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MS. KING: Ladies and gentlemen, please take a seat.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the Draft EIR Meeting for the Mission College Facilities Master Plan. The agenda for tonight's meeting you should have received at the sign-in table. If you don't have one, please see Lindsay or Veronica for the agenda.

The goal for our meeting tonight is to provide information about the draft EIR and to also give you an opportunity to make comments on the Mission College Draft EIR; not the project itself, not the master plan, but the draft EIR. You will have the opportunity to present comments about the master plan to the board of trustees early next year.

After our presentation tonight, you will have
another opportunity to go to our stations and speak to
our experts and give them your comments and questions.
Please do also write those questions down. Since we
will not be receiving comments from the floor this evening,
it is very important that you write your comments down
and put it in the comment box at my left.
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If you prefer to make oral comments, we have a
court reporter that will be happy to take your
statement.
You will also have the opportunity to look at the
draft EIR if you wish. That document is at the sign-in
table where you came in. If you do not provide comments
this evening, it is important that you do submit your
comments by December 4th.

At this time I would like to introduce the
president of Mission College, Mr. Ernest Moreno.

ERNEST MORENO,

MR. MORENO: Good evening, welcome. As you are
complete aware, L.A. Mission College has been working to
the facilities master plan to respond to the demand for access to higher education facilities for the Sylmar area and the surrounding communities. The projected increase in student enrollment in combination with the need for expanded academic programs will require several hundred thousand square feet of additional building space, including classrooms, laboratories, lecture halls, painting and sculpture facilities and spaces, photography laboratories, music practice rooms, food preparation areas, dining and exhibition space, athletic facilities, storage, and other requirements unique to instruction within each academic program.

Shortfalls in these types of facilities are anticipated where the projected enrollment exceeds the current planned physical facilities of the college. If additional space is not provided, the facilities would prevent the college from offering a comprehensive course of study leading to much needed college degree and
L.A. Mission College and district staff have read the transcripts and comments from the community scoping meetings held in July. I am aware of most of your concerns, including the Sylmar Community Plan compatibility, increased traffic, and desire to maintain the immediate neighborhood tranquility and security.

L.A. Mission College has conducted community meetings and has met with the Sylmar Neighborhood Council during the period since the scoping meetings to discuss the progress of the master plan and the EIR. Input from the community has been used to refine the master plan and proposed building layouts.

You have also expressed your concern in knowing the status of the college efforts to acquire the two Harding Street properties. The district is finalizing a purchase and sale agreement with the Syrian Church. The church members are willing to sign the agreement after the EIR is certified by the board of trustees.
After the sale, the district will continue to work with the church members to help them find an alternative location and assist in the design of their facility. The district also has everything it needs to proceed with the eminent domain on the Comstock property. District staff will be recommending to the board that it proceed with the eminent domain action on the Comstock property after the EIR is certified. The EIR consultant has attempted to address all of your concerns in the draft EIR. I encourage you to visit the comment stations this evening or review the EIR further at home or in the library and provide your comments to the college at your convenience. You will also have an opportunity to comment on the draft EIR as presented to the board of trustees on December 13th in downtown Los Angeles.

I'd like to make the following introductions: Brian Perkins with Leo A. Daly Architects, master plan architects; Dev Vrat from URS Corporation, EIR consultant; David Miller, senior transportation engineer, URS Corporation; in addition, Leo A. Daly architects and URS environmental planners are available at the public comment stations to discuss the master plan.
I'd like to turn this program over to Dev right now. Thank you.

DEV VRAT,

MR. VRAT: Thank you very much. I'd like to start off this evening by just kind of giving an overview of the environmental review process. The adoption of the master plan is preceded by the environmental review process. The purpose of the environmental review is to disclose to the public and the decisionmakers the environmental effects of the project and to allow the public to provide input into that process. And all public input received on the draft environmental report will be considered in the preparation of the final EIR which will be presented and considered by the district board of trustees prior to its consideration of adoption of the master plan.

So this process started back in the summer of 2006 when we issued a Notice of Preparation of the EIR,
and we also released an initial study of 60 environmental issue areas that could have potential for environmental effects. And that was our first stab at identifying what we believe might be the issue areas that we would need to look at in the Environmental Impact Report.

We provided the public a 30-day window in which they could review that initial study and comment back to us if we got it right or if we missed something. Usually people that live in an area know more about a project. They know more about the community than the environmental consultants. So your input is very valuable to us because you live here, it’s your community, we want to know what your concerns are. We analyze those concerns in the draft Environmental Impact Report. So during that 30-day period, we had scoping meetings very similar to this meeting where we presented the results of the initial study, and we went around the room and listened to people, what your concerns were,
took down lots of notes and everything, and we analyzed the issues we heard about in the draft Environmental Impact Report. We also had a couple of neighborhood meetings during that period to let the community know the status of the master plan and what was going on with the EIR. So that resulted in the release of the public draft EIR in mid-October. And that document, again, was released for a 45-day public review period. So that gives the public a chance to go through the Environmental Impact Report, make sure that we did address the concerns you raised during the scoping process, and if we didn't, let us know that we didn't. Or if you can think of ways to improve the mitigation measures to lessen the environmental effects, it's an opportunity for you to comment on the adequacy of our analysis in the draft document. So we held one meeting back on November 6th which was a meeting exactly like this one, very similar format. We presented the master plan EIR, and we had
comment stations where the public is encouraged to ask questions and provide comments on the draft EIR. And as you can see here this evening on November 28th, the second public comment meeting.

These are comment meetings where it kind of familiarizes you with what's in the Environmental Impact Report. We really encourage you to look at the document itself which is available in the libraries, on the college website, in the college library. Basically, if you want to get a copy of it, you can request a copy and we can send a copy to you on a CD. So we try to make very readily available. We really encourage public input because it results in the best possible master plan at the end of the day.

So we have until December 4th to give us comments on the draft EIR. Once we get all those comments, we will prepare responses, written responses to every single comment. And when the final EIR comes out, every single comment we receive will be published in
final EIR along with responses to those comments that you provide.

Responses can either change the Environmental Impact Report itself, or it could say this is where your question is addressed in the Environmental Impact Report. But we're required by law to respond in writing to every comment that we receive. So it's a very serious process.

So that document will be coming out, the final EIR, in January of next year. And they will be -- I should have mentioned the first rectangle up there, that the draft EIR will actually be presented to the board of trustees of the district on December 13th. That will be in Downtown L.A. It will be a very similar thing. There will be a brief presentation of the master plan, a presentation of the draft EIR. It's basically a presentation to familiarize the board members with the master plan and the EIR. The public is invited to meeting.

The actual certification of the EIR is planned for January of next year. And that, again, will take
place in a public hearing before the district board. And in that meeting, if the board so chooses, it may certify the final EIR and adopt the master plan.

With that, I'll turn it over to Brian from Leo A. Daly. He'll give us a summary of the master plan. BRIAN PERKINS, MR. PERKINS: Thanks, Dev. Tonight I want to walk you through the master plan we developed working closely with the college, URS during the EIR process, and the public. As we've gone through the process, we have taken into account a lot of the comments we've heard from the public, as well as working closely with traffic consultant engineers throughout the whole process. We've done several things. First of all, we looked at the existing master plan. This is the campus as it exists today. The parking structure that you see outside is under construction. We're actually in the campus center right here right now.
But this is really the starting place that we took a look at. We're going to go through the program that we were given tonight, as well as the phasing in terms of how this will be implemented, and then the final master plan. Master plans are really meant to be flexible projections of the future. As much as possible, we try to project what the campus will need in the different phases and to try to provide the right facilities during those time periods.

The program that we were given really includes about nine major pieces. There are some existing preapproved plans that you see here. The child development center is already approved. The parking structure, like I said, for 1,200 cars is under construction, and then the plant facilities.

The main pieces that we are focused on as a priority are the state-funded projects, including the health, P.E., and fitness which is under design now, family consumer studies, the bookstore, and the media arts. The final pieces or future components of the program are student services, educational buildings 5 and...
functions to be determined, and then an additional parking structure.

The site as we've talked about, and after the if you haven't looked at some of the boards, after the presentation, you're welcome to come over and take a closer look at some of the boards. There is quite a bit of detail in there. It really does include a new site location. The site that we've looked at for expansion of the existing campus is down at the corner of Harding Street and Eldridge and is bounded by Maclay as well. This site was chosen after the area to the north of the existing campus was not available.

Each of the phases we've looked at, including

Phase I, A and B, are on site and off site. The pieces that we're looking at for the first part of really are intended to try to keep the campus in the type of environment that it is now. The buildings are spaced apart with lots of areas for outdoor activities, like the main quad. We intend to try to keep some of those same type of amenities here on campus. It's not
just about the classes, but the activities that take place before and after class.

The parking structure that's under construction is here. The first part of this phase, we looked at doing the family and consumer studies with the book store. That would be located about where you see the plant facilities. Additionally, media arts will be followed. And then this parking that was taken out here will be replaced by the new parking structure. The plant facilities is also part of this phase as well.

So there will be some remaining site parking at this phase. Additionally, we've looked at changing the parallel parking along the north side of Eldridge to diagonal parking as a temporary measure, more than anything, to provide more parking while the structure is under construction.

The east site, which is down at Eldridge and Harding, is planned in the first phase to have the health, P.E., and fitness center. In this phase the road will be continued through the same location that it is
now, but the health, P.E., and fitness center will be the north part of this. And some temporary parking will be brought in with a possible drop-off location adjacent to it.

The second phase on the main campus will include the student services. That's the first part of that which will really complete this whole zone. The second parking structure is actually right behind us.

The student services will be adjacent to the media arts and family consumer. We looked at an area where we can come in and actually create a nice public outdoor space so that your first impression of the college as you come out of the parking structure is nice as you proceed into the heart of the campus.

The other building on this part of the last phase is more of a feature building. It could be more a gateway welcoming building on the corner of Eldridge and Hubbard. On the off-site area down at Eldridge and Harding, the final phase will include additional parking. This parking is intended to be an underground parking structure, two levels that will actually be buried into the hillside along Maclay. So it will be day-lit from
the side, but from the Harding Street side it will be

At this point we're looking at continuing Eldridge through to Maclay to facilitate easier traffic flow. As part of the EIR, we discovered that they're having some traffic problems in this area. This should help to maintain the flow in and out of the campus from an additional location off of the highway so that people are able to enter the campus from Maclay as well as from Hubbard.

This area you can see here with the P.E. building will be bridged across so that pedestrians will be able to cross back and forth to reach the buildings there. And it's really meant to have an open space near the residential area on the south side.

This is more of a bird's-eye view. We do just to try to mock up what the area will look like.

Unless you're in a plane, you probably never see this
view, but it really does help to orient you to the campus. And about a third of a mile down the road is Harding Street property that we're looking at for the expansion. The wash runs down through here, the back side in this area, and then the new parking structure that's under construction as well as the new buildings. The intent for the overall concept on the
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is more of this Arroyo concept. This is from the previous master plan that we continue to refine. This is an idea, more of a naturalistic environment versus a green lawn type of environment. This is meant to have a little bit more of your indigenous low water-use type plants, a lot of outdoor seating areas, areas for the students to gather before and after classes. These are a few examples of other projects. This is the overall master plan as you see from the aerial. It does include all the parts. As we mentioned before, the boards do have a lot of detail. You're welcome to come over and ask us some questions afterwards. So with that, I will pass it back to Dev.
Thank you.

MR. VRAT: Thank you, Brian. Now what I'd like to do is give you a brief summary of the results of the draft EIR. And it is draft, so you are able to comment on it and make adjustments as necessary.

First of all, I want to introduce you to the concept of significant environmental impacts. Basically, what you want to do when you prepare an Environmental Impact Report is to start out with the baseline conditions of what's on the ground at the present time, what's your current environment. That's the baseline. Then we have things called thresholds of significance. In this case, we use the thresholds that are adopted by the State of California as well as some additional thresholds which are provided by the district itself. There's a threshold on sustainability which we analyze in the EIR.

If the impacts of the project on the environment
exceeds this threshold that I'm speaking about, that's called a significant impact. So once we identify a significant impact to the draft EIR, we work to try to come up with mitigation measures or some kind of ideas, concepts, any idea you have that would reduce the impacts. So our goal is to reduce those impacts to less than significant levels so that they're acceptable. And if you look in the draft EIR in each impact area analysis, you'll find a set of mitigation measures. And one of the ways you can help us is if you have additional ideas for either improving those mitigation measures, modify them a little bit or whatever, we try to listen to your concerns at the scoping meetings. We heard a lot of your concerns, and I think you'll find that we did make a serious attempt to address your concerns in the draft EIR. But if you could help us improve upon the quality of the draft EIR and the final EIR, that's where you can help us. But it's really focused on helping us with these mitigation measures to make it a better project.
Now I'm going to go to the issue areas in the document and let you know where we found significant impacts. The first one is aesthetics. And we found the development on the Harding Street site, it would obscure views of the San Gabriel mountains. We have some pictures here on the side. I'll show you a few right now. And we found less than significant impacts on some policy inconsistencies with the Sylmar Community Plan.

So first of all from the Harding Street property, the first view is looking -- we're looking down Harding Street -- or toward Harding Street from Maclay here, and the second view we've actually drawn in what the development would look like up on the hill. So that's not a substantial change. We do not believe that is a substantial change.

Now, the view from the intersection of Eldridge and Harding, we have Harding Street here looking across a vacant field, and you've got a nice view of the mountains in the background. When the campus is developed on Harding Street, you can see this building here, the P.E. and fitness building and development on this side, the great parking structure on this side, and you cut off a
deal of the views of the mountains. So we're calling that a significant environmental effect.

The next one is the views of the main campus. We try to take the worst case scenario. Looking directly across the street right now, this is the view. You see the cars parked parallel. You see a little bit of lawn, and you see some parking beyond that. You see views of the mountains. You know, it's not an outstanding view, but it's a view.

When we introduce the project here, now we have a building. You still have the trees, the cars are parked diagonally instead of parallel. We don't see that as a substantial change. We did not call that a significant effect.

Moving to air quality, we found that there will be construction-related exceedances of nitrogen oxide standards. So these are federal standards for air pollution contaminants. And during the construction period, we're going to see exceedances of the nitrogen oxide standard. And during operations of the master plan after it's developed, we'll experience operational
exceedances of Nox again, volatile organic compounds, VOCs, hydrocarbons, and carbon monoxide emissions. Each of these have standards as well which will be exceeded during the operations of the campus.

A lot of these exceedances are a result of cars commuting to and from the campus, typical of any large construction project in the Southern California air quality basin. Under biological resources, we did find some sensitive plants on the Harding Street property which we're taking a close look at right now. These plants could be possible habitat for coastal gnat catcher. So we'll be conducting some habitat surveys during the period between now and spring. And to make sure that there's no nesting birds -- no, I'm sorry, that it's a habitat for this gnat catcher. It's possible that gnat catcher could come and land there and fly away. We want to make sure it's not a habitat.

And then the second thing is whenever you have tall trees, there's always a potential for raptors
roosting. Or certain periods of time birds lay eggs, and so there's a law that protects nesting birds. So prior to any construction, there will be inspections to make sure that we don't disturb any birds. Under cultural resources, we find there's less than significant impacts. And this is largely due to finds that could be made during construction. We did a Phase I survey, a site record survey of what's out there now. We're unaware of any artifacts right now that are present on these sites, but there's always the potential when you dig that you can find something. So the types of things that you could encounter when you actually do the construction is paleontological resources, archeological resources which are either Native American relics or early pioneer settlements, different periods of development. We all lay down our record that we've been here, and you can encounter those artifacts during
periods. And there's also the potential for encountering human remains. There's always that potential. We have some mitigation measures which we would put into place if we encounter anything. And with the implementation of those measures, we believe there would not be a significant impact in this area.

Under geological resources, we all know this is a very seismically active area. There's a lot of concern about earthquakes. And there are some potential for impacts due to surface fault rupture from an earthquake, ground shaking from an earthquake. The nature of the soils are such that if there is an earthquake, it could liquify. There could be settlement during an earthquake. And there's presence of expansive soils which means the type of soil that's usually clayey soil where when it gets water and it gets wet, it expands and it could displace your buildings.

So these are all things that once you're aware...
of it in an early stage like this, when we go into the individual building design, we will do very detailed geotechnical studies, and these buildings will be designed to withstand these types of forces. So once you're aware of the forces, you can design buildings to withstand them.

As you may know, modern buildings are much safer than older buildings, except maybe a wood-framed house which I guess is probably the safest building to be in in case of an earthquake.

Under water quality, there would be less than significant impact. We did find that when we do the development on the Harding Street property, there would be the use of fertilizers, et cetera, which could run off and introduce pollutants into that drainage there. So there's extensive mitigation measures to make sure that doesn't happen, reduce the use of fertilizers, et cetera.

Again, once we're aware of the problem, we can identify mitigation measures to minimize it. So we think that's a less than significant impact.

Under land use, we did an extensive analysis of the zoning ordinance, City of L.A. Zoning Ordinance,
also the Sylmar Community Plan. You'll find an extensive policy analysis in the document. We did hear you; that was one of your concerns. You'll find an extensive analysis there.

We find a significant impact on the main campus because it conflicts with the L.A. City Zoning Ordinance. However, there's a provision in state law that state colleges may render the city zoning ordinance inapplicable. So if the district so chooses, they could exempt themselves from that ordinance, and that impact would go away at that point.

We find less than significant impacts on the Harding Street site because right now there's a zoning conflict. However, this conflict can be resolved procedurally either through a -- by obtaining a conditional use permit in conjunction with either a general plan change or a rezoning. So it's just a process which could resolve that conflict.

Under noise we find there will be temporarily significant impacts during construction. And I'm sure you're familiar with those types of construction noise
effects. If you're not, they're explained in the Environmental Impact Report.

There's a less than significant impact of operational noise levels. And the types of noises that we will experience once the college is fully developed and operational are heating and air-conditioning systems, machinery, trash pickup type noises, and just increased human activity around the college site. There's no doubt about it, it's going to be noisier than before.

However, the noise levels are not significant. And if you're wondering why we think it's not significant, we provide a good explanation at the noise station. There will also be increased traffic. With increased traffic, you get increased off-site noise.

Under public services, the document determines that it's a less than significant impact. We do find there needs to be increased demand for campus police protection, but this demand can be met with revisions to
the existing contract with the sheriff. So right now

the college contracts with the sheriff, the district
to contracts with the sheriff to provide those services

the existing campus, and they can just modify that

contract to provide additional services to the

Harding Street property.

And there was another public concern about

what happens if there's a major earthquake and the freeways

fall and we're isolated and we're cut off from

emergency responders, et cetera. We consulted with the fire
department, and they indicated to us that they do not

believe that's a concern, that if one or both of the

freeway overpasses did collapse, there's alternate

routes. They're not reliant on those overpasses.

They would assess what routes are available, and they would

choose the shortest possible route. So the fire
department does not believe that this is a significant

concern.

I'm going to turn it over now to David Miller

who is our senior transportation engineer. He'll

explain the traffic analysis much better than me.
DAVID MILLER,

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Dev. Before we get into this first slide, I'd like to give you a quick introduction about how we did our analysis.

Based on the comments at the scoping from the public, input from the college, and also the Los Angeles Department of Transportation, we analyzed the traffic impacts at 20 intersections in the area, eight roadways. We also looked at the impacts to parking, transit, and pedestrian facilities.

We try to take a wholistic approach of what's going to happen when the college -- if the college implements this plan. What we found was not too surprising. There are significant impacts along the major arterials in the area, Hubbard Street and Maclay.

And this is what we expected to find. These are the major routes in the area. They carry a lot of traffic and often -- in several cases these intersections are already exceeding the capacity. We also found some localized impacts to the college.

Using a standard analysis approach, we took
traffic counts at 20 intersections and 8 roadway segments, as I mentioned. We made sure we got all the trips in the area counted and used traffic analysis software to determine where those impacts would be. As you can see from this slide -- it's a little hard to see, so I invite you to come back after we're done. But what we found is we can mitigate almost every single one of the impacts to the intersection roadways in the area, and actually improve a lot of the existing conditions with some technology enhancements, some striping improvements, and other signalization. We specifically looked at the neighborhood that closest to the college where the residents indicated students were using as a pass-through. And when we took our traffic counts on the roadways, we did it in a way not just to count the total number of cars on the road, but to find out how the students were turning into the neighborhood or not turning into the neighborhood. We wanted to know what was really going on out there.

We did find that there's a significant impact,
the students are using this neighborhood to get to and from the college. So we identified this as an area where the college would implement a neighborhood traffic management plan to try and mitigate some of those impacts.

In relation to the college itself, as part of the master plan to go along with the parking structure, the college would be implementing a new driveway and entrance here to bring students quickly from Eldridge into the parking structure to park quickly.

In addition, the existing entrance will be enhanced with a turnaround drop-off area and also to new diagonal parking. And then we've identified a need for some transit site improvements here, possibly a bus turnout with shelters, shading, signage to get the students to use transit more and to lessen the impact on the roadway there.

For the future Harding site, the intersection will be improved to provide access to this surface parking lot and provide in addition this turnaround drop-off area so that people can easily access it and the health, P.E., and fitness building.

On Phase II the college is showing extending Eldridge through Maclay to provide new access in the
area. Right now you need to go up Maclay and over Harding, around Eldridge. This would allow you to go straight through. As part of that, this intersection here will be signalized to control traffic, as the traffic is significant on Maclay right now.

So please feel free to come back and look at our boards. They show a little more detail, some more information. You can ask me any questions, and I'll be happy to take down your comments as well. With that, I'll turn it back over to Dev.

MR. VRAT: Thank you, David. Another way we can reduce environmental impacts is by looking at alternatives to the project which would meet most of the objectives of the college, but would also reduce the environmental effects of the proposed plan. So these are the alternatives that are considered in the Environmental Impact Report. First of all, there's the "no project alternative." That's what would happen if there was
new master plan. The environmental effects of that -- sounds good, right, no project? What that really means is the same enrollment increases, but without accommodating that enrollment through new buildings,
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traffic improvements, et cetera. So you have the growth without the planning, without the facilities to support the growth. So that does not turn out to be the best alternative.

Another one is a compressed plan at the LAMC main campus. And this is one of the original -- when we had two plans. One of the plans was the concept of a compressed where you try to do all of the development on the campus itself. The problem with that plan is it involves a lot of grading, underground work, it's not a very friendly campus, it's very tight, it's more of an urban-type development, it doesn't fit in the community.

So that doesn't turn out to be the best plan.

If you're questioning what I'm giving you as
results, there's extensive analysis and explanation that supports -- of the findings of the draft EIR. The next one is to look at an alternative site. We had comments during the scoping meetings this was too much for this neighborhood. We already have a campus, we don't want another campus, go someplace else. So we did an extensive search for alternative sites. Our screening process is presented in the draft EIR. We found one site. It's called the Terra Vista site.

And that site is looked at in the environmental document, and there's problems with that site, a lot of problems with regard to lack of infrastructure. There's another neighborhood. We'd be shifting problems from neighborhood to another neighborhood. And there's problems with -- it's a hill, so there would be a lot of grading, et cetera. So there is an analysis, an attempt to look at that site, give it serious consideration.
again, that did not turn out to be the environmentally
superior site.

The last one was -- oh, yeah, the idea of
expanding the existing remote campus centers. Right
now the college conducts limited programs in various
community centers around the area. We sat down with
the college to say, Why can't you just do this thing ---
you know, expand the community centers to provide services
that way? Well, that doesn't provide for a campus
environment, scholastic environment, an integrated
campus. So when you read that, you'll see there's
issues associated with that. So that was not determined to
be the -- it doesn't meet the objectives of the college.

So then the last thing we looked at is to
reduce buildout within the existing campus. Why do you have
go to 15,000? Why can't you pick a smaller number and
build less within the existing campus? So we did a

comparative analysis of all the environmental effects
of all these different alternatives. And the California
Environmental Quality Act requires that we, the environmental consultant, identify what we believe is environmentally superior alternative. We identified reduced buildout within the existing campus, that has least environmental impacts.

Does that mean that the college has to approve that alternative? No. We're just telling the college, the district that that's the one that's got the least environmental impacts. It may not meet all of the objectives of the college. So the college at the end of the day can go ahead and approve the project, whatever project it chooses to approve, but it has to consider these alternatives, and it has to make findings about it did or did not adopt the mitigation measures which we have identified in the Environmental Impact Report.

Before I get to this slide, I just want to emphasize that point. If you're really concerned about this development, it's going to be happening in your community, the best thing you can do is help us improve the mitigation measures. Because if the plan goes forward, and there's a great likelihood that it will go forward, the best thing you can do is help us mitigate,
reduce the environmental impacts. So help us find --

through the mitigation measures and see if you have
concerns, are your concerns being mitigated through
those
mitigation measures.

You can help us if you have a concern to say
please do this, that will make my life a lot better.

I'm sure the district will consider those comments when
they finalize the Environmental Impact Report and if they
choose to approve the master plan.

So finally, the Environmental Quality Act
requires us to disclose to the decisionmakers what the
areas of controversy may be when they consider the
adoption of the master plan. And through the scoping
meeting process, through this process, et cetera, this
is what we believe are the areas of controversy. And if
you think we missed some, let us know your comments, and
we will tell the district, no, we made a mistake in the
draft EIR, those aren't the areas of controversy,
these are the areas of controversy. It's just helping the
decisionmakers know what your concerns are.
So what we're going to convey to the district, unless you tell us otherwise, is there's concerns about the compatibility of the Harding Street property with Harding Street neighbors. That's an area of controversy. There's great concern that the college adequately mitigate its traffic impacts, especially in the neighborhood. And there's concern, especially around the Harding Street property, about security and the nuisance impacts. Now that there's going to be a campus here, they're concerned about graffiti, safety, what's going on over the block wall, et cetera. So we believe that's concern. We heard that you wanted us to look at an alternative site that would not impact the Harding neighborhood, and we made a good faith effort to do that. You're concerned that the college respect the policies of the Sylmar plan. And if you look in the document,
find our policy analysis. We believe the plan is largely consistent with the Sylmar plan. It's not a perfect match, but projects never are a perfect match. Generally, we believe it is consistent with the Sylmar plan.

If you look closely at the Sylmar plan, you'll see a lot of indications where they encourage the development of schools, and there's special provisions made for schools. So it doesn't have to be absolutely compatible like a residential. It doesn't need to look like a residential, it just has to be compatible. And then there's concern, again, expressed earlier about the potential isolation of the college and the adjacent community in the event that an earthquake destroys the freeways, the overpasses. And it's not the responsibility of the college to take care of the entire community. But, again, we did run this by the fire department, and we did not believe this was a significant concern. But nevertheless, it's an area of controversy.
So at the end of the document, we take all the impacts and we apply all the mitigation measures. Sometimes the mitigation measures, we couldn't come up with enough mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels, and this is what we call unavoidable impacts. So if the master plan is approved, these impacts will take place. And they are, as I summarized earlier, regional air quality impacts; the traffic impacts, one intersection, Hubbard Street westbound on-ramp to the Freeway. All the other intersections can be, as David indicated, either mitigated or actually improved from existing conditions. But this intersection, there's going to be a problem here. There will be temporary construction noise impacts.

The aesthetic impacts of that facility development on the Harding Street property, there's no doubt about it, the view of the mountains is not going to be the same after the project as before. And there's possible zoning conflict on the main campus if the
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college does not take advantage of its exemption from local zoning ordinances. Okay, Janice.

JANICE KING,

MS. KING: Again, I'd like to invite you to remain and talk to our specialists that are stationed at the back of the auditorium, and also to submit your sheet about the environmental issues with mitigation measures in the draft Environmental Impact Report, and also any other comments that you may have. Please do the comments in the comment box located on my left. And if you decide not to give it to us today, you can mail it in. The address is at the bottom of the comment sheet, or you can e-mail. That address is as well. Thank you for coming.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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.
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.

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.)
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