LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE FACILITIES MASTER PLAN
Draft Environmental Impact Report

Comments

Note: The purpose of tonight’s meeting is to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report only. You will have an opportunity to comment on the LAMC Master Plan during two public hearings before the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees in February 2007.

1. Comments on the environmental impacts of the Master Plan?
   I don’t think it will have any impacts environmentally. The land needs to be used wisely. I think expansion of Mission College would be a burden to our environment.

2. Comments on the Mitigation Measures?
   Community colleges will be impacted with the growth of the college at a niche and traffic wise. But like most proposals there are challenges and sacrifices of the resources for the students.

3. Other Comments?
   Please continue on the reverse as necessary.

Written comments may also be sent by December 4, 2006 to: Nick Quintanilla (c/o Michele Walters), Los Angeles Mission College, 13355 Eldridge Ave., Sylmar, CA 91342. Fax: (818) 367-4607, or E-mail Michele.Walters@PropositionA.org

Please print legibly: Name: Ralph Chavez Phone: N/A E-mail: N/A
Address: N/A
Thank you for your letter commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

**Responses to Comments**

Response to Comment 1:

The LACCD acknowledges your comment regarding the environmental impacts and benefits of expanding Mission College. No changes are proposed in the EIR as a result of this comment.

Response to Comment 2:

The LACCD agrees with your comment that noise and traffic levels will be impacted by the growth of the College. It has been determined in the Draft EIR that a less than significant impact with mitigation will occur due to operational noise as a result of this project. Also, it has been determined in the Draft EIR that all impacts to traffic, except for one, can be mitigated to a less than significant level. It has been determined that a significant unavoidable impact to traffic will occur at the intersection of Hubbard Street and the I-210 west-bound ramps. No changes are proposed in the EIR as a result of this comment.
Comments

Note: The purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report only. You will have an opportunity to comment on the LAMC Master Plan during two public hearings before the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees in February 2007.

1. Comments on the environmental impacts of the Master Plan?

   1. Study impact on railroad crossing at Harbor Blvd & Holly St
   2. Study traffic impact on Sylmar/San Fernando Train Station

2. Comments on the Mitigation Measures?

3. Other Comments?

Please continue on the reverse as necessary

Please print legibly: Name: Lila D. Duran Phone: 818-364-5230
Address: 14550 Saticoy St, #1350 Email: Lila.Duran@urs.com

Written comments may also be sent by December 4, 2006 to: Nick Quintanilla (c/o Michele Walters), Los Angeles Mission College, 13355 Eldridge Ave., Sylmar, CA 91342, Fax: (818) 367-4607, or E-mail: Michele.Walters@Proposition4.org
Thank you for your letter commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

**Responses to Comments**

**Response to Comment 1:**

See page 3.13-13 paragraph 4

In consultation with college staff, LADOT, and comments received during the Notice of Preparation process, the 28 key study area intersections shown on Table 3.13-5 have been identified for analysis in the traffic study. Please refer to the comment letter from the LA DOT concurring with the analysis in the Draft EIR.

**Response to Comment 2:**

See response to Comment 1.
1. Comments on the environmental impacts of the Master Plan?

This plan is much better than the previous one.
I support the Master Plan for Mission College with one suggestion below.

2. Comments on the Mitigation Measures?

Seem to be adequate, except for the need for a stop sign at intersection of Hubbard and Kismet by Hubbard Elementary School.

Please continue on the reverse as necessary.

Please print legibly: Name: Andrea Echavarri Phone: (310) 567-8782
Address: 13237 Calcutta St Sylmar, CA 91342
E-mail: i

Written comments may also be sent by December 4, 2006 to: Nick Quintanilla (c/o Michele Walters), Los Angeles Mission College, 13056 Eldridge Ave., Sylmar, CA 91342, Fax: (818) 367-4667, or E-mail: Michele.Walters@PnRpoollMotA.org
Thank you for your letter commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

**Responses to Comments**

Response to Comment 1:

The LACCD, as Lead Agency, concurs with these descriptive statements. No changes in the EIR are proposed as a result of this comment.

Response to Comment 2:


In consultation with college staff, LADOT, and comments received during the Notice of Preparation process, the 28 key study area intersections shown on Table 3.13-5 have been identified for analysis in the traffic study. Please refer to the comment letter from the LADOT.
RS DRAFT)
TUESDAY: NOVEMBER 28, 2006

YSIDRO ESPINOZA,

MR. ESPINOZA: I'm Ysidro Espinoza. I live at
13000 Cranston Avenue, the corner of Altano and
Cranston.

And I was talking to -- what's his name? I
forgot the name of the guy there, the one in the black
suit. He's the one talking to the people over there.

THE REPORTER: Brian, I think it is.

MR. ESPINOZA: Brian, okay. Write all of this down.

The guy that supposedly wanted to build the houses, he
told me that they would knock my block wall down and
extend, give me four feet into the field where the side
of the housing that they want to build. Did you
understand what I said?

Now, I want to know if the college gets it, if
they're going to do the same thing as what the builders
said they would do if they would go ahead and build
houses. And I want to know if the college gets it, if
they'll do the same thing. Did you get that?

Okay, then maybe I can add something else. If
the college gets the piece of land there, I would like to
see some sort of trees planted from Eldridge to Altano,
which is about two blocks, to have privacy besides my
block wall. You got that? That will be all.

(Off the record.)

PARK AVENUE DEPOSITION SERVICE

Page 1
MR. ESPINOZA: I would like to know, too, from Altano to Harding, because there's other neighbors there too that would probably -- I've never seen anybody mention or question that. Maybe I'm the first one. I want to know if the college builds, if they would extend from Altano to Harding the four feet that the house builder was willing to give us. I want to know if the college will do the same if they succeed in building their structures there in the field. That's it.

(off the record.)
Thank you for your letter commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

Responses to Comments

Response to Comment 1:

As a result of your comment, no action is required.

Response to Comment 2:

According to your comment, the developer of the residential project would offer four feet of additional property for your backyard.

Response to Comment 3:

You would like to know if the LAMC would make a similar offer. The LAMC is willing to consider such an offer.

Response to Comment 4:

The LAMC is working on a landscaping plan for the Harding Street site. Trees will be included in this plan. We invite you to review and comment on the landscaping plan.

Response to Comment 5:

See response to Comment 3.
1. Comments on the environmental impacts of the Master Plan: The situation regarding the pollution of the area due to fertilizers and other additives is not practical. "Proper use" sounds great but the reality is that low-paid workers who care in a hurry to finish their tasks.

2. Consideration of any water flow into the waste. This is currently maintain moisture and relatively clean

2. Comments on the Mitigation Measures: I understand the desire to block the view of parked cars from the streets, installing walls may not be the answer. Come on, a multitude of crimes could be committed out of view of the public. Car break-ins, muggings and rapes could easily be perpetrated outside the view of passerby.

2. Traffic mitigation efforts sound so if they provide it in a carpool. Has the DOT + Caltrans agreed to pay for all these street improvements? What is the guarantee that this cooperation will take place?

3. Other Comments: I received no notice regarding this meeting. I am also on the list to receive periodic news about this process. I have Yet to receive anything. Our community needs to be kept informed. Our community is for education but it appears the college is anti-residents? That needs to be more public meetings because this

Please continue on the reverse as necessary
This format is a bit heavy handed - do not allow any "public" comment from the floor is ridiculous. It appears this is an attempt to either divide and conquer by having the residents move from one station to the next.

I do support the Arrayo concept - functional, aesthetic, and ecological. Good job!
Thank you for your letter commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

Responses to Comments

Response to Comment 1:

Compliance with the mitigation measures will be monitored through the Mitigation Measure Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

Response to Comment 2:

Compliance with the mitigation measures will be monitored through the Mitigation Measure Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

Response to Comment 3:

(see page 3.11-8 of the Draft EIR)

The LACCD has addressed the adequacy of police services to the proposed project site. The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department provides basic police protection services to the existing LAMC campus through the Community College Bureau of the Sheriff’s Department, Field Operations Region II, which has an office within the Plan Facilities temporary building on the campus. This Sheriff’s unit serves the LAMC campus as well as the LAMC centers located at 13000 Sayre Street (Cultural Arts Center), 2843 Foothill Boulevard (Physical Education Building), and 11623 Glenoaks Boulevard (EDD Building). The office is approximately 1,605 gross square feet (gsf) in size. Table 3.11-1 lists the personnel assigned to the Sheriff’s on-campus unit. As shown, the unit currently consists of eight armed officers and two armed deputies. The deputies are sworn personnel of the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, while the officers have a civilian status. Additionally, the Sheriff’s Department recruits on average seven student worker cadets to assist the officers in policing the campus. The Sheriff’s office operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. For an event that necessitates greater security, the Sheriff’s office recruits and deploys additional student-worker cadets.15

The ten County Sheriff personnel employed to serve the LAMC campus work 7- to 12-hour shifts. Monday through Friday, the day shift is from 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.; while the night shift is from 3:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. There is also a graveyard shift from 10:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. The most current schedule for Monday through Friday includes two officers and one deputy during the day shift and the night shift, and one officer during the graveyard shift. On the weekends the campus is patrolled by one officer and one deputy or a sergeant.16 The County uses the broadly accepted national standard of one officer for every 1,000 persons as its guideline.17 The maximum campus population during daytime peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 3:59 p.m.) for Spring 2006 was an average of...
2,540 students, not included campus employees. Assuming this maximum campus population, the current Sheriff schedule for Monday through Friday equates to one officer for every 1,021 people on campus during daytime peak hours and one officer for every 920 people on campus during the evening hours. On the weekends, the current schedule equates to one officer for every 386 people on campus. With the exception of the daytime peak hours which is slightly over, the police-to-population ratios are well within the County and national standard of one officer for every 1,000 persons. Therefore, according to the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, scheduling changes occur on an as-needed basis to maintain police services to LAMC at County acceptable levels.

Response to Comment 4:

LAMC consulted with LADOT in the preparation of the traffic study and mitigation measures. The LADOT has concurred with the results of the traffic analysis (See letter from LADOT). The traffic mitigation measures are a necessary component of the LAMC Master Plan and LAMC will coordinate with LADOT on the timing and funding of these mitigation measures.

Response to Comment 5:

The LAMC exceeded the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act for public noticing, as well as the noticing provisions of the LACCD CEQA Guidelines. Please refer to Appendix for a complete description of the public outreach and involvement process.

Response to Comment 6:

The format of the public comment meetings provided several mechanisms for members of the public to provide comments on the Draft EIR including written comments and oral comments. All oral comments were transcribed and published in the Final EIR. In addition, written comments were accepted throughout the 45 day public review period. Please refer to Appendix for a complete description of the public outreach and involvement process.

Response to Comment 7:

Thank you for your support of the Arroyo concept. The LACCD acknowledges your comment. No change in the EIR is required as a result of this comment.
LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE FACILITIES MASTER PLAN
Draft Environmental Impact Report

Comments

Note: The purpose of tonight’s meeting is to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report only. You will have an opportunity to comment on the LAMC Master Plan during two public hearings before the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees in February 2007.

1. Comments on the environmental impacts of the Master Plan?

2. Comments on the Mitigation Measures?

3. Other Comments?

Please print legibly: Name: [Handwritten Name]
Address: [Handwritten Address]
Phone: [Handwritten Phone Number]
E-mail: [Handwritten E-mail]

Written comments may also be sent by December 4, 2006 to: Nick Quintella (c/o Michele Walters), Los Angeles Mission College, 13356 Eldridge Ave., Sylmar, CA 91342, Fax: (818) 364-4607, or E-mail: Michele.Walters@PropositionA.org.
a magnitude 7 or greater earthquake by the year 2024 is as high as 80 to 90%.

How the threat from earthquake ground shaking varies across Southern California is shown on a new hazard map. This map, derived from decades of work by scientists in government, universities, and private industry, shows how often any location in the region is likely to experience earthquake shaking strong enough to inflict damage. The map was prepared by the Southern California Earthquake Center, a consortium funded largely by the U.S. Geological Survey and the National Science Foundation.

Such maps of expected earthquake shaking help those responsible for public safety decide where actions to reduce future earthquake losses will be most effective. For example, these maps help the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) decide which bridges should have priority for seismic strengthening. In the years between the 1971 San Fernando and the 1994 Northridge earthquakes, Caltrans reinforced more than 100 freeway overpasses in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. Not one of these reinforced freeway overpasses failed in the 1994 shock, whereas seven unreinforced spans in the same area collapsed. These positive results have led Caltrans to step up the pace of this program—they are convinced that every dollar spent on seismic reinforcements will save many dollars by averting future losses. Another 700 bridges and overpasses in the two counties are scheduled for strengthening by the end of 1997.

As well as guiding such seismic strengthening projects, earthquake hazard maps are used by engineers in designing earthquake-resistant structures, by planners in establishing wise land-use policies, by emergency managers for drawing disaster response plans, and by insurance experts for analyzing risks and loss exposure. Furthermore, the data underlying the maps are used by engineers to assess specific hazards at particular sites and develop safe design solutions. Earthquakes may be inevitable, but earthquake disasters are not. Scientists and engineers are continuously working to understand earthquake hazards better. This improved knowledge helps guide steps to reduce future earthquake losses. The result is that residents of Southern California and other seismically active areas of the United States can live with greater peace of mind in earthquake country.

Kenneth W. Hudnut, James J. Mori, William H. Prescott, and Peter H. Steffler

COOPERATING AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS
California Department of Transportation
California Division of Mines and Geology
California Institute of Technology
City and County of Los Angeles
Columbia University
National Science Foundation
Southern California Earthquake Center
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of California, San Diego
University of Southern California

For more information contact:
Earthquake Information Hotline (415) 329-4033
U. S. Geological Survey, Mail Stop 877
245 Middletown Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025
http://quake.wr.usgs.gov

U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 71-147
1995
Thank you for your letter commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

Response to Comments

Response to comment 1:

The Los Angeles Mission College site, like all of southern California, is situated within a seismically active area dominated by numerous active faults. Ongoing regional studies of tectonics, such as the LARSE project referenced by the reviewer, aim to provide detail on the complex nature of tectonics and the associated seismicity of the very complex Los Angeles basin. Given the proximity to significant seismic sources, fault rupture and ground shaking were addressed respectively in Sections 3.6.3.1 and 3.6.3.2 of the Draft EIR as the primary geologic hazards for the proposed site. Furthermore, mitigation measures for these significant hazards are addressed in Section 3.6.4 on page 3.6-17. As discussed in Section 3.6.5 (Level of Significance after Mitigation), implementation of the specified mitigation measures would reduce their associated impacts to less than significant.
Manucog, Lorraine K.

From: Manucog, Lorraine K.
To: Harang, Ernest H. (LAMC)
Cc: 

Subject: USES, Penmar/Park, CA. Contact for earthquake Survey Information to identify seismic hazards beneath the land at McClay and Eidridge.

Attachments:

Halee Dr. Moreno:

Thank you for the fantastic session at the recent College Council meeting with Gary Colombo and you were the main contact for all of us.

I wish to pass on some information that may require your attention.

In February, 2000 Dr. Gary Fuls, Geophysicist with USES was guest presented of his work in LARSE (Los Angeles Region Seismic Survey). He had done extensive work in testing the Los Angeles Basin for Earthquake potential. He took a transect of the landscape from Long Beach to Palindale and detonated hundreds of fertilizer bombs deep into the ground and planted multiple seismographs (seismometers) which registered the pattern of seismity at each location. I have some of his materials. The Maps that chart his work show Sylnstar to be located IN AN AREA AT THE FOOTHILLS OF THE SAN GABRIEL MOUNTAINS AND HIS DOCUMENT PUTS OUR IMMEDIATE AREA IN A SEISMICITY POTENTIAL FOR HAVING 1 OR 2 EARTHQUAKES PER CENTURY.

We have had the predicted earthquake with its focus and epicenter on the north facing slopes of the San Gabriel mountains on the Santa Clarita side of the I-5 Newhall Pass (closer to Highway 14). That one took place in 1971 about 6:30 a.m. on a week day. It measured 8.7 on the Richter Magnitude Scale. The second earthquake centered on the hidden and unknown fault, now called the Northridge Thrust Fault. It occurred on Jan. 17, 1994 at 4:31 a.m. Its magnitude was also 8.7 on the Richter Scale. Most people felt the Northridge Quake was actually stronger since it killed 57 people and brought down the I-5 and Highway 14 interchange. People fell out of their beds, the shaking went both up and down and sideways. I felt it 200 miles away in Bakersfield at exactly 4:31 a.m. Since I have a son living in Ventura county off of interstate 101, I called them to get some details and see how they made it through.

Now why do I tell you all this?

I believe that the property at the end of McClay and Eidridge should be assessed for two things. The first and most important is to get the United States Geologic Survey crew down from from Sylmar Park, CA to test for seismicity in their very inexpensive and non intrusive methods to obtain a "good faith report" about this matter. Perhaps they can extrapolate the information we seek from previous testing. See the map showing the two transects (Line 1 and Line 2) in the accompanying map completed just a few years ago in 2000.

Secondly, they can do a soil test, if it is needed. This may be done at no cost to us. This is their work. We are in dire need or this kind of help and then have the report to be informed about this aspect of the vacant land and vicinity we hope to obtain for construction. It is an emergency situation.

Below is their web site and other information to contact the correct desk.

For more information contact:
Southern California Earthquake Center
University of Southern California, Mail Code 0741 Los Angeles, CA, 90089-0742, Tel (213) 740-0329
http://www.scec.usc.edu
Lorraine Manucog manucog@lacc.cccd.cc.ca.us, Extension 7706

P. S. Furthermore, Dr. Fuls clearly stated that the Los Angeles Basin and particular sites such as the south facing San Gabriel Mountains are protected from the affects of a possible San Andreas Fault shift. The deep roots of the San Gabriel Mountains are a natural fortress to absorb most of the potentially damaging crustal movements. The nice thing about the San Andreas Fault is it is not a mountain builder, it is a fault that transforms the surface by shifting the Mojave Desert to the southwest and the Los Angeles Basin moves to the northwest. The rupture is there, but the relief of the land slides along in opposite directions. The reason the San Andreas Fault is so prominent is because it is 600 miles long. It is a plate tectonic boundary between the Pacific Plate and the North American Plate. So for all San Francisco and its vicinity have had a big one 8.5 back in April 19, 1906. This year was its 100 year birthday.

Also note the black diagram on U.S. Fact sheet 14-19 in lower right hand corner of the colored brochure. It shows the Ms. Tottin value of 4.2. It was a big one too. 7.0 on the Richter Magnitude scale. Ms. Tottin was just limited. The military men fell for a test in Bakersfield. They were not hit back in Fort Pollock. It was 100% demolished. That would be a 7 on the Modified Scale of intensity.

The dates, magnitude scales, and locations and type of faults tell us that the 1 or 2 per century is a reasonable interval of time and Sylnstar can bear this burden as it does many of its other concerns.

I think I should bring this information to the public hearings on Nov. 18 and Nov. 20. What say you?

Lorraine
Thank you for your time.
Thank you for your letter commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

Response to Comments

Response to comment 1: The Los Angeles Mission College site, like all of southern California, is situated within a seismically active area dominated by numerous active faults. As discussed on page 3.6-8 in the Faults and Seismicity section of the Draft EIR, the immediate site area has been subject to several historic earthquakes the most notable of which were the 1994 Northridge (M_w=6.7), and the 1971 Sylmar (M_w=6.6) earthquakes.

Response to comment 2: Several site specific geotechnical and geologic investigations were previously performed at the proposed LAMC expansion sites as described on page 3.6-7 in the Subsurface Conditions section as well as Section 3.6.3.1 (Surface Fault Rupture) on page 3.6-10. These previous investigations address both seismicity and subsurface conditions at the site and provide preliminary engineering recommendations for potential development. We recommend that further site specific investigations be performed as part of the design phase of construction.

It is our understanding that the USGS will typically not perform site specific investigations for site development. Generally, the scope of work performed by the USGS pertains to larger scale scientific research as part of a federal grant similar to the LARSE project as referenced by the reviewer.

Response to comment 3: The site is subject to periodic seismic shaking, perhaps of considerable intensity by both the San Andreas Fault and numerous other faults in the vicinity. Potential seismic sources within 50 kilometers of the proposed site are presented in Table 3.6.1. It is correct that one or more substantial earthquakes may be felt in the site area over the course of a hundred year period. However, to date, earthquake prediction is an inexact science at best.

Response to comment 4: It is our opinion that the information brought up within the letter to Dr. Ernest Moreno (dated 10/21/06) is sufficiently addressed within Section 3.6 of the LAMC Draft EIR. This is typically how this information is conveyed. Additional background information on regional tectonics or historical seismicity could help illustrate seismic hazards if specific questions come up, but we see no need to volunteer additional information.
LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE FACILITIES MASTER PLAN
Draft Environmental Impact Report

Comments

Note: The purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report only. You will have an opportunity to comment on the LAMC Master Plan during two public hearings before the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees in February 2007.

1. Comments on the environmental impacts of the Master Plan?

What you call "new" is not new at all!

a. no new homes or homes built under

b. no new homes built outside

c. no new homes built on

What good is a "new" school when students have to walk everywhere?

2. Comments on the Mitigation Measures?

Traffic issues

Traffic issues

3. Other Comments?

A) Need to restrict tie not allowed parking in

B) Some students want more than 2 hours in street

Please continue on the reverse as necessary

Please print legibly: Name: Gloria Walsh Phone: 213-387-1448
Address: 18450 La Tuna Canyon Road
E-mail: walters@lamarcc.edu

Written comments may also be sent by December 4, 2006 to: Nick Quintanilla (to Michelle Walters), Los Angeles Mission College, 13356 El Monte Ave., Sylmar, CA 91342, Fax: (818) 397-4607, or E-mail: Michelle.Walters@PropositionA.org
Thank you for your letter commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

**Responses to Comments**

Response to comment 1:
The Draft EIR adequately addresses the impacts to Aesthetics, and has determined that there is a significant unavoidable impact. The view of the San Gabriel Mountains will be obscured by the proposed buildings on the Harding Street site when looking east towards across the Harding Street site from the street on the southwest corner of Eldridge Avenue and Harding Street. No changes in the EIR are necessary in response to this comment.

Response to comment 2:
See page 3.13-50 paragraph 3. Maclay Street will operate at an acceptable level of service under future 2015 conditions.

Response to comment 3:
See page 3.13-51 paragraph 2. Planned parking capacity will exceed future demand and no significant impacts will occur.

Response to comment 4:
*(see page 3.10-13 and 3.10-14 of the Draft EIR)*

Parking area noise would be predominantly generated by automobile, light duty truck, and van-related activity, with an occasional bus using the on-site parking areas. Potentially noticeable noises generated by use of a parking area are associated with car door slams, engine starts, raised voices from vehicle occupants, and loud car stereos. Slow speed light-duty vehicle movement would contribute negligible noise. Infrequent noises may include horn honking and loud exhaust pipes. These levels of intermittent sound, while audible, would not cause a significant impact because they would be similar to the level of background noise in the area. A detailed analysis is provided in Section 3.10.3.3 of the Draft EIR.

The traffic volumes associated with project trips would have the potential to increase roadway noise levels on local roadways around the LAMC area. Expansion of the college also has the potential to increase roadway noise levels on local roadways around LAMC from additional students traveling to and from the campus. This increase in traffic noise is below the threshold of significance for noise impact, thus roadway noise impacts...
would be less than significant. A detailed analysis is provided in Section 3.10.3.3 of the Draft EIR.

The Project is planned to provide substantial additional on-site parking for students, staff and visitors. This should reduce the existing volume of off-campus parking on local residential streets. To the extent that students, staff and visitors cause intermittent noise because they are looking for parking places, the project would reduce these existing activities, thus providing a beneficial effect of reducing the noise associated with off-campus parking in local neighborhoods. A detailed analysis is provided in Section 3.10.3.3 of the Draft EIR.

Noise emissions from operation of the Project facilities would be less than significant due to prudent design features of future campus facilities. Section 3.10.5 of the DEIR provides mitigation measures to further mitigate less than significant noise impacts.

Response to comment 5:
See page 3-13.52 of the Draft EIR, paragraphs 2, 3, and 4. The College is adding less than 150 vehicles trips to the I-210 east of Polk Street and therefore does not warrant Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan freeway segment analysis.

Response to comment 6:
(see page 3.11-8 of the Draft EIR)

The LACCD has addressed the adequacy of police services to the proposed project site. Upon evaluation it has been determined that the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department provides basic police protection services to the existing LAMC campus through the Community College Bureau of the Sheriff’s Department, Field Operations Region II, which has an office within the Plan Facilities temporary building on the campus. This Sheriff’s unit serves the LAMC campus as well as the LAMC centers located at 13000 Sayre Street (Cultural Arts Center), 2843 Foothill Boulevard (Physical Education Building), and 11623 Glenoaks Boulevard (EDD Building). The office is approximately 1,605 gross square feet (gsf) in size. Table 3.11-1 lists the personnel assigned to the Sheriff’s on-campus unit. As shown, the unit currently consists of eight armed officers and two armed deputies. The deputies are sworn personnel of the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, while the officers have a civilian status. Additionally, the Sheriff’s Department recruits on average seven student worker cadets to assist the officers in policing the campus. The Sheriff’s office operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. For an event that necessitates greater security, the Sheriff’s office recruits and deploys additional student-worker cadets. 15

The ten County Sheriff personnel employed to serve the LAMC campus work 7- to 12-hour shifts. Monday through Friday, the day shift is from 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.; while the night shift is from 3:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. There is also a graveyard shift from 10:00
p.m. to 8:00 a.m. The most current schedule for Monday through Friday includes two officers and one deputy during the day shift and the night shift, and one officer during the graveyard shift. On the weekends the campus is patrolled by one officer and one deputy or a sergeant. The County uses the broadly accepted national standard of one officer for every 1,000 persons as its guideline. The maximum campus population during daytime peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 3:59 p.m.) for Spring 2006 was an average of 2,540 students, not included campus employees. Assuming this maximum campus population, the current Sheriff schedule for Monday through Friday equates to one officer for every 1,021 people on campus during daytime peak hours and one officer for every 920 people on campus during the evening hours. On the weekends, the current schedule equates to one officer for every 386 people on campus. With the exception of the daytime peak hours which is slightly over, the police-to-population ratios are well within the County and national standard of one officer for every 1,000 persons. Therefore, according to the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, scheduling changes occur on an as-needed basis to maintain police services to LAMC at County acceptable levels.

Response to comment 7:
See page 3.13.54 of the Draft EIR traffic mitigations measures T-10, T-11, and T-13. The College is signalizing two intersections on Maclay Street at Gladstone and Fenton Avenues to provide relief from congestion at these two stop-controlled intersections. Signalizing these two intersections will eliminate delays currently experienced on Maclay Street. Furthermore, the College, according to LADOT guidelines, and in coordination with LADOT and the public will develop and fund a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to reduce impacts to the neighborhoods.

Response to comment 8:
The College is not proposing any changes to current parking restrictions on Harding Street. Residents can request changes to parking restrictions through the LADOT.

Response to comment 9:
The college is developing plans to restripe Eldridge Avenue to implement angled parking on the east side (college side) of the street between Hubbard Avenue and Harding Street. Currently there is unrestricted parallel parking along both sides of this section of Eldridge Avenue. The proposed angled parking will similarly not be time restricted. In addition to a westbound travel lane, LADOT guidelines call for an additional lane for vehicles to back into that is separate from the travel lane. Furthermore, the roadway would be striped with a double-yellow line in the middle making it illegal to cross. By implementing angled parking along the north side of Eldridge Avenue, the total on-street parking capacity will increase by approximately 44%. This will provide users of the college with a free parking alternative and will encourage users to park on the east side of Eldridge Avenue and will reduce demand for parking spaces in the adjacent neighborhoods and at the Golf Course. If residents wish to implement time restricted, metered, or permit parking they may do so through LADOT.
Response to comment 10:
See page 3.13.17 of the Draft EIR Table 3.13-7 and page 3.13-18 paragraph 5.

Residents also raised concerns about students traveling from Maclay Street, up Gavina Avenue, and around to Hubbard Avenue to reach the school. The direct route from Maclay Avenue / I-215 Interchange to Eldridge Avenue to the College is 1.5 miles. To drive up Maclay Street to Gavina Avenue and around to Hubbard Avenue to reach the school is 3.6 miles. There is direct access to the College via Maclay Street, Hubbard Avenue, and Polk Street via Eldridge Avenue. There is no logical reason students would travel 2.1 miles further to reach the school. Existing average daily traffic (ADT) on Maclay Street south of Harding Street is 7,311. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation manual indicates that each single family residential unit will generate an average of ten (10) trips per day. Using this average, this 900 home community will generate approximately 9,000 trips per day (900 X 10 = 9,000). If students were using this route in significant numbers the ADT count would reflect this and the ADT count would be higher than 9,000. Furthermore, additional traffic counts (also shown in Table 3.13-7) show that students are using Fenton Avenue and Harding Street to reach Eldridge Avenue and travel to the College.

Due to these facts the impacts are less than significant and no further analysis or mitigation is warranted.
-----Original Message-----
From: Tom [mailto:tom@weissbarth.us]
Sent: Sunday, December 03, 2006 10:14 PM
To: Walters, Michele
Cc: 'Bonnie Bernard'; tom@weissbarth.us
Subject: Comments on LAMC Facilities Master Plan Draft Program EIR

c/o Michele Walters, Office Manager
Gateway Science & Engineering
Los Angeles Mission College
13356 Eldridge Avenue
Sylmar, CA 91342

Phone (818) 367-7236 Fax: (818) 367-4507
E-mail: Michele.Walters@PropositionA.org

Please include the following comments when preparing the final EIR.

This project as shown in the tables spans 7 or eight years. This assumes funding is available to complete it on this timeline. Table ES-3 lists numerous traffic impacts as less than significant due to mitigation that will be implemented at the completion of project construction.

Significant portions of the project will be complete at least five years before the project is complete. This seems to be a long gap between impact and mitigation. Should this be disclosed and or the mitigations put in place earlier? Does providing fair share contribution toward mitigation mean the mitigation will ever be done? Should these impacts be considered to be mitigated?

Lighting at the Harding location is not being given the scrutiny it needs. There are nocturnal animals that live in the debris basin adjacent and the lighting level there is critical. I believe that lighting is a potential significant impact to both the wildlife and the view of adjacent homes and should be listed along with specific mitigations such as specific types and levels of security and other lighting in order to assure an insignificant level of impact.

The County golf course currently discharges water onto Eldridge. The water flows toward Harding and the 2cen Harding into the flood control drains. This water not only damages the roadway but seems to promote the growth of lush plants as though the water has very high nitrogen content. This run off should be dealt with if any construction is done at that intersection.

Thank you,

Tom Weissbarth
13317 Almetz St
Sylmar, CA 91342
Responses to Comments

Response to Comment 1:

Traffic improvements required to mitigate the effects of each subsequent project will be implemented on a schedule which is determined by the LADOT in order to mitigate impacts as they occur.

Response to Comment 2:

The LACCD disagrees with this comment regarding the generation of substantial light impacts on the Harding Street Site. Section 3.1.3.4 of the Draft EIR addresses new sources of light and glare on the Harding Street Site. It is determined in the Draft EIR that any new sources of light on the Harding Street Site will not be significantly beyond the character of the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Light will not be introduced that increases nighttime illumination levels beyond the property line of the project site, or spillover onto a light-sensitive land use. The structure on the northern parcel of the Harding Street Site is only adjacent to El Cariso Golf Course and the Pacoima Wash, thereby providing no light impact to residential areas. The above ground structure on the southern parcel of the Harding Street Site will be next to Maclay Street, away from the residential homes adjacent to the property. Any temporary surface parking lots will have lighting for security purposes. All surface parking lot lighting will be designed, located and arranged so as to reflect the light away from any streets, adjacent premises and biologically sensitive areas.

Response to Comment 3:

Existing runoff from the County golf course should be addressed with the golf course operator by the appropriate local jurisdictions, which are most likely both the City of Sylmar and the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. Since the existing runoff will continue irrespective of the Project, the local jurisdictions would be the appropriate venue for addressing this issue.

Phase I of the Project does not contemplate any re-construction of the Eldridge Avenue and Harding Street intersection. Phase II of the Project would extend Eldridge Avenue southeast to Maclay Street. As stated in the DEIR, the Project will effectively address stormwater and urban runoff from the Project through compliance with the SWRCB General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit (General Construction Permit) (NPDES No. CAS000002, Order No. 99-08-DWQ) and through the implementation of stormwater source control and treatment control Best Management Practices (BMPs).
after completion of Project construction. During operation of the new college facilities, treatment control BMPs for the catchments associated with new connections may be required as a condition for these connections to City or County drainage facilities (e.g., underground storm drains, flood control channels, etc.).
From: brokertim@comcast.net [mailto:brokertim@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, October 23, 2006 5:30 PM

To: Walters, Michele

Subject: Mission College expansion

October 23, 2006

Mr. Nick Quintanilla, Construction Manager
c/o Michele Walters, Office Manager
Gateway Science & Engineering
Los Angeles Mission College
13356 Eldridge Avenue
Sylmar, CA 91342

The following was taken from the draft EIR recently released concerning the Mission College Expansion program. This traffic study identifies a significant impact at the Fenton Avenue roadway segment between Harding Street and Maclay Street, where Harding Street Elementary Schools is situated. It would be reasonable to assume that impacts at this roadway segment are related to college students and staff using the Maclay St. on/off ramp when commuting to the college.

Summary from DEIR:

From these volumes we can see that there are a significant number of vehicles using the Fenton/Harding neighborhood for travel in the study area.

? 1,427 vehicles turned from eastbound Eldridge Avenue south onto Gridley in a 24hr period indicating students are using this path.

? While 1,930 vehicles turned from northbound Maclay Avenue west onto Fenton Avenue in a 24hr period, this is the main access route for a large residential neighborhood and therefore less.

Certainty is gained from this number in ascertaining how many students are using this path.
969 vehicles turned from eastbound Eldridge Avenue southonto Harding Streetin a 24hr period
indicating that students are using this path. This number in particular is a good indicator that
Students are using this path in their travel to and from the school.

Based on this information the number of students using the neighborhoods as a route to and from the
College is significant. It should be noted that all of the studied roadways are functioning at an acceptable LOS. Several strategies the College will be implementing to ensure that College generated traffic does not
utilize neighborhood streets in the future are discussed in the following chapters.

The proposed project would result in significant impacts to the following four (4) roadway segments:

? Gridley Street from Eldridge Avenue to Fenton Avenue
? Fenton Avenue from Gridley Street to Maclay Avenue
? Harding Street from Eldridge Avenue to Fenton Avenue

These roadways are bordered by single-family residential uses on one or both sides. As an alternative to
widening these roadways, which would affect residential properties and disrupt the community character, a
Neighborhood Traffic Management (NTM) Plan is proposed which provides a process for identifying,
evaluating, and implementing specific traffic calming measures for the affected roadway segments in
consultation with neighborhood residents. With appropriate public participation and implementation of the
resultant traffic calming recommendations this mitigation measure would reduce project impacts by
diverting College related traffic onto major roadways using signage and traffic calming measures. These
measures would reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.

Due to the built-out nature of the Sylmar Community and untenable impacts to residents, no physical
roadway improvements can be realized in the study area. LADOT guidelines state that the applicant should
coordinate with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Management (NTM) Plan. This is discussed in
detail in Chapter 10.0.

10.0 Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan Implementation

To prevent and control college related traffic from traveling through the neighborhoods in the surrounding
Area; Mission College will develop and fund a Neighborhood Traffic Management (NTM) Plan to reduce
impacts on adjacent residential areas. The NTM will be prepared in conformance to guidelines established
by the LADOT Community Programs Division and will contain the following elements:

? Description of existing facility and neighborhood traffic conditions
? Descriptions of proposed neighborhood traffic controls including preliminary street modification.
Analysis of any change in existing or future patterns as a result of implementation of the plan.

Implementation and monitoring program.

Cost estimate.

Funding responsibility and guarantees.

Potential measures to control college related traffic include:

- Signage is the study area directing users to the College via major roadways.
- Signage indicating Neighborhood Traffic Only and No Through Traffic.
- Speed Humps (neighborhood initiated, college funded).
- Traffic Circles (neighborhood initiated, college funded).
- Parking Facilities / Access (school initiated new parking, driveways, and Eldridge Ave. extension).

My comments to the DEIR:

1) The Mitigation measures addresses the need for traffic calming measures and new area signage. This is mitigation deferral and is not acceptable according to CEQA Guidelines.

2) The threatening verbiage used? As an alternative to widening these roadways? is not well taken by neighbors in this community who live on roadways with fixed curbs and sidewalks.

3) Widening these roadways would also affect Harding Street Elementary School. Has the college contacted LAUSD on their plans to disrupt the school character by taking some of their property?

4) The DEIR states: ? Due to the built-out nature of the Sylmar Community and untenable impacts to residents, no physical roadway improvements can be realized.
in the study area?. Isn't this a conflict to the widened these roadways? statement?

5) Why are the proposed stoplights at the intersections of Maclay and Gladstone and Maclay and Fenton not implemented immediately? The traffic problem is already here!

6) Why wait until 2015 until Eldridge Avenue and Maclay are connected? What will keep the college students out of the residential neighborhoods until then? The traffic problem is already here!

7) The section of Project Comparison between the Compressed Plan and the Project, under the Project plan you state? Traffic generation and distribution will be dispersed over a larger area of the roadway network resulting in reduced impacts. A significant number of trips will be distributed to Maclay Avenue lessening the impacts on Hubbard Street ? Isn't this in direct conflict with what you have already stated that the intersections at Maclay and Gladstone and Maclay and Fenton are a significant problem area? How will this help keep students and staff from driving into residential neighborhoods on their commute to the college?

8) Allowing diagonal parking on Eldridge Avenue to gain more parking spaces is a bad idea. Students will be backing out of their parking spaces while other students are speeding by hurrying to class. Traffic accidents will increase ten fold. Eldridge Avenue would have to be narrowed to accommodate this, adding to traffic back up in front of the college. J walking is already a problem on Eldridge as students don't use the cross walks. This would only add to the problem.

9) Under the ?Significant Unavoidable Impacts section?, you state: ?No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the project?'s future significant impacts on Hubbard Street/I-210 westbound ramps during the am and pm peak hours at the completion of either Phase 1 ? 2010 or Phase 2-2015?. Why are you even considering a Mission College expansion plan at this time with such a disastrous prognosis for this off ramp? What will make the Maclay off ramp any different? Maclay narrows to a single lane each way northbound within 200 yards of the off ramp without any plans for the widening of Maclay.

With all of the above listed objections and concerns, I am totally against any expansion to Mission College at its present location. An offsite extension should be pursued which doesn't present the traffic and safety problems that this plan presents.

Sincerely,

Tim Wilkins
13012 Fenton Ave.
Sylmar, Ca 91342
Thank you for your letter commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

**Responses to Comments**

Response to Comment 1:
See responses to traffic related comments below.

Response to Comment 2:
See page 3.13-55 paragraph 2 (below) of the Draft EIR. “LADOT guidelines state that if significant traffic impacts occur on roadway segments and no physical roadway improvements can be realized the project applicant should coordinate with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Management (NTM) Plan. The affected roadway segments are bordered by single-family residential on one or both sides. This makes widening these roadways infeasible. Therefore, to mitigate project traffic impacts to these roadways, a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan must be developed.”

Response to Comment 3:
The statements made in the DEIR stating that physical mitigation to residential roadways are “infeasible” was never intended to be construed as a threat to the residents. Rather, the document points out that physical mitigation to neighborhood roadways are “untenable” because of the negative impact to residents. The alternative, according to LADOT guidelines, is the implementation of a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan.

Response to Comment 4:
See page 3.13-55 paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Draft EIR. The College has not proposed widening any roadways in the study area.

Response to Comment 5:
See page 3.13-55 paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Draft EIR. The College has not proposed widening any roadways in the study area.

Response to Comment 6:
The proposed signalization of Maclay Street and Gladstone Avenue and Maclay Street and Fenton Avenue are in response to impacts caused by future College expansion. The College is proposing signalizing these two intersections to mitigate future impacts of
added College related trips due to expansion. The College is not required to mitigate existing deficiencies. Residents can contact LADOT to request further analysis and mitigations at these locations.

Response to Comment 7:
The proposed extension of Eldridge Avenue is in response to impacts caused by future College expansion. The College is proposing extending Eldridge Avenue from Harding Street to Maclay Street to mitigate future impacts of added College related trips due to expansion. The College is not required to mitigate existing deficiencies in the roadway network. The College has proposed a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan in accordance with LADOT guidelines to mitigate the impacts of College users on the neighborhoods. Residents can contact LADOT to request further analysis, traffic calming devices, signage, and other measures to reduce pass-through traffic.

Response to Comment 8:

The analysis concludes that stop-controlled intersections along Maclay Street will operate at unacceptable levels and should be signalized as a mitigation measure. The analysis also shows that this mitigation will eliminate congestion on Maclay Street. Analysis also shows that Maclay Street will operate at an acceptable level of service under Future 2015 conditions (LOS D or better). Therefore, the statement that under the Extended Plan, projects impacts will be reduced due to dispersion of trips, is not in conflict with the analysis. The Extended Campus Plan (Phase I) will not keep students and staff from driving into residential neighborhoods and no such claim was made in the report. The College will implement a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan in accordance with LADOT guidelines to mitigate neighborhood impacts.

Response to Comment 9:
See page 3.13.11 paragraph 3 of the Draft EIR.

The college is developing plans to restripe Eldridge Avenue to implement angled parking on the east side (college side) of the street between Hubbard Avenue and Harding Street. Currently there is unrestricted parallel parking along both sides of this section of Eldridge Avenue. The proposed angled parking will similarly not be time restricted. In addition to a westbound travel lane, LADOT guidelines call for an additional lane for vehicles to back into that is separate from the travel lane. Furthermore, the roadway would be striped with a double-yellow line in the middle making it illegal to cross. By implementing angled parking along the north side of Eldridge Avenue, the total on-street parking capacity will increase by approximately 44%. This will provide users of the college with a free parking alternative and will encourage users to park on the east side of Eldridge Avenue and will reduce demand for parking spaces in the adjacent neighborhoods and at the Golf Course. If residents wish to implement time restricted, metered, or permit parking they may do so through LADOT.
Response to Comment 10:
See page 3.13-56 paragraph 4

3.13.10 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the project’s future significant impacts on Hubbard Street/I-210 westbound ramps during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours at the completion of either Phase 1 - 2010 or Phase 2 - 2015. Impacts to this intersection remain significant and unavoidable because improvements to this ramp would be physically and institutionally infeasible. The College has a mandate to meet the needs of the community it serves and cannot be restricted by lack of capacity on state highways. Furthermore, the College has no rights to procure right-of-way adjacent to Caltrans facilities, either through purchase or eminent domain. There is insufficient right of way to improve the intersection by widening it. Since the intersection is owned and operated by Caltrans, Caltrans would need to initiate a more global interchange improvement before on-ramp improvements would be made. Caltrans has no published plans to make such improvements. Completing planning, design, and construction of such a plan would take many years and has not been funded.
November 8, 2006

Mr. Nick Quintanilla, Construction Manager  
C/o Michele Walters, Office Manager  
Gateway Science & Engineering  
Los Angeles Mission College  
13356 Eldridge Avenue  
Sylmar, CA 91342  

Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan  
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report  

The following is a direct quote from the DEIR:

3.14 Significant Unavoidable Impacts  
Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR shall:  
"Describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications and the reasons why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, should be described."

3.14.3 Transportation/ Traffic  
No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the project's future significant impacts on Hubbard Street/I-210 westbound ramps during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours. Impacts to this intersection remain significant and unavoidable because improvements to this ramp would be physically and institutionally infeasible. There is insufficient right of way to improve the intersection by widening it. Since the intersection is owned and operated by Caltrans, Caltrans would need to initiate a more global interchange improvement before on-ramp improvements could be made. Caltrans has no published plans to make such improvements. Completing planning, design, and construction of such a plan would take many years and has not been founded. Impacts to traffic at this location would remain significant and unavoidable. Q. Why are we even considering a Mission College expansion plan at this time with such a disastrous prognosis for this off ramp?
If the traffic study was being honest, they should make the same statement about Maclay Street/I-210 westbound and eastbound ramps during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours. The traffic to this off ramp is already significant and the mitigation measures listed in the DEIR are inadequate. Maclay Street narrows to a single lane each way northbound of the I-210 within 200 yards of the off ramp and there are no plans for the widening of Maclay Street. Why not? Large sections of Maclay Street have no fixed curbs or sidewalks in that area. An easement must already exist to widen the Maclay Street at the city's description.

Why are the proposed stoplights at the Intersections of Maclay and Gladstone and Maclay and Fenton not implemented immediately rather than wait until 2010? The traffic problem is already here!

Why wait until 2015 until Eldridge Avenue and Maclay are connected? What will keep college students from driving through our residential neighborhoods until then? The traffic problem is already here!

The DEIR section of Project Comparison between the Compressed Plan and the proposed project states "traffic generation and distribution will be dispersed over a larger area of the roadway networks resulting in reduced traffic impacts. A significant number of trips will be distributed to Maclay Street lessening the impacts on Hubbard Street." Isn't this in direct conflict with what has already been stated that the Intersections at Maclay and Gladstone and Maclay and Fenton are a significant traffic problem area? How will this help keep students and staff from driving into residential neighborhoods on their commute to the college. How will this help keep traffic away from Harding Street Elementary School when the children arrive for class?

The proposal to allow diagonal parking on Eldridge Avenue to gain more parking spaces is a bad idea. Since when do we solve parking problems for building expansion by making more parking spaces on public streets? Are apartment owners, businesses or churches afforded this same luxury? The answer is NO! Diagonal parking would mean students backing out of parking spaces while other students are speeding by hurrying to class. Traffic accidents would be a common occurrence along Eldridge Avenue if this proposal is implemented. Eldridge Avenue would have to be narrowed to accommodate this plan, adding even more back up to traffic in front of the college. Illegal U-turns are already a problem on Eldridge Avenue. Students don't use the cross walks and they don't obey traffic laws. This proposal would only add to the problem. Why isn't Mission College being a good neighbor and enforcing these laws now?

The DEIR traffic study identifies a significant impact at the Fenton Avenue roadway between Harding Street and Maclay Street crossing by where Harding Elementary School is situated. This traffic impact is caused by Mission College...
students and staff using the Macay Street off ramp when commuting to the college. Under section 10.0 entitled the “Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan Implementation”, mitigation measures are described to prevent and control related traffic from traveling through these neighborhoods. Here is one of the plan suggestions:

1. Post signs indicating “Neighborhood Traffic Only” and “No Through Traffic”.

Does anyone really think that kind of signage would work? Why isn’t Mission College being a good neighbor and posting those signs now? Basically all the traffic calming measures described in this Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan are deferral in nature and is not acceptable according to CEQA Guidelines.

The DEIR goes so far as to infer that widening the roadways in these neighborhoods is an option unless a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan is implemented - (Acknowledging that this would affect residential properties and disrupt the community character). Imagine that, the neighborhood owners aren’t even safe having fixed curbs and sidewalks. The DEIR won’t bother to widen Macay where needed and yet it can threaten to take some of our property away from us! How does this help solve traffic problems?

Finally, I have serious doubts about the accuracy of the traffic study that was recently conducted for this DEIR. The last traffic study conducted in 2002 showed 5900 vehicles traveling down Fenton Avenue between Harding Street and Macay Street within a 24 hour period. The most recent traffic study only shows 1930 vehicles in a 24 hour period. Why such a large discrepancy? Shouldn’t the traffic study have revealed even more traffic today than four years ago?

Also taken from the DEIR: Freeway CMP Mainline Segment Analysis

The I-210 (Foothill Freeway) is the only CMP route within the project study area. A local CMP monitoring facility has been defined as the I-210 east of Polk Street. Volumes from Los Angeles County CMP 2004 report were utilized to define the existing demand on the I-210 facility. Existing daily volumes on the I-210 freeway to the east of Polk Street is 94,000 vehicles. Per CMP Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines a traffic impact analysis is conducted where the project will add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours. The project will not add more than 150 trips to this freeway facility and the monitoring facility during the AM or PM peak hours. Therefore, no further CMP analysis is warranted.

Table E.3 - Project Added Trips at CMP Freeway Monitoring Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Project Added Trips</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>CMP Freeway Analysis Segment Project Added Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB WB EB WB</td>
<td>30 24 24 27 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foothill Freeway (I-210) east of Polk Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the CMP analysis guidelines, the freeway segment is not carrying in excess of 150 directional project-added trips and therefore does not warrant the need to conduct a CMP freeway segment analysis.
Once again, I find it hard to believe that the traffic study for the I-210 east of Polk Street is accurate. How can 7500 more students added to Mission College over the next ten years not impact the I-210 more than the figures that are quoted in this study? To project less than 60 vehicles each way during peak hours would be added to the I-210 from Mission College commuters is just too low. What about the residents of all the new homes recently built along the I-210? Were they included in the traffic study?

In conclusion, I am totally against any expansion project of Mission College at its present location or at expanding on the vacant parcel of land located at Harding Street and Eldridge Avenue. An offsite location should be considered which doesn’t present the traffic and safety problems that this plan presents. As it stands now, Mission College is located next to two other immediate public entities - El Cariso Park and El Cariso Golf Course. Expanding student population to the campus by 7500 students over the next 5-10 years is totally unreasonable considering the immense traffic problems this community already endures.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim and Cheryl Wilkins
13012 Fenton Ave.
Sylmar, CA 91342

Cc: Julie Korenstein - Los Angeles City Board of Education - District 6
   Zev Yaroslavsky - Supervisor, Third District
   Alex Padilla – City Council, District Seven
   Antonio Villaraigosa – LA City Mayor
   Cindy Montanez - State Assemblymember -District 39
   Brad Sherman - US Representative
   Barbara Boxer – US Senator
   Diane Feinstein – US Senator
   Arnold Schwarzenegger - California Governor
Thank you for your letter commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

**Responses to Comments**

Response to Comment 1:
The unavoidable significant impacts of the project are summarized in Section __ of the Draft EIR. It is common for projects to have environmental impacts which cannot be completely mitigated. The reasons why the Master Plan should be approved in spite of it’s unavoidable significant impacts will be provided in the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations which will be adopted following certification of the Final EIR, should the LACCD choose to approve the Master Plan.

Response to Comment 2:
See page 3.13-56 paragraph 4

3.13.10 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the project’s future significant impacts on Hubbard Street/I-210 westbound ramps during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours at the completion of either Phase 1 - 2010 or Phase 2 - 2015. Impacts to this intersection remain significant and unavoidable because improvements to this ramp would be physically and institutionally infeasible. The College has a mandate to meet the needs of the community it serves and cannot be restricted by lack of capacity on state highways. Furthermore, the College has no rights to procure right-of-way adjacent to Caltrans facilities, either through purchase or eminent domain. There is insufficient right of way to improve the intersection by widening it. Since the intersection is owned and operated by Caltrans, Caltrans would need to initiate a more global interchange improvement before on-ramp improvements would be made. Caltrans has no published plans to make such improvements. Completing planning, design, and construction of such a plan would take many years and has not been funded.

Response to Comment 3:
The proposed signalization of Maclay Street and Gladstone Avenue and Maclay Street and Fenton Avenue are in response to impacts caused by future College expansion. The College is proposing signalizing these two intersections to mitigate future impacts of added College related trips due to expansion. The College is not required to mitigate
existing deficiencies. Residents can contact LADOT to request further analysis and mitigations at these locations.

Response to Comment 4:
The proposed extension of Eldridge Avenue is in response to impacts caused by future College expansion. The College is proposing extending Eldridge Avenue from Harding Street to Maclay Street to mitigate future impacts of added College related trips due to expansion. The College is not required to mitigate existing deficiencies in the roadway network. The College has proposed a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan in accordance with LADOT guidelines to mitigate the impacts of College users on the neighborhoods. Residents can contact LADOT to request further analysis, traffic calming devices, signage, and other measures to reduce pass-through traffic.

Response to Comment 5:
(See page 3.13-57 of the Draft EIR and Table 3.13-24.)

The analysis concludes that stop-controlled intersections along Maclay Street will operate at unacceptable levels and should be signalized as a mitigation measure. The analysis also shows that this mitigation will eliminate congestion on Maclay Street. Analysis also shows that Maclay Street will operate at an acceptable level of service under Future 2015 conditions (LOS D or better). Therefore, the statement that under the Extended Plan, projects impacts will be reduced due to dispersion of trips, is not in conflict with the analysis. The Extended Campus Plan (Phase I) will not keep students and staff from driving into residential neighborhoods and no such claim was made in the report. The College will implement a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan in accordance with LADOT guidelines to mitigate neighborhood impacts.

Response to Comment 6:
See page 3.13.11 paragraph 3 of the Draft EIR.

The college is developing plans to restripe Eldridge Avenue to implement angled parking on the east side (college side) of the street between Hubbard Avenue and Harding Street. Currently there is unrestricted parallel parking along both sides of this section of Eldridge Avenue. The proposed angled parking will similarly not be time restricted. In addition to a westbound travel lane, LADOT guidelines call for an additional lane for vehicles to back into that is separate from the travel lane. Furthermore, the roadway would be striped with a double-yellow line in the middle making it illegal to cross. By implementing angled parking along the north side of Eldridge Avenue, the total on-street parking capacity will increase by approximately 44%. This will provide users of the college with a free parking alternative and will encourage users to park on the east side of Eldridge Avenue and will reduce demand for parking spaces in the adjacent neighborhoods and at the Golf Course. If residents wish to implement time restricted, metered, or permit parking they may do so through LADOT.
Response to Comment 7:
See page 3.13-55 paragraph 2 of the Draft EIR.

LADOT guidelines state that if significant traffic impacts occur on roadway segments and no physical roadway improvements can be realized the project applicant should coordinate with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Management (NTM) Plan. The affected roadway segments are bordered by single-family residential on one or both sides. This makes widening these roadways infeasible. Therefore, to mitigate project traffic impacts to these roadways, a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan must be developed.

Response to Comment 8:
See response to comment 7 above.

Response to Comment 9:
The statements made in the DEIR stating that physical mitigation to residential roadways are “infeasible” was never intended to be construed as a threat to the residents. Rather, the document points out that physical mitigation to neighborhood roadways are “untenable” because of the negative impact to residents. The alternative, according to LADOT guidelines, is the implementation of a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan.

Response to Comment 10:
The current traffic study did not perform a 24hr average daily traffic (ADT) count on Fenton Avenue. The current study used multiple counts in multiple locations to determine the number of vehicles turning onto Fenton Avenue, not the total number of vehicles on Fenton Avenue. Therefore, comparing at 24hr ADT count from the 2002 study with the number of vehicles turning onto Fenton Avenue in a 24hr period in the current study is erroneous.

Response to Comment 11:
See page 3-13.52 of the Draft EIR, paragraphs 2, 3, and 4. The College is adding less than 150 vehicles trips to the I-210 east of Polk Street and therefore does not warrant Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan freeway segment analysis.

Response to Comment 12:
The LACCD acknowledges your concerns about the traffic impacts of the Master Plan. Your comment will be considered by the LACCD Board of Trustees during public hearings on the adoption of the Master Plan.
Transcript of Traffic Flipchart comments from public meeting on November 8, 2006.

1. How will the new parking garage driveway operate?
2. Eldridge parking – Angle parking will slow traffic and cause accidents.
5. Why wait to extend Eldridge Ave.?
6. Study impact to Hubbard/ rail crossing.
7. Impact related to train station (San Fernando/ Sylmar).
8. Concerns about traffic/ speed on Harding St. added traffic:
   • Speed bumps
   • Cud de sac Harding/ S. of Eldridge
   • Parking issue
9. I thought Caltrans had plans to expand the ramps on Hubbard? Please verify. And 2 on Maclay.
10. Swap acreage on golf course for Harding St. property
11. Concerns about parking at Harding St. and special events.
13. Concerns about left turns from Eldridge into diagonal parking spaces. Increase in accidents.
14. Concerned about amount of traffic projected to use Maclay.
15. Address number of Regional Recreational Facilities served by Hubbard/ Maclay.
16. Maclay private road gated to protect private community. Mt. of gates for 10 years.
17. County Harding/ Maclay. [Review]
Thank you for commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

Responses to Comments

Response to comment 1:

See page 3.13-31 paragraph 1.

New East Driveway: In conjunction with the new 1,200 space parking structure on the southwest corner of the property a new driveway will be constructed. The existing driveway provides access to two general use parking lots and previously to the large student parking area. As part of the new construction the existing driveway will remain in operation and provide access to a visitor parking and pick-up/drop-off area. The new driveway will give users access to the parking structure that will provide short-term guest parking, faculty parking, and student parking.

The new driveway will be stop controlled at Eldridge Avenue. Users will be able to turn left via a striped left turn lane or right into the driveway directly from Eldridge Avenue. Users will also be able to turn left or right out of the driveway. The College will continue to monitor and evaluate the driveway operation and will make modifications and improvements in the future as dictated by traffic conditions.

Response to comment 2:

See page 3.13.11 paragraph 3 of the Draft EIR.

The college is developing plans to restripe Eldridge Avenue to implement angled parking on the east side (college side) of the street between Hubbard Avenue and Harding Street. Currently there is unrestricted parallel parking along both sides of this section of Eldridge Avenue. The proposed angled parking will similarly not be time restricted. In addition to a westbound travel lane, LADOT guidelines call for an additional lane for vehicles to back into that is separate from the travel lane. Furthermore, the roadway would be striped with a double-yellow line in the middle making it illegal to cross. By implementing angled parking along the north side of Eldridge Avenue, the total on-street parking capacity will increase by approximately 44%. This will provide users of the college with a free parking alternative and will encourage users to park on the east side of Eldridge Avenue and will reduce demand for parking spaces in the adjacent neighborhoods and at the Golf Course. If residents wish to implement time restricted, metered, or permit parking they may do so through LADOT.
Response to comment 3:
The proposed signalization of Maclay Street and Gladstone Avenue and Maclay Street and Fenton Avenue are in response to impacts caused by future College expansion. The College is proposing signalizing these two intersections to mitigate future impacts of added College related trips due to expansion. The College is not required to mitigate existing deficiencies. Residents can contact LADOT to request further analysis and mitigations at these locations.

Response to comment 4:
The current traffic study did not perform a 24hr average daily traffic (ADT) count on Fenton Avenue. The current study used multiple counts in multiple locations to determine the number of vehicles turning onto Fenton Avenue, not the total number of vehicles on Fenton Avenue. Therefore, comparing at 24hr ADT count from the 2002 study with the number of vehicles turning onto Fenton Avenue in a 24hr period in the current study is erroneous.

Response to comment 5:
The proposed extension of Eldridge Avenue is in response to impacts caused by future College expansion. The College is proposing extending Eldridge Avenue from Harding Street to Maclay Street to mitigate future impacts of added College related trips due to expansion. The College is not required to mitigate existing deficiencies in the roadway network. The College has proposed a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan in accordance with LADOT guidelines to mitigate the impacts of College users on the neighborhoods. Residents can contact LADOT to request further analysis, traffic calming devices, signage, and other measures to reduce pass-through traffic.

Response to comment 6:
See page 3.13-13 paragraph 4

In consultation with college staff, LADOT, and comments received during the Notice of Preparation process, the 28 key study area intersections shown on Table 3.13-5 have been identified for analysis in the traffic study.

Response to comment 7:
See page 3.13-13 paragraph 4

In consultation with college staff, LADOT, and comments received during the Notice of Preparation process, the 28 key study area intersections shown on Table 3.13-5 have been identified for analysis in the traffic study.

Response to comment 8:

The College will implement a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to mitigate impacts neighborhood streets. No special events, such as competitive sports, are planned for the Health, P.E., Fitness building. Therefore “event parking” will not be an impact and planned surface parking will be adequate. Residents may request traffic calming measures, roadway modifications, and parking restrictions through LADOT. Such changes are generated by petition through resident action and cannot be independently implemented by the College.
Response to comment 9:
See page 3.13-56 paragraph 4

3.13.10 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the project’s future significant impacts on Hubbard Street/I-210 westbound ramps during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours at the completion of either Phase 1 - 2010 or Phase 2 - 2015. Impacts to this intersection remain significant and unavoidable because improvements to this ramp would be physically and institutionally infeasible. The College has a mandate to meet the needs of the community it serves and cannot be restricted by lack of capacity on state highways. Furthermore, the College has no rights to procure right-of-way adjacent to Caltrans facilities, either through purchase or eminent domain. There is insufficient right of way to improve the intersection by widening it. Since the intersection is owned and operated by Caltrans, Caltrans would need to initiate a more global interchange improvement before on-ramp improvements would be made. Caltrans has no published plans to make such improvements. Completing planning, design, and construction of such a plan would take many years and has not been funded.

Response to comment 10:
This project was considered in the environmental analysis for the previous master plan and was determined to be infeasible.

Response to comment 11:

The College will implement a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to mitigate impacts neighborhood streets. No special events, such as competitive sports, are planned for the Health, P.E., Fitness building. Therefore “event parking” will not be an impact and planned surface parking will be adequate. Residents may request traffic calming measures, roadway modifications, and parking restrictions through LADOT. Such changes are generated by petition through resident action and cannot be independently implemented by the College.

Response to comment 12:
Access to the back of the Health, Fitness and PE Building will be provided in coordination with the Fire Department.

Response to comment 13:
See page 3.13.11 paragraph 3 of the Draft EIR.

The college is developing plans to restripe Eldridge Avenue to implement angled parking on the east side (college side) of the street between Hubbard Avenue and Harding Street. Currently there is unrestricted parallel parking along both sides of this section of Eldridge Avenue. The proposed angled parking will similarly not be time restricted. In addition to a westbound travel lane, LADOT guidelines call for an additional lane for vehicles to back into that is separate from the travel lane. Furthermore, the roadway would be striped with a double-yellow line in the middle making it illegal to cross. By implementing angled parking along the north side of Eldridge
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Avenue, the total on-street parking capacity will increase by approximately 44%. This will provide users of the college with a free parking alternative and will encourage users to park on the east side of Eldridge Avenue and will reduce demand for parking spaces in the adjacent neighborhoods and at the Golf Course. If residents wish to implement time restricted, metered, or permit parking they may do so through LADOT.

Response to comment 14:

See page 3.13.54 of the Draft EIR traffic mitigations measures T-10, T-11, and T-13. The College is signalizing two intersections on Maclay Street at Gladstone and Fenton Avenues to provide relief from congestion at these two stop-controlled intersections. Signalizing these two intersections will eliminate delays currently experienced on Maclay Street. Furthermore, the College, according to LADOT guidelines, and in coordination with LADOT and the public will develop and fund a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to reduce impacts to the neighborhoods.

Response to comment 15:

See page 3.13-30 paragraph 2.

Both El Cariso County Regional Park and El Cariso Golf Course are served by Hubbard Street and Maclay Avenue. Traffic generated by these venues is accounted for in existing traffic counts and continued use is accounted for by the 1% annual ambient growth factor applied to all traffic volumes throughout the study area.

Response to comment 16:

Residents also raised concerns about students traveling from Maclay Street, up Gavina Avenue, and around to Hubbard Avenue to reach the school. The direct route from Maclay Avenue / I-215 Interchange to Eldridge Avenue to the College is 1.5 miles. To drive up Maclay Street to Gavina Avenue and around to Hubbard Avenue to reach the school is 3.6 miles. There is direct access to the College via Maclay Street, Hubbard Avenue, and Polk Street via Eldridge Avenue. There is no logical reason students would travel 2.1 miles further to reach the school. Existing average daily traffic (ADT) on Maclay Street south of Harding Street is 7,311. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation manual indicates that each single family residential unit will generate an average of ten (10) trips per day. Using this average, this 900 home community will generate approximately 9,000 trips per day (900 X 10 = 9,000). If students were using this route in significant numbers the ADT count would reflect this and the ADT count would be higher than 9,000. Furthermore, additional traffic counts (also shown in Table 3.13-7) show that students are using Fenton Avenue and Harding Street to reach Eldridge Avenue and travel to the College.

Response to comment 17:

The Draft EIR was provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Transportation for review and comment. No comments were received.
Transcript of Flipchart comments from public meeting on November 28, 2006.

1. With budget constraints, where is the money going to come from for the project?

2. There is no 360° access. A small tremor will land lock the students and will close down the 210. How will this affect emergency access and access in general?

3. Why not just support the compressed plan?

4. Why do they want to expand off campus? A learning facility is not meant to be pretty.

5. Grade schools are not allowed to be built above Gladstone, so why is the college allowed? (due to fault zone)

6. What type of fuel will the shuttles run on?

7. Light from the PE building and the parking facility (Harding Street property) will be seen by the communities to the NE (Mountain Glenn Terrace)

8. Safety issues on Harding Street property (loitering and graffiti). Sherriff is on the main campus far from the Harding property.

9. Details on impact on noise on a straight line to Mountain Glenn are Santiago Estates, Mountain II (elevation study). Will there be a Hollywood Bowl effect?

10. On the impact study, will the data be relative to the neighborhood (current noise levels)? Just because it is just below the noise level doesn’t mean it’s acceptable to the community.

11. Put scales on drawings.

12. Specific pages of College Disaster Plan. How will you control the students? How many days can you support them? College is outside quick response area of the fire department.

13. What is the student body that goes to veteran’s Park (traffic on Gavina)?

14. Provide detailed information about the traffic mitigation measures at each intersection (pg 3.13-53)

15. What will the fuel be in the shuttle between the two campuses?

16. Gate Harding Street on private road beginning (entrance)

17. Is there an additional 4’ added to residents’ backyards along college property at Harding Street to match the developer’s offer?

18. Why not buy the houses across the street from Harding Street from McClay?
19. Why not build a campus on golf course. How many do we need?
20. Student was fined for parking in golf course lot. Why?
21. Will diagonal parking increase traffic impacts near Harding?
22. Lease golf lot for parking at night.
23. Address utility type issue on Harding St. property.
24. What problems were in plugs of utility type (at 15 ft below grade)? What were potential engineering problems with utility pipe and potential for cost over-run?
25. Add speed bumps in areas with fast traffic.
26. The DEIR does not address potential engineering problems with extending Eldridge.
27. Five stories from street? (1 story = 10 feet)
28. Need a cross-section study to show impact of lights at night and scale/size of structure as related to neighborhood and streets viewed from roadways and communities (Harding, convalescent homes and mountain glen terrace).
29. Is it going to look like a fortress on the hill?
30. What is the exact distance of the building from MG2 at the nearest straight line of sight?
L.A. Mission College
Flipchart Comments
Public Comment Meeting
Comments Received 11/28/06

Thank you for commenting on the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) for the Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, provides the following responses.

**Responses to Comments**

Response to comment 1:

The LAMC is a long range plan for development of facilities to meet the educational needs of the community. Funding for many of the Phase I development projects has already been secured. Phase 2 projects would be developed to meet demand through a combination of local state and federal funding sources such as future State schools bonds.

Response to comment 2:

The LAMC has in place the Mission College Emergency Operations Plan (EOP), updated in May 2006. This EOP is designated to meet both California and Federal Homeland Security Presidential Directive (JSPD)-5 requirements. The Mission College EOP:

- Conforms to the National Incident Management System (NIMS)/Standardized Emergency management System (SEMS)/Incident Command System (ICS).
- Provides Emergency Operations Center (EOC) responders with procedures, documentation, and user friendly checklists to effectively manage emergencies.
- Provides detailed information of supplemental requirements such as Public Information, Damage Assessment and Recovery Operations.

This three volume Emergency Response Plan contains information and guidelines on the proper courses of action to be implemented in the event of an emergency or natural disaster. In the unfortunate event of a major earthquake, the college in preparation for these occurrences, holds disaster simulation exercises on an annual basis to demonstrate safety procedures for various types of emergencies. In the event of a major earthquake, Campus Emergency Response Teams and City of Los Angeles Fire Department Uniform Search and Rescue response teams will perform searches for fires, and rescue victims in damaged buildings. In addition, the college has in place an adopted Evacuation Plan that provides for designated Safety Marshalls who are trained to safely evacuate students and staff through the use of primary and alternate escape routes. All Safety Marshals are trained in the evacuation of disabled individuals and the operation of equipment necessary for the evacuation.

Response to comment 3:

Please refer to Section 4.0, Project alternatives for a comparative analysis of the alternatives.
Response to comment 4:

The need to provide additional property for LAMC expansion is not only related to visual appearance. Please refer to Section 4.0, Project alternatives for a comparative analysis of the alternatives.

Response to comment 5:

There are significant fault hazards associated with developments in this general area because of the presence of the Sylmar segment of the San Fernando fault and the location of the site within an Earthquake Fault Zone that crosses the southern portion of the site. Detailed site specific investigations will need to be performed to establish setbacks from active faults for any habitable buildings. Geotechnical evaluations performed for the project site (Lowney Associates, 2005) evaluate the site fault hazard and conclude that the potential for significant surficial fault rupture within the site is considered low, as stated in the DEIR. Minor deformations are also possible and will be a significant design issues as stated in the DEIR.

Response to comment 6:

LACCD and the College will consider what kind of fuel, including alternative fuels, the potential shuttle system will use when the shuttle system is being planned and implemented.

Response to comment 7:

See page 3.1-18 of the DEIR, which states the following regarding new sources of substantial light,

Structures on the Harding Street site would not create a substantial new source of light for the residences adjacent to the site. The structure on the northern parcel of the Harding Street site is only adjacent to El Cariso Golf Course and the Pacoima Wash, thereby providing no light impact to residential areas. The above ground structure on the southern parcel of the Harding Street site will be next to Maclay Street, away from the residential homes adjacent to the property. Any temporary surface parking lots will have lighting for security purposes. All surface parking lot lighting will be standard fixtures, with light shining downwards and appropriate shielding in place. No significant impact would occur.

Response to comment 8:

See page 3.11-8 of the DEIR, which states the following sheriff and security that serve LAMC,

The ten County Sheriff personnel employed to serve the LAMC campus work 7- to 12-hour shifts. Monday through Friday, the day shift is from 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.; while the night shift is from 3:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. There is also a graveyard shift from 10:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. The most current schedule for Monday through Friday includes two officers and one deputy during the day shift and the night shift, and one officer during the graveyard shift. On the weekends the campus is patrolled by one officer and one deputy.
or a sergeant. The County uses the broadly accepted national standard of one officer for every 1,000 persons as its guideline. The maximum campus population during daytime peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 3:59 p.m.) for Spring 2006 was an average of 2,540 students, not included campus employees. Assuming this maximum campus population, the current Sheriff schedule for Monday through Friday equates to one officer for every 1,021 people on campus during daytime peak hours and one officer for every 920 people on campus during the evening hours. On the weekends, the current schedule equates to one officer for every 386 people on campus. With the exception of the daytime peak hours which is slightly over, the police-to-population ratios are well within the County and national standard of one officer for every 1,000 persons. According to the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, scheduling changes occur on an as-needed basis to maintain police services to LAMC at County acceptable levels.

**City of Los Angeles Police Department**

The City of Los Angeles Police Department’s (LAPD) Mission Community Police Station provides secondary police protection to the LAMC campus through a mutual aid agreement with the County of Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department. The Mission Community Station jurisdiction area covers 28.18 square miles and has an estimated population of approximately 202,000 persons. The station is located at 11121 Sepulveda Boulevard in the community of Mission Hills, California. The Mission station employs approximately 2 sworn officers and 26 civilian support staff. The estimated police-to-population ratio is one officer for every 976 persons based on the population estimate of 278,280 for the Foothill community area. The average response time to emergency calls for the Mission community area during 2002 was 11.4 minutes. The citywide average during 2002 was 10.2 minutes. The predominant crimes in the Foothill community area are aggravated assault, vehicle theft, and burglary from vehicles. Figure 3.11-1 shows police station locations in the area.

See page 3.11-28 of the DEIR, which states the following:

The LAMC component of the proposed project is expected to result in a change to on-campus Sheriff services (i.e., up to six sheriff personnel at a peak timeframe), and the demand generated would require new or physically altered police facilities. To meet this demand, as part of the proposed project, Proposition A and AA would fund the creation of a Sheriff/Safety Information Center consisting of approximately 6,000 gsf of building space within the existing Campus Services Building. This facility would provide the space necessary for additional personnel locker room accommodations; report writing; briefing rooms; team leader and deputy offices; and restrooms and showers. The environmental impacts of this construction are analyzed in the EIR. The baseline levels

---

1 Personal communication with Deputy Stan Dease. Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (November 22, 2004).
2 Personal communication with Deputy Stan Dease, Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, January 29, 2003.
4 Fax/letter from Gary J. Brennan, Commanding Officer. Community Affairs Group, City of Los Angeles Police Department. Dated February 5, 2003; cites 2000 census data.
5 Personal communication, Stan Dease, Deputy Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department.
of service for the project site has not changed from 2003-2004 to 2005-2006 school years. The 2003-2004 years was used in this analysis since it was the higher enrollment number, and therefore presents a worse case scenario for the project site. No new or physically altered police facilities would be required beyond those already programmed and analyzed in this EIR, so no significant impacts would occur.

Response to comment 9:

Relatively flat topography in the potentially noise affected area is not likely to create acoustic focusing or unusual acoustic propagation effects if that is what the commenter meant by the Hollywood Bowl effect.

Response to comment 10:

The project’s noise impact analysis was relative to current noise emissions from all area noise sources. The community noise acceptability classifications and impact criteria were established by the political jurisdiction in which the project and residents are located, and not by the EIR analysts or by local residents.

Response to comment 11:

All maps, diagrams, and figure in the Draft EIR include a scale where appropriate.

Response to comment 12:

Please see Response to Comment 2 regarding the safety of students. The College, as part of its EOP, has in place Emergency Evacuation Kits on campus to assist with students and campus personnel in the event of a campus emergency. The Mission College Crisis Action Team is composed of specially trained campus personnel, who in the event of a campus emergency adhere to specified EOP guidelines, determine the appropriate course of action related to the severity of the emergency, and guide students and staff to safety. Specific courses of action for each conceivable type of emergency is provided in the EOP. In addition to continuing life and property protection operations, mass care relocation, registration of displaced persons and damage assessment operations will be initiated.

Response to comment 13:

Students traveling from the College to Veterans Memorial County Park are anticipated to use Hubbard Street as this route represents the shortest distance and most direct route of travel. Students are not anticipated to travel on Gavina Avenue as they would turn left to access the park before reaching Gavina Avenue.

Response to comment 14:

Please see page 3.13-53 of the DEIR.

Response to comment 15:

Please see reply to Comment 6.
Response to comment  16:

Please see Comment Letter and Response: Glynis Walsh – 11/08/06 – Response to Comment 10.

Response to comment    17:

The LAMC is willing to consider this suggestion.

Response to comment    18:

No acquisition of private homes is planned as a part of the LAMC Master Plan.

Response to comment    19:

This alternative was explored in past master plan scenarios and rejected as being infeasible.

Response to comment    20:

The LACCD has no knowledge of this event and is unable to comment on it.

Response to comment    21:

Please see Comment Letter and Response: Tim and Cheryl Wilkins 11/08/06 - Response to Comment 7.

Response to comment    22:

Please see Comment Letter and Response: Traffic Flipchart from 11/08 - Response to Comment 8.

Response to comment    23:

The LACCD is aware of the existence of the 24-inch steel water line located within the 10 foot wide easement within the Harding Street property. In order to proceed with the proposed project, the LACCD plans to relocate approximately 1200 feet of water line as well as replace any segments that require replacement with new steel pipe. LACCD will coordinate with the LADWP in the replacement and relocation of this line to the satisfaction of the LADWP. The relocated line will be built to meet LADWP design specifications.

Response to comment    24:

The LACCD will coordinate extensively with the LADWP regarding the engineering requirements for relocating the transmission pipe, which currently traverses the Harding Street site. Coordination efforts have determined that approximately 1200 feet of water line will be rerouted. Specifications of the engineering required for the rerouting will be addressed during project implementation under the guidance and standards of the LADWP.
Response to comment 25:

Please see Comment Letter and Response: Traffic Flipchart from 11/08 - Response to Comment 8.

Response to comment 26:

Detailed engineering analysis for future phase mitigations is not required for this EIR. Such analysis will be developed in the design phase of specific projects.

Response to comment 27:

According to the Master plan, the Health, P.E., and Fitness Center located on the Harding Street Site will consist of two floor levels.

Response to comment 28:

The Draft EIR provides an analysis of light impacts from the Harding Street Site and has concluded that no significant impact will occur. The Draft EIR includes a photographic simulation from Mountain Glen Terrace across the Pacoima Wash looking onto the Harding Street Site which includes a graphic representation of what the project may look like. A detailed cross-section is not required.

Response to comment 29:

The LACCD acknowledges this comment regarding the merits of the design of the structures on the Harding Street Site.

Response to comment 30:

The approximate distance from the Harding Street Site property to the most south-westerly row of homes in Mountain Glen Terrace 2 is 1,300 feet.