be no substantial increase in the use of energy resources compared to that which would occur under the proposed project since the number of students would remain the same and the number of classes to be held would be similar. Because of their modern design and central location, project facilities would be expected to save more energy per square foot than the remote campus centers. Since slightly greater impacts to energy resources would occur, the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative would be slightly environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Energy Conservation and Sustainability.

4.6.4.6 Geology and Soils

An existing impact already occurs due to the existing project site being situated in an active fault area. However, under the Remote Campus Centers Plan, there would be no additional structures on the existing campus that could potentially pose additional hazards. In addition, only existing facilities will be used on the three remote campuses, thus no new structures on these campuses could pose additional hazards. Since the impacts to Geology and Soils from this alternative would be similar to the impacts from this proposed project, this alternative would be neither superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Geology and Soils.
4.6.4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative the College would add classes at the three remote facilities. This increase would potentially pose an adverse impact in regards to the need to evacuate should a seismic event occur during school hours. Emergency plans would need to be created or updated for each of these remote campuses. Since the increase in the student population would be spread out over four sites, the immediate evacuation of each campus (main and remote campuses) would be easier to accomplish but more difficult to coordinate in the event of an emergency. Since project designs would incorporate state of the art protective features, this alternative would not reduce risks compared to the project. No new risks would occur resulting from hazardous materials that may be on-site during construction activities since no new construction is proposed under this alternative. Therefore, since this alternative would not change risks regarding hazardous materials relative to existing conditions, and would not cause substantially different impacts with regards to student and faculty evacuation during a seismic or other hazardous event, this alternative would neither be environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

4.6.4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative, short term impacts to water quality associated with grading, excavation, and construction activities, would be minor since no new construction or significant alteration to any existing building or facility would occur under this alternative other than from previously approved projects. These projects would likely slightly affect the quality and quantity of storm water and urban runoff from existing conditions, due to previously approved projects. In comparison with the proposed project, there would be more adverse impacts to storm water drainage resulting from this alternative since the improvements to the storm drain would not occur and the existing storm water drainage deficiency would not be addressed. Therefore, the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Hydrology and Water Quality.

4.6.4.9 Land Use and Planning

This alternative would not require any zoning changes or amendments since the three remote campus centers are already used by the College and are all public facilities and/or educational facilities that are currently used for educational purposes. Therefore, this alternative would not pose potential impacts to additional lands in the community which may require zoning changes or amendments. This alternative would result in conflicts with goals and policies of the LAMC Master Plan relating to establishing a cohesive campus center. It would maintain the existing status of consistency with the Sylmar Community Plan and the City of Los Angeles Zoning Code. Since it would avoid the project’s impact on the land use regarding the Harding Street site, but would not meet several LAMC Master Plan goals, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Land Use and Planning.
4.6.4.10 Noise

Under the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative, noise impacts during the construction period would be reduced since no construction of new buildings or facilities would occur other than previously approved projects. Therefore, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to construction noise.

This alternative would, however, result in an increase in mobile source noise levels associated with vehicle traffic in the areas surrounding the three remote campus centers since more students would drive to these remote campuses for class. However, the overall noise in the area would not increase substantially, since the same number of students would drive to the four campuses under this alternative as would be driving to the main campus under the proposed project. A slight increase in vehicular noise would occur from the short trips some students may make when traveling from one campus to another when they have classes on more than one campus on the same day. This could be partially mitigated by the implementation of a campus shuttle which would carry students to and from the four campuses. Since there would be a slight increase in vehicular noise under this alternative, it would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to operational noise.

4.6.4.11 Public Services and Utilities

Since the same number of students would attend the College under both the proposed project and the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative, this alternative would not result in an increase in the demand for water and wastewater services and landfill disposal capacity compared to the proposed project. Likewise, since the student enrollment would be the same, no additional police or fire services would be needed under this alternative compared with the proposed project. Since potential impacts resulting from the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative are comparable to those under the proposed project, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Public Services and Utilities.

4.6.4.12 Recreation

Under the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative, there would be no increase in the utilization of local parks. Since the proposed project will also not increase the use of local parks, this alternative would be neither superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Recreation.

4.6.4.13 Transportation and Circulation

Under the Remote Campus Centers Plan Alternative, traffic and circulation impacts during the construction period would be reduced since no construction of new buildings or facilities would occur. This alternative would, however, create more traffic than the proposed project during operation and it would impact a larger area. Under this alternative, students would be required to travel between the main campus and several
satellite locations. This would increase the number of trips the College would generate as a whole and would impact more intersections and roadways. It is anticipated that traffic improvements would need to be developed at or near the various project sites if this alternative were developed. Since there would be an increase in traffic under this alternative, it would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Transportation and Circulation.

4.6.4.14 Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

The Remote Campus Alternative would not achieve the following project objectives:

Objective b. Maximize the educational benefits of available public funds, including Proposition A and AA, by efficiently developing new educational facilities and improving and reinforcing existing structures at Los Angeles Mission College. (Reason: existing structures would not be improved.)

Objective e. To the extent practicable, design and locate buildings and facilities consistent with the policies, goals, and objectives of the City of Los Angeles General Plan and the Sylmar Community Plan, implement a site layout and architectural design that is compatible with adjacent land uses and the existing community character, and preserve, enhance and restore the natural environment at the campus. (Reason: no campus improvements would occur.)

Objective f. Maximize use of available vacant and under-utilized lands in proximity to the LAMC campus for the development of education opportunities available to the public. (Reason: no vacant land would be utilized.)

4.6.5 Reduced Build-out Within Existing Campus

This alternative is fully discussed and analyzed in the 2005 Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan and Public Recreation Improvement Program as “Alternative 2”, which is hereby incorporated by reference and summarized below.

4.6.5.1 Aesthetics

As with the proposed project, the visual character and quality of the existing LAMC campus and surrounding area would be altered under this alternative. The proposed building configuration would be confined to the existing campus boundaries. As a result, the buildings would be clustered with minimal functioning open space either internally or around the perimeter of the campus. To maximize the amount of building square footage, project design features, such as the amount of landscaping proposed by the project, would be reduced under this alternative. Overall, this alternative would serve to “in-fill” existing open spaces. This alternative would result in an average building height of two stories.
The construction of these buildings would be visible from the residents along Hubbard Street and Eldridge Avenue. As such, the clustering and concentrated mass of these buildings within the existing LAMC campus would contrast with the open space environment provided by the adjacent park. Therefore, the aesthetic impact associated with the LAMC campus under this alternative would be greater when compared to the proposed project and could be significant.

Conversely, this alternative would not result in the significant visual changes to the Harding Street site that would occur with the proposed project. These areas of the project site would remain as they are currently. Therefore, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Aesthetics.

4.6.5.2 Air Quality

This alternative would result in less construction-related air quality emissions than the proposed project since less equipment and excavation would be required. However, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with regional emissions that would occur during construction within the LAMC campus. In addition, as with the proposed project, localized emissions during construction would be temporary, but significant and unavoidable.

Construction of this alternative would increase the campus population to 13,000 students. The increase in local air pollutants (CO) and regional air pollutants (CO, ROC, SOx, NOx, and PM10) emitted from operations, including vehicular use by the additional students and faculty would be less than that of the proposed project. Under this alternative, local and regional operational air quality impacts would be less than significant. Thus, this alternative would avoid the project’s significant and unavoidable impact that would occur due to long-term, operational-related exceedance of SCAQMD significance thresholds for NOx. Therefore, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Air Quality.

4.6.5.3 Biological Resources

Similar to the project, this alternative would have minor impacts to biological resources by removing vegetation at the LAMC campus. Since this alternative would not involve the development of the Harding Street site, potential impacts to biological resources at that site would not occur. Therefore, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project in relation to Biological Resources.

4.6.5.4 Cultural Resources

Since, there are no potentially historic structures near the proposed project site, this alternative would not impact historic structures. Under this alternative, excavation at greater depths than the proposed project on the LAMC Campus may occur in order to compress a greater number of facilities within a smaller footprint. As a result, direct or
indirect impacts to undiscovered onsite paleontological resources of the Fernando Formation, may occur under this alternative. The possibility of impacts at the Harding Street site would be avoided. Thus, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Cultural Resources.

4.6.5.5 Energy Conservation and Sustainability

The Compressed Plan Alternative would result in slightly less energy use by LAMC students due to smaller student enrollment. However, if the remaining students traveled farther to other campuses, additional energy would be consumed compared to the proposed project. Therefore, the Compressed Plan Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Energy Conservation and Sustainability.

4.6.5.6 Geology

This alternative would result in geologic and soil impacts similar to those that would occur with the development of the LAMC campus under the proposed project. As described in section 3.6, Geology and Soils, of this EIR, approximately nine feet of undocumented fill material exists underneath the various sites within the LAMC campus proposed for building construction. With implementation of mitigation measures identified for the proposed project relative to the LAMC campus, this alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to geology and soils. Because all development proposed under this alternative would be confined to the existing campus boundaries, no impacts to geology and soils would occur on the Harding Street site under this alternative. Overall, therefore, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Geology and Soils.

4.6.5.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project would not occur on any undeveloped parcels of land. Potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would not be anticipated to occur at the same likelihood as the proposed project. Therefore, the Reduced Build-out within Existing Campus Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

4.6.5.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Development of this alternative would result in appropriate drainage control and thereby compensate for any increases in storm water runoff volumes that would be associated with an increase in impervious surfaces. Development of this alternative would also incorporate source and treatment control BMPs such that any potential impact associated with pollutant loads would be the same as those of the proposed project. Under this alternative, LAMC would still need to comply with the Construction General Permit. Compliance with this permit would entail implementing construction erosion and
sediment control measures, compliance with approved local plans and ordinances, as well as non-storm water management controls. Since violations of water quality standards would be minimized, impacts to water quality from construction and operation activities associated with these alternatives would be the same as the proposed project. Therefore, the Reduced Build-out within Existing Campus Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Hydrology and Water Quality.

4.6.5.9 Land Use and Planning

Since this alternative would not require any zoning changes or amendments it would not pose potential impacts to additional lands in the community such as might occur with the Harding Street site. This alternative would not result in conflicts with goals or policies of the LAMC Master Plan and would maintain the existing consistency with the Sylmar Community Plan and the City of Los Angeles Zoning Code. Therefore, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Land Use and Planning.

4.6.5.10 Noise

Construction and operational noise under this alternative would be increased but would be limited to the immediate area around the existing campus. The Harding Street area of the project would remain unaffected. Compared to the project, this alternative would result in a reduction of mobile source noise levels associated with vehicle traffic and truck deliveries as a result of the reduction in development, since the development activities would be condensed into one area and would lessen the amount of area impacted by noise. Since this alternative would reduce potential noise impacts, it would be environmentally superior to the project in relation to Noise.

4.6.5.11 Public Services and Utilities

As a result of the reduction of development area under the Reduced Build-Out within Existing Campus Alternative, this alternative would result in a slight reduction in demand for water and wastewater services and landfill disposal capacity compared to the proposed project. Potential impacts would still result related to water supply and wastewater collection and treatment, and mitigation measures would be required to reduced impacts to a less than significant level. Since potential impacts resulting from this alternative would be comparable to those under the proposed project, this alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Public Services and Utilities.

4.6.5.12 Recreation

Under this alternative, there would be no increase in utilization of local parks. However, since the proposed project will also not increase the use of local parks, this alternative would be neither superior nor inferior to the project in relation to Recreation.
4.6.5.13 Transportation and Circulation

This alternative would create more traffic than the project due to the concentration of growth at the main campus. The majority of all traffic coming and going to the campus would be distributed to Hubbard Street. Preliminary analysis showed that this will result in a significant degradation of intersections along Hubbard Street. Due to physical constraints, available mitigations measures are limited and some of these impacts would be unavoidable. Furthermore, due to this concentration, traffic and parking in and around the school would worsen resulting in negative impacts to the surrounding communities. Therefore, this alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project in relation to Transportation and Circulation.

4.6.5.14 Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

The Reduced Build-Out within Existing Campus Alternative would not achieve the following project objectives:

- **Objective a:** The primary objective to create a high quality, innovative and attractive physical college environment to promote academic excellence and service in the Mission College community, region and State for a projected enrollment of 15,000 students. Leading edge facilities, including buildings, classrooms, and laboratories, will support a strong comprehensive academic setting, provide technology opportunities, and encourage workforce development making Mission College a premier learning environment. (Reason: would not accommodate projected enrollment.)

- **Objective e:** To the extent practicable, design and locate buildings and facilities consistent with the policies, goals, and objectives of the City of Los Angeles General Plan and the Sylmar Community Plan, implement a site layout and architectural design that is compatible with adjacent land uses and the existing community character, and preserve, enhance and restore the natural environment at the campus. (Reason: would not enhance campus environment or improve compatibility with adjacent land uses.)

- **Objective f:** Maximize use of available vacant and under-utilized lands in proximity to the LAMC campus for the development of education opportunities available to the public. (Reason: would not utilize available vacant land.)

4.7 **Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Table 4-2 compares the impacts of the proposed project with those of the alternatives evaluated in this section. Where an alternative would cause impacts that would be worse
than those of the project, a “−” is shown. Where it would cause impacts that would be better than those of the project, a “+” is shown.

The table shows that the No Project Alternative would reduce or avoid the project’s significant aesthetics and air quality impacts but would increase significant traffic impacts. It would also have the same or better (less adverse) impacts than the project in all other categories except hydrology, which would worsen since existing drainage deficiencies would not be addressed. Compared to the project, the Compressed Alternative would worsen significant air quality impacts during construction and significant traffic impacts during operation. The Terra Vista Alternative would avoid the hillside viewshed impact of the project, but would add other aesthetic impacts and would not lessen any other impacts of the project. The Remote Centers Alternative would reduce significant aesthetics impacts and air quality impacts from construction but would worsen significant traffic impacts. The Reduced Build-Out Alternative would avoid the project’s significant aesthetic impacts at Harding Street but would potentially worsen aesthetic impacts at the LAMC campus and would worsen significant traffic impacts. It would lessen the project’s significant air quality impacts and impacts in several other categories.

This comparative analysis shows that No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior, since it would reduce project impacts in the most categories, including significant aesthetics and air quality impacts. The environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative would be the Reduced Build-Out within Existing Campus Alternative. This alternative would reduce the project’s significant impacts with respect to construction- and operation-related air emissions and would avoid significant aesthetics impacts at Harding Street.

The Reduced Build-Out alternative would meet most of the project objectives, but would not meet three objectives. First, because it would involve constructing fewer facilities, it would not be able to accommodate the planned growth in enrollment. Second, because it would occupy a greater portion of the LAMC campus, it would not be able to enhance the campus environment or allow as much buffer between the campus and surrounding community that would ensure it would be compatible with adjacent land uses and the existing community character. Third, it would not make use of available vacant and under-utilized lands for development.
Table 4-2

Significant Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared with Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Impact of Proposed Project</th>
<th>Alternative 1 No Project</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Compressed Plan</th>
<th>Alternative 3 New Site</th>
<th>Alternative 4 Remote Campus Centers</th>
<th>Alternative 5 Reduced Build-Out within Existing Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETICS</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Area</td>
<td>Impact of Proposed Project</td>
<td>Alternative 1 No Project</td>
<td>Alternative 2 Compressed Plan</td>
<td>Alternative 3 New Site</td>
<td>Alternative 4 Remote Campus Centers</td>
<td>Alternative 5 Reduced Build-Out within Existing Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Hydrology) (Water Quality)</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND USE AND PLANNING</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Hydrology)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Indicates level of significance after mitigation. Bolded project impacts would be significant after mitigation.

+ Impacts would be less adverse compared to the proposed Project (Environmentally Superior)

− Impacts would be more adverse compared to the proposed Project (Environmentally Inferior).

o Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project (Neither Environmentally Inferior nor Superior).