LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE
MASTER PLAN
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2002011125

Prepared for

THE LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
770 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

Prepared by

TERRY A. HAYES ASSOCIATES LLC
6083 BRISTOL PARKWAY, SUITE 200
CULVER CITY, CA 90230

APRIL 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (con't.)

Page No.

APPENDICES (Provided in a Second Volume)

LIST OF FIGURES

TABLE OF CONTENTS (con't.)

Page No.

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS (con't.)

Page No.

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Los Angeles City College District (LACCD) has prepared a Master Plan for improvements to Los Angeles City College (LACC) located in Los Angeles, California (see **Figure 1-1**). This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addresses the potential environmental effects of the proposed LACC Master Plan. The Master Plan includes the relocation of the athletic field, construction of two parking structures and the addition of 200,000 net new square feet of building space for a total of 996,428 square feet of space as well as an increase in parking from 1,645 parking spaces to 2,604 spaces.

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The purpose of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), as defined in Section 15121 (a) of the State Guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3 "Guidelines," is to "inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effect and describe reasonable alternatives to the project." This document assesses the significant environmental impacts, including unavoidable adverse impacts and cumulative impacts, related to the adoption and implementation of the proposed Los Angeles City College Master Plan (hereafter referred to as the "proposed project"). Where there is potential for a significant adverse effect, this report identifies mitigation measures or alternatives that would either eliminate the impact or reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. This report also identifies those significant effects that may be unavoidable even after the implementation of feasible mitigation or feasible project alternatives, if any.

1.2 AUTHORIZATION AND FOCUS

This EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 and the Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (the "State CEQA Guidelines"), as amended to date. Specifically, this document evaluates the environmental effects which may result from the implementation of the LACC Master Plan. The following environmental issues were identified as having potential to result in a significant impact:

- Aesthetics and Lighting
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Seismicity
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

1.3 LEAD AGENCY

The Los Angeles Community College District is the Lead Agency in accordance with Section 15367 of the CEQA Guidelines, which defines the lead agency as "the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving the project."

Los Angeles Community College District
770 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Contact: Andy Dunn

1.4 INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

This EIR is prepared at the direction and under the supervision of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). As discussed above, the LACCD is the Lead Agency. The intended use of this EIR is to assist the LACCD in making decisions with regards to the approval of the LACC Master Plan. Additionally, the EIR will be used for future approvals of projects by the LACCD which are consistent with the Master Plan.

1.5 PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENTS

A Notice of Preparation for this EIR was issued on January 28, 2002 by the Lead Agency. Information, data, and observations resulting from these contacts are included where relevant. This Draft EIR will be circulated for a 45-day public review period. The public is invited to comment in writing on the information contained in this document. Persons and agencies commenting are encouraged to provide information that they believe is missing from the Draft EIR, and to identify where the information can be obtained. All comment letters received will be responded to in writing, and the comment letters, together with the responses to those comments, will be included in the Final EIR.

2.0 SUMMARY

This chapter summarizes the key findings of this Environmental Impact Report, including the environmental effects, mitigation measures, unavoidable significant adverse impacts, and any areas of environmental controversy concerning the proposed project.

2.1 SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The primary goal of the Master Plan is to provide a framework for long-term development for the campus, whose growth has been static for some years. The proposed Master Plan will allow the campus to grow and respond to evolving community needs.

Improvements contemplated in the Master Plan will add approximately 200,000 square feet of enclosed building area to the LACC facilities and increase parking from 1,645 spaces to 2,604 parking spaces.

2.2 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental impacts associated with the construction and long-term operation of the proposed project, and to identify mitigation measures capable of avoiding or substantially reducing the impacts. To satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and to assist the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) and other interested citizens and community organizations in understanding the findings of the EIR, potential impacts of the proposed project have been divided into three categories: unavoidable significant adverse impacts, significant impacts that can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels, and impacts which are less-than-significant or nonexistent when compared to the environmental impact thresholds identified in this report. The criteria for the determination of a significant impact in each environmental topic area is discussed in the body of this report.

The impacts are evaluated for the construction period as well as for the period of ongoing operations. As required by CEQA, mitigation measures are identified in this EIR to avoid or substantially reduce the level of all identified significant impacts to the extent feasible. However, certain significant environmental impacts cannot be reduced to a level below significance, even with application of the identified mitigation measures. Such impacts are identified in this Draft EIR as "unavoidable significant adverse impacts." **Table 2-1** provides a summary of impacts and mitigation measures discussed in Section 4.0 of this EIR.

TABLE 2-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES			
Potential Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**		**Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts**
AESTHETICS			
Visual Impacts on Adjacent Residences	**AL1**	All mature trees shall be retained in the present location or relocated. If a qualified arborist determines that a tree cannot be relocated, then the tree shall be replaced on a one-for-one basis with a minimum 24-gallon species consistent with the proposed landscaping plan.	Implementation of mitigation measure **AL1** would reduce impacts on mature trees to a less-than-significant level.
	AL2	All light fixtures mounted at a height of greater than 20 feet shall be equipped with cutoff shields or hoods to prevent a direct line of sight from the light luminaries to an adjacent residential property.	Implementation of mitigation measures **AL2** and **AL3** would reduce impacts related to increased lighting levels to a less-than-significant level.
	AL3	The stadium, athletic field and tennis courts shall be screened using a combination of landscaping and structures along the western perimeter of these facilities to eliminate glare affecting residences on the west side of Heliotrope Drive.	
AIR QUALITY			
Construction Air Quality Impacts	**AQ1**	The construction area and vicinity (500-foot radius) shall be swept and watered at least twice daily. Site-wetting shall occur often enough to maintain a 10 percent surface soil moisture content throughout all earth-moving activities.	None
	AQ2	All unpaved parking or staging areas shall be watered at least once every two hours of active operations.	
	AQ3	Site access points shall be swept/washed within thirty minutes of visible dirt deposition.	
	AQ4	On-site stockpiles of debris, dirt or rusty material shall be covered or watered at least twice per hour.	
	AQ5	All haul trucks shall either be covered or maintain two feet of freeboard.	
	AQ6	All haul trucks shall have a capacity of no less than 14 cubic yards.	
	AQ7	At least 80 percent of all inactive disturbed surface areas shall be watered on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind-driven fugitive dust.	
	AQ8	Operations on any unpaved surfaces shall be suspended when winds exceed 25 mph.	
	AQ9	During grading and earthwork activities for construction of the new athletic field, the Child Development Center shall be temporarily relocated to an area that is 500 feet from any construction activities.	
	AQ10	Ventilation systems for all parking structures shall	

TABLE 2-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts
Operations	be located away from all sensitive receptors, particularly the residential uses on Heliotrope Drive.	Mitigation measure **AQ10** will reduce CO levels to less-than-significant levels.
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Historical Resources	**CR1** Historic American Building Survey documentation level 2 shall be prepared for the Chemistry Building and the Men's Gymnasium. This report shall document the significance of the building and its physical conditions, both historic and current through site plans, historic maps, photographs, written data, and text. The written text (HABS Narrative Format) documenting the architectural features and historic significance of the property, including contextual history of the junior college development era, biographies of the principal architect, published references to the construction, and other biographic sources. The photographic documentation shall note all significant exterior elevations and interior character-defining features. Photographs shall be large format, black and white, archival processed, and be taken by a professional photographer familiar with the recordation of historic buildings, and prepared in a format consistent with HABS standards for field photography. **CR2** The renovation and modernization of Holmes Hall, Cafeteria and Life Science buildings shall be carried out in accordance with the procedures established by the US Secretary of Interior for the Preservation of Historic Buildings. **CR3** Buildings, structures and outdoor spaces constructed adjacent to the Life Science Building shall be compatible in scale, style and character to this building. **CR4** An interpretive element such as a permanent historical display or integrative art work depicting the history of the campus will be included in the rehabilitation of the cafeteria/Holmes Hall area.	Implementation of mitigation measures **CR1** through **CR4** would enhance the integrity of the remaining 1930s buildings as well as provide an important documented and visual record for the buildings that would be removed. This documentation, however, would not reduce historical resource impacts to a less-than-significant level.
Archaeological Resources	**CR5** Consistent with CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15064.5(d) and (e)): If during construction, the existence of, or the probable likelihood, of Native American human remains are identified within the Project Area, the lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission as provided in Public Resources Code SS5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with	Implementation of mitigation measures **CR5** through **CR8** would reduce impacts to archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

TABLE 2-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts
	Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the steps identified in Section 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines shall be taken. **CR6** All civil engineering contracts shall indicate the potential for uncovering archaeological resources. Should archaeological resources be discovered, all activities in the vicinity of the find shall be halted and an RPA-certified archaeologist retained to assess the importance of the find and develop appropriate follow-up measures. **CR7** If buried cultural materials are exposed during construction, work must be halted in the immediate vicinity of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance (CEQA Section 15064.5-f and Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 210.82. **CR8** If the finds are termed significant, the archaeologist and a Native American Monitor should be permitted to remove the items in a professional manner for further laboratory evaluation (CEQA Section 15064.5-f and PRC Section 21082).	
GEOLOGY		
Seismic Hazards	**GS1** Soils shall be evaluated on a project-by-project basis, and appropriate mitigation recommended. If found, all compressible materials shall be removed and replaced as compacted fill (with the exception of peat, which shall be removed from the fills). The criteria for leaving surficial soils in place should be consistent with the grading specifications of the City of Los Angeles. Other recommendations may include deep piles or caissons to support the structures, and/or in-place mechanical densification of compressible layers. **GS2** If soils underlying the site specific proposed project area are determined susceptible to ground lurching, site-specific foundation recommendations may be made to mitigate this hazard. An alternative mitigation measure is to remove and recompact the subsurface soils prone to ground lurching. **GS3** If soils underlying the site specific proposed project area are determined to be highly expansive, impacts shall be mitigated by special foundations, such as post-tensioned slab foundations, raft foundations, or caissons.	Implementation of mitigation measures **GS1** through **GS3** would reduce potential topographic changes and erosion impacts to less-than-significant levels.

TABLE 2-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES			
Potential Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**		**Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts**
	GS4	The potential effects of ground shaking will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by designing the new LACC facilities to resist strong ground motions approximating the Design Basis Earthquake standards and the associated ground accelerations expected to occur in the vicinity of the site.	Implementation of mitigation measure **GS4** would reduce potential impacts of ground shaking to less-than-significant levels.
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
Removal of Buildings	**HR1**	Asbestos and lead investigations shall be conducted on structures built prior to 1988 that are to be demolished or rehabilitated. Where ACM, lead sheeting or lead based paint exceed regulatory action levels, appropriate abatement and management techniques shall be developed and implemented. Construction monitoring may be required to ensure the health and safety of construction workers.	Implementation of mitigation measures **HR1** through **HR4** would reduce potential impacts related to hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.
	HR2	For those campus facilities affected by the Master Plan, lead-based paint testing should be conducted due to the deteriorating condition of many painted surfaces. All materials identified as containing lead shall be removed by a licensed lead-based paint/materials abatement contractor.	
	HR3	For those campus facilities affected by the Master Plan, asbestos sampling should be conducted to determine if building materials used in the construction of the structures in question have an asbestos fiber content. All material identified as containing asbestos shall be removed and/or encapsulated by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor as provided by the provisions of Rule 1403 of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rules and Regulations	
	HR4	PCB containing units removed from buildings affected by the Master Plan should be properly disposed of as required by law.	
NOISE			
Construction Noise	**N1**	Haul truck routes shall avoid all schools and residential areas.	Construction noise would continue to exceed five decibels after implementation of mitigation measures **N1**, **N2**, **N3** and **N5**. This impact is considered unavoidable and significant.
	N2	Construction contracts shall specify that all construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices.	
	N3	Pursuant to the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code Article 1, Section 41.40, construction activities shall not occur between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the weekdays (Monday	

TABLE 2-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts
	through Friday), and before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and national holidays. No construction activities shall occur on Sundays. **N4** Construction operations shall be staged as far from noise sensitive land uses as possible. **N5** All sound-reducing devices and restrictions shall be maintained throughout the construction period. **N6** When feasible, replace noise equipment with quieter equipment (for example, a vibratory pile driver instead of a conventional pile driver and rubber-tired equipment rather than track equipment). **N7** Construction equipment shall be located as far as possible from noise sensitive areas. **N8** Construction occurring within 1,000 feet of the Child Development Center shall be limited to hours when the Child Development Center would not be affected. The Child Development Center shall be notified of particularly noisy activities. **N9** All residential units located within a quarter mile of the construction site (approximately 1,320 feet) shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule of the proposed project. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet, shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints. **N10** A "noise disturbance coordinator" shall be established for the construction of the proposed project. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and would be required to implement reasonable measures such that the complaint is resolved. All notices that are sent to residential units within 1,320 feet of the construction site and all signs posted at the construction site shall list the telephone number for the disturbance coordinator.	
Stadium Related Noise	**N11** Noise abatement shall be designed to limit the incremental noise change to less than 5 dB. Abatement measures may include the construction of a solid permanent screened wall of sufficient height along the perimeter of the athletic field on Heliotrope Drive, or other screening or buffering techniques.	Implementation of mitigation measures **N11** through **N14** would be effective in reducing crowd noise and noise from amplified sound. It is possible, however, that there would be intermittent and

TABLE 2-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES			
Potential Impacts		**Mitigation Measures**	**Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts**
			infrequent peaks where the noise change would be discernible after the implementation of the mitigation measures. However, these infrequent intermittent noise peaks would not be considered significant. With respect to vehicular noise, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.
	N12	The public address system shall be designed and operated to minimize sound being directed to areas outside of the athletic field. The speaker system shall be located behind the bleachers, oriented eastward, such that the speakers would be directed away from the residential uses on Heliotrope Drive.	
	N13	Contracts for events at the athletic field shall require that speakers be oriented in a north, east or south direction away from residences on Heliotrope Drive.	
	N14	Events at the athletic field shall be limited between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. All activities at the athletic field and tennis courts shall stop at 10:00 p.m.	
PUBLIC SERVICES			
Fire Protection-Emergency Response Times	No Mitigation Available		Unavoidable
Police protection services due to increased enrollment	**PS1**	Implement security features (i.e., install video surveillance cameras on campus, improve lighting, install or relocate emergency call stations) as proposed in the Los Angeles City College Master Plan.	Implementation of mitigation measures **PS1** through **PS4** would reduce police protection impacts to a less-than-significant level.
	PS2	Use “mantrap” controlled doors that comply with the California Building Code for Special Egress Control in areas where there are large amounts of money (i.e., Business Office, Cash Counting areas, and Staff access portals) as proposed in the Los Angeles City College Master Plan.	
	PS3	Install physical countermeasures that control or regulate how an associate operates their daily job function in the campus environment. Physical countermeasures include such elements as walls, fences, windows, barriers against movement, doors, locks, and other architectural elements of the facility.	
	PS4	The LACC staff and Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department shall develop a comprehensive liaison program with the Los Angeles Police Department. Develop specific points of contact and ongoing relationships between staffs to improve security on campus and in its surrounding areas.	
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC			
Operational Traffic Impacts	**T1**	**Sunset Boulevard and Vermont Avenue.** Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and	With the implementation of mitigation measure **T1**, the

TABLE 2-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts
	construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.	significant impact expected during the evening peak hour would be mitigated to a level less than significant (V/C ratio of 0.967 and LOS E).
	T2 **Santa Monica Boulevard and Normandie Avenue.** Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.	With the implementation of mitigation measure **T2**, the significant impact expected during the evening peak hour would be mitigated to a level less than significant (V/C ratio of 0.929 and LOS E).
	T3 **Melrose Avenue and Normandie Avenue.** Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.	With the implementation of mitigation measure **T3**, the operating conditions at the intersection would improve during both peak hours (V/C ratio 1.152 in the AM and 1.396 in the PM) however, the projects significant impact would not be mitigated to a level less than significant. Therefore, a residual significant impact at this location would be expected.
	T4 **Melrose Avenue and Vermont Avenue.** Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.	With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the significant impact expected during the morning peak hour would be mitigated to a level less than significant (V/C ratio of 0.716 and LOS C).
	T5 **Melrose Avenue and Virgil Avenue.** Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.	With the implementation of mitigation measure **T5**, the significant impact expected during the morning peak hour would be mitigated to a level less than significant (V/C ratio of 0.927 and LOS E).
	T6 **Beverly Boulevard and Vermont Avenue.** Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.	With the implementation of mitigation measure **T6**, the significant impact expected during the evening peak hour would be mitigated to a level less than significant (V/C ratio of 0.887 and LOS D).

TABLE 2-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES			
Potential Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**		**Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts**
UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS			
Impact on Utilities Capacity due to increased enrollment	**U1**	Water efficient landscaping and native and drought tolerant plants shall be used wherever possible.	None.
	U2	Landscaping design shall incorporate the use of high efficiency irrigation systems.	
	U3	Proposed projects shall be equipped with wastewater conservation fixtures including low flow toilets.	
	U4	The projects shall exceed local building codes in water reduction.	
	U5	Exceed the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHEAE) 1999 energy performance requirements by 15% for new construction and 10% for major renovation projects.	
	U6	Optimize building's energy performance using features such as functioning windows.	
	U7	Utilize renewable energy sources where feasible.	
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC.			

Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts. Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within an area affected by the project, including land, air, water, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance." In order to approve a project with unavoidable significant adverse impacts, the lead agency, Los Angeles Community College District, must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations (in accordance with 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines) indicating that the benefits of approving the proposed project outweigh the negative environmental consequences. For this reason, the public benefits of the proposed project must be clearly articulated.

Based on the analysis contained in this Draft EIR, the proposed project would create the following unavoidable significant impacts after the application of mitigation measures:

- Cultural Resources (historic resources)
- Noise (construction impact)
- Public Services (emergency response time)
- Transportation and Traffic - Impact at Melrose and Normandie Avenues
- Cumulative Parking Impact

Significant Impacts That Can Be Mitigated To A Less-Than-Significant Level. Based on the analysis contained in this Draft EIR, the proposed project would result in the following significant impacts that can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels:

- Aesthetics (mature trees and landscaping, lighting)

- Cultural Resources (archaeological resources)
- Geology and Soils (geologic materials and soils, ground shaking)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (asbestos, lead-based paint, and PCBs)
- Noise (Athletic Field - crowd noise and public address system)
- Public Services (police protection)
- Transportation and Traffic (five intersections)

Less-Than-Significant Or No Impact. Based on the analysis contained in this Master Plan Draft EIR, the following were found to result in a less-than-significant impact or no impact.

- Aesthetics (scenic highways, campus open space, and shadows)
- Air Quality (construction emissions, operation emissions, CO Hot Spots, Consistency with AQMP)
- Geology and Soils (landslide hazards, liquefaction hazards, other seismic hazards, tsunamis, inundation, and seiches)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (subsidence and methane gas, soil and/or groundwater contamination, and release of hazardous materials)
- Land Use and Planning (compatibility with SCAG regional policies, and local plans and land use regulations)
- Noise (traffic-related noise)
- Transportation and Traffic (fourteen intersections, parking)
- Utilities (water supply, wastewater, solid waste, stormwater runoff, electricity and natural gas)

2.3 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The supply of parking provided by LACC has been and continues to be an area of controversy. A complete discussion of parking impacts can be found in Section 4.9 Transportation and Traffic and 6.0 Cumulative and Long-Term Impacts.

No other areas of controversy or issues to be resolved by the decision-makers have been identified for this project.

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 BACKGROUND

Los Angeles City College (LACC) is one of nine colleges within the Los Angeles Community College District (the District). The campus, previously used as a Normal school by the University of California as the Los Angeles campus, was first built in the early 1900s. The campus began operating as a junior college in 1929 and acquired its current name, Los Angeles City College, in 1938.

In April 2001 a $1.245 billion General Obligation bond was proposed by the District to implement a capital improvement program for the nine colleges within the District. The bond, entitled the Proposition A Bond Initiative, was passed by the voters of the District on April 10, 2001. Of the funds, $147,000,000 was allocated to LACC. To undertake key development projects identified for LACC, a Master Plan team was formed and long term and short-term goals for facility improvements were evaluated. The total cost for the proposed Master Plan facility improvements is placed at $250,000,000. The Master Plan is a 10-year program and will be completed in six phases. Phases 1 through 5, using Proposition A funding, shall be completed within eight years with the final phase, using other funding, occurring in the last two years. Construction is slated to begin by summer of 2002.

3.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVE

The Los Angeles City College has developed a vision statement that identifies the campus as an urban oasis of learning that educates minds, opens hearts, and celebrates community. To meet the vision that this statement embodies, the college has developed specific goals. Long-term goals include the development of a green campus where a supportive environment is fostered by encouraging a student-centered campus. The campus will be safe and open to community activities while at the same time supporting educational goals and faculty needs. Further, a clear visual link between the campus and the neighboring community will be created. In the short-term, substantive discrete objectives have been identified such as: resolution of parking issues, modernization of various existing facilities, creation of new facilities, relocation of entry points to address the identity of the college, improvements for compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to increase accessibility, campus signage, and landscape character.

The Master Plan has identified the following specific goals and objectives focused toward improving the LACC physical environment:

- Foster a culture of academic excellence by systematically strengthening the educational program and the quality of teaching that lead directly to greater student success;
- Maintain and enhance a safe, aesthetically pleasing campus environment that encourages involvement, nurtures community, and leads to student success;
- Expand and strengthen partnerships with business, industry, educational institutions, neighborhood groups, and regional associations;
- Create a student-centered learning environment that focuses on students' needs and reduces the barriers to their success;
- Enhance the college's visibility and reputation for quality;
- Increase the resources available to the college through state and district allocation processes and through extramural development efforts;

- Develop and implement plans and procedures to enhance the efficient allocation of resources that support the college's vision and priorities; and

- Collect and use data systematically to make informed decisions that lead to continuous improvement.

The Master Plan document addresses the Master Plan Goal and Objectives, the campus context and site analysis, a description of the Master Plan including Diagrams, Basis of Design and Design Guidelines, a Landscape Master Plan and Design Guidelines and a Basis of Design.

The LACC campus presently serves approximately 15,500 full time equivalent (FTE) students.[1] Implementation of the Master Plan will result in student growth on campus within the next 10 years of an additional 3,500 FTE students for a total of 19,000 FTE students.

3.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The Los Angeles City College is located in the greater Los Angeles Basin in the City of Los Angeles in Los Angeles County. The campus is 3.5 miles northwest of Downtown Los Angeles. The LACC campus is generally bounded by Willowbrook Avenue to the north, Melrose Avenue to the south, Heliotrope Drive to the west and North Vermont Avenue to the east (excludes the Braille Institute for the Blind located at the southwest corner of Vermont Avenue and Melrose Avenue) (see **Figure 3-1**). Located east of the campus on the west side of Vermont Avenue is Lot 1 (surface parking and parking structure).

Regional access to the LACC campus is provided by the US101 Freeway and the Interstate 5 Freeway. The 101 and the I-5 Freeways run parallel in a northwest/southeast direction. The 101 Freeway is approximately 0.25 miles south of the college. Access between the campus and the 101 Freeway is obtained via ramps at Melrose and Vermont Avenues. The I-5 is approximately three miles northeast of the college. Access from the I-5 Freeway is obtained via the Los Feliz Boulevard exit. The major streets serving the campus are Vermont Avenue, in a north-south direction, and Melrose Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard in the east-west direction.

A Metro Red Line Vermont/Santa Monica/LACC portal is located at the northeast corner of the LACC campus (i.e., Willowbrook and Vermont Avenues).

3.4 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Buildings

The LACC campus encompasses 48 acres (see **Figure 3-2**). Established in 1929, the campus is well developed with a mixture of temporary and permanent buildings. The LACC buildings are generally one- to three-story structures. Many of the buildings are more than 40 years old and require maintenance. The total gross square footage (GSF) of the campus buildings is approximately 796,350 (GSF). Many programs are housed in temporary buildings on campus (bungalows). Most of the bungalows are located near the northwest boundary of the campus.

Figure 3-1 Regional Location

[1]The Full Time Equivalent (FTE) total is obtained by dividing the total hours of class attendance over an academic year by 525, a number representing 15 hours per week of class attendance by one student over two standard semesters.

Figure 3-2 Existing site plan

Parking

The campus provides a total of 1,645 parking spaces. Parking Lot 1 located southeast of the main campus on Vermont Avenue, provides 378 surface spaces and 772 spaces in the three-story parking structure (total 1,150 parking spaces). Two additional surface lots (Lots 3 and 5) provide an additional 227 parking spaces. Finally, an additional 268 spaces are provided in various locations throughout the campus. Although not included in the total campus parking numbers, 233 metered parking spaces are provided around the campus boundaries.

Overall Campus Conditions

Landscaping. The LACC campus contain several open park-like areas. The largest open space area, the Main Quad/Main Lawn, is located near the southern boundary of the campus. Other major open space areas include the North Quad located near the Communications building and the existing tennis courts, and the Athletic Field located at the northeast corner of the campus.

Technology. The existing Information Technology (IT) system was last upgraded in 1997. However, this system does not extend to all areas of the campus. Further, implementation of the Master Plan will require the expansion and upgrade of the existing system.

Safety requirements. Campus security is currently being provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The LACC campus serves as the Sheriff's headquarters for the Los Angeles Community College District. It has been acknowledged that campus security has improved a great deal with the use of the Sheriff's Department. However, to further reduce the incidence of crime on campus several areas have been identified for improvement.

Surrounding Land Uses

The community surrounding LACC is primarily residential with predominately multi-family units located to the west, east and north of the campus. There are small section of single-family residential throughout. Along Melrose and Vermont Avenues retail/commercial uses predominate. Along the southeast border of the campus is the Braille Institute for the blind. Saint Mary's Center is on Willowbrook Avenue.

3.5 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The Master Plan is intended to act as a guide for future development within the campus. In order to meet the goals of the Master Plan, several projects have been proposed (see **Figure 3-3**). As shown in **Table 3-1**, 227,762 square feet of building space is targeted for demolition. As shown in **Table 3-2**, the proposed project will replace the demolished uses with 427,840 square feet of building space for a total of approximately 200,000 net square feet of space (building space will increase from 796,350 to 996,428 GSF with the implementation of the Master Plan). A total of 1,450 new parking spaces are proposed in two new parking structures for a total of 2,604 spaces throughout the campus or 959 net new spaces.

Figure 3-3

TABLE 3-1: BUILDINGS TARGETED FOR DEMOLITION	
Action	**Building**
Bungalows	Bungalows Z-1, Z-2, A-B, C-D, X-Y Bungalows 124-126, 127-129 Bungalow R Bungalows 7-9, 29, 105-107 Child Development Center (North, South and Addition) Other Misc space
Permanent Fixed Structures	Chemistry Men's Gymnasium Women's Gymnasium Library Stadium Maintenance Operations and Receiving Radiologic Technology
SOURCE: Leo A. Daly Associates**.**	

TABLE 3-2: PROPOSED PROJECT CONSTRUCTION	
Project	**Size (Square Footage and Parking Spaces)**
Tennis Courts and Underground Parking	400 spaces
Stadium/Athletic Field	10,000
Athletic Field Parking Structure	1,000 spaces
Science and Technology Building	75,000
North Entry Plaza and Bell Tower	25,000
Maintenance Facilities	17,000
Child Development Center	25,000
Gymnasium	100,000
Theater Arts Addition	40,000
Martin Luther King Library	48,000
Other Expansion	
Financial Aid/Counseling/Admission Center Modernization of the Life Science Building Modernization of Cesar Chavez Administration Building Remodel of Communications Building to Include Speech and ITV Modernize Classrooms Performing and Fine Arts Facilities Bookstore and Food Service	90,480
Grand Total Proposed Space **Net New Space (after proposed demolitions)**	**427,840** **200,000**
SOURCE: Leo A. Daly Associates.	

The primary goal of the Master Plan is to enhance the operational efficiency as well as the aesthetic quality of the campus. This shall be accomplished through the reorientation of the campus uses. Development shall place the athletic uses at the southwest portion of the campus. This shall require the demolition of the Men's gymnasium and Athletic Field. The new stadium, to be located off of Heliotrope Drive, shall seat 2000. The new stadium shall replace Parking Lots 3 and 5 and be built above a new 1,000-space parking structure. A second parking structure (400 spaces) will be built where the existing tennis courts are, and the tennis courts will be relocated onto the roof of the new structure. The project will also replace a small surface lot and the bungalows at the northwest edge of the campus.

All support functions will be relocated to the west boundary of the campus along Heliotrope Drive at the north end of the campus. The core instruction functions relocated along the eastern edge of the campus will provide convenience and encourage the use of the MTA Rail Line at the corner of Vermont and Willowbrook Avenues.

Both vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be improved. New on-campus parking is designed to reinforce the support function while the placement of instructional programming and the creation of a new pedestrian access point provides connectedness with the existing Parking Lot 1 located on the east side of Vermont Avenue. The Master Plan includes the use of landscaping to strengthen the campus perimeter and the historic campus entry points. New entry plazas shall be provided along Vermont Avenue at the south and north ends of the campus. The existing Main Quad and Lawn shall remain with the North Quad redefined. A new Science, Math and Technology Quad shall be developed. Secondary quads and courtyards shall be interspersed throughout the campus.

Other improvements include Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements to make buildings, parking and paths more accessible; Electrical Service Transformer Upgrade; Upgrade Campus-wide Computer Network for Internet Access; upgrade the campus-wide security system which will include additional security kiosks, camera surveillance, improved security lighting, replacement of windows, an upgrade of perimeter openings, an upgrade of electrical services, and landscaping improvements; relocation and/or acquisition of temporary facilities; Signage; and restrooms (included in interior remodels).

Project Phasing

The Master Plan is a 10-year program (from 2002 through 2012) and is forecast to be completed in six phases, as shown in **Table 3-3** and **Figures 3-4** through **3-9**. Phases 1 through 5, using Proposition A funding, shall be initiated within eight years with construction of Phase 6 would be initiated in the 10th year (2012) of the Master Plan. Construction is slated to begin by summer of 2002.

TABLE 3-3: PROJECT PHASING
PHASE 1
Student Admissions Center Parking Structure 1 with Roof Top Tennis Courts (400 Space) Relocate Maintenance Facilities (Temporary) Parking Lot 1 Network Connection Parking Lot 1Landscaping Financial Aid/Counseling/Admission Center
PHASE 2
Parking Structure 2 Below Athletic Field (1 level partially below-grade and 1 level above-grade for a total of 1,000 Spaces) Relocate and Modernize Athletic Field on Top of Parking Structure Relocate Maintenance Facilities (Permanent) Landscape Main Quad Math, Science and Technology Building Franklin Hall New Campus Entrance & Vermont Ave Landscaping Renovation of Caesar Chavez Modernize and Expand the Police Station (Ground Floor of Cezar Chavez) Athletic Field and Parking Structure
PHASE 3
Child Development Center Life Science Facilities Modernization Remodel Communications to Include Speech and ITV Demolish Radiologic Technology Building and Landscape
PHASE 4
Gymnasium Landscaping - Monroe Mall and South Entry Plaza Modernize the Following Outdated/Deteriorating Instructional Classroom Buildings Clausen Hall DaVinci Hall Franklin Hall Holmes Hall Jefferson Hall Caesar Chavez - Admin Building Performing & Fine Arts Facilities Renovations/Additions
PHASE 5
Martin Luther King Library Book Store Food Service
Bookstore and Food Service
PHASE 6
Art and Entertainment Center
SOURCE: Leo A. Daly Associates.

Figure 3-4 Phase 1 of the Master Plan

Figure 3-5 Phase 2 of the Master Plan

Figure 3-6 Phase 3 of the Master Plan

Figure 3-7 Phase 4 of the Master Plan

Figure 3-8 Phase 5 of the Master Plan

Figure 3-9 Phase 6 of the Master Plan

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section examines the potential adverse environmental impacts that may result from the implementation of the proposed project. Discussion is focused on the identification of changes that may be considered to be environmentally significant (a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment).

Analysis of each environmental issues is organized within the following five subsections:

Environmental Setting - A description of existing conditions, prior to the implementation measures envisioned in the LACC Master Plan, and a discussion of the policy and technical background necessary for analysis of potential impacts.

Significance Criteria - The thresholds by which the Master Plan and subsequent implementation projects are measured to determine if a project will cause a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the existing environmental conditions.

Environmental Impact - An analysis of the beneficial and adverse effects of the Master Plan, including, where appropriate, assessments of the significance of potential adverse impacts relative to established criteria and thresholds (relative to existing conditions per CEQA).

Mitigation Measures - Wherever significant adverse impacts relative to existing conditions have been identified under the preceding Environmental Impact section, appropriate and reasonable measures are recommended to minimize impacts to the extent feasible.

Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts - A discussion of whether impacts would still be significant after mitigation (unavoidable significant adverse impact) or reduced to a level of less than significant or no impact after mitigation.

4.1 AESTHETICS AND LIGHTING

This section evaluates the potential impacts of aesthetics, lighting, and shadows. Aesthetics refers to visual resources and the quality of what can be seen, or overall visual perception of the environment, and may include such elements as buildings, design character, landscaping, and open areas. Lighting addresses the effects of exterior illumination and sources of glare on adjoining uses. Shading issues are concerned with effects of shadows cast by existing or proposed structures on adjacent land uses.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Scenic Highways

A review of the Transportation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan indicates that there are no state- designated or locally-designated scenic highways within the project vicinity.

Mature Trees and Landscaping

As part of the Master Plan development process, an inventory and assessment of existing landscape resources was prepared. This assessment concluded that there are approximately 291 trees that are four inches in diameter or greater. The assessment also indicated that the basic issue regarding existing campus landscaping is the wide variety of plant and species used; however, the landscaping does not reinforce outdoor spaces and campus entry points. As shown in **Figure 4.1-1**, most of the significant landscaping is located along the western perimeter of the campus along Heliotrope Drive, or adjacent to or within the main campus quad and plaza area.

The predominant species on the LACC campus include:

- Eucalyptus citriodora
- Eucalyptus globulus
- Ficas microcarpa Nitida
- Tupidanthus calptratus
- Pittosporum undulatum
- Calodendron capense
- Washingtonia robusta

The inventory also indicated that there are a number of mature and prominent trees on the campus. Of particular note are two mature oak trees. One is at the west campus entry at Monroe Street. A second oak tree is located adjacent to the Sheriff's substation. Other prominent species are as follows:

- Quercus agrifolia
- Ficus microphylla
- Strelitzia nicolii
- Phoenix reclinata
- Fraxinus uhdei
- Ulmus parvifolia
- Jacaranda acutifolia
- Liquidambar stryraciflua

FIGURE 4.1-1 AREAS SIGNIFICANT LANDSCAPING

Campus Open Space

Existing campus open spaces are shown in **Figure 4.1-2.** These spaces include the central plaza, the Main Quad, located east of the Caesar Chavez Administration building; a main lawn located between Da Vinci and Jefferson Halls, a hardscape court area located between the cafeteria, and Da Vinci Hall, a landscaped plaza located west of the Media Communications building, and the athletic field located in the northeast corner of campus. The Main Quad, main lawn and cafeteria court area are the most heavily used areas. The athletic field is limited to recreational uses. The central plaza and main lawn are the focal spaces on campus. These spaces are used for large events such as graduation.

Shadow Patterns Along Campus Perimeter

Residential properties (primarily two-story apartment buildings) are located both west of the LACC campus on the west side of Heliotrope Drive and north of the campus along the north side of Willowbrook Avenue. The administration building, women's gymnasium, chemistry building and men's gymnasium are located at the perimeter of the campus in these areas. These buildings which are approximately 35 feet in height are each setback approximately 10 feet from the campus property line. Under existing conditions, no shadows are currently cast from campus buildings onto residences on the west side of Heliotrope Drive or the north side of Willowbrook Avenue.

Existing Lighting Levels

Lighting levels along the campus perimeter are typical to an urban area with higher levels found on the major travel roadways such as Vermont and Melrose Avenues and lower levels found on adjacent residential streets. Specifically, a sample of lighting levels in these areas indicate that lighting levels along Heliotrope Drive (a residential street) range up to one foot-candle,[1] while lighting levels along Vermont Avenue (a commercial street) are typically greater than one foot-candle and may approach two foot-candles at intersections.

An assessment of existing lighting on campus conducted as part of the Master Plan process concluded that lighting is not used effectively on campus to highlight entry points and walkways or to define important outdoor spaces. Lighting levels on campus provide inconsistent or intermittent security lighting in some areas. The most visible light sources on campus are the illumination on the athletic fields. Field lights are mounted atop poles 80 to 100 feet in height. Spillover lighting from these lights falls primarily onto commercial properties located along the east side of Vermont Avenue. Glare from the field lights for residences along the north side of Willowbrook Avenue is effectively screened by existing trees and the men's gymnasium building.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

A significant visual and aesthetic impact would result if the proposed project would:

- Disrupt or obstruct the vista from a designated scenic highway;
- Remove mature trees and landscaping;

FIGURE 4.1-2 EXISTING CAMPUS OPEN SPACES

[1] A foot-candle is a standard measure of illumination. Standards for light poles and signs are typically presented in foot-candles. Generally a foot-candle is the minimum amount of light necessary to fully illuminate one square foot. A major street intersection is typically illuminated at 1 to 1.5 foot-candles. A baseball field is typically illuminated to a level of 30 to 50 foot-candles.

- Reduce the amount of existing open space;
- Cast a new shadow for more than three hours in a day onto a residential backyard;
- Generate spillover light onto adjacent residential properties, and/or noticeably increase ambient lighting levels; or
- Create a direct line of sight between pole mounted lighted fixtures and adjacent residential properties.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Scenic Highways

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts related to scenic highways

Discussion of Impacts

There are no designated scenic highways in the project vicinity and, as a result, no scenic highways would be affected by the proposed project. There would be no significant impacts in this category.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Mature Trees and Landscaping

Summary of Impacts

- Potentially significant impacts related to mature trees (mitigated).

Discussion of Impacts

The landscape element of the proposed Master Plan indicates that there are significant components of the existing landscaping that should be retained. The landscape plan indicates locations where mature trees should either be retained or relocated. Pending the findings and recommendations of a report by a qualified arborist, if mature trees cannot be successfully relocated, then the loss of these trees would constitute a significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

AL1 All mature trees shall be retained in the present location or relocated. If a qualified arborist determines that a tree cannot be relocated, then the tree shall be replaced on a one-for-one basis with a minimum 24-gallon species consistent with the proposed landscaping plan.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

Implementation of mitigation measure **AL1** would reduce impacts on mature trees to a less-than-significant level.

Campus Open Space

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts related to campus open space.

Discussion of Impacts

With the exception of the Main Lawn, the proposed Master Plan recommends that existing open spaces on campus be reconfigured and modified.

- The Central Plaza would be re-landscaped and would be slightly reduced in size;
- The North Quad adjacent to the Communications building would be re-configured and re-landscaped with a grove of trees concept;
- The athletic field would be relocated; and
- The Cafeteria Court area would be re-landscaped, including the addition of trees.

In addition to the proposed changes to existing open space, the Master Plan also recommends the creation of additional spaces. These would entail five to six new court yards adjacent to classroom buildings; creation of landscaped entries along Monroe Street, and a major landscaped focal point at the MTA portal near Vermont Avenue and Willowbrook Avenue.

Although some existing open spaces would be reconfigured and/or relocated. The creation of additional courtyards and entry focal points would increase the overall amount of usable open space on the LACC campus. As a result, no significant adverse impacts on open space are anticipated.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Shadows

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts related to creation of additional shadows onto adjacent residential properties.

Discussion of Impacts

At this stage in the LACC Master Plan process no specific building designs have been prepared. The proposed Master Plan indicates the general location of new facilities. From the perspective of shadows, the most relevant concerns are those from new buildings or structures that would be constructed along the perimeter of the campus either along Heliotrope Drive and along Willowbrook Avenue. Master Plan proposed facilities that fall into this category would include:

- The raised athletic field and spectator stands;
- Bookstore;
- Tennis Court Parking Structure;
- Relocated Child Development Center; and
- Library and Resource Center

To maintain scale with existing campus buildings, it is not expected that these new structures would exceed three to four stories. It should be noted that the tennis court parking structure and child development center would not likely exceed 20 feet in height. At the 20-foot height, no shadow impacts would be anticipated.

Along Heliotrope Drive, the new spectator stands, bookstore building and tennis court parking structure would not likely cast shadows onto residential buildings on the west side of the street, if the height of these structures remains under 45 feet. Along Willowbrook Avenue, the proposed Library Resource building if constructed to a height of 45 feet would cast shadows on apartments across the street during the 4:00 p.m. hour on a December afternoon. It would not cast a shadow onto those properties at any other time and no significant impacts are anticipated (see **Figure 4.1-3**). It should also be noted that the existing buildings along Willowbrook Avenue (the Chemistry Building and the Mens Gymnasium) currently cast shadows onto Willowbrook Avenue. Further, shadows resulting from new development would be substantially the same as those currently cast by these existing buildings.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Lighting

Summary of Impacts

- Significant impact related to spillover light and glare (mitigated).

Discussion of Impacts

The proposed Master Plan calls for improved lighting on the campus. The lighting plan would be oriented toward reinforcing entry points, walkways and enhancing the sense of security in and around parking areas and structures. It is not anticipated that improvements to walkway, entry and building security lighting would

FIGURE 4.1-3 SHADOW DIAGRAM WINTER SOLSTICE

result in any adverse light spillover onto adjacent residential areas along Willowbrook Avenue or Heliotrope Drive. Improved lighting for existing parking structures (Lot 1) and for proposed parking structures, however, could be a significant source of spillover light and glare, particularly if interior parking structure levels are maintained at a level of five or more foot-candles with no screening. In these circumstances several residences along Heliotrope Drive could be adversely affected as well as residences on Marathon and Monroe Streets and North Madison Avenue east of Vermont Avenue that are located adjacent to the Parking Lot 1 structure.

The most visible new source of light that would stem from the proposed Master Plan would be the lighting of the relocated athletic field. As is currently the case, the field would be used for track and field, soccer, and baseball. The illumination level for an athletic field to accommodate these uses would typically range from 30- to 50-foot candles according to lighting industry standards. Similar to current conditions, lights would be mounted atop 80- to 100-foot poles. Achieving these levels would, however, likely result in spillover light onto the westside of Heliotrope Drive if not mitigated. Spillover lighting levels could range from two to four foot-candles and be appreciably higher than ambient conditions (less than one foot-candle) and typical city street lighting conditions (one to two foot-candles). Thus, athletic field lighting would be considered a significant impact.

The relocated tennis courts atop of the new proposed parking structure would also be a source of additional light along Heliotrope Drive if not mitigated. When these courts are lighted to 15 to 20 foot-candles as suggested in industry standards, then lighting levels on the west side of Heliotrope Drive would likely range from one to two foot-candles. Although greater than the existing ambient levels of less than one foot-candle, tennis court lighting effects on the west side of Heliotrope Drive would not be greater than a typical city street light and no significant impacts are anticipated.

It should also be noted that due to the height of the mounted lights, the proposed athletic field and tennis courts would both create a direct line of sight between the lighting fixtures and adjacent residences on the west side of Heliotrope Drive. This line of sight could be a potential source of nuisance glare and would constitute a significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

AL2 All light fixtures mounted at a height of greater than 20 feet shall be equipped with cutoff shields or hoods to prevent a direct line of sight from the light luminaries to an adjacent residential property.

AL3 The stadium, athletic field and tennis courts shall be screened using a combination of landscaping and structures along the western perimeter of these facilities to eliminate glare affecting residences on the west side of Heliotrope Drive.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

Implementation of mitigation measures **AL2** and **AL3** would reduce impacts related to increased lighting levels to a less-than-significant level.

4.2 AIR QUALITY

This section examines the degree to which the proposed project may result in changes to air quality. Both intermittent (short-term construction emissions that occurs from activities such as site grading and haul truck trips during individual projects), as well as the long-term effects related to the ongoing operation of the proposed project, are evaluated in this section. The analysis contained herein focuses on pollution in two distinct ways: 1) daily emissions (total volumes of pollutants expressed in pounds per day) from construction activity or vehicle trips attributable to the proposed project; and 2) potential "hot spots" where concentrations of pollutants could be an issue.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Climate

Regional. The climate of the project site vicinity, as with all of Southern California, is controlled largely by the strength and position of the subtropical high pressure cell over the Pacific Ocean. This high pressure cell maintains moderate temperatures and comfortable humidity, and limits precipitation to a few storms during the winter wet season. Temperatures are normally mild, except during the summer months, which commonly bring substantially higher temperatures. Winds in the project area are usually driven by the dominant land/sea breeze circulation system. Regional wind patterns are dominated by daytime on-shore sea breezes. At night, the wind generally slows and reverses direction, traveling toward the sea.

Southern California experiences frequent temperature inversions. Temperature typically decreases with height. However, under inversion conditions, temperature increases as altitude increases, thereby preventing air close to the ground from mixing with the air above it. As a result, air pollutants are trapped near the ground. During the summer, air quality problems are created due to the interaction between the ocean surface and the lower layer of the atmosphere. This interaction creates a moist marine layer. An upper layer of warm air mass forms over the cool marine layer, preventing air pollutants from dispersing upward. Additionally, hydrocarbons and nitrogen dioxide react under strong sunlight, creating pollution, commonly referred to as smog. Light, daytime winds, predominantly from the west, further aggravate the condition by driving air pollutants inland, toward the mountains.

During the fall and winter, air quality problems are created due to carbon monoxide and nitrogen dioxide emissions. Carbon Monoxide (CO) concentrations are generally worse in the morning and late evening (around 10:00 p.m.). Morning levels are relatively high due to the large number of cars during the commute and colder temperatures. The high levels during the late evenings are a result of stagnant atmospheric conditions trapping CO in the area. Since CO is produced almost entirely from automobiles, the highest CO concentrations in the SCAB are associated with heavy traffic. Nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) levels are also generally higher during autumn or winter days. High levels of NO_2 in the fall and winter usually occur on days with summer-like conditions.

Local. The mountains and hills within the South Coast Air Basin contribute to the variation of rainfall, temperature and winds throughout the region. Within the project site and its vicinity, the average wind speed, as recorded at the Downtown Los Angeles Wind Monitoring Station, is approximately 5.4 miles per hour, with calm winds occurring approximately 7.9 percent throughout the year. Wind in the vicinity of the project site predominately blows from the southwest.[1]

[1] Based on data from the Downtown Los Angeles wind monitoring station. See Appendix B.

The annual average temperature in the project area is approximately 65 degrees Fahrenheit. The project area experiences an average winter temperature of approximately 58 degrees Fahrenheit and an average summer temperature of approximately 72 degrees Fahrenheit. Total precipitation in the project areas averages approximately 14.8 inches annually. Precipitation occurs mostly during the winter. Precipitation during the winter is approximately 8.8 inches and approximately 0.12 inches during the summer.[2]

Air Quality Management

The proposed project is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), a 10,743 square-mile area encompassing all of Orange County, Los Angeles County (except for Antelope Valley), the western urbanized portions of San Bernardino County, and the western and Coachella Valley portions of Riverside County. The SCAB is bounded by Pacific Ocean to the west; the San Gabriel, San Bernardino and San Jacinto mountains to the north and east; and the San Diego County line to the south (see **Figure 4.2-1**). Ambient pollution concentrations recorded in the Los Angeles County are among the highest in the four counties comprising the SCAB.

Air quality control in the SCAB is regulated by federal, state, and regional control authorities. At the federal level, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is involved in air quality planning through the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA). The USEPA regulates emission sources that are under the exclusive authority of the federal government, such as aircraft, ships, and certain types of locomotives. The agency has jurisdiction over emission sources outside state waters (e.g., beyond the outer continental shelf) and establishes various emission standards, including those for vehicles sold in states other than California. Automobiles sold in California must meet the stricter emission standards established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Under the Federal CAA, the USEPA is responsible for establishing the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Under the Federal CAA, the SCAB/Los Angles County has been designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide, and PM_{10}, and as an attainment area for nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide.[3]

At the state level, the CARB, which became part of the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) in 1991, is responsible for meeting the state requirements of the Federal CAA, administering the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), and establishing the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). The CARB regulates mobile air pollution sources, such as motor vehicles. The agency is responsible for setting emission standards for vehicles sold in California and for other emission sources, such as consumer products and certain off-road equipment. The CARB established passenger vehicle fuel specifications, which became effective on March 1996. The CARB oversees the functions of local air pollution control districts and air quality management districts, which in turn administer air quality activities at the regional and county level. The CCAA, as amended in 1992, requires all air districts in the State to endeavor to achieve and maintain the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). The CAAQS are generally more stringent than the corresponding federal standards (see **Table 4.2-1**) and incorporate additional standards for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride and visibility reducing particles.[4] Under the CCAA, the Los Angeles County

[2] Western Regional Climate Center, 2001.

[3] California Air Resources Board, Proposed Area Designations and Maps, September 2000.

[4] Since the CAAQS is more stringent than the NAAQS, the CAAQS is used as the comparative standard in this air quality analysis.

Figure 4.2-1

portion of the SCAB is designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide and respirable particulate matter. The air basin is designated as an attainment area for nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, sulfates, and lead.[5]

TABLE 4.2-1: STATE AND FEDERAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

Air Pollutant	Average Time	California Standards	Federal Standards	
			Primary	Secondary
Ozone (O_3)	1 Hour	0.09 ppm/a/ (180 ug/m^3)/b/	0.12 ppm (235 ug/m^3)	0.12 ppm (235 ug/m^3)
	8 Hour	-	0.08 ppm (157 ug/m^3)	0.08 ppm (157 ug/m^3)
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	24 Hour	50 ug/m^3	150 ug/m^3	150 ug/m^3
	Annual Geometric Mean	30 ug/m^3	-	-
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	-	150 mg/m^3	150 ug/m^3
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1 Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m^3)	35 ppm (40 mg/m^3)	-
	8 Hour	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m^3)	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m^3)	-
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (470 mg/m^3)	-	-
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	-	0.053 ppm (100 mg/m^3)	0.053 ppm (100 ug/m^3)
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 mg/m^3)	-	-
	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 mg/m^3)	0.14 ppm (365 mg/m^3)	-
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	-	0.030 ppm (80 mg/m^3)	-

/a/ ppm = parts per million
/b/ mg/m3 = micrograms per cubic meter
SOURCE: California Air Resources Board, 1999.

At the regional and county level, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). Specifically, the SCAQMD is responsible for monitoring air quality, as well as planning, implementing and enforcing programs designed to attain and maintain state and federal ambient air quality standards in the district. Programs that were developed include air quality rules and regulations that regulate stationary source, area source, point source and certain mobile source emissions. The SCAQMD is also responsible for establishing permitting requirements for stationary sources and ensuring that new, modified or relocated stationary sources do not create net emission increases and therefore, are consistent with the region's air quality goals.

The SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) have responsibility for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which addresses the Federal CAA and CCAA requirements and demonstrates attainment with ambient air quality standards. Designated portions of the AQMP, which is prepared or subsequently revised to comply with the national ambient air standards, are submitted to CARB for incorporation in the SIP with plans and regulations from other air quality management and air pollution control districts in the state. When approved by CARB and the EPA, the AQMP becomes part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the SCAB. The SIP is a collection of AQMPs for all air basins within the state.

[5] California Air Resources Board: Proposed Area Designations and Maps, September 2000.

Pollutants and Effects

Air quality studies generally focus on five pollutants which are most commonly measured and regulated: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), ozone (O_3), respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}), and sulfur dioxide (SO_2).

CO, a colorless gas, interferes with the transfer of oxygen to the brain. CO is emitted almost exclusively from the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels. Along with carbon dioxide (CO_2), CO is emitted by motor vehicles, power plants, refineries, industrial boilers, ships, aircraft, and trains. Automobile exhausts release most of the CO in urban areas. CO concentrations are influenced by local meteorological conditions, primarily wind speed, topography, and atmospheric stability.

O_3, a colorless toxic gas, enters the blood stream and interferes with the transfer of oxygen, depriving sensitive tissues in the heart and brain of oxygen. O_3 also damages vegetation by inhibiting growth. Although O_3 is not directly emitted, it forms in the atmosphere through a chemical reaction between reactive organic compounds and nitrogen oxides (NO_X), which are emitted from industrial sources and from automobiles. Substantial O_3 formation generally requires a stable atmosphere with strong sunlight.

NO_2, a brownish gas, irritates the lungs. It can cause breathing difficulties at high concentrations. Like O_3, NO_2 is not directly emitted, but is formed by a reaction between nitric oxide (NO) and atmospheric oxygen. NO and NO_2 are collectively referred to as nitrogen oxides (NO_X) and are major contributors to ozone formation. NO_2 also contributes to the formation of PM_{10}, small liquid and solid particles that are less than ten microns in diameter (see discussion of PM_{10} below). At atmospheric concentration, NO_2 is only potentially irritating. In high concentrations, the result is a brownish-red cast to the atmosphere and reduced visibility. There is some indication of a relationship between NO_2 and chronic pulmonary fibrosis. Some increase in bronchitis in children (two and three years old) has also been observed at concentrations below 0.3 parts per million (ppm).

PM_{10} refers to particulate matter less than ten microns in diameter, about one-seventh the thickness of a human hair. Particulate matter pollution consists of very small liquid and solid particles floating in the air, which can include smoke, soot, dust, salts, acids, and metals. Particulate matter also forms when gases from industry and gases emitted from motor vehicles undergo chemical reactions in the atmosphere. Major sources of PM_{10} include motor vehicles; wood burning stoves and fireplaces; dust from construction, landfills, and agriculture; wildfires and brush or waste burning; industrial sources; windblown dust from open lands; and atmospheric chemical and photochemical reactions. Suspended particulates produce haze and reduced visibility. Additionally, PM_{10} poses a greater health risk than larger-sized particles. When inhaled, these tiny particles can penetrate the human respiratory system's natural defenses and damage the respiratory tracts. PM_{10} can also increase the number and severity of asthma attacks, cause or aggravate bronchitis and other lung diseases, and reduce the body's ability to fight infections.

$PM_{2.5}$ refers to particulates that are 2.5 microns or less in diameter, roughly 1/28th the diameter of a human hair. $PM_{2.5}$ result from fuel combustion (from motor vehicles, power generation, industrial facilities), residential fireplaces and wood stoves. In addition, $PM_{2.5}$ can be formed in the atmosphere from gases such as sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and volatile organic compounds. Like PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$ can penetrate the human respiratory system's natural defenses and damage the respiratory tract when inhaled. Whereas particles 2.5 to 10 microns in diameter tend to collect in the upper portion of the respiratory system, particles 2.5 microns or less are so tiny that they can penetrate deeper into the lungs and damage lung tissues.[6]

[6]The federal air quality standard for $PM_{2.5}$ was adopted in 1997. Presently, no methodologies for determining impacts relating to $PM_{2.5}$ have been developed. In addition, no strategies or mitigation programs for this pollutant have been developed or adopted by federal, state, or regional agencies. Currently, this standard is not enforceable, but may be instated in the future.

SO_2 is a product of high-sulfur fuel combustion. The main sources of SO_2 are coal and oil used in power stations, industry, and for domestic heating. Industrial chemical manufacturing is another source of SO_2. SO_2 is an irritant gas that attacks the throat and lungs. It can cause acute respiratory symptoms and diminished ventilator function in children. SO_2 can also yellow plant leaves and erode iron and steel.

Existing Air Quality

The SCAQMD monitors air quality conditions at 37 locations throughout the SCAB. The proposed project is located in the SCAQMD's Central Los Angeles County Air Monitoring Area (No. 1), which is served by the Los Angeles - North Main Street Monitoring Station, located at 1630 North Main Street, in the City of Los Angeles (see **Figure 4.2-2**). Historical data from the Los Angeles - North Main Street Monitoring Station was used to characterize existing conditions within the vicinity of the proposed project areas and to establish a baseline for estimating future conditions with and without the proposed project.

Criteria pollutants monitored at the Los Angeles - North Main Street Monitoring Station include ozone (O_3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxides (NO_2), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), and respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}). A summary of the data recorded at the Los Angeles - North Main Street Monitoring Station is located in Appendix B. **Table 4.2-2** shows the number of violations recorded at the Los Angeles - North Main Street Monitoring Station during the 1998-2000 period. The CAAQS for the criteria pollutants are also shown in the table. As **Table 4.2-2** indicates, criteria pollutants CO, NO_2 and SO_2 did not exceed the CAAQS between the years 1998 and 2000. However, O_3 and PM_{10} exceeded the State standard at least eight times during the 1998-2000 period.

TABLE 4.2-2: 1998-2000 CRITERIA POLLUTANT VIOLATIONS - LOS ANGELES-MAIN STREET MONITORING STATION

Pollutant	State Standard	Number of Days Above State Standard		
		1998	1999	2000
Ozone	0.09 ppm (1-hour)	17	13	8
Carbon Monoxide	9.0 ppm (8-hour average)	0	0	0
Nitrogen Dioxide	0.25 ppm (1-hour)	0	0	0
Sulfur Dioxide	0.04 ppm (24-hour average)	0	0	0
PM_{10}	50 $\mu g/m^3$ (24-hour average)	66	114	90

SOURCE: California Air Resources Board, see Appendix B.

Thus, this air quality analysis does not analyze $PM_{2.5}$.

Figure 4.2-2

Existing Carbon Monoxide (CO) Concentrations. Carbon monoxide concentrations are typically used as the indicator of conformity with the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAS) because: (1) CO levels are directly related to vehicular traffic volumes, the main source of air pollutants; and (2) CO concentrations and characteristics can be modeled using EPA and SCAQMD recognized methods. In other words, the operational air quality impacts associated with a project are generally best reflected through the estimated changes in related CO concentrations.

For purposes of this assessment, the ambient, or background, concentration of CO is first established. The background level of CO is typically defined as the highest of the second-maximum eight-hour readings over the past two years.[7] Based on recorded monitoring data at the Los Angeles - Main Street air monitoring station, the existing eight-hour background concentration is estimated to be approximately 5.38 ppm for eight hour concentrations. Assuming a typical persistence factor of 0.7, the estimated one-hour background concentration would be approximately 7.69 ppm.[8]

There is a direct relationship between traffic/circulation congestion and CO impacts since exhaust fumes from vehicular traffic is the primary source of CO. Carbon monoxide is a localized gas that dissipates very quickly under normal meteorological conditions. Therefore, CO concentrations decrease substantially as distance from the source (intersection) increases. The highest CO concentrations are typically found along sidewalk locations directly adjacent to congested roadway intersections. For the proposed project, CO concentrations were evaluated along the sidewalks at the eight study intersections most affected by the proposed project and have the worst levels of operation and delay. It is at these locations that carbon monoxide concentrations would be the highest. For each of the eight intersections modeled, traffic related contributions were added to the background conditions discussed above. One-hour and eight-hour CO concentrations adjacent to these intersections were estimated using the CAL3QHC dispersion model, which was developed by the EPA. This model utilizes EMFAC 7F emissions factors, meteorological data, traffic volume, speed, and vehicle mix inputs. Existing conditions at the study intersections are shown in **Table 4.2-3**. Currently, no intersection exceeds the state one-hour standard of 20.0 ppm. However, seven intersections exceed the state eight-hour standard of 9.0 ppm.

Sensitive Receptors. Some land uses are considered more sensitive to changes in air quality than others, depending on the types of population groups and the activities involved. CARB has identified the following people who are most likely to be affected by air pollution: children under 14, the elderly over 65, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. Locations that may contain a high concentration of these sensitive population groups are called sensitive receptors and include residential areas, hospitals, daycare facilities, elder care facilities, elementary schools, and parks.

[7] Garza, Vicente J., Peter Graney, Daniel Sperling. Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol. Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Davis. May 1996.

[8] Persistence factor is the ratio between the eight hour and one hour second annual maximum CO concentrations measured at a continuous air monitoring station. A persistence factor of 0.7 is typically used in urban areas.

TABLE 4.2-3: EXISTING CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS /a/

Intersection	CO Concentration at Nearest Sidewalk (parts per million-ppm)	
	1-Hour (State Standard = 20.0 ppm)	8-Hour (State Standard = 9.0 ppm)
Sunset Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	13.8	9.7
Santa Monica Blvd. and Western Ave.	4.2	9.9
Santa Monica Blvd. and Normandie Ave.	13.0	9.1
Santa Monica Blvd. and Virgil Ave.	13.8	9.7
U.S. 101 Northbound On-Ramp & Normandie Ave.	9.6	6.7
Melrose and Normandie Aves.	13.8	9.7
Melrose and Virgil Aves.	12.5	8.7
Beverly Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	15.5	10.8

/a/ All concentrations include existing one- and eight-hour ambient concentrations of 7.7 ppm and 5.4 ppm, respectively.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates, Meyers Mohaddes Associates, see Appendix B.

Within the immediate vicinity of the project site, five sensitive receptors have been identified. These sensitive receptors are shown in **Figure 4.2-3**. They include:

- Residential uses on Heliotrope Drive;
- Residential uses on Willowrook Avenue;
- Mary's Christian Center;
- Braille Institute; and
- Vermont Avenue (due to high pedestrian activity on the street and entrances to the MTA Metro Red Line at the southwest corner of Willowbrook Avenue/Vermont Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard/Vermont Avenue intersections)

On-site sensitive receptors include the Child Development Center, which is located at the southwest corner of the Hampshire Avenue and Monroe Street intersection.

For purposes of providing a worst-case analysis, CO concentrations have been modeled at sidewalk locations adjacent to eight study area intersections, see discussion above. Since CO is a localized gas which disperses quickly, concentrations are highest within close proximity to intersections. Concentrations at specific sensitive receptors will be substantially lower than those concentrations immediately adjacent to intersections.

Figure 4.2-3

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Air quality impacts of a project can be separated into two categories: short-term impacts due to construction and long-term permanent impacts due to project operations. The proposed project would have a significant air quality impact if:

- Daily construction emissions were to exceed the SCAQMD construction emissions thresholds for CO, ROG, NO_X, SO_X, or PM_{10}. The SCAQMD significance thresholds for construction activities appear in **Table 4.2-4**;

- Project-related traffic causes CO concentrations at study intersections to violate the CAAQS for either the one- or eight-hour period. The CAAQS for the one- and eight-hour period are 20.0 ppm and 9.0 ppm, respectively. If CO concentrations currently exceed the CAAQS, then, an incremental increase of 1.0 ppm over "no project" conditions for the one-hour period would be considered a significant impact. Additionally, an incremental increase of 0.45 ppm over the "no project" conditions for the eight-hour period would be considered significant;[9] or

- The proposed project is not consistent with the SCAQMD AQMP.

TABLE 4.2-4: SCAQMD DAILY EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS

Pollutant	Construction (pounds per day)	Operations (pounds per day)
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	550	550
Reactive Organic Gas (ROG)	75	55
Nitrogen Oxides (NO_X)	100	55
Sulfur Oxides (SO_X)	150	150
Particulates (PM_{10})	150	150

SOURCE: SCAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Construction Emissions

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts related to construction emissions.

Discussion of Impacts

Construction of the proposed developments in the Los Angeles City College Master Plan is anticipated to occur between the years 2002 and 2012. Construction for the proposed project would generate pollutant emissions from the following construction activities: (1) demolition of existing structures, (2) grading, (3) excavation, (4) construction worker travel to and from project sites, (5) delivery and hauling of construction

[9] Consistent with the SCAQMD Regulation XIII definition of a significant impact.

supplies and debris to and from project sites, and (6) fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment. These construction activities would temporarily create emissions of dusts, fumes, equipment exhaust, and other air contaminants. However, PM_{10} is the most significant source of air pollution from construction, particularly during site preparation and grading.

Construction of the development would occur in six phases. Phase 1 through 5 would be initiated within eight years and Phase 6 would be initiated in year ten. **Table 3-2**, in Chapter 3.0, identifies the type of developments that would occur during each of the six phases. It is assumed that construction for each phase would last approximately 1.5 years. Average daily emissions would vary from phase to phase due to the size and type of construction that would occur during each phase. Among the six phases, Phase 2 would require the most construction since a total of approximately 316,000 square feet of the project site would be disturbed. However, no demolition activities are anticipated during this phase. Phases 1, 3, 4, and 5 would result in the demolition of buildings. Among these four phases, Phase 4 would require the most demolition, approximately 66,113 square feet of building space. For the purposes of analyzing the worst-case scenario, Phase 4 was used to calculate daily construction emissions during the demolition phase, and Phase 2 was used to calculate daily construction emissions during the grading/excavation and foundation phases.

Table 4.2-5 shows worst-case construction emissions for the proposed project. Construction-related emissions are not anticipated to exceed any of the SCAQMD thresholds on any days during the construction period. Thus, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.

TABLE 4.2-5: CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

Construction Phase	Pollutants (pounds per day)				
	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Reactive Organic Gas (ROG)	Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)	Sulfur Oxides (SO_x)	(Mitigated) Particulate Matter (PM_{10})
Demolition /a/	17	3	30	2	21
Grading/Excavation /b/	18	3	31	2	50
Foundation /b/	25	4	31	2	19
Maximum	25	4	31	2	50
SCAQMD Thresholds	550	75	100	150	150
Exceed Thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No

/a/ Emissions were based on the demolition of the Women and Men's Gymnasium.
/b/ Emissions were based on all developments in Phase 2.
NOTE: Assumes proper implementation of dust abatement measures consistent with AQMD Rule 403.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC. See Appendix B.

The proposed project is subject to the provisions of SCAQMD Rule 403-Fugitive Dust, which restricts fugitive emissions. This rule would reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the air as a result of construction activities at the project site. Under Rule 403, a person conducting activities capable of generating fugitive dust is required to use the applicable best available control measures to minimize future dust emissions from fugitive dust source types that are part of the activities. Rule 403 prevents fugitive dust that is visible in the atmosphere from an active operation, open storage pile, or disturbed surface area from being emitted in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emissions source. In addition, Rule 403 requires the bulk material, which has been tracked-out by the fugitive dust generating activity, on the public paved roadways to be removed within one hour. At the end of each work day, all visible roadway dust,

generated by the fugitive dust generating activity, is required to be removed from public paved roadways. Rule 403 also states that at least one of the options in Table 3 of the rule needs to be implemented. The complete text of Rule 403 is provided in Appendix B.

SCAQMD Rule 403 would reduce PM_{10} emissions generated by construction activities. Implementation of mitigation measures would further decrease construction emissions, such that emissions would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible. Reductions in PM_{10} emissions during the foundation phase is negligible.

MITIGATION MEASURES

AQ1 The construction area and vicinity (500-foot radius) shall be swept and watered at least twice daily. Site-wetting shall occur often enough to maintain a 10 percent surface soil moisture content throughout all earth-moving activities.

AQ2 All unpaved parking or staging areas shall be watered at least once every two hours of active operations.

AQ3 Site access points shall be swept/washed within thirty minutes of visible dirt deposition.

AQ4 On-site stockpiles of debris, dirt or rusty material shall be covered or watered at least twice per hour.

AQ5 All haul trucks shall either be covered or maintain two feet of freeboard.

AQ6 All haul trucks shall have a capacity of no less than 14 cubic yards.

AQ7 At least 80 percent of all inactive disturbed surface areas shall be watered on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind-driven fugitive dust.

AQ8 Operations on any unpaved surfaces shall be suspended when winds exceed 25 mph.

AQ9 During grading and earthwork activities for construction of the new athletic field, the Child Development Center shall be temporarily relocated to an area that is 500 feet from any construction activities.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

Implementation of mitigation measures **AQ1** through **AQ9**, would reduce intermittent significant impacts during the construction phases of developments that are undertaken as a result of the proposed project to a less-than-significant level.

Operational Emissions

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impact related to mobile emissions.
- No significant impacts related to CO Hot Spots.
- No significant impact related to consistency with the AQMP.

Discussion of Impacts

Mobile Emissions

Long-term project emissions would be generated by motor vehicles (mobile sources). Air quality impacts for the operations phase was estimated using trip generation statistics, average trip length statistics, and CARB emission factors.[10] The results, shown in **Table 4.2-6**, show that incremental increases in operational emissions are not anticipated to exceed any of the SCAQMD significance threshold. Thus, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

TABLE 4.2-6: DAILY OPERATIONS EMISSIONS

Project	Pollutant (pounds per day)				
	CO	ROG	NO_x	SO_x	PM_{10}
Los Angeles City College Facilities Master Plan	228	17	44	2	2
SCAQMD Threshold	**550**	**75**	**100**	**150**	**150**
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC. See Appendix B.

Carbon-Monoxide Hot Spot Analysis

CO Concentrations from Street Intersections. Overall, CO concentrations are expected to be lower than existing conditions in the year 2011 due to stringent state and federal mandates for lowering vehicle emissions. Although traffic volumes would be substantially higher in the future with and without implementation of the proposed project, CO emissions from vehicles are expected to be much lower due to technological advances in vehicle emissions system and turnover in the vehicle fleet.

As indicated in **Table 4.2-7**, year 2011 "no project" conditions (i.e., ambient growth plus cumulative projects, but does not include the proposed project), one-hour CO concentrations at study intersections would range from approximately 5.4 ppm to 8.5 ppm, and eight-hour concentrations would range from 3.8 ppm to 6.0 ppm. Under "project" conditions, one-hour CO concentrations at study intersections would range from approximately 5.4 ppm to 8.6 ppm, and eight-hour concentrations would range from 3.8 ppm to 6.0 ppm. Under "project" conditions, the State one- and eight-hour standards of 20.0 ppm and 9.0 ppm, respectively, would not be exceeded at the five study intersections. A less than significant impact is anticipated at the study intersections.

CO is a gas that disperses quickly. Thus, CO concentrations at sensitive receptor locations are expected to be much lower than CO concentrations at sidewalk locations, which is the model in this analysis. As shown in **Table 4.2-7**, no impact is expected at the analyzed sidewalk locations. Thus, no significant increase in CO concentrations at sensitive receptor locations are expected, and no significant impacts would occur.

[10]Trip generation estimates were derived by the project traffic consultant, Meyers Mohaddes Associates. Average trip length was based on the Los Angeles Community College District's service area study for the Los Angeles City College. Emissions factor data were derived from the CARB Motor Vehicle Emissions Inventory (MEVI) year 2011 statistics for the Los Angeles County portion of the SCAB (see Appendix B).

TABLE 4.2-7: FUTURE (2011) CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS AT PROJECT AREA INTERSECTIONS/a/

Intersection	1-Hour Concentration (State Standard = 20.0 ppm)		8-Hour Concentration (State Standard = 9.0 ppm)	
	No Project	Project	No Project	Project
Sunset Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	7.4	7.4	5.2	5.2
Santa Monica Blvd. and Western Ave.	7.8	7.8	5.5	5.5
Santa Monica Blvd. and Normandie Ave.	6.8	6.8	4.8	4.8
Santa Monica Blvd. and Virgil Ave.	7.3	7.4	5.1	5.2
U.S. 101 Northbound On-Ramp and Normandie Ave.	5.4	5.4	3.8	3.8
Melrose and Normandie Aves.	7.4	7.5	5.2	5.3
Melrose and Virgil Aves.	6.8	6.8	4.8	4.8
Beverly Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	8.5	8.6	6.0	6.0

/a/ All concentrations include year 2011 one- and eight-hour ambient concentrations of 4.3 ppm and 3.0 ppm, respectively.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates, CAL3QHC (carbon-monoxide dispersion) model printouts contained in Appendix B.

CO Concentrations from Underground Parking Facilities. The proposed project would construct two partially underground parking facilities. A partially underground parking facility is proposed at the northwest corner of the project site, under the proposed tennis courts. This parking facility would provide approximately 400 parking spaces. Another partially underground parking facility is proposed at the southwest corner of the project site, under the proposed athletic field. This facility would provide approximately 1,050 parking spaces. It is likely that the two parking facilities would be ventilated. However, because the two facilities are located adjacent to residential uses on Heliotrope Drive, these residential uses would likely be exposed to vehicular emissions through the vents of the parking structures. It is estimated that the 1,050 parking facility would result in an estimated one- and eight-hour CO concentration to be approximately 5.8 ppm and 4.1 ppm, respectively, at adjacent residential uses in year 2011. It is estimated that the 400 parking facility would result in an estimated one- and eight-hour CO concentration to be approximately 4.8 ppm and 3.4 ppm, respectively, at adjacent residential uses in year 2011.[11] CO concentrations from the parking facilities would not increase ambient CO concentrations such that the State one- and eight-hour CO standards of 20.0 ppm and 9.0 ppm, respectively, would be exceeded. Thus, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.

Consistency with the Air Quality Management Plan

Criteria for determining consistency with the AQMP is defined in Chapter 12, Section 12.2 and Section 12.3 of the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook.

- <u>*Consistency Criterion No. 1*</u>: *The proposed project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP.*

[11] Contributions of CO from parking structures were added onto year 2011 one- and eight-hour ambient concentrations of approximately 4.3 ppm and 3.0 ppm, respectively.

SCAQMD methodologies require that an air quality analysis for projects include forecasts of project emissions in a regional context during construction, and in a regional as well as local context, during project occupancy. The analysis above shows that daily construction and operational emissions are not anticipated to exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds. However, the air quality violations that Consistency Criterion No. 1 pertains to are the CAAQS (which refers to pollutant concentrations), rather than the SCAQMD emissions thresholds (which refer to total regional emissions).

The analysis pertaining to "CO Concentrations from Street Intersections" and "CO Concentrations from Underground Parking Facilities" discusses pollutant concentrations. The CO analysis, above, indicates that the proposed project would not exceed or exacerbate existing violations of the CAAQS for CO. Thus, the proposed project complies with Consistency Criterion 1.

- <u>*Consistency Criterion No. 2*</u>: *The proposed project will not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP in 2010 or increments based on the year of project build-out phase.*

  The AQMP growth assumptions are generated by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). SCAG derives its assumptions, in part, based on the General Plans of cities located within the SCAG region. Therefore, if a project does not exceed the growth projections in the General Plan, it is consistent with the growth assumptions in the AQMP. The proposed project is a service institution and, thus, implementation of the proposed project would not directly result in the growth of population, housing, and employment. Thus, the proposed project complies with Consistency Criterion 2.

The proposed project complies with Consistency Criteria 1 and 2. Therefore, the proposed project is considered consistent with the AQMP.

MITIGATION MEASURES

AQ10 Ventilation systems for all parking structures shall be located away from all sensitive receptors, particularly the residential uses on Heliotrope Drive.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

Mitigation measure **AQ10** will reduce CO levels due to underground parking structures to less-than-significant levels. Significant impacts related to mobile emissions however will remain.

4.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section summarizes the findings of a Cultural Resource Inventory and Assessment prepared by Kaplan Chen Kaplan (See Appendix C). The assessment addresses the cultural and historic resources in the vicinity of the Project Area and on the project site. To identify the potential for finding cultural or historic resources both a records search and a site visit of the campus was conducted. The search involved review of archaeological resources maps, historic topographic maps, and historic register lists, as well as geologic maps of the area.

For purposes of this study, Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines defines "historical resource" as the following:

(1) A resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (PRC SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.)

(2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code, or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of the evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

(3) Any object, building, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (PRC SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

(D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local Register of Historical Resources (pursuant to section 5021.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1."

Section 15064.5(c) applies to effects on archaeological sites as follows:

(1) When a project will impact an archaeological site, a lead agency shall first determine whether the site is an historical resource, as defined in subsection (a).

(2) If a lead agency determines that the archaeological site is an historical resource, it shall refer to the provisions of this section and Section 15126.4 of the Guidelines.

In addition, the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.5(c)(1), (2), (3), and (4)) provide tests for significance for archaeological resources, as summarized below:

(1) When a project will impact an archaeological site, a lead agency shall first determine whether the site is an historical resource as defined in 15064.5(a).

(2) If the lead agency determines that the archaeological site is an historical resource, it shall refer to the provisions of Section 21084.1 of the Public Resources Code, and this section, Section 15126.4 of the Guidelines.

(3) If the site does not meet the criteria defined in subsection (a), but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code, the site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of section 21083.2.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Summary of Campus Development History

In 1914 the Los Angeles Normal School (teachers college) moved to a new campus on Vermont Avenue (from its location in downtown Los Angeles at 5th and Hope Streets). The Los Angeles architectural firm of Allison and Allison designed the campus that consisted of nine brick buildings designed in the Northern Lombard Italian style. The campus featured an expansive lawn, with buildings organized around it. In 1919, the campus was reopened as the Southern Branch of the University of California. The precursor to UCLA, the Southern Branch was housed on the Vermont Avenue campus until it moved to its new Westwood campus in 1929.

In the fall of 1928, the Los Angeles Board of Education deliberated on establishing a junior college. The Vermont Avenue campus, centrally located adjacent to transit lines, was acquired to serve as the City's first Junior College. Classes began in the fall of 1929. In 1931 the voters of Los Angeles approved the formation of a junior college district that changed the school's organizational structure from a department of the Los Angeles Board of Education to a separate District that allowed the school to draw aid directly from state funds. The name of the school was changed to City College in 1938.

It appears that a number of events converged to shape the physical character of the Junior College. In 1934, the new campus Director, Rosco C. Ingalls, initiated a new building program. "It was designed to add new buildings, eliminate old wooden shacks from Southern Branch days, and replace certain old buildings, damaged by the earthquake of 1933, that did not meet new state building requirements. The old Library and Science Hall—both in the North Lombard style—were demolished at that time. The compact poured-concrete buildings that rose among the older fig-covered structures were the Library, Student Union, Men's Physical Education Building, Life Sciences Building, Chemistry Building, and a classroom building called Holmes Hall." (R. Lilliard, *Twenty-five Years of Service*). The buildings were designed by the architectural firm of Allison and Allison who produced and exceptional body of work in Southern California, specializing in schools. Funding for the project came from the Public Works Administration (PWA), the federal

government's response to the Depression. The purpose of the PWA was to stimulate private employment of labor through funding of useful public construction projects. Because of earthquake resistant standards, the buildings were designed using reinforced concrete in a streamlined, minimalist style that was original and inventive in the era of the 1930s. The campus buildings of the 1930s were featured in the PWA Survey of Architecture, with the Life Science Building highlighted.

The *Curricular of Information* from 1937-38 notes that the Southern Branch buildings, "in the interest of safety and expansion will give way to new structures following a building plan which covers a period of years. In the spring of 1936 the first unit of a Men's Physical Education Building was added to the campus. This includes offices, lecture hall, locker rooms, and showers to accommodate 2000 men, as well as a second story deck for games. In 1936-37 there were erected a new library, a new biological science building, one for chemistry, and a student union building. They are of concrete, earthquake proof and modern in every particular."

By 1950, the Los Angeles City College had become the largest Junior College in the United States. It was the first in Los Angeles and established the model for the City's subsequent network of nine Junior Colleges.

Historical Significance of Campus Buildings

Sanborn maps for as late as 1955 show four original 1914 buildings. None of these buildings exist today. Seven buildings, constructed during the 1930s, are extant: Chemistry (1934), Library (1937), Cafeteria (1937), Biology (1937), Holmes Hall (1938), Men's Gym (1936). Field observations confirmed that the five of the six 1930s buildings retain some level of historic character-defining features, particularly the representation of the original 1930s post-earthquake junior college campus. No other campus buildings appear to have historic potential.

The potential historic buildings are located in two clusters. The location of the 1930s era buildings is shown in **Figure 4.3-1** and representative photographs of these buildings are shown in **Figures 4.3-2** through **4.3-7**. These buildings shown include the Cafeteria, and Holmes Hall on the south side of the campus, and the Life Science, Chemistry and Men's Gym on the north side of the campus. Each of these buildings from the 1930s retains architectural integrity and direct importance to development of the first junior college in Los Angeles. The library building has undergone significant exterior and interior alterations to the building. The two clusters of 1930 vintage buildings are separated by campus buildings of later construction. As a result, there is no clearly defined visual continuity to the remaining elements of the original junior college campus. Visual continuity of the PWA moderne architectural style of these structures stems primarily from the adjacency of the buildings to each other such as Holmes Hall and the Cafeteria; and the Life Science and Chemistry, and Men's Gymnasium buildings.

The buildings were designed by the important architectural firm of Allison and Allison. Utilizing new technology and responding to more rigorous seismic requirements, the buildings were designed in a moderne style expressive of the utilitarian reinforced poured concrete building material. The buildings, particularly Life Sciences and Chemistry, merge utilitarian building technology with aesthetically pleasing styling. The 1930s buildings retain enough architectural integrity to meet the threshold for the California Register of Historical Places in terms of their significance to the physical development of Los Angeles' first Junior College as well as for their architectural significance. The Life Sciences Building, the best example of the moderne style that emerged from PWA-sponsored work, appears eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in terms of its architectural significance.

Figure 4.3-1 1930 REMAINING BUILDINGS

FIGURE 4.3-2 CAFETERIA BUILDING

FIGURE 4.3-3 HOLMES HALL

FIGURE 4.3-4 MLK LIBRARY BUILDING

FIGURE 4.3-5 LIFE SCIENCE BUILDING

FIGURE 4.3-6 CHEMISTRY BUILDING

FIGURE 4.3-7 MEN'S GYMNASIUM

Historical and Cultural Monuments

A review of designated City of Los Angeles Cultural Monuments was conducted for the project vicinity. No cultural monuments are located on the project site. The nearest cultural monument is Monument No 314 (Cahuenga Branch Library) located at 4591 Santa Monica Boulevard. This monument is approximately 0.5 miles northeast from the project site. Other nearby monuments include the resources at Barnsdall Park (Monuments no.'s 12, 33, and 34). These monuments which include the Hollyhock House, Barnsdall Arts Center, and Barnsdall Art Park are located approximately 1.3 miles north of the project site.

National Register of Historic Places

The current listing of the National Register of Historic Places for Los Angeles County was reviewed. No current National Register sites are located on the project site or adjacent to the project site. The nearest listings are:

- Jardinette Apartments located at 5128 Marathon Street (approximately 1.5 miles south west of the project site); and

- Barnsdall Park located at 4800 Hollywood Boulevard (approximately 1.3 miles north of the project site).

Archaeological Resources

The master environmental data base and maps created for the City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework was reviewed. This review found that there are no known archaeological sites within one-quarter mile of the project site.

A records search was conducted at the South Central Coast Information Center. This search indicated that no archaeological sites have been identified within a one-mile radius of the project area.[1] No previous archaeological investigations have been conducted within a one-mile radius of the project area. However, there are seventeen investigations located on the Hollywood 7.5 minute USGS quadrangle that may be near the project area, but are not mapped due to insufficient locational information.[2]

Native American Heritage Commission

The State of California Native American Heritage Commission was contacted to determine whether there are any sites on the Commission's data base of sacred significance on or adjacent to the project site. Coordination indicates that there are no such sites.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The proposed project would have a significant impact on cultural resources if:

- The proposed project has the potential to disturb areas that are considered to be archaeologically or paleontologically sensitive;

- The proposed project would remove buildings or places listed on or eligible for either the National

[1]W.H. Bonner Associates, March 25, 2002. See Appendix C.

[2]Ibid.

Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources, locally designated landmarks, or have the potential to remove or affect buildings constructed prior to 1949; and

- The proposed project has the potential to disturb or affect sacred areas that are known to the archaeological resource centers, the Native American Heritage Commission, or to tribal descendants of Native Americans.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Historic Resources

Summary of Impacts

- Because the Chemistry Building and Men's Gymnasium would be eligible for the California Register, the removal of these two buildings would result in a significant cultural resource impact.

- Because the Cafeteria Building, Holmes Hall and the Life Science Buildings appear eligible for the California Register, the rehabilitation of these buildings in a manner inconsistent with their architectural character would damage significant character defining features, thus constituting a significant impact.

Discussion of Impacts

Historic resources include, but are not limited to, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic agricultural, education, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

The effect of the proposed Master Plan on the remaining 1930s era junior college buildings is as follows:

- Library Building. Slated for demolition. A new library and resource center would be constructed on the north east side of the campus. Because the building has been significantly altered exterior and interior, this loss is not considered to constitute a significant cultural resource impact.

- Holmes Hall. This building will be retained and renovated. If renovation complies with the US Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings, no significant impacts are anticipated. It should be noted that the renovation of Holmes and the Cafeteria Building in conjunction with the court yard space between them would strengthen the relationship between the buildings and would likely result in a beneficial impact.

- Cafeteria Building. This building will be retained and renovated. If renovation complies with the US Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings, no significant impacts are anticipated.

- Chemistry Building. This building would be removed. Because the building may be eligible for the California Register, this loss would constitute a significant cultural resource impact.

- Life Science Building. This building will be retained and renovated. A new Child Development Center will be constructed directly adjacent to this building to the east and a parking structure would be constructed on the site to the south of the Life Science Building. The removal of the Chemistry building which is located east of the Life Science building would leave the Life Science building an

isolated remnant of the old campus, and would pre-empt the visual perception of a historic area or district. This condition, combined with unsympathetic renovations or incompatible adjacent buildings would constitute a significant impact on this remaining north campus resource.

- Men's Gymnasium. This building complex would be removed. The removal would also eliminate any visual continuity of the 1930s north campus buildings. The loss of the Men's Gymnasium would constitute a significant cultural resource impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

CR1 Historic American Building Survey documentation level 2 shall be prepared for the Chemistry Building and the Men's Gymnasium. This report shall document the significance of the building and its physical conditions, both historic and current through site plans, historic maps, photographs, written data, and text. The written text (HABS Narrative Format) documenting the architectural features and historic significance of the property, including contextual history of the junior college development era, biographies of the principal architect, published references to the construction, and other biographic sources. The photographic documentation shall note all significant exterior elevations and interior character-defining features. Photographs shall be large format, black and white, archival processed, and be taken by a professional photographer familiar with the recordation of historic buildings, and prepared in a format consistent with HABS standards for field photography. A set of photos will be put on file as part of Building Archives at the Martin Luther King Library Building.

CR2 The renovation and modernization of Holmes Hall, Cafeteria and Life Science Buildings shall be carried out in accordance with the procedures established by the US Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings.

CR3 Buildings, structures and outdoor spaces constructed adjacent to the Life Science Building shall be compatible in scale, style and character to this building.

CR4 An interpretive element such as a permanent historical display or integrative art work depicting the history of the campus will be included in the rehabilitation of the Cafeteria/Holmes Hall area.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

The implementation of measures **CR1** through **CR4** would enhance the integrity of the remaining 1930s buildings, as well as provide an important documented and visual record for the buildings that would be removed. This documentation, however, would not reduce historical resource impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Archaeological Resources

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts related to archaeological resources are anticipated.

Discussion of Impacts

As indicated in the existing conditions section, no known archaeological sites are found on or adjacent to the LACC campus. Because the Los Angeles area has a long history of human habitation, however, this does not preclude the possibility that archaeological resources may be found during the site preparation or grading/excavation phases of the proposed project. Encountering resources, artifacts and/or human remains and destroying or improperly disposing of these resources would violate State and Federal laws and constitute a significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

CR5 Consistent with CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15064.5(d) and (e)): If during construction, the existence of, or the probable likelihood, of Native American human remains are identified within the Project Area, the lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission as provided in Public Resources Code SS5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the steps identified in Section 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines shall be taken.

CR6 All civil engineering contracts shall indicate the potential for uncovering archaeological resources. Should archaeological resources be discovered, all activities in the vicinity of the find shall be halted and an RPA-certified archaeologist retained to assess the importance of the find and develop appropriate follow-up measures.

CR7 If buried cultural materials are exposed during construction, work must be halted in the immediate vicinity of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance (CEQA Section 15064.5-f and Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 210.82.

CR8 If the finds are termed significant, the archaeologist and a Native American Monitor should be permitted to remove the items in a professional manner for further laboratory evaluation (CEQA Section 15064.5-f and PRC Section 21082).

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

Implementation of mitigation measures **CR5** through **CR8** would reduce impacts to archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

4.4 GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY

This section identifies the potential for geologic and seismic hazards to occur on and near the project site.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Geologic Materials and Soils

The project site is located in the City of Los Angeles within Los Angeles County. The topography of Los Angeles County is widely varied and includes mountains, valleys, coastal plain and desert areas. The Los Angeles City College is located on the northern portion of the greater Los Angeles Basin. Specifically, within the Los Angeles Basin, the project site is located on the border area between the Transverse Ranges Geomorphic Province on the north and the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province on the south. The site is located on the western edge of the Elysian Hills, west of Silver Lake Reservoir in western Los Angeles. The south border of the Santa Monica Mountains is located not quite two (2) miles to the north. The La Brea Plain is located just to the west.

Based on review of the Los Angeles County Soil Survey General Report and Soil Map, the site has been identified with Ramona Placentia Association. Specifically, the site is overlain with up to forty (40) feet of Pleistocene age older alluvium which are comprised of sandy clays, sandy silts and silty sands, which are underlain by siltstone/sandstone bedrock. Elevations on campus range from approximately 300.0 feet above Mean-Sea-Level (MSL) on the south to just over 320.0 feet above MSL on the north.

Seismicity

The site is not within a state designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for surface rupture hazard. There are, however, faults in the vicinity of the site (see **Figure 4.4-1)**. By definition, a fault is one that has had surface displacement with Holocene time (about the last 11,000 years). A potentially active fault is a fault that has demonstrated surface displacement of Quaternary age deposits (last two million years). Inactive faults have not moved in the last two million years.

The Hollywood Fault is less than two miles from the site. This site constitutes the most significant ground motion hazard to the site (see **Table 4.4-1**). The Hollywood Fault is a Type B dip-slip fault with a slip rate of about one (1) millimeters per year. The Hollywood Fault due to its proximity to the site, will also affect the site relative to strong ground shaking. Other more distant active faults may also produce notable ground motions but not to the same degree as the Hollywood Fault.

The Raymond Fault is an oblique-slip fault and is not known to be active. The site is about 4.7 miles away. The Verdugo Fault is also a dip-slip fault that is approximately 6.0 miles away from the site. The Santa Monica Fault is approximately 6.6 miles away from the site, and is a reverse fault system that has not been active since the Holocene period. Other faults include the Newport-Inglewood Fault, the Sierra Madre Fault, and the Malibu Coast Fault. These faults are thought to have a lower potential for impacting the site.[1]

A second type of fault which is not exposed at the surface, known as "blind or buried thrust," has been the focus of study since the 1987 Whittier Narrows earthquake. Of these, the Elysian Park-Wilshire thrust zone has the greatest potential to impact the proposed project area because the entire Central City subregion of the City (which includes the proposed project area) is underlain by this zone. This fault zone was responsible

[1] *Geotechnical Evaluation for Los Angeles City College*, Geobase, Inc., January 2002. See Appendix D.

Figure 4.4-1

for the 1987 Whittier Narrows earthquake (magnitude 5,9) and has the potential capability of producing a maximum probable earthquake of between magnitude 5.5 to 6.0, and a maximum credible earthquake of magnitude greater than seven.

TABLE 4.4-1: CAPABLE FAULTS

Fault	Maximum Moment Magnitude/a/	Distance From Site	Type of Fault
Hollywood	6.5	1.8 miles	Dip-slip
Raymond	6.5	4.7 miles	Dip-slip
Verdugo	6.7	6.0 miles	Dip-slip
Santa Monica	6.6	6.6 miles	Dip-slip
Newport-Inglewood (Los Angeles Basin)	6.9	7.1 miles	Strike-slip

/a/ The moment magnitude is denoted by Mw. It takes into account both the energy released and the amplitude of a distant earthquake. The commonly used Richter Scale is not used because it is known to saturate at higher magnitudes and does not correlate well with other fault parameters such as fault length and slip rate.
SOURCE: California Division of Mines and Geology. Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment for the State of California; Appendix A, Table 182 California Faults.

The most widespread, damaging effects of earthquakes are caused by strong ground shaking. According to the EIR for the Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework, the proposed project area should reach a Modified Mercelli Intensity (MMI) of VIII-VIII+ from the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone scenario earthquake ("VIII" intensity is characterized by the following: damage slight in specially designed structures; considerable in ordinary substantial buildings with partial collapse; damage great in poorly built structures; fall of chimneys, factory stacks, columns, monuments, walls; heavy furniture overturned.)[2] Furthermore, according to the Framework, the proposed project area could experience peak ground acceleration (PGA) of 0.5- 0.6g ("g" is the force associated with PGA) from a large earthquake on any of the nearby faults. An earthquake with ground motion with a magnitude of PGA 0.57g is expected to result in "severe" perceived shaking, with "moderate to heavy" damage potential.

Landslide

A landslide is the descent of earth and rock down a slope. Some areas are at higher risk for landslides due to inherent instability. This instability is generally caused by a steep slope or unstable soil composition. Heavy rainfall, flooding, or ground movements such as earthquakes can induce landslides. The March 25, 1999 Seismic Hazard Zones Map lists areas which have been identified as landslide hazard zones. Review of the Map identified no landslide zones near the project site (see **Figure 4.4-2**). The site is relatively flat

[2] The effect of an earthquake on the Earth's surface is called the intensity. The intensity scale consists of a series of certain key responses such as people awakening, movement of furniture, damage to chimneys, and finally - total destruction. Although numerous intensity scales have been developed over the last several hundred years to evaluate the effects of earthquakes, the one currently used in the United States is the Modified Mercalli (MM) Intensity Scale. The Modified Mercalli Scale is commonly used to rank the intensity from I to XII according to the kind and amount of damage produced. In practice, an earthquake is assigned one magnitude, but it may give rise to reports of intensities at many different levels. For example, the magnitude 6.5 April 29, 1965, Seattle-Tacoma earthquake produced intensity VII to VIII damage near its epicenter, intensity V damage 150 kilometers from the epicenter. U.S.G.S. National Earthquake Information Center, 1999; http://vulcan.wr.usgs.gov/Glossary/Seismicity/description_earthquakes.html.

Figure 4.4-2

and lies far enough from the nearest significant upland slopes to preclude the hazards of induced landsliding. Thus, the potential for landsliding to have a significant impact on the site is considered very low and no significant impacts are anticipated.

Liquefaction

Liquefaction is essentially the transformation of the soil to a liquid state. Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which the strength and stiffness of a soil is reduced by earthquake shaking or other rapid loading. Liquefaction potential has been found to be the greatest where the groundwater level is shallow, and loose, fine sands occur with a depth of about 50 feet or less. Significant factors that affect liquefaction include water level, soil type, particle size distribution and gradation, relative density, confining pressure, intensity of shaking and duration of shaking. A review of the March 25, 1999 Seismic Hazard Zones Map has indicated that the project site is located outside the area where historic occurrence of liquefaction, or local geological, geotechnical and groundwater conditions indicate a potential for permanent ground displacements such that mitigation as defined in Public Resources Code Section 2693 (c) would be required. In addition, the possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered very low due to the indurated older alluvium (low plastic clays/silts and medium to very dense silty sands) and shallow bedrock.

Floods, Tsunamis, Inundation, and Seiches

Tsunamis are usually caused by displacement of the ocean floor causing large waves. Tsunamis are typically generated by seismic activity. A seiche is a standing wave in an enclosed or partly enclosed body of water. Seiches are normally caused by earthquake activity, and can affect harbors, bays, lakes, rivers and canals. Inundation is flooding caused by tsunamis or seiches. The site is not located within a coastal zone or within miles of a body of water; therefore tsunamis, inundation, and seiches are not a potential hazard. The site is not located in the one hundred (100) year flood zone as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Immediately southwest of the proposed project site, is a 100-year flood plain, as shown in **Figure 4.4-2.** None of the proposed project area is within a 500-year flood plain.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The proposed project would be considered to be a significant geologic hazard if:

- It would entail the development within or adjacent to known geologic hazard areas, including areas of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, active faults, landsliding, and liquefaction;
- It would entail development that would increase the exposure of the population to tsunamis, inundation, seiches, or volcanic activity;
- It would entail development on or near other seismic hazards;
- Associated construction activity resulted in the potential for failure of new construction due to loose saturated sand or soft clay, and/or cobbles and large boulders obstructing excavation.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Geologic Materials and Soils

Summary of Impacts

- Significant impact related to geologic materials and soils (mitigated).

Discussion of Impacts

The proposed project would result in the construction of new buildings and the redevelopment of others throughout the proposed project area. Within these areas, some soil associations may not be suitable for construction, resulting in significant impacts in areas found to be unsuitable. Such conditions would represent a significant, but mitigable, impact associated with future development in the proposed project area.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce potential significant impacts associated with erosion potential:

GS1 Soils shall be evaluated on a project-by-project basis, and appropriate mitigation recommended. If found, all compressible materials shall be removed and replaced as compacted fill (with the exception of peat, which shall be removed from the fills). The criteria for leaving surficial soils in place should be consistent with the grading specifications of the City of Los Angeles. Other recommendations may include deep piles or caissons to support the structures, and/or in-place mechanical densification of compressible layers.

GS2 If soils underlying the site specific proposed project area are determined susceptible to ground lurching, site-specific foundation recommendations may be made to mitigate this hazard. An alternative mitigation measure is to remove and recompact the subsurface soils prone to ground lurching.

GS3 If soils underlying the site specific proposed project area are determined to be highly expansive, impacts shall be mitigated by special foundations, such as post-tensioned slab foundations, raft foundations, or caissons.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

Implementation of mitigation measures **GS1** through **GS3** would reduce potential topographic changes and erosion impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Seismicity

Summary of Impacts

- Significant impact related to ground shaking (mitigated).
- No significant impact related to landslide hazards.
- No significant impact related to liquefaction hazards.
- No significant impact related to other seismic hazards.

Discussion of Impacts

The LACC campus is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. However, the site is situated near the Hollywood Fault. The site could be subject to strong ground shaking as a result of an earthquake on this fault. There is potential for ground shaking to have a significant impact on the proposed development.

Movements of any of the previously described active and potentially active faults could cause strong ground shaking a the site. Ground motions have been postulated for the site corresponding to the Design Basis Earthquake as having a ten percent probability for exceedance during a 50 year time period.[3] The estimated peak ground acceleration for the DBE is 0.48g. Ground motions for the site for an Upper Bound Earthquake (UBE) is postulated as a ten percent chance of exceedance in 100 years. UBE is defined in Section 1629.2.6 of the 1995 California Building Code as "the motion having a 10 percent probability of being exceeded in a 100-year period of maximum level of motion which may ever be expected at the building site within the known geologic framework."

The City of Los Angeles evaluated the ground shaking hazard for parts of the City they believe will accommodate the majority of future growth (i.e., Targeted Growth Areas [TGAs]). The proposed project area is located within one of these TGAs (Hollywood-1 TGA). This TGA was determined to have a moderate potential impact from ground shaking. Because ground shaking has the potential to affect all structures within the City of Los Angeles, this hazard would pose a significant, but mitigable impact associated with the proposed project. Potential impacts from ground shaking will be further reduced through proper engineering design and conformance with current City and State seismic building and development code requirements as administered by the State Architect.

MITIGATION MEASURES

GS4 The potential effects of ground shaking will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by designing the new LACC facilities to resist strong ground motions approximating the Design Basis Earthquake standards and the associated ground accelerations expected to occur in the vicinity of the site.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Liquefaction

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts related to liquefaction hazards.

Discussion of Impacts.

The proposed project is not within an area of liquefaction. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to liquefaction.

[3] Design Basis Earthquake standards as identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code Section 1627, 1629.1, 1631.2 for Residential and Commercial.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Landslides

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts related to landslide hazards.

Discussion of Impacts.

The proposed project is not within an area susceptible to landslides. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to landslides.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Tsunamis, Inundation, and Seiches

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts related to tsunamis, inundation, and seiches.

Discussion of Impacts

The proposed project area is not in an area subject to volcanic and tsunami hazards or in an area subject to dam-related inundation, caused by dam failure, conditions of excess precipitation or seiching. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact with regard to these hazards.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

4.5 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section identifies the potential for the proposed project to expose the public to hazards or risk of upset that may be related to existing conditions within the proposed project area or to surroundings, or new hazards created as a result of the proposed project.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A Phase One Environmental Site Assessment was conducted of the Los Angeles City College (LACC) campus and selected buildings on March 17, 2002 by NATEC International, Inc. (See Appendix E). The purpose of the assessment was to attempt to uncover past or present environmentally related events that negatively impact the LACC campus. Research included a governmental records search, research of permits, interviews, review of historical and aerial photographs and other supporting documentation and an on-site inspection.

There is at least one underground storage tank within the proposed project area, which is located in the facilities maintenance area. It is used for unleaded gasoline storage. There were seven known underground storage tanks removed from the proposed project site. All but the most recent (1996 by Global Solutions) were properly removed and closure granted according to the City of Los Angeles Fire Department records.[1]

The LACC campus is comprised of buildings mostly constructed between 1950 and 1970. Some of the buildings appeared to have been constructed as early as 1935 and as late as the 1990s.[2]

Subsidence/Methane Gas

Subsidence is the downward settling of the earth's surface with little or no horizontal motion. The removal of oil (and gas or other fluids) from the deep geologic formations can leave void spaces at depths which, unless refilled with fluids by re-pressurization techniques, may collapse causing subsidence in the shallower earth layers between the ground surface and the pumped geologic units at depth. Engineered structures built above or within these subsiding earth layers will settle along with the earth materials potentially causing varying degrees of distress to foundations and the structures they support. Also, these earth materials may become conduits for methane (or other) gas seeping upward from these petroleum-rich formations. Methane may accumulate in layers or pockets within the construction zone. Encountering these poisonous or combustible gases could lead to exposure to workers, to fire, or to explosion.[3]

California Division of Oil and Gas maps were reviewed for the presence of active, inactive, or abandoned oil and gas wells within the proposed project area. Based on the information obtained, there are no known oil or gas wells within the proposed project area, although unreported "wildcat" oil wells could be on or near the proposed project site.[4]

---

[1] *Environmental Site Assessment*, NATEC International, Inc. March17, 2001.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework EIR, January, 1995.

[4] *Environmental Site Assessment*, NATEC International, Inc. March17, 2001.

Hazardous Materials

Soil and/or Groundwater Contamination. The government environmental records database search indicated that thirteen leaking underground storage sites and five underground/aboveground storage tanks are located within one-half mile of the proposed project area. Based on their distance and direction from the subject property, it is not expected that contamination from these sites would have migrated onto the proposed project site.[5]

Asbestos Materials. Asbestos containing building materials (ACMs) were widely used in structures built between 1945 and 1980. Common asbestos-containing building materials include vinyl flooring and associated mastic, wallboard and associate joint compound, plaster, stucco, acoustic ceiling spray, ceiling tiles, heating system components and roofing materials. Commercial/industrial structures are affected by asbestos regulations if damage occurs or if remodeling, renovation or demolition activities disturb asbestos-containing building materials. The structures on the property in question were constructed between 1945 and 1980.

Asbestos containing building materials are likely to be identified in types of building targeted for removal. Building materials suspected of having an asbestos content include floor tiles and linoleum, plaster walls, wallboard, ceiling tiles, exterior stucco and roofing materials. Based on the age of the structures on the proposed project property, building materials are suspected of having an asbestos content as part of their manufacture.

Lead-Based Paint (LBPs). Leaded paint was primarily utilized from the 1920s through 1978. Commercial/industrial structures are affected by lead-based paint regulations if damage occurs or if remodeling, renovation or demolition activities disturb lead-based paint surfaces. It is considered likely that there is the presence of lead-based paint in the buildings constructed during these times.[6]

Lead may also exist within the walls of the radiology building, as lead is designed to protect human health from x-rays.

Poly-chlorinated biphenyl (PCB). PCB containing transformers were banned in 1976 by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA). By 1985, the US EPA required that commercial property owners with transformers containing more than 500 parts per million (ppm) PCBs must register the transformer with the local fire department, provide exterior labeling and remove combustible materials within 5 meters. The EPA has designated transformers containing less than 50 ppm PCB as non-PCB containing transformers.

At least two electrical transformers were identified at the site. Transformers in the vicinity are owned and operated by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. According to a utility representative, the majority of the transformers have been tested and are below 50 ppm PCB.

Underground Storage Tanks. A records search was performed to determine the number, extent, and condition of reported hazardous material sites. The information from the database search provides identification and insight on the location of identified environmental problems that include leaking underground storage tanks. There is at least one underground storage tank on the proposed project property, which is used for unleaded gasoline storage and one hazardous materials storage. These are designated for removal and relocation/removal, respectively, as part of the 10-year plan. The government environmental

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

records database search indicated that thirteen leaking underground storage sites and five underground/aboveground storage tanks are located within one-half mile of the proposed project area. Based on their distance and direction from the subject property, these sites do not pose an environmental threat.[7]

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The proposed project would have a significant hazards and risk of upset impact if:

- The proposed project would expose daytime and/or residential populations to health hazards; and
- The proposed project would entail a risk of explosion or release of hazardous substances.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Subsidence/Methane Gas

Summary of Impacts

- No impact related to subsidence/methane gas.

Discussion of Impacts

The proposed project area does not contain known oil or gas wells. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Hazardous Materials

Summary of Impacts

- No impact related to soil and/or groundwater contamination.
- Significant impact related to asbestos, lead-based paint, and PCBs (mitigated).
- No impact related to the release of hazardous materials.

Discussion of Impacts

There are no areas of concern regarding migration of subsurface contamination from off site sources.[8] The present underground storage tank is a continued source of environmental concern by virtue of its existence. However, there was no evidence to indicate that immediate action to an environmentally-related concern was

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

needed. Any future removal of this underground storage tank will be done in accordance with state statutory requirements. Therefore, no impact related to soil and/or groundwater contamination is expected.

Renovation and/or replacement of buildings containing asbestos, leaded paint, or the removal of electrical transformers and lighting ballasts that contain PCBs, could create health hazards to workers at construction sites, and residents and employees within the vicinity of these sites. Improper disposal of lead-based paint removed during renovation or demolition could also pose a hazard. Additionally, lead sheeting within the walls of the radiology building may also pose a threat to human health. PCB containing units also pose a risk upon disposal. Due to the age of the buildings within the proposed project area, and given that implementation of the redevelopment activities would likely result in the removal of electrical transformers that contain PCBs, there is potential for the existence of hazardous materials, and therefore, would result in a significant but mitigable impact.

Construction Impacts. The demolition and/or renovation of any structures with asbestos containing materials, lead-based paint or PCBs would have the potential to release these substances into the atmosphere if these substances are not properly stabilized or removed prior to demolition activity. This could result in a significant impact.

Operation Impacts. Operation of the expanded LACC campus would continue as it currently does. All potentially hazardous materials would be stored, handled and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Consequently, campus operations would not be expected to pose any significant risks related to accidental release of hazardous materials due to the expansion of the campus. Operational impacts would be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

HR1 Asbestos and lead investigations shall be conducted on structures built prior to 1988 that are to be demolished or rehabilitated. Where ACM, lead sheeting or lead based paint exceed regulatory action levels, appropriate abatement and management techniques shall be developed and implemented. Construction monitoring may be required to ensure the health and safety of construction workers.

HR2 For those campus facilities affected by the Master Plan, lead-based paint testing should be conducted due to the deteriorating condition of many painted surfaces. All materials identified as containing lead shall be removed by a licensed lead-based paint/materials abatement contractor.

HR3 For those campus facilities affected by the Master Plan, asbestos sampling should be conducted to determine if building materials used in the construction of the structures in question have an asbestos fiber content. All material identified as containing asbestos shall be removed and/or encapsulated by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor as provided by the provisions of Rule 1403 of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rules and Regulations

HR4 PCB containing units removed from buildings affected by the Master Plan should be properly disposed of as required by law.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

Implementation of mitigation measures **HR1** through **HR4** would reduce the potential impacts related to hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.

4.6 LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section examines the relationship between the proposed project and local and regional long-term land use plans. The proposed project is evaluated for consistency with the City of Los Angeles General Plan, the City of Los Angeles Zoning Ordinance, and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan.[1] Potential conflicts between existing land uses in the vicinity of the project area and the proposed project are also addressed in this section.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Land Use

The Los Angeles City College (LACC) campus encompasses approximately 48 acres and is located in the City of Los Angeles. The LACC campus is bounded by Willowbrook Avenue to the north, Melrose Avenue to the south, Vermont Avenue to the east, and Heliotrope Drive to the west (excluding the Braille Institute which lies just on the southeast corner of the intersection of Vermont and Melrose Avenues. The LACC campus is located in a fully developed urban environment. The surrounding neighborhood consists primarily of commercial and residential land uses that include several retail/commercial uses, and single- and multiple-family dwelling units. The campus has operated in its current location since 1929.

Specifically, land uses to the immediate north of the LACC campus on Willowbrook Avenue consist primarily of multi-family residential units. Multiple-family residential units are located to the west of campus along Heliotrope Drive with a few single-family residential units located on the north end of the block and commercial/retail uses located on the street's south end. Commercial retail uses are also located on the south and east edge of the campus on Melrose and Vermont Avenues. A mixed- use building exists on Vermont Avenue between Monroe Street and Normal Avenue. Also, on Vermont Avenue is the LACC Parking Lot 1 located between Marathon and Monroe Streets just southeast of the main campus.

Existing buildings and uses within the LACC campus include classrooms, lecture halls, a library, administrative offices, bungalows, parking lots, a cafeteria, two gymnasiums, tennis courts, Child Development Center, a community center, auditorium, a main quad, an athletic field, a student center, and other miscellaneous buildings.

Land Use Plans

Regional

SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide. The LACC campus is located within the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region. SCAG has prepared the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) to serve as a framework to guide decision-making with respect to the growth and changes that can be anticipated by the year 2015 and beyond. At the regional level, the goals, objectives, and policies in the RCPG are used for measuring consistency with the adopted plan.

[1] Consistency with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's *Air Quality Management Plan* is addressed separately in Section 4.2 of this EIR, "Air Quality."

Local

The project site lies within the Hollywood Community Plan Area and the Vermont/Western Station Neighborhood Area Plan as shown in **Figure 4.6-1**. The Hollywood Community Plan is part of the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles, and serves as an official guide to the future development of the community by promoting an arrangement of land use, circulation, and services which encourage and contribute to the economic, social and physical health, safety, and welfare of the community within the larger framework of the City and the metropolitan area. According to the Hollywood Community Plan, the campus is located on land designated "recreation" and "school site on public land". The surrounding areas are designated medium density housing to the north and west of the campus. To the east of campus along Vermont Avenue, high density designated housing is located from Lockwood Avenue to Monroe Street, recreation and school site is designated from Monroe Street to Marathon Street, and neighborhood and office is designated from Willowbrook to Lockwood Avenue and between Marathon Street to Melrose Avenue. Areas to the south on Melrose Avenue are designated neighborhood and office. The Hollywood Community Plan is currently being revised.

The Vermont/Western Station Neighborhood Area Plan is intended to implement the goals and policies of the Hollywood Community Plan, and the General Plan. As shown in **Figure 4.6-1**, the Vermont-Western Neighborhood Plan shows that the LACC campus is in a sub-area designated as a community facility. This classification includes current school sites, City owned land, and Caltrans right-of-ways. Surrounding areas are designated as community center to the north of campus along Willowbrook Avenue. A mixed-use boulevard designation, typically located near subway stations and allow for live/work, runs along the east and south of the campus along Vermont Avenue and Melrose Avenue. Adjacent to the west side of the campus along Heliotrope Drive the block is designated Neighborhood Conservation. The purpose of this designation is to maintain the current prevailing scale and character of residential blocks and improve the pedestrian environment.

The project site is zoned PF-1XL (Public Facility, Height District 1, Extra Limited) (see **Figure 4.6-1**). According to the City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code no building designated PF-1XL shall exceed two stories, nor shall the highest point of the roof of any building or structure exceed 30 feet in height. The total floor area of a main building within PF-1 shall not exceed three times the buildable amount of the said lot. Surrounding areas north and west of campus generally have low medium density residential uses, zoned R1.5-1XL (Residential, Height District 1, Extra Limited). Areas south and east of campus along Melrose and Vermont, primarily have commercial uses zoned C2-1 (Commercial zone, Height District 1).

A conditional use permit is required for educational institutions to operate in this zone. Because of their size or unusual characteristics, they require special consideration as to their proper location in relation to their adjacent uses or to the development of the community, and to the various elements of the General Plan. The Commission grants approval of the use of a lot in any zone designated for conditional uses.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The proposed project would have a significant land use impact if it:

- Physically divides an established community;
- Brings conflict with existing surrounding land uses; or
- Brings conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Proposed Project which was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Figure 4.6-1

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Consistency with SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impact related to consistency with SCAG Regional Policies.

Discussion of Impacts

The proposed Master Plan projects, goals and objectives were compared to the SCAG Regional Policies for consistency (see **Table 4.6-1** below).

TABLE 4.6-1: COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT TO SCAG REGIONAL POLICIES

Policy Type and Goals		Finding	Discussion/Cross Reference
REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND GUIDE			
3.03	The timing, financing, and location of public facilities, utility systems, and transportation systems shall be used by SCAG to implement the region's growth policies.	Not Applicable.	The proposed project is not the development of public facilities, utility systems or transportation systems.
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN POLICIES			
4.01	Transportation investments shall be based on SCAG's adopted Regional Performance Indicators (mobility, accessibility, environment, reliability, safety, livable communities, equity, and cost effectiveness).	Not applicable.	The proposed project does not contain any regional transportation investment elements. Therefore, this policy is not applicable.
4.02	Transportation investments shall mitigate environmental impacts to an acceptable level.	Not applicable.	The proposed project does not contain any regional transportation investment elements.
4.04	Transportation Control Measures shall be a priority.	Consistent with this policy.	See Section 4.9, Transportation and Traffic which identifies project-specific mitigation measures.
4.06	Implementing transit restructuring, including Smart Shuttles, freight improvements, advanced transportation technologies, airport ground access and traveler information services are RTP priorities.	Not applicable.	The proposed project does not require the implementation of transit restructuring.

TABLE 4.6-1: COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT TO SCAG REGIONAL POLICIES			
Policy Type and Goals		**Finding**	**Discussion/Cross Reference**
4.16	Maintaining and operating the existing transportation system will be a priority over expanding capacity.	Consistent with this policy.	The proposed project may result in localized impacts to the transportation system which would be mitigated. The project would be within projected growth forecasts and would not place an undue burden on the existing regional transportation system. The project may include local improvements to the existing transportation system (See Section 4.9)
GROWTH MANAGEMENT CHAPTER POLICIES TO IMPROVE THE REGIONAL STANDARD OF LIVING			
3.05	Encourage patterns of urban development and land use, which reduce costs on infrastructure construction, and make better use of existing facilities.	Consistent with this policy.	The proposed project is located within an urbanized area, with an extensive network of infrastructure in place. As a result, development of this project would not demand expansion of infrastructure into outlying or undeveloped areas. The project would use existing facilities to the greatest extent possible.
3.09	Support local jurisdictions' efforts to minimize the cost of infrastructure and public service delivery, and efforts to seek new sources of funding for development and the provision of services.	Consistent with this policy.	See Discussion for Policy 3.05.
3.10	Support local jurisdictions' actions to minimize red tape and expedite the permitting process to maintain economic vitality and competitiveness.	Consistent with this policy.	This report is an EIR to a Master Plan. Because this report evaluates all proposed projects within the Master Plan, future permitting of the individual component in the Master Plan can be streamlined.
GROWTH MANAGEMENT CHAPTER POLICIES TO IMPROVE THE REGIONAL QUALITY OF LIFE			
3.12	Encourage existing or proposed local jurisdictions' programs aimed at designing land uses which encourage the use of transit and thus reduce the need for roadway expansion, reduce the number of auto trips and vehicle miles traveled, and create opportunities for residents to walk and bike.	Not applicable.	The proposed project consists of renovation and expansion of an existing use.
3.14	Support local plans to increase density of future development located at strategic points along the regional commuter rail, transit systems, and activity centers.	Not applicable.	The proposed project is the buildout of an existing use.

TABLE 4.6-1: COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT TO SCAG REGIONAL POLICIES			
Policy Type and Goals		**Finding**	**Discussion/Cross Reference**
3.16	Encourage developments in and around activity centers, transportation corridors, underutilized infrastructure systems, and areas needing recycling and redevelopment.	Not Applicable.	See Discussions for Policies 3.12-3.14.
3.18	Encourage planned development in locations least likely to cause environmental impact.	Not applicable.	The site is a fully improved urban location.
3.21	Encourage the implementation of measures aimed at the preservation and protection of recorded and unrecorded cultural resources and archaeological sites.	Consistent with this policy.	See Section 4.3 of this EIR.
3.23	Encourage mitigation measures that reduce noise in certain locations, measures aimed at preservation of biological and ecological resources, measures that would reduce exposure to seismic hazards, minimize earthquake damage, and to develop emergency response and recovery plans.	Consistent with this policy.	See Summary of Mitigation Measures discussed in Chapter 2.0 Summary of this EIR.
GROWTH MANAGEMENT CHAPTER POLICIES TO PROVIDE SOCIAL, POLITICAL, AND CULTURAL EQUITY			
3.27	Support local jurisdictions and other service providers in their efforts to develop sustainable communities and provide, equally to all members of society, accessible and effective services, such as: public education, housing, health care, social services, recreational facilities, law enforcement, and fire protection.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.

TABLE 4.6-1: COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT TO SCAG REGIONAL POLICIES

Policy Type and Goals		Finding	Discussion/Cross Reference
AIR QUALITY CHAPTER CORE ACTIONS			
5.07	Determine specific programs and associated actions needed (e.g., indirect source rules, enhanced use of telecommunications, provision of community-based shuttle services, provision of demand management-based programs, or vehicle-miles-traveled/emission fees) so that options to command and control regulations can be assessed.	Consistent with this policy.	See Mitigation Measures summarized in Chapter 2.0 Summary of this EIR.
5.11	Through the environmental document review process, ensure that plans at all levels of government (regional, air basin, county, subregional, and local) consider air quality, land use, transportation and economic relationships to ensure consistency and minimize conflicts.	Consistent with this policy.	As discussed in Chapter 4.2 Air Quality, this AIR would be considered consistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Air Quality Management Plan.
WATER QUALITY CHAPTER RECOMMENDATIONS AND POLICY OPTIONS			
11.07	Encourage water reclamation throughout the region where it is cost-effective, feasible, and appropriate to reduce reliance on imported water and wastewater discharges. Current administrative impediments to increased use of wastewater should be addressed.	Consistent with this policy.	The feasibility of using reclaimed water for the landscaped and open space areas of the project site will be examined and utilized as necessary to comply with all applicable City-mandated water conservation and wastewater discharge policies.

SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates, LLC, 2002.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Compatibility with Local Plans and Land Use Regulations

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts relating to compatibility with local plans and land use regulations.

Discussion of Impacts

The LACC campus has been a major land use fixture in the community since 1929. The Los Angeles Community College District has jurisdiction and authority to make decisions in regards to the project site and its development. However, the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) intends to take into account the goals of the City of Los Angeles' General Plan in implementing any new developments within the college campus.

In evaluating the potential impacts of the LACC Master Plan, existing campus land use was reviewed for compatibility with local planning regulations (Hollywood Community Plan and the Vermont/Western Neighborhood Plan). The LACC campus does not conflict with the policies or goals of the Hollywood Community Plan and the Vermont/Western Neighborhood Plan. There is no indication that the proposed expansion and renovation of the LACC campus would result in any conflict as the proposed project does not involve a change in intensity, character or scale of the existing use.

The Master Plan does not include any new uses that does not already exist on the LACC campus as the proposed projects are the same as existing uses (educational facilities). Some of the proposed new buildings will exceed 30 feet in height, however, the District, under state law has discretion to exempt educational facilities from local zoning. Further, the proposed building heights are compatible in size and scale with existing building heights on campus. Therefore, the planned projects in the Master Plan will not result in a significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

4.7 NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Noise Definition and Terminology

Noise is defined as unwanted or excessively loud sound. The degree to which noise can impact the human environment range from levels that interfere with speech and sleep (annoyance and nuisance) to levels that cause adverse health effects (hearing loss and psychological effects). Human response to noise is subjective and can vary greatly from person to person. Factors that influence individual response include the intensity, frequency, and pattern of noise, as well as the amount of background noise present and the nature of work or human activity that is exposed to the noise source.

Sound is technically described in terms of loudness (amplitude) and frequency (pitch). The standard unit of measurement for sound is the decibel (dB). The human ear is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies. The "A-weighted scale" (dBA) reflects the normal hearing sensitivity range of the human ear. On this scale, the range of human hearing extends from approximately 3 to 140 dBA. The smallest perceptible sound level change is about three decibels, while ten dBA increase is perceived by most people as a doubling of the sound level. Examples of typical A-weighted sound levels in different environments are shown in **Figure 4-7.1**.

Leq is the average noise level on an energy basis for any specific time period. The Leq for one hour is the energy average noise level during the hour. The average noise level is based on the energy content (acoustic energy) of the sound. Leq can be thought of as the level of a continuous noise which has the same energy content as the fluctuating noise level. The equivalent noise level is expressed in units of dBA.

CNEL is an average sound level during a 24-hour day. CNEL is a noise measurement scale, which accounts for noise source, distance, single event duration, single event occurrence, frequency, and time of day. Human reaction to sound between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. is as if the sound were actually five decibels higher than if it occurred from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. From 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., humans perceive sound as if it were 10 dBA higher due to the lower background level. Hence, the CNEL is obtained by adding an additional five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., and 10 dBA to sound levels in the night before 7:00 a.m. and after 10:00 p.m. Because CNEL accounts for human sensitivity to sound, the CNEL 24-hour figure is always a higher number than the actual 24-hour average.

Sound Propagation and Attenuation

Generally, noise is most audible when traveling by direct line-of-sight.[1] Barriers, such as walls, berms, or buildings, that break the line-of-sight between the source and the receiver greatly reduces noise levels from the source since sound can only reach the receiver by bending over the top of the barrier (diffraction). Sound barriers can reduce sound levels by approximately 10 to 15 dBA. However, if a barrier is not high or long enough to break the line-of-sight from the source to the receiver, its effectiveness is greatly reduced. In a situation where the source or the receiver is located three meters above the ground, or whenever the line-of-sight averages more than three meters (approximately 9.84 feet) above the ground, sound levels would reduce by approximately three decibels for each doubling of distance.

[1] Line-of-sight is a direct line between the noise source and the noise receptor.

Figure 4.7-1

Sensitive Receptors

Land uses that are considered sensitive to noise impacts are referred to as "sensitive receptors." Noise sensitive receptors include, but are not limited to, schools, residences, libraries, hospitals and other care facilities. Noise sensitive receptors adjoining the proposed project site include:

- Multi- and single-family residential uses on Heliotrope Drive;
- Multi-family residential uses on Willowbrook Avenue;
- Mary's Christian Center;
- Braille Institute; and
- Child Development Center (on-site).

The sensitive receptors listed above are shown in **Figure 4.7-2**.

Existing Setting

The existing noise environment of the project area is typical of an urban region and can be characterized by a background, or ambient, noise level generated by vehicular traffic on the nearest roadways and a variety of other characteristic urban noise events, such as home and car stereos and people.

The Quest Q-400 Noise Dosimeter was used to measure ambient noise levels at five sensitive receptor locations within the vicinity of the project site. Noise measurements were conducted during the daytime hours between 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. and during the evening hours between 7:30 p.m. and 9:30 p.m. on March 12, 2002. Evening and daytime noise measurements were taken to correspond with day and evening classes. The five noise monitoring locations, as well as the noise measurements, are listed in **Table 4.7-1** and shown in **Figure 4.7-3**. As shown in **Table 4.7-1**, daytime ambient noise levels at each sensitive receptor range from 61 to 67 dBA, and evening ambient noise levels at each sensitive receptors range from 58 to 63 dBA. Ambient noise levels at noise monitoring position 4 is higher during the evening due to the high volume of automobiles entering and leaving the parking structure.

TABLE 4.7-1: EXISTING NOISE LEVELS (dBA, Leq)

	Noise Measurement (dBA)	
Noise Monitoring Position	**Daytime**	**Evening**
1. Multi-Family Residential Use on Heliotrope Dr. (west of the existing southwest parking lot)	63	60
2. Single-Family Residential uses on Heliotrope Dr. (west of the existing tennis courts)	61	61
3. Multi-Family Residential on Willowbrook Ave. (north of the existing Chemistry building)	61	58
4. Multi-Family Residential on Monroe St. (north of the existing southeast parking lot and structure (Lot 1)	62	63
5. Braille Institute Courtyard (located at the northwest corner of Vermont and Melrose Aves.)	67	60

SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC.

Figure 4.7-2

Figure 4.3-3

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The authority to approve the LACC Master Plan rests primarily with the Los Angeles Community College district. However, noise sensitive land uses, such as adjacent residential units, surround the campus. These sensitive land uses are located within the City of Los Angeles and have the potential to be impacted by noise generated by activities on the LACC campus. In an effort to use established criteria to determine a significant impact and because these noise sensitive land uses are located within the City of Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles CEQA Threshold Guide was used as the thresholds of significance for noise.

According to the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, the proposed project would result in a significant impact if any of the following occur:

- Construction activities would exceed noise levels by five decibels or more at a noise sensitive use, and;

- Project operations would cause ambient noise levels measured at the property line of affected uses to increase by three decibels (CNEL) to or within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category or any five decibels or greater noise increase (see **Table 4.7-2**).

TABLE 4.7-2: COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE (dBA, CNEL)

Land Use	Normally Acceptable	Conditionally Acceptable	Normally Unacceptable	Clearly Unacceptable
Single-Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes	50 - 60	55 - 70	70 - 75	above 70
Multi-Family Homes	50 - 65	60 - 70	70 - 75	above 70
Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes	50 - 70	60 - 70	70 - 80	above 80
Transient Lodging - Motels, Hotels	50 - 65	60 - 70	70 - 80	above 80
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	50 - 70	-	67 - 75	above 72
Office Buildings, Business and Professional Commercial	50 - 70	67 - 77	above 75	-
Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture	50 - 75	70 - 80	above 75	-

Normally Acceptable: Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction without any special noise insulation requirements.
Conditionally Acceptable: New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.
Normally Unacceptable: New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detail analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.
Clearly Unacceptable: New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.

SOURCE: Office of Noise Control, California Department of Health Services (DHS).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Construction Impacts

Summary of Impacts

- A significant impact is anticipated as to construction related noise activities (unavoidable).

Discussion of Impacts

In general, construction activities resulting from development within the project site would increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity on an intermittent, but temporary, basis. Noise levels during construction would fluctuate depending upon the construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and the presence/absence of barriers between the noise source and receptor.

Typical noise levels from various types of equipment that may be used during construction of the proposed project are listed in **Table 4.7-3**. The table shows noise levels at distances of 50 feet and 100 feet from the construction noise source. Generally, noise levels decrease by six decibels over hard surfaces and nine decibels over soft surfaces for each doubling of distance. For example, the noise level for a paving breaker would be 82 dBA at 50 feet, 76 dBA at 100 feet, and 70 dBA at 200 feet.

TABLE 4.7-3: MAXIMUM NOISE LEVELS OF COMMON CONSTRUCTION MACHINERY

	Noise Level (dBA) /a/	
Noise Source	**50 Feet**	**100 Feet**
Paving Breaker	82	76
Jackhammer	82	76
Steamroller	83	77
Street Paver	80	74
Backhoe	83	77
Street Compressor	67	61
Front-End Loader	79	73
Street Cleaner	70	64
Idling Haul Truck	72	66
Cement Mixer	72	66

/a/ Assumes a 6 dBA drop-off rate for noise generated by a "point source" and traveling over hard surfaces. Actual measured noise levels of the equipment listed in this table were taken at distances of 10 feet and 30 feet from the source.
SOURCE: Cowan, James P., 1994. Handbook of Environmental Acoustics, p. 230.

Table 4.7-3 shows noise levels of individual equipment. However, noise level would vary depending on the amount and type of equipment used during construction. **Table 4.7-4** shows the typical noise levels that can be expected during each construction phase. As the table shows, the highest noise levels are expected to occur during the grading/excavation and finishing phase. It should be emphasized that the noise levels presented in **Table 4.7-4** represent worst case conditions and would be of an infrequent and temporary nature.

TABLE 4.7-4: OUTDOOR CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS		
	Noise Level (dBA, Leq)	
Construction Phase	**At 50 Feet**	**At 50 Feet with Mufflers**
Ground Clearing	84	82
Grading/Excavation	89	86
Foundations	78	77
Structural	85	83
Finishing	89	86

SOURCE: Environmental Protection Agency, Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances, PB 206717, 1971.

To determine worst-case noise impacts at sensitive receptor locations, construction noise was modeled by introducing the noise level associated with the grading/excavation or finishing phase of a typical development project to the ambient noise level. The noise source was assumed to be active for approximately 40 percent of the eight-hour work day, generating a noise level of 89 dBA (Leq) at a reference distance of 50 feet.[2]

Sensitive land uses would be impacted the most when construction activities occur within close proximity. Thus, noise level during the construction period for each sensitive receptor location were calculated by (1) making a distance adjustment from the sensitive receptor to the nearest construction source sound level and (2) logarithmically adding the adjusted construction noise source level to the ambient noise level. Results appear in **Table 4.7-5**.

TABLE 4.7-5: CONSTRUCTION NOISE IMPACTS (dBA, Leq)					
Sensitive Receptor	**Nearest Construction Site**	**Distance To Nearest Construction Site**	**Existing Ambient (dBA)**	**New Ambient (dBA) /a/**	**Increase (dBA)**
1	Athletic Field and Parking Structure	120	63	73	10
2	Tennis Court and Underground Parking	120	61	73	12
3	Martin Luther King Library	120	61	73	12
4	Landscaping Monroe Mall and South Entry, Modernize Classrooms	425	62	64	2
5	Gymnasium, Performing and Fine Arts Facilities	70	67	78	11

/a/ New ambient sound level assumes construction noise sources would be active for approximately 40 percent of the eight-hour work day, which is consistent with the Environmental Protection Agency studies of construction noise). Construction sound levels are adjusted for distance.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC.

As shown in **Table 4.7-5**, construction activities within close proximity to noise monitoring positions 1, 2,

[2] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety, March 1974.

3, and 5 would incrementally increase the existing ambient noise levels by 10 to 12 dBA. Construction activities would exceed the significance criteria for construction activities. Thus, a significant impact is anticipated. Mitigation measures should be implemented to reduce noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

MITIGATION MEASURES

N1 Haul truck routes shall avoid all schools and residential areas.

N2 Construction contracts shall specify that all construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices.

N3 Pursuant to the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code Article 1, Section 41.40, construction activities shall not occur between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the weekdays (Monday through Friday), and before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and national holidays. No construction activities shall occur on Sundays.

N4 Construction operations shall be staged as far from noise sensitive land uses as possible.

N5 All sound-reducing devices and restrictions shall be maintained throughout the construction period.

N6 When feasible, replace noise equipment with quieter equipment (for example, a vibratory pile driver instead of a conventional pile driver and rubber-tired equipment rather than track equipment).

N7 Construction equipment shall be located as far as possible from noise sensitive areas.

N8 Construction occurring within 1,000 feet of the Child Development Center shall be limited to hours when the Child Development Center would not be affected. The Child Development Center shall be notified of particularly noisy activities.

N9 All residential units located within a quarter mile of the construction site (approximately 1,320 feet) shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule of the proposed project. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet, shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints.

N10 A “noise disturbance coordinator” shall be established for the construction of the proposed project. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and would be required to implement reasonable measures such that the complaint is resolved. All notices that are sent to residential units within 1,320 feet of the construction site and all signs posted at the construction site shall list the telephone number for the disturbance coordinator.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

Construction Impacts

Topographical and meteorological conditions affect sound wave propagation and the effectiveness of the mitigation measures listed above. As previously indicated in **Table 4.7-4,** machinery equipped with mufflers would reduce noise levels. **Table 4.7-6** shows construction noise impact at nearby sensitive receptor locations with muffler utilization.

TABLE 4.7-6: MITIGATED CONSTRUCTION NOISE IMPACTS (dBA, Leq)

Noise Monitoring Position	Nearest Construction Site	Distance To Nearest Construction Site	Existing Ambient (dBA)	New Ambient (dBA) /a/	Increase (dBA)
1	Athletic Field and Parking Structure	120	63	71	8
2	Tennis Court and Underground Parking	120	61	71	10
3	Martin Luther King Library	120	61	71	10
4	Landscaping Monroe Mall and South Entry, Modernize Classrooms	425	62	63	1
5	Gymnasium, Performing and Fine Arts Facilities	70	67	76	9

/a/ New ambient sound level assumes construction noise sources would be active for approximately 40 percent of the eight-hour work day, which is consistent with the Environmental Protection Agency studies of construction noise). Construction sound levels are adjusted for distance.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC.

Muffler utilization would reduce ambient sound levels by one to two decibels at each location. However, construction noise would continue to exceed five decibels at monitoring positions 1, 2, 3 and 5. This impact is considered unavoidable and significant.

Operational Impacts

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impact is anticipated to result from traffic related operational noise.
- A significant impact related to the Athletic Field (crowd noise and public address system) is anticipated (mitigated).

Discussion of Impacts

Traffic-Related Noise. The predominant operational noise source for the proposed project would be vehicular traffic. According to the traffic consultant, Meyers Mohaddes Associates, the proposed project would generate a total of approximately 24,871 net new daily trips.

The greatest noise impacts associated with vehicular traffic are anticipated to occur at sensitive receptor locations adjacent to roadways substantially affected by the proposed project. Using the FHWA RD77108 noise calculation formulas and the predicted traffic volumes provided by the project traffic consultant, noise

impacts associated with project-related traffic were predicted. Based on traffic volumes provided by the project traffic report, the CNEL was calculated at each sensitive receptor location (see **Table 4.7-7**).[3]

TABLE 4.7-7: FUTURE (2011) ESTIMATED COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL (dBA, CNEL)

	CNEL Scenario	
Sensitive Receptor	**No Project**	**With Project**
1	61.2	61.5
2	61.8	61.9
3	55.2	55.7
4	60.2	60.3
5	61.3	61.3

Assumptions:
Vehicular traffic is the predominate noise source.
The p.m. peak hour traffic represents 10% of ADT.
The 24 hour distribution is 75% , 20%, and 5% for 7 am - 7 pm, 7 - 10 pm, and 10 pm - 7 am, respectively.
Vehicle distribution is 91%, 6%, and 3% for auto, medium truck, and heavy truck, respectively.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC. See Appendix F.

As shown in **Table 4.7-7**, the proposed project is anticipated to incrementally increase CNEL by less-than-one decibel at all sensitive receptor locations. There would not be a noticeable noise change (increase of three decibels or more) at any of the sensitive receptor locations. Additionally, the incremental increases in CNEL at the six sensitive receptor locations do not exceed the City of Los Angeles noise threshold of a three-decibel (CNEL) increase. The noise levels at each location remains within the "normally acceptable" and "conditionally acceptable" category of the Community Noise Exposure Compatibility Chart. A less-than-significant impact is therefore anticipated to occur at all six sensitive receptor locations.

Athletic Field - Crowd Noise and Public Address System. One of the projects proposed by the LACC Master Plan is the construction of an athletic field to the southwest of the project site. Development of this facility would potentially increase noise levels in the surrounding area, particularly the multi-family residential uses to the west of Heliotrope Drive, adjoining the athletic field. It is anticipated that the new athletic field would have a seating capacity of approximately 2,000 people. The seats would be located at the western portion of the athletic field. Events that are held on the athletic field (such as athletic events) would result in noise from the crowd, such as from applause, loud talking, cheering, and yelling, as well as from the public announcement system. A crowd size between 2,000 to 2,500 people could result in a noise level of approximately 97 dBA at the bleachers.[4] Adjacent multi-family residential uses are approximately 120 feet from the athletic field. During an event in which a crowd of approximately 2,000 to 2,500 people would be on the athletic field, noise levels at the adjacent residential uses could reach up to approximately

[3] See Appendix F.

[4] Estimates is based on the assumption that a typical noise level of a crowd of 65,000 people during a football game could reach up to approximately 111 dBA (Handbook of Environmental Acoustics, James P. Cowan, 1994) and that sound level decreases by three decibels each time the number of identical sources is decreased by half.

83 dBA.[5] Noise levels during an event would increase the ambient noise level in the evening by approximately 23 dBA. The incremental increase exceeds the significance threshold of a five-decibel increase over the existing ambient noise level.

In addition to crowd noise, the public address system would be another noise source from the athletic field when an event is taking place. To be clearly intelligible, the public address system must generate sound levels that are at least 10 dBA greater than the ambient noise levels. As discussed above, a crowd size of 2,000 to 2,500 people would result in a noise level of approximately 97 dBA. Thus, the sound level from the public address system need to be at least 107 dBA where the crowd would be seated. Should the speakers of the public address system be oriented westward, toward the crowd, as well as the multi-family residential uses, ambient noise level at the residential uses (when noise from the public address system is combined with crowd noise) would be approximately 87 dBA.[6]

Typically, the horizontal coverage of a speaker is approximately 135 degrees. If the speakers are directed eastward, toward the crowd and away from the multi-family residential uses, sound waves are expected to be substantially reduced by 10 to 30 dBA. Assuming that sound waves would be reduced by approximately 10 decibels, the ambient noise level at the residential uses (when noise from the public address system is combined with crowd noise) would be approximately 77 dBA, which is approximately 17 decibels greater than the existing evening ambient noise level. Thus, a significant impact is anticipated.

MITIGATION MEASURES

N11 Noise abatement shall be designed to limit the incremental noise change to less than 5 dB. Abatement measures may include the construction of a solid permanent screened wall of sufficient height along the perimeter of the athletic field on Heliotrope Drive, or other screening or buffering techniques.

N12 The public address system shall be designed and operated to minimize sound being directed to areas outside of the athletic field. The speaker system shall be located behind the bleachers, oriented eastward, such that the speakers would be directed away from the residential uses on Heliotrope Drive.

N13 Contracts for events at the athletic field shall require that speakers be oriented in a north, east or south direction away from residences on Heliotrope Drive.

N14 Events at the athletic field shall be limited between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. All activities at the athletic field and tennis courts shall stop at 10:00 p.m.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

A solid permanent screened wall can have a sound transmission loss of approximately 36 dBA.[7] Should mitigation measures **N11** through **N14** be implemented, ambient noise levels at the multi-family residential uses that adjoin the athletic field would be approximately 60 dBA during an event. These mitigation

[5] Assumes a evening ambient noise level of approximately 60 dBA and that crowd noise would occur approximately 60 percent of the time during an event.

[6] Assumes that noise from the public announcement system and the crowd would occur approximately 60 percent of the time during an event.

[7] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, The Noise Guidebook, 1985.

measures would be effective in reducing crowd noise and noise from amplified sound. It is possible, however, that there would be intermittent and infrequent peaks where the noise change would be discernible after the implementation of the mitigation measures. However, these infrequent intermittent noise peaks would not be considered significant.

With respect to vehicular noise, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.

4.8 PUBLIC SERVICES

This section of the EIR addresses the impact the proposed project will have on fire and emergency service and police protection.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Fire Protection and Emergency Services

Fire protection for the LACC campus is provided by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). Three fire stations are located within 1.2 miles of the project site and serve the LACC campus as shown in **Table 4.8-1** and **Figure 4.8-1**. The nearest fire station is located on 1601 N. Hillhurst Avenue (approximately 1.1 miles north of the project site). Currently, there are a total of 28 LAFD employees within the three fire stations. In 2001, there was a total of 26 emergency calls made from the LACC campus. Emergency response times were reported as 4.7 minutes for emergency calls, 5.1 minutes for medical services, and 6.1 minutes for paramedic services.[1]

TABLE 4.8-1: FIRE STATIONS SERVING THE LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE CAMPUS

Fire Station	Address	Response Personnel	Equipment	Location
Station 35	1601 N. Hillhurst Ave.	14	-1 engine company -1 truck company -1 paramedic ambulance -1 EMT ambulance	1.1 miles north of the LACC campus
Station 6	326 N. Virgil Ave.	8	-1 engine company -1 battalion chief -1 paramedic ambulance	1.1 miles south of the LACC campus
Station 52	4957 Melrose Ave.	6	-1 engine company -1 paramedic ambulance	1.2 miles west of the LACC campus

SOURCE: City of Los Angeles Fire Department, 2002.

Police Protection

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Security protection at the LACC campus has been provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department since early 2001. The LACC campus serves as the headquarters for all Los Angeles Community College district (LACCD) campuses. The boundary of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's jurisdiction covers the entire campus, including Lot 1 located east of the campus on Vermont Avenue. Currently, the Los Angeles County Sheriff employs 9 sworn officers, 10 campus security officers, 5 clerks, and 16 cadets to serve as campus escorts. The LACC campus currently has a 1:2,153 officer to student ratio.

[1] Based on March 7, 2002 conversation with William Wells, Paramedic Captain in the LAFD Planning Section.

Figure 4.8-1

A total of 150 calls to the on-campus Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department for the year 2001. Petty theft (52 counts reported) comprised the majority of campus offenses for the year 2001. Other offenses included vandalism and auto theft at 16 and 15 incidents respectively as well as 14 incidents of bike theft. Other incidents include 2,900 parking citations and 6 moving violations. In that same year, there was a total of four arrests made.[2]

Los Angeles Police Department

The nearest Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) station serving the LACC campus is the Rampart Station of the Central Bureau. (See **Figure 4.8-1**.) This station is approximately 1.7 miles east of the campus, and located at 2710 W. Temple Street. The Rampart Station currently employs 391 sworn officers for a population of approximately 375,000 people. The station currently has about a 1:959 police to person ratio.

According to the 2000 Los Angeles Police Department Statistical Digest, the Rampart Station responded to approximately 61,575 calls. The average response time was just under seven minutes. There were 10,917 Part I offenses (i.e., homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and vehicle theft) and 29,916 traffic violations. Most Part I offenses consisted primarily of larceny (3,963 incidents), aggravated assault (2,651 incidents), and vehicle thefts and attempts (1,627 incidents).

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The proposed project would have a significant impact on emergency services if:

- It substantially diminishes the level of fire protection services;
- It creates a substantial need for additional fire department personnel or equipment;
- It fails to comply with applicable fire codes and regulations, thereby putting persons or property at substantial risk in the event of a fire;
- It increases the maximum response distances; and
- Creates a substantial need for additional police department personnel or facilities, or substantially diminishes the level of police protection services by adversely affecting police response time.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Fire Protection

Summary of Impacts

- Significant impact on emergency response times (unavoidable).

Discussion of Impacts

Emergency response time is the total time from when a call requesting assistance is made to the time a unit responds to the scene. The response time of a fire protection service depends on the distance from the nearest station to a given location and the level of traffic congestion. According to the Los Angeles Fire Department, the city is sufficiently covered in terms of distances from stations to areas within the City. Implementation

[2] Based on March 7, 2002 conversation with Deputy Terrence Holden of the Los Angeles County Sherriff's station, Community College Bureau.

of the LACC Master Plan would encourage an increased enrollment of up to approximately 4,375 additional students (3,500 fte). This would result in an additional 5,390 daily vehicular trips to the campus. A reduction in the Level of Service on the surrounding streets could result in a decrease in response time to the LACC campus and/or surrounding uses. Section 4.9, Transportation and Traffic, indicates that the proposed project would have a significant traffic impact 1 of the 20 analyzed intersections (Melrose Avenue and Normandie Avenue intersection). The traffic analysis indicated that traffic impacts at this intersection is unavoidable. As a result, fire response time for Fire Station No. 6 during both the AM and PM peak hours would be adversely effected. In this case traffic generated by the proposed Master Plan would result in the reduction in emergency response time and would be considered to be a significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None available.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

There is no available mitigation to reduce adverse impacts on the impacted intersection therefore, the impact on emergency response times is significant and unavoidable.

Police Protection

Summary of Impacts

- Significant impact related to police services (mitigated).

Discussion of Impacts

The addition of 4,375 students is expected to result in an increased need for campus security features. Currently, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department responds to calls taking place all throughout campus. With an enrollment of 19,375 students, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department maintains a 1 officer for every 2,153 students ratio or 1 security personnel (officers, security officers, and campus escorts) for every 587 students. A 4,375-student growth would raise the total number of students to 23,750, increasing the ratio to 1 officer for every 2,639 students, or 1 security personnel for every 679 students. This would likely result in an increased demand for the services of police officers and increased utilization of campus security systems. It could diminish the level of police protection service by affecting police response times. Thus, an impact on the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department may occur if student enrollment increases as proposed in the Los Angeles City College Master Plan.

MITIGATION MEASURES

PS1 Implement security features (i.e., install video surveillance cameras on campus, improve lighting, install or relocate emergency call stations) as proposed in the Los Angeles City College Master Plan.

PS2 Use "mantrap" controlled doors that comply with the California Building Code for Special Egress Control in areas where there are large amounts of money (i.e., Business Office, Cash Counting areas, and Staff access portals) as proposed in the Los Angeles City College Master Plan.

PS3 Install physical countermeasures that control or regulate how an associate operates their daily job function in the campus environment. Physical countermeasures include such elements as walls, fences, windows, barriers against movement, doors, locks, and other architectural elements of the facility.

PS4 The LACC staff and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department shall develop a comprehensive liaison program with the Los Angeles Police Department. Develop specific points of contact and ongoing relationships between staffs to improve security on campus and in its surrounding areas.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

Implementation of mitigation measures **PS1** through **PS4** would reduce police protection impacts to a less-than-significant level.

4.9 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

This section summarizes the findings of the traffic and parking study conducted by Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc.[1]

The traffic and parking study was prepared to evaluate traffic generated by the proposed Master Plan and the impacts on the surrounding street system. The traffic analysis addresses existing conditions, cumulative base conditions, and cumulative plus project conditions. Existing and potential future parking demands were analyzed in detail. Traffic and parking mitigation measures were recommended as needed.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Street System

Regional access to the LACC campus is provided by the Golden State Freeway (I-5), Hollywood Freeway (U.S. Highway 101), and the Glendale Freeway (State Highway 2). The Golden State Freeway is located approximately 2 miles northeast of the project site. The Hollywood Freeway is approximately 0.12 miles southwest of the project and the Glendale Freeway is approximately 1.8 miles east of the project site. Direct access to the LACC campus from the Hollywood Freeway can be obtained via Vermont Avenue.

The following provides a brief description of the major roadways within the study area.

Santa Monica Boulevard – Santa Monica Boulevard is a state highway located north of the Los Angeles City College (LACC) campus. It travels in an east-west direction with two lanes provided in each direction. A two-way center left-turn lane divides the travel lanes. The curb-to-curb width is 60 feet and the posted speed limit is 35 mph. Metered parking is available along most segments. West of Hobart Avenue to the Hollywood Freeway (U.S. 101) vehicles are not permitted to stop along the curb in the westbound direction during the PM peak period. West of the Hollywood Freeway, vehicles are not permitted to stop along the curb during the AM and PM peak periods in both direction. Parking restrictions provide an additional through lane. Both sides of the street are fronted by commercial-retail development.

Melrose Avenue – Melrose Avenue is an east-west facility located south of LACC. Segments east of Virgil Avenue are fronted by residential land uses. Along these segments there is one through lane in each direction, the roadway width is 40 feet and curbside parking is permitted. West of Virgil Avenue to Vermont Avenue the land use is primarily residential mixed with some commercial/retail development. During the AM and PM peak periods a total of two travel lanes are provided in each direction with no stopping allowed along the curb. West of Vermont Avenue the roadway width increases to 50 feet and a center left-turn lane separates the two directions of traffic. Land use becomes commercial and retail and peak hour stopping restrictions are still present.

Western Avenue – Western Avenue is four lane, north-south facility located west of LACC. Curbside parking restrictions provide an additional through lane for the southbound direction during the AM peak period and for both directions during the PM peak period. Curbside parking is permitted during off-peak hours. Western Avenue has a center left-turn lane and is fronted by commercial/retail land use. It has a roadway width of 60 feet and a posted speed limit is 35 mph.

[1] Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., "Los Angeles City College Master Plan - Draft Traffic and Parking Study," March 2002. See Appendix G for complete traffic report.

Normandie Avenue – Normandie Avenue is located west of LACC. This roadway travels in a north-south direction providing one lane in each direction. Curbside stopping restrictions for the northbound direction south of Santa Monica Boulevard are in effect during the PM peak period. For the southbound direction south of Monroe Street curbside parking restrictions are in effect for AM and PM peak periods. These restrictions provide an additional through lane. Normandie Avenue is fronted by residential land use. It has a roadway width of 40 feet and a posted speed limit of 30 mph.

Heliotrope Drive – Heliotrope Drive is a north-south street that forms the western boundary of the LACC campus and provides direct access to two on-campus parking lots. It has one lane in each direction and a roadway width of 50 feet. It is fronted by residential uses and has evening and overnight parking restrictions for vehicles without a residential permit. Curbside parking is allowed during the daytime. Heliotrope Drive also has angled parking spaces next to the LACC campus.

Vermont Avenue – Vermont Avenue is a north-south major arterial bordering the LACC campus on the east. It provides two through lanes and curbside parking during off-peak hours. No stopping is allowed in the southbound direction for the AM and PM peak periods. This restriction provides an additional through lane for southbound traffic. The same restriction is in effect for the northbound direction except north of Melrose Avenue where no stopping is allowed during the PM peak only. Vermont Avenue is fronted primarily by commercial and retail land use. It has a roadway width of 70 feet and a posted speed limit of 35 mph.

Virgil Avenue – Virgil Avenue is a north-south street located east of LACC. It provides two through lanes in each direction with curbside parking and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. South of Lockwood Avenue no stopping is permitted on the northbound side of the street and the posted speed limit is 25 mph. Land use along Virgil Avenue is mixed with commercial/retail and residential. The roadway width is about 55 feet.

Existing Transit Operations

The Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) and the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) operate several bus lines within the study area. The MTA Metro Red Line subway also services the study area. Description of transit service follows:

Metropolitan Transit Authority

MTA Line 2, 3, and 302 – Sunset Boulevard - These routes operate between downtown Los Angeles and the City of Beverly Hills (Line 3) and the City of Santa Monica (Line 2 and 302). Line 302 is an express service with limited stops. These lines travel east-west through the project study area.

MTA Line 4 and 304 – Santa Monica Boulevard – Lines 4 and 304 operate between downtown Los Angeles and the City of Santa Monica. Within the study area it travels along Santa Monica Boulevard. Line 304 is an express service with limited stops. These lines travel east-west through the study area.

MTA Line 10 and 11 – Melrose Avenue – Lines 10 and 11 operate between downtown Los Angeles and the City of West Hollywood. Line 10 travels eastbound-westbound along Melrose Avenue and connecting to Temple Street via Virgil Avenue and Hoover Street. Line 11 also travels along Melrose Avenue but connects to Beverly Boulevard via Vermont Avenue. Both lines have stops in close proximity to the LACC campus.

MTA Line 14 – Beverly Boulevard – Line 14 operates between downtown Los Angeles and the City of Beverly Hills. Within the study area it travels eastbound and westbound along Beverly Boulevard.

MTA Line 26 – 7th Street/Virgil Avenue/Franklin Avenue – Line 26 operates between downtown Los Angeles and Hollywood. The line travels along north and south along Virgil Avenue within the study area.

MTA Line 156 – Panorama City/Van Nuys/North Hollywood/ Hollywood/LA City College – Line 156 operates in the City of Los Angeles between the Hollywood district and Panorama City in the San Fernando Valley. Within the study area it travels primarily east-west along Santa Monica Boulevard and also along Vermont Avenue. This line provides direct transit access to LACC.

MTA Line 175 – Fountain Avenue/Talmadge Street/Hyperion Avenue – Line 175 operates between the Silver Lake and Hollywood districts of the City of Los Angeles. It travels along Virgil Avenue and Vermont Avenue via Sunset Boulevard within the study area.

MTA Line 204 and 354 – Vermont Avenue – Lines 204 and 354 operates between Athens/South Central Los Angeles and Hollywood via Vermont Avenue. It offers direct transit access to LACC. Line 354 is an express service with limited stops.

MTA Line 206 – Normandie Avenue – Line 206 operates between Athens/South Central Los Angeles and Hollywood via Normandie Avenue.

MTA Line 207 and 357 – Western Avenue – Lines 207 and 357 operates between the Watts and Hollywood districts of the City of Los Angeles via Western Avenue. Line 357 is an express service with limited stops.

MTA Line 217 – Hollywood Boulevard/Fairfax Avenue/West Los Angeles Transit Center – Line 217 operates between West Los Angeles and Hollywood. The line begins and terminates near the intersection of Sunset Boulevard/Vermont Avenue.

Metro Red Line – The Metro Red Line provides rail service between downtown Los Angeles, Wilshire Center and North Hollywood. The entire Metro rail system can be accessed from any Metro station. The Vermont Avenue/Santa Monica Boulevard/LACC Metro Red Line station, adjacent to the project site, provides direct rail transit access to the LACC campus.

Los Angeles Department of Transportation

LADOT DASH Hollywood – DASH Hollywood line loops around the Hollywood district of the City of Los Angeles. It travels mainly along Vermont, Avenue, Avenue, and Franklin Avenues.

Existing Traffic Conditions

The level of service (LOS) is a qualitative measure used to describe the condition of traffic flow, ranging from excellent conditions at LOS A to overloaded conditions at LOS F. Level of service D is generally considered to be the lowest acceptable LOS in an urban or suburban area. Level of service E and F are considered to be unacceptable operating conditions which warrant mitigation. The definitions for each level of service are described in **Table 4.9-1** for signalized intersections and **Table 4.9-2** for unsignalized intersections.

TABLE 4.9-1: LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS FOR SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

Level of Service	Volume/Capacity Ratio	Definition
A	0.00 - 0.60	EXCELLENT. No vehicles waits longer than one red light and no approach phase is fully used.
B	0.61 - 0.70	VERY GOOD. An occasional approach phase is fully utilized; many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within groups of vehicles.

TABLE 4.9-1: LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS FOR SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

Level of Service	Volume/Capacity Ratio	Definition
C	0.71 - 0.80	GOOD. Occasionally drivers may have to wait through more than one red light; backups may develop behind turning vehicles.
D	0.81 - 0.90	FAIR. Delays may be substantial during portions of the rush hours, but enough lower volume periods occur to permit clearing of developing lines, preventing excessive backups.
E	0.91 - 1.00	POOR. Represents the most vehicles intersection approaches can accommodate; may be long lines of waiting vehicles through several signal cycles.
F	> 1.00	FAILURE. Backups from nearby locations or on cross streets may restrict or prevent movement of vehicles out of the intersection approaches. Tremendous delays with continuously increasing queue lengths.

SOURCE: Transportation Research Board, *Transportation Research Circular No. 212, Interim Materials on Highway Capacity*, 1980.

TABLE 4.9-2: LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS FOR UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

Level of Service	Average Total Delay (seconds/vehicle)
A	0 - 10.0
B	10.0 - 15.0
C	16.0 - 25.0
D	26.0 - 35.0
E	36.0 - 50.0
F	> 50.0

SOURCE: Transportation Research Board, *Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209*, 1997.

Traffic operating conditions in the vicinity of the project were analyzed using intersection capacity-based methodology known as the Circular 212 Critical Movement Analysis (CMA) method for the signalized locations. At the stop-controlled intersections, the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology for unsignalized locations was utilized to calculate the average delay and corresponding level of service.

Figure 4.9-1 identifies the 20 intersections analyzed in this analysis. **Figures 4.9-2** and **4.9-3** presents existing a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic volumes, and **Figure 4.9-4** presents existing lane configurations of the 20 analyzed intersections. **Table 4.9-3** summarizes the existing weekday morning and afternoon peak hour V/C ratio and/or average vehicle delay, and corresponding LOS, at each of the study intersections based

Figure 4.9-1

figure 4.9-2

figure 4.9-3

figure 4.9-4

TABLE 4.9-3: EXISTING CONDITIONS LEVEL OF SERVICE SUMMARY

Intersection		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
1	Sunset Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	0.602	B	0.872	D
2	US-101 On-ramp and Western Ave. /a/	20.7	C	21.9	C
3	Lexington Ave. (US-101Off-ramp) and Western Ave.	0.421	A	0.568	A
4	Santa Monica Blvd. and Western Ave.	0.781	C	0.824	D
5	Santa Monica Blvd. and Normandie Ave.	0.765	C	0.862	D
6	Santa Monica Blvd. and Heliotrope Dr. /a/	40.8	E	51.4	F
7	Santa Monica Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	0.521	A	0.697	B
8	Santa Monica Blvd. and Virgil Ave.	0.969	E	0.761	C
9	US-101 On-ramp and Normandie Ave. /a/	167.6	F	97.4	F
10	Monroe St. and Heliotrope Dr. /a/	10.7	B	12.2	B
11	Monroe St. and Vermont Ave.	0.259	A	0.338	A
12	Melrose Ave. and Normandie Ave.	1.044	F	1.263	F
13	Melrose Ave. and US-101 Off-ramp	0.777	C	0.703	C
14	Melrose Ave. and Heliotrope Dr.	0.415	A	0.615	B
15	Melrose Ave. and Vermont Ave.	0.555	A	0.592	A
16	Melrose Ave. and Virgil Ave.	0.848	D	0.750	C
17	US-101On/Off-ramps and Vermont Ave.	0.612	B	0.732	C
18	Rosewood Ave. (US-101 Off-ramp) and Vermont Ave.	0.648	B	0.609	B
19	Oakwood Ave./US-101 On-ramp and Vermont Ave.	0.484	A	0.503	A
20	Beverly Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	0.875	D	0.804	D

/a/ Location controlled by stop sign(s). Value represents average delay in seconds.
SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., March 2002.

on the methodology described above. The results indicate that four of the twenty analyzed intersections are currently operating at LOS E or F during one or both of the peak hours. These intersections are:

1. Santa Monica Boulevard and Heliotrope Drive (both peak hours)
2. Santa Monica Boulevard and Virgil Avenue (AM peak hour)
3. US-101 On-ramp and Normandie Avenue (both peak hours)
4. Melrose and Normandie Avenues (both peak hours)

The remaining sixteen study intersections currently operate at LOS D or better during both peak hours. It should be noted that all of the signalized intersections analyzed in the study are part of the City of Los Angeles Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) system. The benefits of the ATSAC system were considered in the level of service calculations for existing and future conditions.

Existing Parking Conditions

Currently, a total of 1,645 parking spaces are provided for students and staff. The majority of student parking is provided in Lot 1, which is located on the east side of Vermont Avenue. Lot 1 contains 1,147 parking spaces, 22 of which are handicapped spaces. Lot 1 provides both surface and structured spaces and occupies the entire city block bounded by Vermont Avenue, Monroe Street, Madison Avenue, and Marathon Street.

The majority of parking on-campus on the west side of Vermont Avenue is allocated to staff. Some student and disabled parking is available. There are 388 staff spaces, 32 handicapped spaces, and 75 student spaces.

Parking is also available on city streets that adjoin the LACC campus (on the east side of Vermont Avenue and to the west of Heliotrope Drive).

Based on current class scheduling and programming at the college there is an substantial existing deficiency in student parking spaces. During the peak condition (9:00 to 10:00 am) there is a demand for approximately 2,998 spaces. This exceeds the existing supply by 1,353 spaces (see **Table 4.9-4**) The parking shortage is further exacerbated by the fact that Lot 1, where the majority of student parking spaces are located, is not fully used. This underutilization of Lot 1 appears to stem from a variety of factors, including:

- Distance of Lot 1 from the campus;
- Lack of a clear visible link from Lot 1 to the campus;
- Limited signs directing students to use Lot 1; and
- The perception that conditions within and adjacent to Lot 1 may not be safe.

Based on this condition many students appear to find it more desirable to park at metered spaces on Willowbrook Avenue and Heliotrope Drive or park along neighborhood streets adjacent to the campus. Currently there are a variety of curb parking restrictions along the streets surrounding the college. These variations in parking restrictions provide students with the opportunity to search for short term spaces that meet their needs, but also results in the use of spaces that are needed by local residents. Many of these residents rely on street parking because the older apartment buildings, duplexes and triplexes in which they reside do not have adequate off-street parking.

TABLE 4.9-4: LACC EXISTING PARKING DEMAND ESTIMATES

Existing 2002 FTES Average No. of Students per Class		15,500 26
Time	Number of Classes in Session	Number of Students per Class (Average = 26)
6:00 - 7:00 A.M.	11	286
7:00 - 8:00	15	390
8:00 - 9:00	83	2,158
9:00 - 10:00	201	5,226
10:00 - 11:00	156	4,056
11:00 - 12:00 P.M.	139	3,614
12:00 - 1:00	190	4,940
1:00 - 2:00	116	3,016
2:00 - 3:00	83	2,158
3:00 - 4:00	89	2,314
4:00 - 5:00	71	1,846
5:00 - 6:00	81	2,106
6:00 - 7:00	160	4,160
7:00 - 8:00	118	3,068
8:00 - 9:00	116	3,016

TABLE 4.9-4: LACC EXISTING PARKING DEMAND ESTIMATES		
9:00 - 10:00	108	2,808
Parking Demand Estimates		
Peak Students		5,226
Percentage Drive to Campus	46%	
Drive alone	37%	1,930
Carpool	9%	495
Auto Occupancy		
Drive Alone	1.0	1,930
Carpool	2.5	198
Total Vehicles/Spaces		2,128
Faculty and Staff (No. of Spaces)		580
Non In-Class Activities (No. of spaces) /a/		290
Total Peak Demand for Spaces		2,998
Supply of Spaces		**1,645**
Shortfall		***1,353***

/a/ Includes demand for classes ending at 9:00 a.m. and new classes starting at 10:00 a.m.
SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., March 2002.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Per CEQA, any significant project related impacts are required to be identified in the EIR. Significant traffic impacts are determined based on threshold of significance set by respective agencies. The City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) has established threshold criteria, which are used to determine if a project has a significant traffic impact. Using the LADOT standard, a project impact would be considered significant if the conditions shown in **Table 4.9-5** are met.

TABLE 4.9-5: LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SIGNIFICANT IMPACT THRESHOLD FOR LINK-BASED TRAFFIC ANALYSIS		
With Project Condition		
LOS	**V/C**	**Project V/C Increase on a Roadway Segment**
C	0.701 - 0.800	0.040 or more
D	0.801 - 0.900	0.020 or more
E/F	0.900 or more	0.010 or more

SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

The above criteria were applied to determine potential significant traffic impacts associated with the project at the twenty study locations.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Summary of Impacts

- A significant impact at the intersection of Sunset Boulevard and Vermont Avenue during the PM peak hour is anticipated (mitigated).
- A significant impact at the intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard and Normandie Avenue during the PM peak hour (mitigated).
- A significant impact at the intersection of Melrose and Normandie Avenues during the both peak hours (significant and unavoidable).
- A significant impact at the intersection of Melrose and Vermont Avenues during the AM peak hour (mitigated).
- A significant impact at the intersection of Melrose and Virgil Avenues during the AM peak hour (mitigated).
- A significant impact at the intersection of Beverly Boulevard and Vermont Avenue during the PM peak hour (mitigated).
- No significant impacts on the remaining fourteen analyzed intersections.

Discussion of Impacts

Future No Project Conditions

To evaluate the potential impact of the proposed project on local traffic conditions, it is first necessary to develop a forecast of future traffic volumes in the study area under conditions without the proposed project. This provides a basis against which to measure the potential significant impacts of the proposed project.

The anticipated buildout year of the proposed project is expected to be 2012. The projection of Year 2012 "No Project" traffic consists of existing traffic plus ambient traffic growth (general background regional growth) plus growth in traffic generated by specific cumulative projects expected to be completed by Year 2012. The following describes the two growth components.

Ambient Traffic Growth. Ambient traffic growth is the traffic growth that will occur in the study area due to general employment growth, housing growth and growth in the region through trips in southern California. Even if there was no change in housing or employment in the City of Los Angeles, there will be some background (ambient) traffic growth in the region. Per the LADOT, a one percent per year growth rate was assumed as a conservative estimate of traffic increase in the study area. Existing 2002 traffic volumes were increased by a factor of 1.10 to account for ambient traffic growth to the year 2012.

Cumulative Project Growth. Cumulative project traffic growth which is growth due to specific, known development projects in the study area is also included in the analysis of the Year 2012 No-Project conditions. Based on information obtained from the City of Los Angeles, there were a total of 21 projects identified which may affect traffic circulation within the study area. **Table 4.9-6** summarizes the location, size and type of land use for each of project. **Figure 4.9-5** shows the general locations of the cumulative projects.

Traffic generated due to these projects has been estimated based on information from the LADOT and supplemented with standard trip generation data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation, 6th Edition.* The estimated trip generation for each of the 21 cumulative projects is summarized in **Table 4.9-7**. As shown, the cumulative projects are forecast to generate a total of approximately 58,995 daily trips, 3,410 morning peak hour trips and approximately 5,800 evening peak hour trips. These trips

TABLE 4.9-6: CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

No.	Project	Location	Land Use	Size
1	Corner mini-mall mixed use retail	Sunset Bl/Serrano Av	Mixed Use Fast food	4,788 s.f. 2,592 s.f.
2	Children's Hospital	Sunset Bl/Vermont Av	Surgery wing/demolish existing	67,955 s.f.
3	Mini shopping center	Western Av/Santa Monica Bl	Mini-shopping center	20,695 s.f.
4	Office/retail development	Serrano Av/6th St.	Demo -8,700 s.f. office/retail Construct office	42,600 s.f.
5	Westlake Recovery Redevelopment Project	Hoover St./3rd St.	Various growth development	-
6	Food 4 Less	Hoover St./Santa Monica Bl	Discount supermarket	51,182 s.f.
7	Western Plaza	Western Av/Carlton Wy.	Retail commercial bldg.	11,864 s.f.
8	Wilshire Galleria	Wilshire Bl/New Hampshire Av	Health club Restaurant	15,850 s.f. 1,878 s.f.
9	Apartment building	Catalina St./Wilshire Bl	Apartment building (five story)	90 units
10	Hollywest Promenade	Hollywood Bl/Western Av	Retail Low income housing	120,928 s.f. 100 units
11	Shopping center	6th St./Catalina St.	Demo 1,000 s.f. used car sales Construct shopping center	16,548 s.f.
12	Food Market convenience store at gas station	Western Av/Oxford Av	Convenience market at gas station w/ 12 fueling stations	5,990 s.f.
13	Scientology apartment	Bronson Av/Franklin Av	Renovate existing 81 unit apartment to 126 units	126 units
14	Laundry mart mini-shopping center	Sunset Bl/St. Andrews Pl.	Laundry, fast food/drive-thru, convenience store, child ent.	-
15	Burger King	Sunset Bl/Kenmore Av	Fast food restaurant/drive-thru	-
16	Carl's Jr. restaurant	Melrose Av/Juanita Av	Fast food restaurant/drive-thru	-
17	Laundry mart/Burger King	Temple St./Coronado St.	Laundry shop Fast food restaurant/drive-thru	7,524 s.f.
18	Restaurant	Beverly Bl/Serrano Av	Restaurant/dinner club	5,577 s.f. (44 seats)
19	Hotel	Micheltorena St./Landa St.	Hotel	45 rooms
20	McDonald's restaurant	Beverly Bl/Virgil Av	Fast food restaurant with drive-through	1,500 s.f.
21	LA Intl Church	Kent St./Waterloo St.	Church	2,500 seats

SOURCE: Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

expected from the cumulative projects were then assigned to the traffic model as part of the development of the future no-project traffic projections.

Figure 4.9-5

TABLE 4.9-7: FUTURE RELATED PROJECT LEVEL OF SERVICE SUMMARY

Related Project	Street	Cross Street	Project Description	Size Sf	Net Daily Trips	AM Peak Hour Inbound	AM Peak Hour Outbound	Net AM Peak Hour Trips	PM Peak Hour Inbound	PM Peak Hour Outbound	Net PM Peak Hour Trips
Mini-mall mixed use retail	Sunset Blvd.	Serrano Ave.	4,788 sf mixed use	4,788	NA	4	2	6	10	10	20
Children's Hospital	Sunset Blvd.	Vermont Ave.	67,955 sf surgery wing and demolish existing	67,955	1,141	46	17	63	14	46	60
Mini-shopping center	Western Ave.	Santa Monica Blvd.	20,695 sf mini-shopping center	20,695	2,640	42	22	64	116	125	241
Office/Retail Development	Serrano Ave.	6th St.	42,600 sf new office, demo 8,700 sf office/retail	42,600	392	54	7	61	8	50	58
Westlake Recovery/Redev. Project	Hoover St.	3rd St.	Various growth development	---	35,546	1,477	834	2,311	1,778	1,926	3,704
Food 4 Less Supermarket	Hoover St.	Santa Monica Blvd.	51,182 sf discount supermarket	51,182	3,110	26	17	43	157	151	308
Western Plaza	Western Ave.	Carlton Way	11,864 sf retail commercial bldg	11,864	483	0	0	0	15	16	31
Wilshire Galleria	Wilshire Blvd.	New Hampshire Ave.	15,850 sf health club, 1,878 sf restaurant,	17,728	340	3	4	7	52	30	82
Apartment Building	Catalina St.	Wilshire Blvd.	5-story 90-unit apartment building	---	597	7	39	46	38	18	56
Hollywest Promenade	Hollywood Blvd.	Western Ave.	120,928 sf of retail and 100 units of low inc	120,928	5,498	83	48	131	220	239	459
Shopping Center	6th St.	Catalina St.	16,548 sf shopping center, demo 1,000 sf used car sales	16,548	873	1	1	2	30	33	63
Food Market and Gas Station	Western Ave.	Oxford Ave.	5,990 sf convenience market w/ 12 fueling stations	5,990	605	12	11	23	23	22	45
Scientology Apartment	Bronson Ave.	Franklin Ave.	Renovate existing 81 unit apartment to 126 units	---	298	4	19	23	19	9	28
Laundry Mart/Mini-Shopping Center	Sunset Blvd.	St. Andrews Pl.	Laundry, Fast-Food w/dt, Conv. Store & Child. Ent.	---	1,525	24	14	38	66	71	137

TABLE 4.9-7: FUTURE RELATED PROJECT LEVEL OF SERVICE SUMMARY

Related Project	Street	Cross Street	Project Description	Size Sf	Net Daily Trips	AM Peak Hour Inbound	AM Peak Hour Outbound	Net AM Peak Hour Trips	PM Peak Hour Inbound	PM Peak Hour Outbound	Net PM Peak Hour Trips
Fast Food Restaurant	Sunset Blvd.	Kenmore Ave.	Fast-Food Restaurant w/ Drive-thru	---	1,396	56	54	110	37	35	72
Fast Food Restaurant	Melrose Ave.	Juanita Ave.	Fast-Food Restaurant w/ Drive-thru	---	1,054	55	53	106	37	34	71
LaundryMart & Fast Food Restaurant	Temple St.	Coronado St.	7,524 sf laundry shop/fast food w/ drive-thru	7,524	1,437	94	62	156	58	38	96
Restaurant	Beverly Blvd.	Serrano Ave.	5,577 sf 44 seats restaurant/diner club	5,577	538	3	2	5	29	14	43
Hotel	Micheltorena St.	Landa St.	45 rooms hotel	---	457	9	6	15	12	10	22
Fast Food Restaurant	Beverly Blvd.	Virgil Ave.	1,500 fast food restaurant w/ drive-thru	1,500	1,065	41	39	80	29	26	55
LA International Church Dream Center	Kent St.	Waterloo St.	2,500 seat church	---	NA	64	54	118	80	69	149
TOTAL					**58,995**	**2,105**	**1,305**	**3,408**	**2,828**	**2,972**	**5,800**

SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc.

Future Without Project Traffic Analysis. The proposed Master Plan is anticipated to be complete by 2012, therefore future conditions without the project were assessed for this year. The no-project traffic projections were developed and operating conditions were analyzed at the twenty study intersections for the morning and evening peak hours, taking into account the addition of the background ambient growth and traffic related to the cumulative projects. As a conservative approach, the no-project analysis assumes that the existing LACC campus does not experience any growth.

Based on the forecast parameters discussed above, the morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes were developed for the year 2012 conditions. **Figures 4.9-6** and **4.9-7** illustrate the year 2012 no-project morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes, respectively, at the twenty study intersections. Based on the 2012 without project traffic forecast, the levels of service at the analyzed intersections were calculated for both peak hours. **Table 4.9-8** summarizes the peak hour level of service results. As shown in **Table 4.9-8**, eight of the twenty analyzed intersections are currently operating at LOS E or F during one or both of the peak hours. These intersections are:

- Sunset Boulevard and Vermont Avenue (PM peak hour)
- Santa Monica Boulevard and Western Avenue (both peak hours)
- Santa Monica Boulevard and Normandie Avenue (PM peak hour)
- Santa Monica Boulevard and Virgil Avenue (AM peak hour)
- US-101 On-ramp and Normandie Avenue (AM peak hour)
- Melrose and Normandie Avenues (both peak hours)
- Melrose and Virgil Avenues (AM peak hour)
- Beverly Boulevard and Vermont Avenue (both peak hours)

The remaining twelve study intersections currently operate at LOS D or better during both peak hours. It should be noted that the four existing stop-controlled intersections were analyzed as if signalized under future conditions, per LADOT guidelines. The City's significance criteria are based on an increase in V/C ratio.

Future With Project Conditions

Project Trip Generation. The proposed project would result in an increase in student enrollment from the existing 15,500 students to 19,000 students by the year 2012. Utilizing trip generation rate data contained in the ITE *Trip Generation, 6th Edition*, the estimated trips for the proposed project were calculated. The resulting trip generation estimates are summarized in **Table 4.9-9**. As shown, the increase in student enrollment is expected to generate a total of approximately 4,580 net daily trips of which approximately 415 trips are expected to occur during the morning peak hour and approximately 505 trips during the evening peak hour. As shown on **Table 4.9-9**, a transit trip reduction is expected given that the site is located at a Metro Redline station. Per the County of Los Angeles Congestion Management Program guidelines, a 15 percent reduction was applied to the trip generation estimates. It should be noted that this would appear to be a conservative estimate since data from an on-campus survey showed that only 46 percent of the students arrive to campus via the automobile.

Figure 4.9-6

Figure 4.9-7

TABLE 4.9-8: FUTURE NO-PROJECT LEVEL OF SERVICE SUMMARY

Intersection		Peak Hour	Existing		Future No Project	
			V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C	LOS
1	Sunset Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.602	B	0.672	B
		PM	0.872	D	0.981	E
2	US-101 On-ramp and Western Ave. /a/	AM	20.7	C	0.713	C
		PM	21.9	C	0.743	C
3	Lexington Ave. (US-101Off-ramp) and Western Ave.	AM	0.421	A	0.478	A
		PM	0.568	A	0.653	B
4	Santa Monica Blvd. and Western Ave.	AM	0.781	C	0.902	E
		PM	0.824	D	0.975	E
5	Santa Monica Blvd. and Normandie Ave.	AM	0.765	C	0.838	D
		PM	0.862	D	0.943	E
6	Santa Monica Blvd. and Heliotrope Dr. /a/	AM	40.8	E	0.464	A
		PM	51.4	F	0.573	A
7	Santa Monica Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.521	A	0.673	B
		PM	0.697	B	0.768	C
8	Santa Monica Blvd. and Virgil Ave.	AM	0.969	E	1.066	F
		PM	0.761	C	0.863	D
9	US-101 On-ramp and Normandie Ave. /a/	AM	167.6	F	0.934	E
		PM	97.4	F	0.863	D
10	Monroe St. and Heliotrope Dr. /a/	AM	10.7	B	0.211	A
		PM	12.2	B	0.235	A
11	Monroe St. and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.259	A	0.290	A
		PM	0.338	A	0.375	A
12	Melrose Ave. and Normandie Ave.	AM	1.044	F	1.141	F
		PM	1.263	F	1.380	F
13	Melrose Ave. and US-101 Off-ramp	AM	0.777	C	0.858	D
		PM	0.703	C	0.777	C
14	Melrose Ave. and Heliotrope Dr.	AM	0.415	A	0.463	A
		PM	0.615	B	0.695	B
15	Melrose Ave. and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.555	A	0.689	B
		PM	0.592	A	0.656	B
16	Melrose Ave. and Virgil Ave.	AM	0.848	D	0.941	E
		PM	0.750	C	0.824	D
17	US-101On/Off-ramps and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.612	B	0.681	B
		PM	0.732	C	0.821	D
18	Rosewood Ave. (US-101 Off-ramp) and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.648	B	0.719	C
		PM	0.609	B	0.678	B
19	Oakwood Ave./US-101 On-ramp and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.484	A	0.534	A
		PM	0.503	A	0.554	A
20	Beverly Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.875	D	0.973	E
		PM	0.804	D	0.905	E

/a/ Location controlled by stop sign(s). Value represents average delay in seconds for existing conditions. For future conditions, location analyzed as if signalized.
SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., March 2002.

TABLE 4.9-9: LACC MASTER PLAN EIR PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

	No. of Students	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Future 2012	19,000	29,260	2,421	239	2,660	2,196	1,034	3,230
Existing 2001	15,500	23,870	1,975	195	2,170	1,792	843	2,635
Increase in Trips		5,390	446	44	490	405	190	595
Transit Credit /a/	15%	-809	-67	-7	-74	-61	-29	-89
Net trips		**4,582**	**379**	**37**	**417**	**344**	**162**	**506**

/a/ The 15% Transit Credit is consistent with CMP Guidelines for Commercial Development around Transit Center.
The 15% credit is conservative because LACC survey indicates that only 46% of students drive to campus.
SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., March 2002.

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment. The trip distribution assumptions are used to determine the origin and destination of the new vehicle trips associated with the project. The geographic distribution of a sample of the existing student population was determined based on the results of the on-campus survey conducted during the spring semester of 2002. The distribution was based on the zip cope of the students responding to the survey. Based on the responses a trip distribution pattern for the proposed project was developed. **Table 4.9-10** shows the general areas where trips associated with the project would be expected to generate from. As can be seen the majority of the trips would come from the south and west of the site. Based on the project trip generation and the trip distribution pattern, the project only traffic volumes were assigned to the street network. **Figures 4.9-8** and **4.9-9** illustrate the resulting project only morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes, respectively, at the analyzed intersections.

TABLE 4.9-10: PROJECT TRIP DISTRIBUTION

General Area		Percent
1	Wilshire Center/Western-Crenshaw Corridor	19%
2	I-110 Corridor s/o Olympic Blvd.	13%
3	Silver Lake/Echo Park/Boyle Heights/East LA/East LA County	9%
4	Downtown LA/Westlake/I-710 Corridor	7%
5	West LA/Beverly Hills/Culver City/Santa Monica/W. Hollywood/Fairfax	12%
6	Los Feliz	9%
7	Hollywood/San Fernando Valley	14%
8	LACC Adjacent	9%
9	Silver Lake/Atwater Village/Highland Park/Glendale/Pasadena/Alhambra	8%
Total		**100%**

Note: Percentages based on zip-code information obtained from Spring 2002 campus survey.
SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., March 2002.

Figure 4.9-8

figure 4.9-9

The project only peak hour traffic volumes shown in **Figures 4.9-8** and **4.9-9** were then added to the future no-project traffic volumes. The resulting year 2012 With Project morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes are shown on **Figures 4.9-10** and **4.9-11**, respectively.

Future With Project Analysis. The intersection volume-to-capacity ratios and corresponding levels of service for future with project were calculated and the results summarized in **Table 4.9-11** for each of the twenty analyzed locations. The resultant change in V/C ratio comparing the Future With Project to the Future No Project is also presented in the table.

Based on the City of Los Angeles thresholds of significance, the future with project forecast indicate that the proposed project would create significant traffic impacts at six of the twenty analyzed intersections during one or both peak hours. **Table 4.9-11** summarizes the results of the analysis. As shown on the table, the six analyzed intersections which are forecast to be significantly impacted include:

- Sunset Boulevard and Vermont Avenue (PM peak hour)
- Santa Monica Boulevard and Normandie Avenue (PM peak hour)
- Melrose and Normandie Avenues (both peak hours)
- Melrose and Vermont Avenues (AM peak hour)
- Melrose and Virgil Avenues (AM peak hour)
- Beverly Boulevard and Vermont Avenue (PM peak hour)

The remaining fourteen analyzed intersections are not expected to be significantly impacted by traffic from the proposed project during the morning and evening peak hours.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation measures were developed for those locations where it was feasible and their effectiveness was analyzed. The potential measures were designed to increase capacity and included operational improvements and potential physical improvements. Physical improvements involving right-of-way acquisition were not considered since the study area is a relatively built-up area with little or no easily available right-of-way for roadway improvements.

T1 **Sunset Boulevard and Vermont Avenue.** Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.

T2 **Santa Monica Boulevard and Normandie Avenue.** Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.

T3 **Melrose Avenue and Normandie Avenue.** Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.

T4 **Melrose Avenue and Vermont Avenue.** Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.

T5 **Melrose Avenue and Virgil Avenue.**. Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.

Figure 4.9-10

Figure 4.9-11

TABLE 4.9-11: FUTURE WITH PROJECT LEVEL OF SERVICE SUMMARY

	Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing V/C or Delay	Existing LOS	Future No Project V/C	Future No Project LOS	Future With Project V/C	Future With Project LOS	Increase In V/C	Significant Impact
1	Sunset Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.602	B	0.672	B	0.686	B	0.014	No
		PM	0.872	D	0.981	E	0.997	E	0.016	Yes
2	US-101 On-ramp and Western Ave. /a/	AM	20.7	C	0.713	C	0.715	C	0.002	No
		PM	21.9	C	0.743	C	0.745	C	0.002	No
3	Lexington Ave. (US-101Off-ramp) and Western Ave.	AM	0.421	A	0.478	A	0.480	A	0.002	No
		PM	0.568	A	0.653	B	0.655	B	0.002	No
4	Santa Monica Blvd. and Western Ave.	AM	0.781	C	0.902	E	0.904	E	0.002	No
		PM	0.824	D	0.975	E	0.980	E	0.005	No
5	Santa Monica Blvd. and Normandie Ave.	AM	0.765	C	0.838	D	0.856	D	0.018	No
		PM	0.862	D	0.943	E	0.959	E	0.016	Yes
6	Santa Monica Blvd. and Heliotrope Dr. /a/	AM	40.8	E	0.464	A	0.537	A	0.073	No
		PM	51.4	F	0.573	A	0.651	B	0.078	No
7	Santa Monica Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.521	A	0.673	B	0.694	B	0.021	No
		PM	0.697	B	0.768	C	0.777	C	0.009	No
8	Santa Monica Blvd. and Virgil Ave.	AM	0.969	E	1.066	F	1.075	F	0.009	No
		PM	0.761	C	0.863	D	0.876	D	0.013	No
9	US-101 On-ramp and Normandie Ave. /a/	AM	167.6	F	0.934	E	0.935	E	0.001	No
		PM	97.4	F	0.863	D	0.865	D	0.002	No
10	Monroe St. and Heliotrope Dr. /a/	AM	10.7	B	0.211	A	0.331	A	0.120	No
		PM	12.2	B	0.235	A	0.353	A	0.118	No
11	Monroe St and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.259	A	0.290	A	0.315	A	0.025	No
		PM	0.338	A	0.375	A	0.450	A	0.075	No
12	Melrose Ave. and Normandie Ave.	AM	1.044	F	1.141	F	1.182	F	0.041	Yes
		PM	1.263	F	1.380	F	1.426	F	0.046	Yes
13	Melrose Ave. and US-101 Off-ramp	AM	0.777	C	0.858	D	0.872	D	0.014	No

TABLE 4.9-11: FUTURE WITH PROJECT LEVEL OF SERVICE SUMMARY

Intersection		Peak Hour	Existing V/C or Delay	Existing LOS	Future No Project V/C	Future No Project LOS	Future With Project V/C	Future With Project LOS	Increase In V/C	Significant Impact
		PM	0.703	C	0.777	C	0.798	C	0.021	No
14	Melrose Ave. and Heliotrope Dr.	AM	0.415	A	0.463	A	0.523	A	0.060	No
		PM	0.615	B	0.695	B	0.698	B	0.003	No
15	Melrose Ave. and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.555	A	0.689	B	0.746	C	0.057	Yes
		PM	0.592	A	0.656	B	0.671	B	0.015	No
16	Melrose Ave. and Virgil Ave.	AM	0.848	D	0.941	E	0.957	E	0.016	Yes
		PM	0.750	C	0.824	D	0.841	D	0.017	No
17	US-101On/Off-ramps and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.612	B	0.681	B	0.686	B	0.005	No
		PM	0.732	C	0.821	D	0.832	D	0.011	No
18	Rosewood Ave. (US-101 Off-ramp) and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.648	B	0.719	C	0.721	C	0.002	No
		PM	0.609	B	0.678	B	0.685	B	0.007	No
19	Oakwood Ave./US-101 On-ramp and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.484	A	0.534	A	0.535	A	0.001	No
		PM	0.503	A	0.554	A	0.568	A	0.014	No
20	Beverly Blvd. and Vermont Ave.	AM	0.875	D	0.973	E	0.974	E	0.001	No
		PM	0.804	D	0.905	E	0.917	E	0.012	Yes

/a/ Location controlled by stop sign(s). Value represents average delay in seconds for existing conditions. For future conditions, location analyzed as if signalized.
SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., March 2002.

T6 Beverly Boulevard and Vermont Avenue. Fund a proportionate share of the cost of the design and construction of the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) upgrade to the existing ATSAC system.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

With the implementation of mitigation measure **T1**, the significant impact expected during the evening peak hour would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level (V/C ratio of 0.967 and LOS E).

With the implementation of mitigation measure **T2**, the significant impact expected during the evening peak hour would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level (V/C ratio of 0.929 and LOS E).

With the implementation of mitigation measure **T3**, the operating conditions at the intersection would improve during both peak hours (V/C ratio 1.152 in the AM and 1.396 in the PM) however, the project s significant impact would not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, a residual significant impact at this location would be expected.

With the implementation of mitigation measure **T4**, the significant impact expected during the morning peak hour would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level (V/C ratio of 0.716 and LOS C).

With the implementation of mitigation measure **T5**, the significant impact expected during the morning peak hour would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level (V/C ratio of 0.927 and LOS E).

With the implementation of mitigation measure **T6**, the significant impact expected during the evening peak hour would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level (V/C ratio of 0.887 and LOS D).

Parking Analysis

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts related to parking is anticipated.

Discussion of Impacts

As described in the introduction, the proposed Los Angeles City College Master Plan will provide 959 new parking spaces. The site overall would provide a total of 2,604 spaces. The majority of the on-site parking would be provided in the existing Lot 1, located on the east side of Vermont Avenue, and new parking facilities located on the northeast corner of Heliotrope Drive and Melrose Avenue and the southeast corner of Heliotrope Drive and Willowbrook Avenue. This section provides an analysis of the parking conditions at the LACC with the proposed completion of the Master Plan.

Future Parking Demand. The parking demand expected from the completion of the Master Plan was based on the existing program activities at the college and the projected increase in student population by the year 2012. Current class schedules were utilized to determine the degree of activity on the campus during a peak day (Monday). Based on this information it was determined that 201 classes were in session during the 9-10 AM hour. The 9-10 AM hour along with the adjacent hour before and after were utilized to determine the future peak parking demand for the campus.

Based on information provided by the campus, the average number of students per class is currently 26. It is expected that by the year 2012 with the completion of the Master Plan, the average number of students per class would increase to 32. This is consistent with the overall growth from 15,500 students to 19,000 students by the year 2012. Based on this increase in student enrollment (average of six students per class) and the

existing schedule of classes, the peak number of students were estimated for the 9-10 AM hour. **Table 4.9-12** summarizes the projected increase in the number of students for 9-10 AM assuming that 201 classes are in session and the average number of students per class increases from 26 (existing 2002) to 32 (year 2012). As shown, during this hour it is estimated that approximately 1,206 additional students would be in class. The 8-9 AM hour and the 10-11 AM hour were also considered, as students may stay on campus after class and arrive during the hour before class starts. There are 17 classes which end at 9:00 AM and seven new classes which start at 10:00 AM. For purposes of analysis, the activity associated with these classes were assumed in the peak parking demand calculations.

A detailed survey was conducted at the campus, during the spring 2002 semester, which provided information on the mode of arrival and auto occupancy. This information was also utilized in the development of the future peak parking demand. Based on the survey results, a total of 46 percent of the students drive to campus. Of the people that drive to campus approximately 20 percent carpool with an average auto occupancy of 2.5. A detailed summary of the survey results is provided in **Appendix G**.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

TABLE 4.9-12: LACC MASTER PLAN YEAR 2012 PARKING DEMAND ESTIMATES

Existing 2000-01 FTES	15,500
Year 2012 FTES	19,000
Growth Factor	1.23
Average # of Students per Class (Existing)	26
Average # of Students per Class (Year 2012)	32

Time	Number of Classes in Session	Number of Students Added per Class (Average = 6)
6:00 - 7:00 A.M.	11	66
7:00 - 8:00	15	90
8:00 - 9:00	83	498
9:00 - 10:00	201	1,206
10:00 - 11:00	156	936
11:00 - 12:00 P.M.	139	834
12:00 - 1:00	190	1,140
1:00 - 2:00	116	696
2:00 - 3:00	83	498
3:00 - 4:00	89	534
4:00 - 5:00	71	426
5:00 - 6:00	81	486
6:00 - 7:00	160	960
7:00 - 8:00	118	708
8:00 - 9:00	116	696
9:00 - 10:00	108	648

Parking Demand Estimates

Peak Students		1,206
Percentage Drive to Campus	46%	
Drive alone	37%	445
Carpool	9%	114
Auto Occupancy		
Drive Alone	1.0	445
Carpool	2.5	46
Total Vehicles/Spaces		491
Non In-Class Activities (No. of spaces) /a/		59
Total Peak Demand for Spaces		550
Supply of Spaces added by Master Plan		**959**
Surplus		***409***

/a/ Includes demand for classes ending at 9:00 a.m. and new classes starting at 10:00 a.m.
SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., March 2002.

4.10 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The proposed project area is within a highly urbanized environment, with infrastructure already in place to support the provision of water, sewer, solid waste, electrical, and natural gas services to the site. This section addresses the incremental demand placed on the service providers, whether this demand can be met without the need for additional infrastructure, and whether the proposed project would be in compliance with regulations governing the provision of these utilities.

Sustainable Development

In an effort to encourage sustainable development, the Los Angeles Community College District has formulated recommendations for sustainable building principles, standards and processes.[1] Sustainable principles applicable to this section of this EIR include conservation of natural resources, maximizing the use of renewable resources and maximizing energy efficiency and utilization. These principles will be applied as mitigation measures as appropriate in this Section.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Water Supply

Water at LACC, as well as in the rest of the Los Angeles Basin, is supplied by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP). The DWP obtains its water from the Los Angeles Aqueduct (water supplied from the eastern Sierra Nevada Mountains, local wells, water purchased by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) from the Colorado River and the State Water Project, and from the reclamation of wastewater (for specific non-drinking uses).

The LACC campus currently uses 372,000 gallons of water per day (gpd)(1.141625 acre foot per day or 416.69 acre feet per year [af/y]).[2] In 2001, the City of Los Angeles used 665,695 af/y of water.

Wastewater

The City of Los Angeles contains a total of 126 miles of main line sewers, which collect more than two billion gallons of raw sewage each year. Wastewater flow from the LACC campus is discharged into the local sewer line and conveyed to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP) via the North Outfall Sewer-La Cienega, San Fernando Valley Relief Sewer Interceptor System (NOS-LCSFVIS). HTP is operated by the Los Angeles DWP and is the largest wastewater treatment plant in the city. It provides advanced primary and partial secondary treatment for an average flow of 362 million gallons per day (mgd). Total wastewater treatment capacity for HTP is 420 mgd.

Based on 20 gallons per day (gpd) per student, as outlined by the County of Los Angeles Sanitation District, LACC currently generates 310,000 gpd of sewage.[3]

---

[1] *Sustainable Building - Principles, Standards and Processes.* DMJM/JGM, March 6, 2002.

[2] Based on 24 gpd/student and based on a 20 percent increase over wastewater generation.

[3] Los Angeles County Sanitation District, Loadings for Each Class of Land Use table..

Solid Waste

California Integrated Waste Management Act, AB 939

As many of the landfills in the state were approaching capacity and siting of new landfills became increasingly difficult, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (IWMA) AB 939 was designed to focus on source reduction, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe landfilling and transformation activities. The Act required cities and counties to divert 25 percent of all solid waste from landfills and transformation facilities by 1995, and 50 percent by the year 2000.

Los Angeles City College Efforts

Based on a review of the State Agency Waste Management Annual Report for Los Angeles City College, for the year 2001 LACC generated 563 tons of solid waste. Materials generated included beverage containers, cardboard, paper, plastics, scrap metal, xeriscaping and grass waste, wood waste, concrete/asphalt/rubble and generic commercial pickup of waste. As part of the District-wide Integrated Waste Management Plan LACC is currently diverting 39.9% of all wastes generated. Thus, 338 tons are diverted to area landfills. To further reduce impacts on area landfills LACC contracts with a vendor who picks up waste materials and recycles them for remanufacture.

In July of 2001 the LACCD Board of Trustees adopted Waste Reduction Policy 71100.[4] By adopting this policy the district mandates that the various colleges within the district engage in responsible business practices intended to help protect the environmental by meeting California's goals for diverting solid waste from landfills. Waste diversion goals shall be accomplished through such strategy as source reduction, purchasing and utilizing durable and reusable products, support new markets fo recycled content products, provide a recycling coordinator to manage activities and provide educational/outreach program, etc.

Area Landills

Los Angeles County currently has eight major landfills, four minor landfills, and 14 Class III landfills. Class III landfills accept all types of nonhazardous solid waste and must comply with strict environmental and technical standards mandated by local, state, and federal agencies. Solid waste generated at the site would be transported to area landfills, thus, it would be difficult to determine which landfill would be most affected. Three landfills are currently in use by the City of Los Angeles: Calabasas (25,500 tons per year), Sunshine Canyon (219,000 tons per year), and the Bradley West Landfill (542,000 tons per year).

Stormwater Runoff

The proposed project area is within the Los Angeles River Basin, which involves the coastal areas of Los Angeles County, south of the divide of the San Gabriel Mountains and Santa Susana Mountains, and includes a small part of the coastal portion of Ventura County south of the divide of the Santa Monica Mountains. Three major rivers drain the basin. The Los Angeles River and the Rio Hondo join and empty into the Pacific Ocean at the Port of Long Beach. The third, the San Gabriel River, empties into the ocean near Seal Beach.

LACC has occupied the current site since 1929. At present, the majority of the site consists of impermeable areas. Areas which are not paved or developed are landscaped with trees and grass. A stormwater drainage system is in place to accommodate existing runoff.

Electricity and Natural Gas

[4]Chapter VII Article XI Environmental Protection 71100.

Electricity. Electricity is supplied to the proposed project area by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP). DWP serves a 464-square mile area and is the largest municipally-owned utility in the nation. According to the DWP, the power distribution system is adequate for present load conditions. Electric power will be provided in accordance with the DWP's rules and regulations. Major elements of the power system include power generating plants, transmission lines, receiving stations, distributing stations, and switching stations. There is one receiving station within the proposed project area.[5]

It should be noted that the State of California has been experiencing market pricing and supply issues relative to electrical service. However, the DWP maintained ownership of its generating facilities and chose not to deregulate its market. Therefore, DWP has sufficient power for its customers' needs both now and for the foreseeable future.[6] According to the DWP, while the California Public Utilities Commission has approved two electric rate increases in 2001 for the two largest utilities in California, these rate increases will not affect DWP customers (rates have remained unchanged for over nine years).[7]

In 2000, the City of Los Angeles consumed 24,115 Gigawatt hours. Within California, for 2000, universities and colleges used an average of 10.4 kilowatt hours (kWh) per square foot of building space per year.[8] Based on this consumption rate, LACC, which currently has 796,350 sq. ft. of building space would consume 8.3 million kWh per year.

Natural Gas. Natural gas is supplied to the proposed project area by the Southern California Gas Company (SCG). Natural gas is available to the SCG from various sources. These sources include on- and off-shore supplies within the State of California as well as out-of-state reserves.

California natural gas demand is expected to grow at an annual average rate of 0.5 percent from 2000 to 2020. This forecast is consistent with projections of population and employment growth rates. Load growth of approximately 1 percent is expected for the residential and commercial sectors, and more modest growth of 0.6 percent is estimated for the industrial sector.[9]

Within California, for 2000, universities and colleges used an average of 0.42 therms per square foot of building space per year. Based on this consumption rate, LACC, which currently has 796,350 sq. ft. of building space consumes 334,467 therms per year.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The proposed project would result in a significant impact on water if:

- The proposed project would represent a disproportionate demand for water compared to existing usage levels;
- The proposed project would require the construction of a new water supply distribution system;

[5] Op. cit., Downtown Strategic Plan Master Environmental Database, 1994.

[6] Department of Water and Power, http://www.ladwp.com/whatnew/crisisfaq.htm, December 2001.

[7] Ibid, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Daily Energy Update, Monday, July 9, 2001.

[8] Conversation with Mark Ciminelli, California Energy Commission, March 20, 2002.

[9] 2000 California Gas Report, California Gas Utilities, 2000.

- The proposed project would place a substantial burden on local infrastructure or regional treatment facilities, such that the increased demand could not be met by available facilities or feasible local improvements, or would warrant an unforeseen or unanticipated expansion of regional treatment facilities;

- The proposed project would generate substantial amounts of solid waste; or

- A significant impact would occur if storm water runoff under the proposed project would be increased above the level presently in existence to the extent that the existing drainage infrastructure would be insufficient.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Water Supply

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impact related to water supply.

Discussion of Impacts

LACC currently uses approximately 372,000 gallons of water a day. The proposed project is anticipated to increase student enrollment from 15,500 students to 19,000 students within the 10-year master plan. With a water usage factor of 24 gallons of water a day per student, future usage is expected to increase by 84,000 gallons per day (0.257786 acre foot per day or 94.09 af/y). This increase is negligible in relation to the City's total water usage (less than 0.00014%). The addition of the proposed project would not create a significant impact.

It must be noted however, that the provision of water to California has been an ongoing issue. The ability to meet future demand will depend in part upon the implementation of water conservation and reclamation efforts. Procurement of adequate water supplies is a regional issue. The following mitigation measures are recommended to ensure that water resources will be conserved to the greatest extent possible.

MITIGATION MEASURES

U1 Water efficient landscaping and native and drought tolerant plants shall be used wherever possible.

U2 Landscaping design shall incorporate the use of high efficiency irrigation systems.

U3 Proposed projects shall be equipped with wastewater conservation fixtures including low flow toilets.

U4 The projects shall exceed local building codes in water reduction.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Wastewater

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impact related to wastewater.

Discussion of Impacts

Currently, LACC averages a total of 310,000 gpd of sewage. Implementation of the proposed project is anticipated to increase enrollment by 3,500 students. As determined by the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, the expected increase in average wastewater flow from the additional 3,500 students will be 70,000 gpd (0.070 mgd). As HTP has a capacity of 420 mgd and uses 362 mgd, an increase of 0.070 mgd of wastewater generation is a negligible increase and would not result a significant impact, as there is sufficient capacity to accommodate this increase.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Solid Waste

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impact related to solid waste generation.

Discussion of Impacts

Student Generated Waste

Currently, LACC averages a total of 563 tons of solid waste per year. Implementation of the proposed project is anticipated to increase enrollment by 3,500 students by year 2012. In order to project the amount of waste generated by an additional 3,500 student a generation factor of 0.02 tons per student per year was used. This factor was extrapolated from existing waste generated.[1] The additional student would generate an additional 70 tons per year. At the present diversion rate of 39.9% the additional student would result in an additional 42 tons per year. This additional solid waste contribution to area landfills would be negligible (0.000063% per year). Further, efforts for waste reduction are being encouraged and monitored by the District and the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) to ensure that waste reduction activities continue and the District meet the goals of AB939. Thus, a significant impact on solid waste facilities are not anticipated.

[1]Solid waste generation factors take into account the following solid waste streams: beverage containers, cardboard, office paper (white and mixed), plastics, and commercial pickup of waste for a total of 326 tons (0.02 tons per student per year).

Construction and Demolition Due to the Master Plan Projects

The implementation of the 10-year LACC Master Plan would also result in demolition and construction waste. Based on the square footage of space planned for demolition (227,767 gross square feet), approximately 1,437 tons of waste per year (total 13,666 tons) will be generated over the next 10 years. The District undertaken waste management efforts which include ways of handling this type of waste. The District's Facilities Development and Planning Department is in the process of revising bid specification procedures and project contracts to ensure that construction companies are made aware of the Integrated Waste Management Plan requirements. Requirements include the tracking of demolition and excess construction materials in consultation with general contractors to ensure marketable materials are recycled. Due to the proactive approach and ongoing efforts by the college and the District no significant impact is anticipated. Further, these materials are approximately 0.002% of the total waste disposed of (before implementation of waste management activities) which is negligible in relation to the amount of landfill space available. Finally, this level of demolition/construction only extends through the implementation of the proposed Master Plan projects.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Stormwater Runoff

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impact related to stormwater runoff.

Discussion of Impacts

The proposed plan is not anticipated to have an impact on storm water runoff quantities. Storm water runoff depends largely upon the amount of permeable (i.e. unpaved) areas on the site. The proposed projects involve the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of new buildings, as well as the remodeling of existing buildings. The ratio of impermeable areas to unpaved areas will remain essentially unchanged. Additionally, the project areas would be paved and landscaped to effectively convey surface runoff to flow within existing drainage patterns. Thus, the rate of rainwater absorption will remain approximately the same, and the change in the amount of runoff generated will be negligible. No significant impact is anticipated.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

Electricity and Natural Gas

Summary of Impacts

- No significant impacts related to electricity and natural gas.

Discussion of Impacts

The proposed project would demolish 227,762 sq. ft. of space and add 427,840 sq. ft. of space, for a net increase of 200,078 sq. ft. This additional area would increase campus electricity usage by 2.06 Gwh per year. The City of Los Angeles consumed 24,115 Gwh during the year 2000. An increase of 2.06 Gwh would not significantly impact the energy system of the City. The increase in square footage would increase the amount of natural gas consumed by 84032.76 therms per year.

The infrastructure needed to provide electrical and natural gas service to the proposed project area are in place and they are not anticipated to require expansion or rehabilitation beyond that planned by the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to the electrical and natural gas infrastructure system.

It is not anticipated that the proposed project would be affected by or affect the available supply of electricity related to the unresolved issues of price given that DWP has indicated that its generators are not affected by the crisis. In an effort to comply with the LACCD goals of sustainable development, the following mitigation measures are provided..

MITIGATION MEASURES

Electricity.

U5 Exceed the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHEAE) 1999 energy performance requirements by 15% for new construction and 10% for major renovation projects.

U6 Optimize building's energy performance using features such as functioning windows.

U7 Utilize renewable energy sources where feasible.

Natural gas. Since no significant impacts would occur related to natural gas, no mitigation measures are required.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

None.

5.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

5.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives to the proposed project must be evaluated under Section 15126.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Because an Environmental Impact Report must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, the discussion of alternatives focuses on changes to the project or the project's location which are capable of achieving the objectives of the proposed project while avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects associated with the project.

In the scope of alternatives to be examined in an EIR, the public agency must be guided by the doctrine of "feasibility." In the event specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof (Public Resources Code Section 21002).

The Legislature has defined "feasible" for purposes of CEQA review as "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors." (Public Resources Code Section 21061.1; Guidelines Section 15364). In addition, among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (Guidelines Section 15126.6). A project alternative which cannot be feasiblely accomplished need not be extensively considered.

5.2 ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1 - No Project Alternative

The No Project alternative is required by Section 15126(e) of the CEQA Guidelines and assumes that the proposed project would not be implemented. The No Project Alternative does not mean that development within the project area will be prohibited. The "No Project" alternative allows decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. With respect to the proposed project, analysis of the "No Project" alternative includes existing environmental impacts on-site, as well as those environmental effects which would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

The No Project Alternative would mean that Proposition A bond funds would not be used and the Master Plan would not be implemented. The Los Angeles City College campus and facilities would remain as is except for improvements and changes made possible through scheduled maintenance funding. No additional on-campus parking would be constructed. No significant physical changes to existing buildings would be made to improve efficiency. Correction of fire-life-safety deficiencies in buildings such as the library would be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Better internal circulation, including access to the campus via transit and subway stops, and other elements of a "green" campus would not be implemented.

Without improvements it is anticipated that the LACC main campus would continue to grow, but at a much slower rate than if Master Plan improvements were implemented. It is expected that reduced growth would stem from the college reaching capacity in terms of classroom and laboratory space and scheduling, parking

limitations, and the loss of enrollment market share from LACC to other community colleges or private technical colleges due to more modernized facilities and amenities at these other locations.

Enrollment trends over the past 10 years suggest that without the proposed project the annual growth rate for the main LACC campus would be approximately 0.3 percent (or a total of 3.7 percent change over the 10-year planning horizon for the Master Plan). Under these circumstances, semester enrollment would likely increase by about 631 students (or a full time student equivalent of approximately 473 students, FTES). According to LACC officials, it is expected, however, that much of the overall 10-year growth of 23 percent (3,500 FTES) or more in enrollment could be maintained, by expanding the College's focus on community outreach at LACC satellite facilities such as the Northeast Campus in Atwater/Glassel Park, Koreatown and up to three additional satellite sites within the LACC service area. In some cases, the college would take advantage of underutilized facilities available within industries served by the college, such as training rooms in local hospitals.

The environmental effects of the No Project Alternative on the LACC campus would include the following:

- Aesthetics. No improvements to campus perimeter landscaping and screening. There may be some improvement to the facades of individual buildings through re-painting.

- Air Quality. Excess mobile emissions for the streets surrounding the campus resulting from cars circulating to find available on and off-campus parking spaces.

- Biological Resources. No impact.

- Cultural Resources. This alternative would not remove the Men's Gymnasium building and the Chemistry Building, two of oldest buildings remaining on the LACC campus which have some historical significance. It would leave intact the remaining north campus and south campus clusters of 1930s era junior college buildings. However, unless money is invested in rehabilitation of these buildings, continued deferred maintenance would result in deterioration and possible loss of historic fabric.

- Geology and Hydrology. The No Project Alternative would not entail major construction projects and there would be no impact on the geology or the hydrology of the LACC site. There would be no change to the amount impervious surface that would affect drainage patterns or the rate of runoff. Maintenance activities would continue to focus on measures to reduce basement flooding from underground sources. This activity would largely focus on the installation of sump pumps and use of sealants in below-grade areas of buildings. None of these measures or conditions would result in a significant adverse impact to geology or hydrology.

- Noise. Since there would be no major new construction, there would be no new noise effects. Also, because the athletic field and stadium would not be relocated there would be no adverse effects on adjacent residential along Heliotrope Drive from spectators in the stands or from public address systems.

- Public Services.

  – Police. The demand for Sheriff services would be incremental on the main LACC campus. The additional use of satellite campuses would, however, increase demand and disperse requirements over a larger geographic area.

  - Fire. Some incremental change in the demand for emergency services due to the slight increase in student enrollment. Greater potential for demand from facilities with that may have fire/life safety deficiencies such as the library.

- Traffic and Parking.

  - Traffic. Street intersections adjacent to the college would be adversely affected by the incremental added number of vehicle trips from student enrollment growth as well as by the excess circulation of these vehicles attempting to find parking spaces on or adjacent to the campus.

  - Parking. No major expansion possibilities for on site campus parking. Student parking on local neighborhood streets would continue. In addition no major improvements would be made to Parking Lot No. 1 on the east side of Vermont Avenue to increase its use through better lighting, signage, or its physical connection to the main campus. Without improvements and expansion to parking, the shortfall in needed student parking would increase by 60 to 70 spaces, i.e. a total short fall of 1,413 to 1423 spaces.

  - Transit. College initiatives to expand transit use by students would be limited by the current 900 to 1100 foot walk distance (approximately 6 to 10 minutes) between existing campus main entrance and the MTA portal on Vermont and Willowbrook Avenues or Vermont Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard.

- Utilities and Infrastructure. It is not expected that the incremental increase in approximately 631 students per semester on the main campus would create a significant increased demand for utilities and infrastructure. More importantly, failure to implement the Master Plan would mean that there would not be resources to design sustainable and energy efficient buildings consistent with the policy direction established by the Los Angeles Community College Board.

Although not a part of the Master Plan, LACC improvements at satellite campus' are expected to be addressed on a case-by-case basis. The greatest change would occur at the Northeast Campus satellite campus which is expected to have 24 classrooms and an enrollment of approximately 3,000 students (FTES of 1,200). The anticipated environmental effects have been addressed in a separate Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Significant effects identified at the Northeast Campus site include: traffic impacts at one intersection, and nitrogen oxide emission impacts during the construction phase of the project.

The anticipated satellite locations for LACC are expected to enroll on average approximately 250 students. The satellite locations will most likely be located in leased space in existing buildings. Most importantly, satellite locations would be selected to maximize convenient community access via transit, walk or biking. Because of these factors it is expected that the other satellite locations would result in less than significant impacts with respect to traffic and parking. Typically, no more than 15 peak hour automobile trips and a maximum demand for approximately 20-25 parking spaces would be generated at these locations. No other environmental effects are expected with leased spaced for community satellites. Normally, these types of facilities would be considered Categorically Exempt under Section 15300.4 of the CEQA Guidelines governing such topics as use of existing facilities, replacement and reconstruction of structures and facilities, conversion of small structures and minor alterations of land.

Alternative 2 - Re-use Alternatives

The analysis contained in the body of this report concludes that there would be a significant impact to cultural resources with implementation of the proposed Master Plan. Specifically, two of the three remaining 1930s buildings on the north campus (Men's Gymnasium and Chemistry Building) would be removed, leaving the Life Science building as the only remaining element of the 1930s junior college in the north part of the campus. Demolition of these buildings would pre-empt the creation of a district of contributing buildings. Although mitigation measures are proposed in Section 4.3, Cultural Resources, the assessment concludes that the impacts to these cultural resources remain significant and unavoidable. Two re-use alternatives have been considered to preserve the Men's Gymnasium and Chemistry Building. The first alternative involves rehabilitation of the buildings and re-use for the same functions. The second alternative involves rehabilitation and remodeling of the buildings for adaptive re-use.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

To eliminate this impact to cultural resources, adaptive re-use of the Men's Gymnasium and Chemistry Building are considered as alternatives. It is not expected that these buildings would continue in their current use with implementation of the Master Plan because of the functional and spatial arrangement of the proposed Master Plan. Specifically, the anticipated success of the proposed Master Plan relies on the reorganization of the campus to concentrate athletic functions in the southwest part of the campus to create a campus plan that is focused around access to the Metrorail station at the northeast corner of the campus. Convenient pedestrian movement to the main campus is a priority of the Master Plan, along with providing development areas for a new science and technology building, as well as library and resource center.

Renovation and modernization of the Men's Gymnasium and Chemistry Buildings for their current use would require that the functional arrangements proposed in the Master Plan be discarded. This is largely because the Men's Gymnasium function is logically tied to its proximity to the athletic field. If the Gymnasium is retained in its present location, then there is no rationale to move the athletic field. Without the relocation of the athletic field, a new pedestrian gateway access into the campus cannot be created to capitalize on the close proximity of the Metrorail station. Los Angeles City College currently has an extremely high proportion (54 percent) of students that use public transit. The proposed Master Plan builds on this to increase further the potential for transit use by students, faculty and staff and to correspondingly reduce traffic, circulation, parking, and air quality impacts. Also, development of new building areas would be shifted to the far southwest part of the campus, where linking academic functions would be difficult and less efficient.

Although no detailed studies have been completed, it is expected that the Men's Gymnasium and Chemistry Buildings could be adaptively re-used.[1] The re-use of the Men's Gymnasium and Chemistry Building would require reorganization of the Master Plan functions as it is not likely that the Gymnasium can be adapted for a library and resource center because the size and physical load requirements of a library structure exceed that of the existing Gymnasium. It should be noted that the Men's Gymnasium also includes an outdoor swimming pool which cannot be reused for any other purpose and would represent loss of space. Similarly, the Chemistry Building may not be able to cost effectively accommodate a function such as the Child Development Center (slated in the Master Plan for the Chemistry Building's location) which has numerous statutory requirements regarding the layout of indoor and outdoor spaces, as well as access. These limitations strongly suggest that while re-use of the buildings is possible, the overall functional arrangement and

[1] The LACCD is currently renovating and restoring the historic Van de Kamp bakery building as part of their Northeast Satellite Campus project

organization of the campus would have to be altered to accommodate different uses in the north campus area than those anticipated in the Master Plan.

In addition, it should be noted that the maintenance and upgrading of college facilities is governed by state requirements pertaining to cost of renovation versus new construction. The ultimate viability of the re-use of the Men's Gymnasium and Chemistry Building in this context is dependent on the intended use and physical improvement costs. In this context, renovation of the Men's Gymnasium as a community services facility and the Chemistry Building as additional classrooms would lessen the physical change requirements on the structures but would also require a reworking of the basic Master Plan arrangement and layout of College functions. It would also preclude the relocation of the athletic field and stadium to the south part of campus and the creation of a pedestrian gateway at the north end of campus adjacent to the Metrorail station. This gateway is linked to the opportunity to increase use of public transit and reduce traffic, circulation, parking, and air quality impacts.

Alternative 3 - Off-Site Alternative

Unavoidable significant impacts identified in this report, include cultural resources, construction noise, traffic, emergency response time, and cumulative parking impacts. These effects suggests that if growth were channeled to another location(s) these impacts would be eliminated. Under No Project conditions what would have been a small amount of growth at these satellite locations would be increased to 3,500 additional students.

Under this option, cultural resources and construction noise impacts would be eliminated, but other environmental impacts such as parking and to some extent traffic and circulation impacts would be shifted to the vicinity of the satellite locations also in the densely developed north-central Los Angeles area. The magnitude of impacts at these satellite locations is, however, expected to be reduced compared to the concentrated impact at the main campus.

It is important to note that this type of decentralized alternative would be inconsistent with the goals of the Master Plan which are focused on enhancing the image and improved functionality of the main campus by concentrating resources.

5.3 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6 (e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the selected alternatives (excluding the No Project alternative).

The proposed Los Angeles City College Master Plan has been developed to provide for needed college facilities and functions over the next 10 years. The physical arrangement of the Master Plan, including the spatial distribution of re-use functions and activities, is intended to achieve the College's basic mission. One of the key elements of the proposed Master Plan is the relocation of the existing athletic field and stadium to the south part of campus, and the creation of additional space for the development of a library and resource center and a new science and technology building in this newly defined main campus area, Also, the Master Plan would create a direct and convenient pedestrian gateway from the Metrorail station to the main campus at the north end.

The redevelopment of the north part of campus would involve the removal of two buildings (Men's Gymnasium and Chemistry Building). These buildings are considered to be cultural resources because they buildings are eligible for the California Register and because these structures are the remaining elements of the 1930s junior college.

The Re-use alternatives would preserve the two buildings, but it would also mean that the Master Plan would not be implemented as envisioned in terms of the arrangement and spatial functions of the College and creation of a pedestrian gateway to the Metrorail station located at the north end of campus. Without this reconfiguration of the Master Plan, the College may not be able to fully achieve the traffic, parking, circulation and air quality benefits anticipated with implementation of the Master Plan.

The Off-Site Alternative would not meet the objectives of the master plan, it would dissipate the impact of the Proposition A funding resources, and this option would shift other impacts such as parking and traffic circulation to other densely developed areas where there could also be significant adverse effects.

The No Project alternative would retain the two buildings but, again, would not meet any of the objectives of the Master Plan. Improvements to the two buildings would likely be limited to scheduled maintenance and would not meaningfully extend the economic or useful life of these structures.

Compared to the options, the proposed Master Plan is the environmentally superior alternative.

6.0 CUMULATIVE AND LONG-TERM EFFECTS

In certain instances, a proposed project may have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. In accordance with Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines (as amended through January 1, 2000), this EIR analyzes the cumulative impacts that could occur with the proposed project. Cumulative impacts (e.g., two or more individual effects which, when considered together, compound or increase the environmental impact of a proposed project) can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

The CEQA Guidelines require a discussion of the cumulative impacts of a project "when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable," e.g., when "the incremental effects of an individual 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."[1] The Guidelines provide further direction as to the scope of a cumulative impact analysis. The discussion "need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone" and "should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness."[2] Furthermore, an EIR should not discuss impacts that do not result in part from the evaluated project. An EIR may also determine that a project's contribution to a significant impact is *de minimus* and thus is not significant (i.e., the environmental conditions would be essentially the same whether or not the proposed project is implemented).

An adequate discussion of significant cumulative impacts can be accomplished by analyzing either (1) "a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency" or (2) "a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact."[3]

The list of applicable projects for this cumulative impacts analysis was compiled in coordination with the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT). These projects are listed in **Table 6-1**, with corresponding locations reflected in Figure 4.9-5 in Section 4.9, Transportation and Traffic.

In this regard, Chapter 4.0 of this report indicated that the proposed project would result in changes within the following environmental topic areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural and Historic Resources
- Geology
- Hazards and Risk of Upset
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

[1] CEQA Guidelines, Section 15065(c).

[2] CEQA Guidelines, 15130(4)(b).

[3] CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130 (b)(1).

For each of the impact categories addressed below, the effects of the proposed project were considered cumulatively with the likely effects of the projects listed in **Table 6-1**.

TABLE 6-1: CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

No.	Project	Location	Land Use	Size
1	Corner mini-mall mixed use retail	Sunset Blvd./Serrano Ave.	Mixed Use Fast food	4,788 s.f. 2,592 s.f.
2	Children's Hospital	Sunset Blvd./Vermont Ave.	Surgery wing and demolish existing	67,955 s.f.
3	Mini shopping center	Western Ave./Santa Monica Blvd.	Mini-shopping center	20,695 s.f.
4	Office/retail development	Serrano Ave./6th St.	Demo -8,700 s.f. office/retail Construct office	42,600 s.f.
5	Westlake Recovery Redevelopment Project	Hoover St./3rd St.	Various growth development	-
6	Food 4 Less Supermarket	Hoover St./Santa Monica Blvd.	Discount supermarket	51,182 s.f.
7	Western Plaza	Western Ave./Carlton Wy.	Retail commercial bldg.	11,864 s.f.
8	Wilshire Galleria	Wilshire Blvd./New Hampshire Ave.	Health club Restaurant	15,850 s.f. 1,878 s.f.
9	Apartment building	Catalina St./Wilshire Blvd.	Apartment building (five-story)	90 units
10	Hollywest Promenade	Hollywood Blvd./Western Ave.	Retail Low income housing	120,928 s.f. 100 units
11	Shopping center	6th St./Catalina St.	Demo 1,000 s.f. used car sales. Construct shopping center	16,548 s.f.
12	Food Market convenience store at gas station	Western Ave./Oxford Ave.	Convenience market at gas station w/ 12 fueling stations	5,990 s.f.
13	Scientology apartment	Bronson Ave./Franklin Ave.	Renovate existing 81 unit apartment to 126 units	126 units
14	Laundry mart mini-shopping center	Sunset Blvd./St. Andrews Pl.	Laundry, fast food with drive-through, convenience store, child ent.	-
15	Burger King	Sunset Blvd./Kenmore Ave.	Fast food restaurant with drive-through	-
16	Carl's Jr. restaurant	Melrose Ave./Juanita Ave.	Fast food restaurant with drive-through	-

TABLE 6-1: CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

No.	Project	Location	Land Use	Size
17	Laundry mart/Burger King	Temple St./Coronado St.	Laundry shop Fast food restaurant with drive-through	7,524 s.f.
18	Restaurant	Beverly Blvd./Serrano Ave.	Restaurant/dinner club	5,577 s.f. (44 seats)
19	Hotel	Micheltorena St./Landa St.	Hotel	45 rooms
20	McDonald's restaurant	Beverly Blvd./Virgil Avenue	Fast food restaurant with drive-through	1,500 s.f.
21	LA International Church Dream Center	Kent St./Waterloo St.	Church	2,500 seats

SOURCE: Los Angeles Department of Transportation

6.1 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Aesthetics. The listed projects are too distant from each other to have a combined effect. In addition, each project is of a scale in keeping with the surrounding area. No cumulative change in the physical environment is expected.

The LACC campus will be provided with upgraded lighting in an already developed environment. None of the listed projects would produce an intense concentration of lighting that would be different from a typical urban environment. No cumulative change in lighting is expected.

Air Quality. As shown in **Table 6-2**, daily mobile emissions for the proposed project and related projects are expected to fall below the daily cumulative emissions thresholds for all pollutants. However, daily mobile emissions of ROG, NO_x, and CO during the operational phase of the LACC Master Plan would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for individual projects. Additionally, the proposed project accounts for approximately 29 percent of the overall cumulative emissions for ROG, NO_x, and CO. Thus, the proposed project would contribute to cumulative impacts of ROG, NO_x, and CO.

TABLE 6-2: CUMULATIVE AIR EMISSIONS

		Operational Emissions (Pounds per Day) /a/				
No.	Project	ROG	NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	SO_x
1	Corner mini-mall mixed use retail	12	29	152	1	1
2	Children's Hospital	4	11	57	1	1
3	Mini shopping center	10	25	131	1	1
4	Office/retail development	2	4	20	1	1
5	Westlake Recovery Redevelopment Project	136	341	1,770	15	12
6	Food 4 Less Supermarket	12	30	155	1	1
7	Western Plaza	2	5	24	1	1
8	Wilshire Galleria	1	3	17	1	1
9	Apartment building	2	6	30	1	1

TABLE 6-2: CUMULATIVE AIR EMISSIONS

No.	Project	Operational Emissions (Pounds per Day) /a/				
		ROG	NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	SO_x
10	Hollywest Promenade	21	53	274	2	2
11	Shopping center	3	8	43	1	1
12	Food Market convenience store at gas station	2	6	30	1	1
13	Scientology apartment	1	3	15	1	1
14	Laundry mart mini-shopping center	6	15	76	1	1
15	Burger King	5	13	69	1	1
16	Carl's Jr. restaurant	4	10	52	1	1
17	Laundry mart/Burger King	6	14	71	1	1
18	Restaurant	2	5	27	1	1
19	Hotel	2	4	23	1	1
20	McDonald's restaurant	4	10	53	1	1
21	LA International Church Dream Center	0	0	0	0	0
22	LACC Master Plan	96	239	1,238	10	8
	TOTAL EMISSIONS	333	834	4,327	45	40
	Cumulative SCAQMD Threshold /b/	1,650	2,200	12,100	3,300	3,300
	Cumulative Projects' Percent of Threshold	20%	38%	36%	1%	1%
	LACC PERCENT OF TOTAL EMISSIONS	29%	29%	29%	22%	20%

/a/ Daily emissions are expressed in pounds per day.
/b/ The individual project threshold multiplied by number of individual projects.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC, URBEMIS7G model output. See Appendix B.

Cultural Resources. One cultural resources has been identified within an ½ mile radius of the LACC campus and no archeological resources were found, therefore, no cumulative effects are anticipated.

Geology and Seismicity. Concerns related to geology and seismicity are site specific. The proposed project site would not be expected to be affected by the other projects on the cumulative project list thus no cumulative effects are expected.

Hazardous Materials. Concerns related to hazardous materials are site specific. All new development projects would be required to mitigate, prior to implementation, hazardous concerns (if existing). The proposed LACC project has not identified risks related to the exposure of the public to the accidental release of hazardous materials, therefore, no cumulative effects are anticipated.

Land Use. The LACC campus has been a fixture in the community as an educational facility for almost 100 years. The campus is in character with the surrounding developed setting. Further, the proposed Master Plan

projects appear to be in keeping with the scale and character of the area as well as the existing uses on campus. Thus, no cumulative effects are expected.

Noise.

Construction

Although several projects are within the vicinity of the project site, the timing of development and degree of overlapping construction is unknown at this time. Because of the long-term phasing of the buildout of the LACC Master Plan, overlapping construction is unlikely. It is also important to note that few of the proposed projects are located close enough together that they would likely disrupt traffic flows on the same street nor combine together to increase overall construction related noise as it would affect a single neighborhood or sensitive land use area. Thus, no construction-related noise cumulative impacts are anticipated.

Operation

When calculating future traffic impacts, the traffic consultant took 21 additional projects into consideration. Thus, the future traffic results with and without the proposed project already account for the cumulative impacts from these other projects. Since the noise impacts are generated directly from the traffic analysis results, the future with project and future without project noise impacts described in this report already reflect cumulative impacts. As discussed in Section 4.7, a cumulative increase in traffic would result in sound level changes of less-than-one to one decibels when existing conditions are compared to future conditions, including the LACC Master Plan. Because significant noise changes are typically defined as an increase of three decibels or more, no significant cumulative noise impacts are anticipated.

With respect to stationary noise, operations of the proposed athletic field would generate additional noise in the area. However, the listed projects (shown in **Table 6-1**) are too far from the LACC campus to have a combined effect. As discussed in Section 4.7, with implementation of mitigation measures, a less than significant impact associated with noise generated from the athletic field is anticipated. Thus, no significant cumulative noise impacts are anticipated.

Public Services. An increased demand police service is expected and therefore, cumulative impacts would occur. However, LACC intends to mitigate any cumulative impacts through mitigation. Further, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department has principal authority over security issues on campus such that impacts on the Los Angeles Police Department is lessened or eliminated.

Traffic. An assessment of future traffic conditions is needed to determine the impact of the project at the time of development. Future conditions must account for other known or planned projects. Forecasts of the future year 2015 Cumulative Base traffic volumes were developed by adding the traffic expected to be generated by approved or proposed development projects in the area to the forecast ambient traffic growth described above. Listings of proposed projects in the study area were obtained from the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation. A review of these lists indicated that a total of 21 projects of notable size have been proposed or approved within the study area (see **Table 6-3**). This list does not include projects expected to generate fewer than ten PM peak hour trips, or development that is located outside an approximate two-mile radius from the campus.

TABLE 6-3: TRAFFIC RELATED CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

No.	Project	Net Daily Trips	Net AM Peak Hour	Net PM Peak Hour
1	Corner mini-mall mixed use retail	3,058	135	107
2	Children's Hospital	1,141	63	60

TABLE 6-3: TRAFFIC RELATED CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

No.	Project	Net Daily Trips	Net AM Peak Hour	Net PM Peak Hour
3	Mini shopping center	2,640	64	241
4	Office/retail development	392	61	58
5	Westlake Recovery Redevelopment Project	35,546	2,311	3,704
6	Food 4 Less Supermarket	3,110	43	308
7	Western Plaza	483	0	31
8	Wilshire Galleria	340	7	82
9	Apartment building	597	46	56
10	Hollywest Promenade	5,498	131	459
11	Shopping center	873	2	63
12	Food Market convenience store at gas station	605	23	45
13	Scientology apartment	208	23	28
14	Laundry mart mini-shopping center	1,525	38	137
15	Burger King	1,396	110	72
16	Carl's Jr. restaurant	1,054	106	71
17	Laundry mart/Burger King	1,437	156	96
18	Restaurant	538	5	43
19	Hotel	457	15	22
20	McDonald's restaurant	1,065	80	55
21	LA International Church Dream Center	0	118	149
	Sub Total	62,053	3,357	5,887
	LACC Master Plan	24,871	2,261	2,746
	Grand Total	**86,924**	**5,618**	**8,663**

SOURCE: Meyer Mohaddes Associates, Inc., March 2002

When calculating future traffic impacts, the traffic consultant took 21 additional projects into consideration. Thus, the traffic analysis contained in this Draft EIR is cumulative in nature. Specifically, the analysis takes into account ambient traffic growth as well as the effects of future planned and proposed projects. As discussed in the traffic section, ambient traffic was expected to increase by a factor of 1.09 percent per year over the life of the LACC Master Plan. Future developments, including the buildout of the LACC Master Plan, were expected to increase daily trips by approximately 86,924 trips. The impact analysis, however, revealed that these cumulative traffic increases with the implementation of mitigation measures would not result in unavoidable significant impacts. Thus, no cumulative traffic impacts are anticipated.

Cumulative Parking Impact

The projected parking demand generated by the additional 3,500 students would be met by the additional parking supply being provided by the Master Plan. There is, however, the potential for a cumulative parking impact to occur when the campus as a whole is considered. As noted above, it is expected that by the year 2012 with the completion of the Master Plan, the average number of students per class would increase from 26 to 32. Using the average student projection and the existing schedule of classes, the peak number of students were estimated for the 9-10 AM hour. **Table 6-4** summarizes the projected increase in the number of students for 9-10 AM assuming that 201 classes are in session and the average number of students is 32. As shown, during this hour it is estimated that approximately 6,432 students would be in class. The 8-9 AM hour and the 10-11 AM hour were also considered, as students may stay on campus after class and arrive during the hour before class starts. There are 17 classes which end at 9:00 AM and 7 new classes which start at 10:00 AM. For purposes of analysis, the activity associated with these classes were assumed in the peak parking demand calculations.

Utilizing the survey data discussed in Section 4.9, Traffic and Parking, the future peak parking demand was calculated for the campus for cumulative conditions with the Master Plan. The results are summarized in **Table 6-4.** As shown, the student (in class) parking demand during the peak hour (9-10 AM) is projected to be approximately 2,620 spaces. In addition to the in-class student demand, 580 spaces were assumed to be needed for faculty and staff, and an additional 350 spaces for activities associated with the classes ending at 9:00 AM, classes starting at 10:00 AM and other non in-class related activities. Overall, as shown on **Table 6-4**, the campus would require approximately 3,550 parking spaces. Based on the projected supply of 2,604 spaces, there would be a cumulative shortfall of approximately 945 spaces for the campus.

TABLE 6-4: LACC MASTER PLAN YEAR 2012 PARKING DEMAND ESTIMATES - CUMULATIVE

Existing 2000-01 FTES	15,500
Year 2012 FTES	19,000
Growth Factor	1.23
Average No. of Students per Class (Existing)	26
Average No. of Students per Class (Year 2012)	32

Time	Number of Classes in Session	Number of Students (Average = 32)
6:00 - 7:00 A.M.	11	352
7:00 - 8:00	15	480
8:00 - 9:00	83	2,656
9:00 - 10:00	201	6,432
10:00 - 11:00	156	4,992
11:00 - 12:00 P.M.	139	4,448
12:00 - 1:00	190	6,080
1:00 - 2:00	116	3,712
2:00 - 3:00	83	2,656
3:00 - 4:00	89	2,848
4:00 - 5:00	71	2,272
5:00 - 6:00	81	2,592

TABLE 6-4: LACC MASTER PLAN YEAR 2012 PARKING DEMAND ESTIMATES - CUMULATIVE			
6:00 - 7:00	160		5,120
7:00 - 8:00	118		3,776
8:00 - 9:00	116		3,712
9:00 - 10:00	108		3,456
Parking Demand Estimates			
Peak Students			6,432
Percentage Drive to Campus		46%	
Drive alone		37%	2,376
Carpool		9%	609
Auto Occupancy			
Drive Alone		1.0	2,376
Carpool		2.5	244
Total Vehicles/Spaces			**2,619**
Faculty and staff (No. of spaces)			**580**
Non In-Class Activities (No. of spaces) /a/			**350**
Total Spaces			**3,549**
Supply			2,604
Short-fall			**945**

/a/ Includes demand for classes ending at 9:00 a.m. and new classes starting at 10:00 a.m.
SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., March 2002.

To address this cumulative short fall in parking spaces, the college could address the deficiency in overall parking spaces through implementation of one or more of the following measures:

- Revise class scheduling. Because the peak demand for parking spaces is function of when classes are offered, the college can eliminate this peak demand by limiting the numbered of schedule class sessions to 128 in any given hour. Currently approximately 201 classes are in session in the 9-10 am hour. To achieve this objective, sessions in the peak hour would have to be reduced by 36 percent and rescheduled largely in afternoon hours. The college must weigh the feasibility of this time shift against the needs of working students where there has traditionally been a demand for morning classes.

- Construct Additional Parking Spaces at Lot 1. The most obvious opportunity is for the college to provide additional structured parking at Lot 1. A new 4-level structure constructed on the existing surface lot would satisfy the unmet parking demand. Enhancing the visibility, perceived safety, and information about this parking location are key, however, to ensuring high student utilization. The disadvantage of providing more parking in this location would primarily related to attracting more traffic east of Vermont Avenue and increasing traffic on neighborhood streets east of Vermont.

- Increasing Number of Spaces in Master Plan Parking Structures. As discussed previously, two new parking structures are proposed as part of the Master Plan. One structure of 1,050 spaces would be located beneath the relocated athletic field at the south west corner of the campus, and the other structure of approximately 400 spaces would be located beneath relocated tennis courts in the northwest quadrant of the campus. Both of the structures would be partially below grade. Creating enough parking at these locations to meet demand would mean that 1-2 additional parking levels would have to be added. Increasing the depth of the parking structures would add substantial cost, particularly because of existing groundwater conditions. Increasing the height would also add cost,

but also affect the design character of Heliotrope Drive, likely creating a condition where the parking structures would dominate the scale and massing along this residential street.

- Provide Parking at the Driving Range Site. Currently the college has entered into 25-year agreement to construct and operate a driving range with a private party in the southern part of the campus. This Driving Range is currently under construction. The Driving Range site is approximately five acres. A re-design and reconfiguration of the driving range could provide the needed parking spaces in a 3-level parking structure over which the driving range could be built. The advantage of this option is that traffic would not likely be attracted through any residential area, and the parking structure could be constructed partially below grade or at grade to avoid groundwater problems or zoning code height restrictions. The disadvantage to college would be that driving range agreement would have to be re-negotiated at cost to the college as well as the college obtaining additional funding to construct the parking structure. Elimination of the Driving Range would eliminate a potential revenue source to the college.

- Provide Off-Site Shuttle Parking. The college has determined that there are a number of publicly owned rights-of-way or properties within the vicinity of the college that could be used to establish a shuttle parking system. The success of this approach would hinge on the number of spaces available, frequency of the shuttle service provided by the college, and perceived safety levels at these remote lots.

Conclusion.

A combination of the measures outlined above would mitigate the cumulative parking problem at Los Angeles City College. Because the feasibility or implementability of these measures cannot be established at this time, a significant cumulative impact on parking would result until one or more of these mitigation measures are put in place.

Utilities. A combined effect on utilities is expected. It is not expected that the increase will be significant as there appears to be adequate capacity in the current utility systems to accommodate the projects except electricity. The electricity crisis has an impact on all users throughout the southland.

6.2 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the assessment of growth-inducing impacts in the EIR must describe the "ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment."

The proposed project will not extend infrastructure such as roads, utilities and public facilities, beyond that which already exists and meets the needs of existing development in the project area. The proposed project site is located within a densely developed urban setting and will not introduce new land uses into a previously undeveloped area that could induce changes to the surrounding area.

Although the proposed project inherently represents growth within the area, including expansion of existing facilities, creation of new facilities, and marginal localized job growth, such growth is not of the scale that would affect regional population, housing, or employment forecasts. Thus, no significant growth-inducing impacts are anticipated.

6.3 IRREVERSIBLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Irreversible adverse environmental effects are not anticipated for the proposed project or any of the project alternatives. Construction and operation of the proposed project would rely upon the use of nonrenewable resources. Use of fossil fuel derived energy sources such as gasoline, diesel fuel, electricity, and natural gas would be necessary for transport of workers and materials during construction and provision of electricity, natural gas, and fuel for vehicles during the life of the project. Although the fossil fuel consumption associated with the project would constitute the depletion of a resource which is irretrievable and irreversible, the amount of resources consumed would not be of an extraordinary nature in a regional context. Thus, the proposed project's use of nonrenewable energy sources is not considered to constitute a significant impact.

7.0 EFFECTS DETERMINED NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

This section discusses expected effects of the proposed project and why these effects are not considered significant or why various effects would not be expected to occur.

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

The project site is not currently utilized as farmland, or as any other agricultural use. In addition, the project is located in an urbanized and developed area in which no farmland exists.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The project site is located within an area that has been urbanized for many years and does not contain species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species. The site is not located within an area with riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game. The site is not located near a surface water body and there are no corridors for native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species nor will the proposed project impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites as there are no such sites located within or adjacent to the proposed project area.

MINERAL RESOURCES

No mineral resources of value to the region or to the residents of the state were found to be known or to exist on or immediately adjacent to the proposed project site.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The proposed project is not anticipated to induce substantial population growth in the area since no residential units would be included in the project. New employment may be generated from the new development, possibly drawing employees from the local area and general region.

SCENIC RESOURCES

The general project area can be described as a fully developed urban setting with no distinguishing scenic or public views. Consequently, no scenic impact will occur.

SCHOOLS

The proposed project does not contain a residential component and would not directly affect school enrollment within the Los Angeles Unified School District. Further, any change in site employment would be minimal and thus, no secondary student generation would be created due to new or unusual housing demand within the Los Angeles Unified School District service area.

RECREATION

The proposed LACC Master Plan does not contain a residential component. Thus, there will not be an increase in population nor a significant increase in employment on campus resulting from an increased student population. Therefore, no new or expanded recreation facility shall be required. The proposed project includes the replacement of existing recreational facilities with improved facilities, which has a beneficial effect.

8.0 ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES CONSULTED

- Southern California Association of Governments
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- State of California, The Resources Agency Department of Conversation, Division of Mines and Geology
- California Energy Commission
- Native American Heritage Commission
- South Central Coastal Information Center, California Historic Resources Information System
- County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
- Los Angeles Fire Department, Public Service Department
- Los Angeles Fire Department, Planning Section
- Los Angeles County Sheriff, Crime Analyst Section
- Los Angeles County Sheriff, Community College Bureau
- Los Angeles Police Department, Rampart Division

DOCUMENT PREPARERS

Lead Agency

Los Angeles Community College District
770 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Andy Dunn

Preparers of EIR

Environmental Impact Report Preparation

Terry A. Hayes Associates
6083 Bristol Parkway, Suite 200
Culver City, CA 90230
Terry A. Hayes, Principal
Randi L. Cooper, Project Manager
Teresa Li, Assistant Planner
Kevin Maggay, Assistant Planner
Henry Chu, Assistant Planner

Julie Berger, Planning Assistant
Janet Murphy, Graphics

Master Plan Manager

Leo A Daly
550 S. Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Michael Fuller, AIA Project Manager
Vincent Coffeen, AIA Project Manager

Master Planner

Bobrow/Thomas and Associates
1001 Westwood Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90024
Michael Bobrow, FAIA Principal Planner
Greg Doench, Project Architect/Planner

Traffic

Meyer Mohaddes Associates
900 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Bryan Mayeda, Traffic Engineer

Historic Resources

Kaplan Chen Kaplan
2524 18th Street
Santa Monica, CA 90405
David Kaplan, Principal
Pam O'Connor, Historic Preservationist

Hazardous Materials

Natec International
7441 Anaconda Avenue
Garden Grove, CA 92841
Al Dages, Vice President