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ABSTRACT

CEQA Lead Agency: Los Angeles Community College District (District)
770 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90017

Applicant: Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC)
13356 Eldridge Ave
Sylmar, CA 91342-3245

Responsible Agencies: U.S. Fish and Wildlife, California Department of Fish and Game, Southern California Association of Governments, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the City of Los Angeles.

A. PROJECT NEED

The proposed project would improve the capacity and operational functions for Los Angeles Mission College to accommodate future student growth of up to 15,000 students.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The District and LAMC have prepared the Updated LAMC Master Plan 2006 (Master Plan) to guide the orderly development of instructional and support facilities in order to accommodate increased enrollment through 2015. LAMC enrollment is projected to grow from the current estimated 7,000 students to 15,000 students by the year 2015.

The proposed Master Plan site is located at 13356 Eldridge Ave, within the City of Los Angeles, in the community of Sylmar, California. (See Figure 1 – Regional Vicinity Map) The existing 22.5 acre campus provides 206,000 gross square feet (gsf) of instructional and support facilities housed within permanent buildings and temporary structures. An additional 349,000 gsf, or a total of 555,000 gsf, would be necessary in order for the College to serve the anticipated enrollment growth.

Two plan alternatives have been developed to plan for this growth (See Figure 2– Project Site Map). In Plan A - Compressed Campus Plan, the growth is accommodated on the existing 22.5 acre campus by consolidating campus programs and utilizing underground construction where economically feasible to maintain the existing low profile of the campus. In addition to underground construction, the use of three story design in limited areas of the campus, where compatible with adjacent residences, is being considered as an option to provide more open space on the main campus. The second Plan B - Extended Campus Plan adds an off-site location adjacent to the intersection of Eldridge and Harding Street to be acquired by the College, potentially through eminent domain with just compensation, to accommodate a portion of the campus growth. This option would reduce the intensity of development on the main campus and provide increased design flexibility for the College.
The land to be acquired for Plan B – Extended Campus Plan in the off-site option includes two parcels. The district is currently in negotiations with St. Ephraim’s Church (Syrian Orthodox Church) for the North parcel of approximately 3 acres. The District has also extended a purchase offer to Comstock Homes to acquire the approximately 7 acre parcel to the south. It is intended in this option to extend Eldridge Avenue through the Harding Street intersection, connecting to Maclay to partially mitigate neighborhood impacts from future increases in traffic to and from the campus. Maclay provides an additional connection to the 210 freeway along with the Hubbard Street freeway connection.

The Revised Master Plan identifies eight new buildings and additional parking to expand the LAMC campus and accommodate the projected growth in student enrollment. The locations of the facilities on the two proposed sites and within individual sites has not been determined at this time. The Master Plan will be refined based on a dialogue with the college community and representatives from local neighborhood groups. The following programs would be accommodated (all gross square footages [GSF] and parking stalls are approximate):

### Table 1: LAMC Master Plan Floor Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Existing Buildings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fl. Area GSF</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional/Administration</td>
<td>83,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Learning</td>
<td>55,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Center</td>
<td>35,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Studies</td>
<td>17,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Services</td>
<td>13,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>206,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposed Buildings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fl. Area GSF</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant Facilities</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Consumer</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Center</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and P.E.</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 5</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 6</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>349,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total GSF. Exist.+ Proposed)**: 555,000

**Total Parking Required = 555,000 GSF / 250 GSF per stall = 2220 stalls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Parking Facilities</strong></th>
<th><strong>No. of Stalls</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure ‘A’</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Parking Required</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Master Plan Parking Required</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 1,200-car parking structure is currently under construction at the southern end of the main campus. Several of the proposed facilities would initially be developed on the existing LAMC property. The
facilities include the new child development center, a Health and Physical Education Facility; and the Family & Consumer Studies Building including a book store, along with associated parking. The Media Arts Project is also included in the initial phase and may have flexibility to be located off site. Additional parking would also be developed offsite. This initial phase of development is expected to begin in early 2007 and be completed in 2010.

Under Plan B – Extended Campus Plan, off site land could be used to accommodate a portion of the second phase of development. This phase of development would include plant facilities, student services, and associated parking. This second phase is not yet funded and will be scheduled as funding becomes available.

The full implementation of the proposed master plan would also include two new educational buildings within the LAMC Expansion totaling approximately 60,000 square feet. Construction of this latter phase is expected to be completed some time between 2010 and 2015.

C. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA), as amended, an Initial Study (IS) for the proposed project has been conducted to identify any potential significant environmental effects and to determine whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration (ND) should be prepared. Based on the preliminary analysis in this Initial Study, future development and construction pursuant to the Mission College Master Plan has the potential to result in significant effects on the environment. The District finds that a Program Environmental Impact Report is the appropriate environmental document per the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

Effects Found to be Potentially Significant

The development of the Mission College Master Plan is examined in this Initial Study to identify potential effects on the environment (refer to attached Environmental Checklist). Some project specific and some cumulative impacts have been determined to be potentially significant and will be analyzed in the EIR. These include impacts to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards/Hazardous Materials, Hydrology / Water Quality, Land Use/Planning, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, Utilities/Service Systems, Energy Conservation and Sustainability. The EIR will provide a detailed assessment of the effects identified as potentially significant in this Initial Study and through the EIR scoping process and will identify ways to mitigate these impacts.

Effects Not Found to be Potentially Significant

The following potential impacts were determined either to be not significant or to be mitigable through measures included in the project: Agricultural Resources, Mineral Resources, and Population / Housing. These issues require no further environmental analysis in the Master EIR.
D. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the Initial Study, the proposed project, related project, and project and construction activities along with the implementation of mitigation measures may have a significant effect on the environment. An EIR is the appropriate environmental document per the requirements of CEQA.

E. DOCUMENT PREPARATION

This Initial Study (IS) was prepared by URS Corporation (URS) under contract to Los Angeles Mission College.
1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This environmental document is an Initial Study (IS). An IS is a preliminary analysis of the proposed project to ascertain those areas in which the project may have a significant impact on the environment requiring detailed analysis in an Environmental Impact Report. The Los Angeles Community College District is the Lead Agency for the project under CEQA.

This document has been prepared in accordance with the California CEQA Guidelines, with Title 14 of the California Administrative Code, as revised.

1.2 PROJECT TITLE

Proposed Mission College Master Plan and Improvement Program

1.3 LEAD AGENCY

Los Angeles Community College District

1.4 CONTACT PERSON

Nick Quintanilla –Construction Manager
C/o Michele Walters –Administrative Assistant
13356 Eldridge Avenue
Sylmar, CA 91342
Email: Michele.Walters@PropositionA.org
Phone: 818-364-7819

1.5 PROJECT LOCATION

13356 Eldridge Avenue, Sylmar, CA 91342-3245 and two parcels on Harding Street between El Cariso County Golf Course and Kismet Avenue

1.6 PROJECT SPONSOR’S CONTACT NAME AND ADDRESS

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

1.7 GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION

Public Facilities and Single Family Residential
1.8 ZONING
Public Facilities (PF), and Low Density Residential (RE9, RS, R1 and RD6)

1.9 PROJECT LOCATION
The proposed project is located within Township 3 North, Range 15 West, as depicted on the Sylmar, California USGS 7.5 Minute Series Topographic Quadrangle Map. The project site is situated in the San Fernando Valley, located just south and west of the Angeles National Forest and approximately 20-miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles. Regional access to the project site is provided via the Interstate 210 (Foothill) Freeway, located approximately one-mile southwest of the project site. The project site consists of approximately 31 acres.

1.10 SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING
The Project site is bounded by single-family and multi-family residential development to the north, south, and west, and Pacoima Wash to the east. The Harding Street Site is located on land designated as Single-Family Residential and is bounded by Open Space to the north and east and single-family residential to the west and south. Single-family homes border the LAMC main campus, fronting Eldridge Avenue, and a mix of single-family and multi-family (condominium and apartments) front Hubbard Avenue. Single family homes border the Harding Street Site, fronting Harding Street and Crenston Street. Pacoima Wash, which runs in a north-south direction, is located east of the Project site, with single-family homes located further east beyond Pacoima Wash.
DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier FIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier FIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature:  Dr. Jose Leyba, Ph.D.  Date:  July 6, 2006

Printed Name: Dr. Jose Leyba, Ph.D.  For:  Los Angeles Community College District
2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factor(s) checked below would be potentially affected by the project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

| ☑ Aesthetics | ☐ Agricultural Resources | ☑ Air Quality |
| ☑ Biological Resources | ☑ Cultural Resources | ☑ Geology / Soils |
| ☑ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | ☑ Hydrology / Water Quality | ☑ Land Use / Planning |
| ☐ Mineral Resources | ☑ Noise | ☐ Population / Housing |
| ☑ Public Services | ☑ Recreation | ☑ Transportation / Traffic |
| ☑ Utilities / Service Systems | ☑ Energy Conservation and Sustainability | ☑ Mandatory Findings of Significance |
2.1 **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND ANALYSIS**

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). Earlier analyzes are discussed in Section 17 at the end of the checklist.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

The following is a checklist used to address the different environmental disciplines that could be potentially impacted by the proposed project.
2.1.1 Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation**

The project site does not contain any unique or valuable scenic features, and none of the roadways adjacent to or in the near vicinity of the Project site are designated as a scenic highway in the Transportation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan. The City-designated scenic highway nearest to the Project site is the Interstate 210 (Foothill) Freeway, located approximately one mile southwest of the site. As project development would not affect any portion of this Scenic Highway, no impact upon the scenic resources associated with this highway would occur. Further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.¹

As described in detail in the Project Description, implementation of the proposed project would result in construction of additional educational facilities on both the main campus and the Harding Street property. Therefore, the Project would substantially alter the visual character of the site, would create new sources of light and glare, which could potentially be significant. Furthermore, the proposed development could potentially affect existing views of the mountains from both sites and the Pacoima Wash from the Harding Street property. These issues shall be analyzed in the EIR, with feasible mitigation measures proposed as necessary.

¹ City of Los Angeles. 1999. *City of Los Angeles General Plan: Transportation Element*. Available at: http://www.ci.la.ca.us/PLN/Cwd/GnlPln/TransElt/index.htm
2.1.2 Agricultural Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) Prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional Model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

Explanation

According to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines and the California Department of Conservation, a project will have a significant impact on agricultural resources if it falls into any of the following state and federal farmland designations: Prime Farmland; Farmland of Statewide Importance; or Unique Farmland (US Department of Conservation). The project site is not zoned for agricultural uses nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. Furthermore, no agricultural uses or related operations are present on the project or within the surrounding area. The site is not considered prime or unique farmland of statewide or local importance as identified by the State Department of Conservation and the City of Los Angeles General Plan. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of designated farmland, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses. Further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.2

2.1.3 Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
b) Violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality standard? ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Explanation

No objectionable odors are expected as a result of Project construction or operation. Objectionable odors are typically associated with waste handling, treatment and disposal, facilities and with industrial operations that utilize strong-smelling elements or processes. The Project does not include these types of uses or activities. Therefore, no impact related to objectionable odors would occur. Further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.

The state and federal governments have set health standards for air pollution, specifying levels beyond which the air is deemed unhealthful. The Project Site is located in the South Coast Air Basin and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Governing Board adopted the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) on August 1, 2003 to achieve compliance with State and federal air quality standards. The 2003 AQMP updates the attainment demonstration for the federal standards for ozone and particulate matter (PM$_{10}$); replaces the 1997 attainment demonstration for the federal carbon monoxide (CO) standard and provides a basis for a maintenance plan for CO for the future; and updates the maintenance plan for the federal nitrogen dioxide (NO$_{2}$) standard that the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) has met since 1992. The 2003 AQMP is consistent with and builds upon the approaches taken in the 1997 AQMP and the 1999 Amendments to the Ozone SIP for the South Coast Air Basin for the attainment of the federal
ozone air quality standard. The AQMP provides the framework for air quality planning within the South Coast Air Basin, and lay out the SCAQMD’s strategy to reduce emissions of non-attainment pollutants.

The project could result in increases in air emissions from construction, vehicle trips, and other sources, which could potentially; conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD or Congestion Management Plan; violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of ozone, carbon monoxide, or PM$_{10}$, for which the South Coast Air basin, as described above, is currently in non-attainment. Furthermore, the increases in air emissions could potentially expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Potential air quality impacts resulting from the proposed project shall be analyzed in detail in the EIR with feasible mitigation measures proposed as necessary.\textsuperscript{3} The EIR will provide for dust control measures to protect adjacent residential neighborhoods.

\textsuperscript{3} South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2003. \textit{Air Quality}. Available at: \url{http://www.aqmd.gov/smog/index.html}
2.1.4 Biological Resources

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of he Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use if native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Explanation

The Project site is not currently a part of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impact related to conflict with habitat conservation plans would occur. Further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.

It is not yet known with specificity whether any of Harding Street parcels support species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the
California Department of Fish and game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS), or whether any of the parcels support the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or native nursery sites. Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the development of open space/recreational and wash-adjacent properties that support trees and other vegetation, which could serve as foraging and nesting habitat for birds and other species. Furthermore, the site parcels could contain habitat within CDFG or USFWS jurisdiction that could be affected by Project development. Potential impacts related to biological resources resulting from the proposed project shall be analyzed in detail in the EIR with feasible mitigation measures proposed as necessary.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5 Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation

Section 15064.5 (a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines defines cultural resources as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript determined to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social political, military, or cultural annals of California. Significant cultural resources are defined as those associated with significant events, important persons, or distinctive characteristics of a type, period, method of construction, representing the work of a master, or possessing high artistic values.

The proposed project site is located within the boundaries of the former lands of the San Fernando Rey de Espana Mission. In addition, four Historical Landmarks are located within the community of Sylmar: ⁵

- San Fernando (Pioneer Memorial) Cemetery: California State Historic Landmark 753

---

14451 Bledsoe Street, Sylmar, CA  
*Within 1.5 miles of the Project Site*

- Griffith Ranch: California State Historic Landmark 716  
  12685 Foothill Blvd, Sylmar, CA  
  *Within 2 miles of the Project Site*

  Havana St. and Bleeker St., Sylmar, CA  
  *Within 4 miles of the Project Site*

- The Cascades: California State Historic Landmark 653  
  Foothill Blvd and Balboa Blvd, Sylmar, CA  
  *Within 5 miles of the Project Site*

The proposed project area shall be formally evaluated for the presence of historically significant structures or extant buildings that may be impacted by the proposed project. In addition, an archaeological records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center shall be conducted to determine the potential impact to archaeological resources as a result of the proposed project will be conducted for the EIR. Since the project site is located within former Mission Lands, and given the presence of historic resources within the community, there is a likelihood the project may impact cultural resources related to historic and archaeological resources.

The proposed project site is underlain with Surficial Sediments (Qg and Qa), Older Dissected Surficial Sediments (Qae), and at deeper depths the Saugus Formation (QTs). While Surficial Sediments and Older Dissected Surficial Sediments do not contain paleontological resources, excavation at greater depths into the Saugus Formation may encounter fossils of Pleistocene age. A record search with the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County: Department of Vertebrate Paleontology will be conducted for the EIR.

The nearest formal cemetery to the project site is Pioneer Cemetery, which is registered with the State of California as California State Historic Landmark 753. Pioneer Cemetery is located 14451 Bledsoe Street, Sylmar, CA, within 1.5 miles of the proposed project site. The proposed project site is not within a formal cemetery. An archaeological record search and coordination with local Native American groups will assist in the assessment of the potential impact on non-formal burials for of the EIR.

Cultural Resources will be assessed further in the Environmental Impact Report with feasible mitigation measures proposed as necessary.

---

6 Dibblee, Thomas W. Jr., California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology; and U.S. Geological Survey. 1991. Geologic Map of the San Fernando and Van Nuys (North ½) Quadrangles, Los Angeles County, California. Published by: Dibblee Geological Foundation P.O. Box 60560, Santa Barbara, CA 93160.
2.1.6  Energy Conservation and Sustainability

a) Cause wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during the project construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐
   - Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated: ☑
   - Less Than Significant Impact: ☐
   - No Impact: ☐

b) Cause preempting of future energy development or future energy conservation?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐
   - Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated: ☐
   - Less Than Significant Impact: ☑
   - No Impact: ☐

c) Cause short-term gain vs. long-term impacts?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐
   - Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated: ☐
   - Less Than Significant Impact: ☑
   - No Impact: ☐

Explanation

The proposed project has the potential to cause inefficient use of energy during construction, operation, or maintenance. In analyzing impacts related to the consumption of energy and other natural resources, the EIR will discuss the Sustainability Guidelines adopted by the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees for the Proposition A program. Therefore, Energy Conservation and Sustainability will be analyzed in the EIR, in accordance with CEQA Appendix F: Energy Conservation and the LACCD Sustainability Guidelines. The EIR will evaluate energy conservation measures such as the use of photovoltaics in the construction of the College buildings.

2.1.7  Geology and Soils

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, or injury, or death involving:

   i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.  
      - Potentially Significant Impact: ☑
      - Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated: ☐
      - Less Than Significant Impact: ☐
      - No Impact: ☐

   ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?  
       - Potentially Significant Impact: ☑
       - Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated: ☐
       - Less Than Significant Impact: ☐
       - No Impact: ☐

   iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?  
       - Potentially Significant Impact: ☑
       - Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated: ☐
       - Less Than Significant Impact: ☐
       - No Impact: ☐
## Potentially Significant Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Explanation

The project site is located in an area served by existing sewer infrastructure, and implementation of the proposed project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. As such, impacts related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not occur. Therefore, further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not required.

The project site is located in the seismically active southern California region and the potential exists for moderate to strong ground shaking to occur at the project site during large local seismic events. While the site is not located within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (APEX), an Earthquake Fault Rupture Hazard Zone as designated by either the State or the County, or a Fault Rupture Study Area as designated by the City, there are other known surface ruptures throughout the Sylmar area attributable to the 1971 Sylmar Earthquake; such as the Sylmar Fault Zone, Tujunga Fault, and Mission Wells Fault. Furthermore, designated APEFZ areas exist with the subregion. Therefore, undetected and unmapped faults may exist with the project site. The potential to expose people, property, and infrastructure to seismic related hazards such as fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, and seismic ground failure including but not limited to liquefaction and landslides, shall be analyzed in detail in the EIR with feasible mitigation measures as necessary.

---

8 Dibblee, Thomas W. Jr., California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology; and U.S. Geological Survey. 1991. Geologic Map of the San Fernando and Van Nuys (North ½) Quadrangles, Los Angeles County, California. Published by: Dibblee Geological Foundation P.O. Box 60560, Santa Barbara, CA 93160.
2.1.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☧

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ☐ ☐ ☧ ☐

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? ☐ ☐ ☧ ☐

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites Compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ☐ ☧ ☐ ☐

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☧ ☐

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☧ ☐

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan or emergency evacuation plan? ☐ ☐ ☧ ☐

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? ☐ ☐ ☧ ☐

Explanation

Construction and operation of the Project would not involve use of hazardous materials. Any hazardous materials utilized would be limited to those typically used in construction, academic support and standard maintenance activities. All hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers’ instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. Any associated risk would be adequately reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with these standards and regulations, and no mitigation measures are required.
Los Angeles Mission College Facilities Master Plan
INITIAL STUDY

With regard to the potential hazardous materials that might exist on the Project site, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment\(^9\) was prepared for the Main Campus, which found that there are no listed hazardous materials sites on the subject properties, or in the immediate vicinity. The Main Campus and the Harding Street Campus parcels are not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The nearest site is located at 12831 Hubbard Street approximately 0.8 miles from the Project site\(^10\). A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will be prepared for the Harding Street Campus to further investigate the presence of hazardous materials on the two parcels.

The Project site is not included within an airport land use plan, nor is it in the vicinity of a private air strip or within two miles of a public use airport. As such, the Project would not result in an airport-related hazard to people residing or working in the Project Area. Further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.

Implementation of the Project would not result in the closure of any street, particularly those designated as an evacuation route in an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. To the extent feasible, construction activities and staging areas would not physically block any streets or impair access to and around the Project site or any adjacent properties. The proposed development would be designed to conform to the standards of the Los Angeles Fire department for emergency egress. Furthermore, proposed LAMC developments would be integrated into the existing LAMC emergency response and evacuation plans. The EIR will discuss the effects of an earthquake related shutdown of Highway 210 on emergency access. As such, potential impacts to adopted emergency response or evacuation plans would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

While the Project site is near the Angeles National Forest, given the distances and intervening residential uses, wildfire hazards are not considered potentially significant.

---


\(^10\) Department of Toxic Substances and Control (DTSC), Envirostor Database (Cortese List) http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/
## Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure if a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanation

The project site is not subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. A seiche is an oscillation of a body of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin, such as a reservoir, harbor, lake or storage tank. A tsunami is a great sea wave, commonly referred to as a tidal wave, produced by a significant undersea disturbance such as a tectonic displacement of the sea floor associated with large, shallow earthquakes. Mudflows result from the downslope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity. The
The project site is located over 20 miles from the nearest ocean and is therefore unlikely to be impacted by the occurrence of a tsunami. The project site is not in the vicinity of a reservoir, harbor, lake, or storage tank capable of creating a seiche. Therefore, no impact would occur with regard to seiche or tsunami.

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map according to the City of Los Angeles Flood Zone Information Map, or a levee or dam failure-related inundation area, nor does the project propose residential development. As such, project implementation would not place housing or school buildings within a 100-year flood hazard area. The Flood Zone Information Map however, indicates a possible 100-year special flood hazard area that runs through an adjacent property (El Cariso Park - County Recreation Area). To assure that potential flooding impacts, if any, are addressed, the flood plain issues and flooding shall be analyzed in detail in the EIR with feasible mitigation measures proposed as necessary.

The project proposes removal of some of the existing facilities and the addition of new buildings within the project site. This increase in impervious area resulting from the Project could marginally reduce percolation, though not to a significant extent such that local groundwater supplies would be substantially depleted. As such, groundwater impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures required. Further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.

Implementation of the project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. The project proposes an artificial Arroyo through the Main Campus, which would carry some of the anticipated storm water. Furthermore, an increase in urban contaminants can be expected from the project. Regulatory and permitting processes have been established to control water quality of runoff from construction sites within urban environments, such as the project site. In 1987, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, also referred to as the CWA, was amended to provide that the discharge of pollutants into waters of the United States from storm water is effectively prohibited, unless the discharge is in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. The 1987 amendments to the CWA added Section 402 (p), which established a framework for regulating municipal, industrial and construction stormwater Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs). The project site is within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB. The SWRCB has adopted a statewide general construction permit that applies to most construction projects. This permit allows storm water discharge under certain conditions during the construction period but is intended to minimize the pollution of downstream receiving waters from construction activities. The project would be served by engineered drainage systems that would connect to the existing storm drain system and is expected to be designed to meet all applicable NPDES permits requirements.  

As part of the project, the City Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan (SUSMP) requirements would be implemented. Under the SUSMP requirements, the project would be designed to ensure that post-development peak storm water runoff discharge rates would not exceed the estimated pre-development peak storm water runoff discharge rates would not exceed the estimated pre-development rates such that there would be an increased potential for downstream runoff. The SUSMP requirements also include, but are not

---

limited to, the following: minimizing stormwater pollutants of concern; providing storm drain system stenciling and signage; containing properly designed outdoor material storage areas; and providing proof of ongoing BMP maintenance. Issues concerning hydrology and water quality will be addressed in detail in the EIR with feasible mitigation measures proposed as necessary.\textsuperscript{12, 13}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.1.10 Land Use and Planning

a) Physically divide an established community? ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? ☐ ☐ ☑ ☑

Explanation

The Project site is directly bounded by single-family and multi-family residential development to the north, south, and west, and Pacoima Wash to the east. The Harding Street Campus is located on land designated as Single-Family Residential and is bounded by Open Space to the north and east and single-family residential to the west and south. Single-family homes border the LAMC main campus, fronting Eldridge Avenue, and a mix of single-family and multi-family (condominium and apartments) front Hubbard Avenue. Single family homes border the Harding Street Campus, fronting Harding Street and Crenston Street. Pacoima Wash, which runs in a north-south direction, is located east of the Project site, with single-family homes located further east beyond Pacoima Wash. All of the project components fall within either the existing College campus or at the Harding Street site. The existing College campus will not divide an existing community. The Harding Street site is located on vacant land at the edge of a residential community and hence will have less significant impacts in physically dividing an existing community.\textsuperscript{14}

Although California State Law permits District classroom facilities to be exempted from local zoning control, the EIR will address consistency between the proposed Master Plan facilities and existing zoning regulations of the City of Los Angeles. The pertinent plans and policies include the City of Los Angeles General Plan, the City of Los Angeles, 2001. City of Los Angeles, Sylmar Community Plan. Available at: www.lacity.org/PLN


\textsuperscript{13} Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Water Quality Control Plan: Los Angeles Region Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. Available at: www.swrceb.ca.gov/rwqcb4/

\textsuperscript{14} City of Los Angeles, 2001. City of Los Angeles, Sylmar Community Plan. Available at: www.lacity.org/PLN
the Sylmar Community Plan, and the City of Los Angeles Municipal code. The Los Angeles Community College District and the Los Angeles Mission College Master Plan specifically influence LAMC land use decisions for the campus. Regional agencies including the SCAG, Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and the SCAQMD, are also involved with planning and land use issues that affect the Project site. The Project’s relationship with these policies, regulations and plans will be evaluated in detail in the EIR. The EIR will discuss the compatibility and potential conflicts of proposed Master Plan land uses with existing established neighborhood. Additionally, air quality impacts and traffic impacts will also be analyzed in the EIR. These analyses will address the Project’s relationship to the Congestion Management Plan and the AQMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 2.1.11 Mineral Resources

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?

- No significant impacts

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- No significant impacts

**Explanation**

Development associated with the project would occur on sites currently containing educational or recreational uses, or on vacant, undeveloped land. The project site is not located in an area containing significant mineral deposits, as designated by the City of Los Angeles.\(^{15}\) No significant impacts to mineral resources will occur. Therefore, development associated with the project would not change the availability of known or potential mineral resources. The applicable local land use plans do not delineate that the site or that the area contains significant mineral deposits or are designated as a locally important mineral resources site.\(^{16}\) Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a land use plan. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required. Further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.

---

\(^{15}\) City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning. Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework, Environmental Impact Report, 2001. Figure GS-1.

\(^{16}\) Sylmar Community Plan, Part of the General Plan, City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning.
2.1.12 Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation

The Project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of an airport, public use airport or private airstrip. Additionally, construction and operation of the Project would not include activities that would generate excessive groundborne noise or vibration. Therefore, the Project would not expose people to excessive groundborne noise or airport related noise levels. Further discussion of this issue is not necessary in the EIR.

The LAMC establishes regulations regarding allowable increases in noise levels as a result of project implementation, both in terms of project operations and construction activities. In addition, the city’s General Plan Noise Element has established noise guidelines that are used for planning purposes. These guidelines are based in part on the community noise compatibility guidelines established by the State Department of Health Services and are intended for use in assessing the compatibility of various land use types with a range of noise levels. The Project would generate noise as a result of short-term construction activities, short-term and long-term vehicular activity, long-term outdoor uses including recreational uses, and on-site stationary noise sources. Topographical noise effects on residential areas north of the extended campus site in the wash will be evaluated. The relationship of the Project generated noise and the established City standards shall be analyzed and discussed in the EIR with feasible mitigation measures proposed as necessary.
2.1.13 Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Induce substantial growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation

Development associated with the Project would occur on sites that do not contain residential uses and none would be provided as part of the proposed Project. The Project would not result in the displacement of any housing. The Project would expand the capacity of the LAMC campus in order to accommodate the needs of the surrounding population and therefore, it is not expected to induce substantial population growth in the area. Currently, students who attend the campus either live in the community or commute from the local area. Further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.

2.1.14 Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanation

The project would generate additional demands for fire and police protection services. The relationship of the existing fire and police protection services capabilities and the project generated demands on these services shall be analyzed and discussed in the EIR. The effects of an earthquake related shutdown of Highway 210 access on fire and police protection services will be considered in the EIR. The project site is located adjacent to El Cariso County Park. However, the proposed project will not utilize park space, reduce park space, or impede use or access to the park. However, further discussion of this issue will be included in the EIR with feasible mitigation measures proposed as necessary.

The project is not expected to introduce any new population to the region that would require instruction or service from the public school system (other than those being served by the project itself) or the public library system. As such, project development would result in a less than significant impact on schools and libraries, and no mitigation measures are required. Further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.

2.1.15 Recreation

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration the facility would occur to be accelerated? □ ☑ □ □

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment? □ □ □ ☑

Explanation

The proposed project would not induce growth to the area nor promote the use of neighborhood or regional parks. No significant impacts will occur.

The proposed project does not involve the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities and, therefore, no impacts to the environment would occur. However, while there would be direct impacts to the nearby El Cariso County Park, there is a possibility of indirect impacts by the potential increase in
student use as a result of the Facility Plan development of the College. Therefore, this issue will be discussed further in the EIR and mitigation measures as appropriate will be provided.

### 2.1.16 Transportation/Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation**

The Project does not propose any uses expected to change air traffic patterns. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, nor is it within two miles of an airport. No impact is expected, and no mitigation measures are required. Further discussion of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.

Construction and operation of the proposed Project would result in an increase in traffic. Therefore, the proposed Project could result in an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to ratio capacity on roads, or congestion at intersections). Existing and future traffic patterns relative to nearby neighborhoods will be evaluated. The EIR will conduct traffic counts at affected intersections, including but not limited to Hubbard Street, Maclay Street, Gladstone, Fenton Avenue and neighborhood streets north of the College. The EIR will analyze the existing cumulative and project related traffic on affected streets and intersections. The EIR will also analyze neighborhood safety issues related to traffic along affected roads and discuss the feasibility of employing traffic calming measures where college related traffic affects adjacent neighborhoods.
Furthermore, the proposed development would generate increased demands for parking. Both on-campus and off-campus parking impacts are possible. The EIR will assess the availability of parking to accommodate the total number of students and faculty members expected to be present on the campus during peak times. Reasonable worst case scenarios will be generated considering peak student and faculty presence on campus and active LAUSD sessions. Under Plan B - Extended Campus Plan, the EIR will examine the feasibility of a people mover or a shuttle service between the main campus and the extended campus to reduce traffic along local streets. The EIR will also discuss measures such as providing incentives for transit use.

The Extended Campus Plan extends Eldridge Avenue connecting it to Maclay Street. The EIR will examine the effects of this extension and the future of the remaining segment of Harding Street north of Eldridge Avenue.

Implementation of the Master Plan should not result in the closure of any street, particularly those designated as an evacuation route in an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. The proposed development would be designed to conform to the standards of the Los Angeles Fire Department for emergency access and egress. Furthermore, proposed LAMC developments would be integrated into the existing LAMC emergency response and evacuation plans. The EIR will discuss the effects of an earthquake related shutdown of Highway 210 on emergency access.

These issues, along with the relationship of the Project to adopted policies, plans and programs supporting alternative transportation, will be evaluated in the EIR and mitigation measures shall be proposed where feasible.
2.1.17 Utilities and Service Systems

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? □ □ ✔ ○

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? □ □ ✔ ○

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? □ ✔ ○ ○

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? □ ✔ ○ ○

e) Result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? □ □ ✔ ○

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? ✔ □ ○ ○

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? □ □ □ ✔

Explanation

The proposed project would generate additional potable water demand and an increase in the volume of wastewater flows, which could affect the City’s water conveyance system, or the wastewater conveyance or treatment systems. The ability of the local water and wastewater conveyance systems to accommodate the project will be evaluated in further detail in the EIR and mitigation measures shall be proposed where feasible. The EIR will examine the relationship of the Master Plan to existing easements and underground utilities.

The project would operate in accordance with the City’s Solid Waste Management Policy Plan and Framework Element of the General Plan, in addition to applicable Federal and State regulations associated with solid waste. The proposed project will include construction waste and operations
recycling programs. This issue will also be evaluated in further detail in the EIR and mitigation measures shall be proposed where feasible.\textsuperscript{17,18}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation**

Based on the analysis contained in this Initial Study, aspects of the project have the potential for significant impacts. An EIR will be prepared to analyze and document these potentially significant impacts. Though these impacts are not expected to directly reduce or eliminate any plant or animal species, or destroy prehistoric records of the past, they do have the potential to degrade habitat.

Some aspects of the Project have been identified as having the potential for significant environmental impacts and will be analyzed itself and documented in the EIR. In addition, the potential for cumulative impacts related to Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Air Quality, Land Use, Noise, Traffic, Public


\textsuperscript{18} City of Los Angeles. 2001. City of Los Angeles Solid Waste Management Policy Plan and Framework Element. Available at: http://www.ci.la.ca.us/PLN/Cwd/Framwk/Frame0.htm
Services, Geology and Soils, Recreation, and Utilities/Service Systems resulting from the Project in conjunction with related projects cannot be fully determined in this study and will also be analyzed and documented in the EIR.
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