

2014 ADDENDUM TO THE 2002 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

for the

Los Angeles Pierce College
2014 Facility Master Plan Update

(SCH # 2002021004)

**Los Angeles Community College District
Board of Trustees**

July 2014

Contents

List of Tables..... ii
 List of Figures ii
 List of Acronyms and Abbreviations ii

ADDENDUM AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM 1
 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected..... 15
 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts 15

Issues 15
 1 Aesthetics..... 15
 2 Agriculture Resources 17
 3 Air Quality..... 18
 4 Biological Resources..... 24
 5 Cultural Resources..... 27
 6 Geology and Soils 30
 7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 33
 8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials..... 36
 9 Hydrology and Water Quality 41
 10 Land Use and Planning 45
 11 Mineral Resources 46
 12 Noise 46
 13 Population and Housing 52
 14 Public Services..... 53
 15 Recreation..... 55
 16 Transportation/Traffic 55
 17 Utilities and Service Systems..... 62
 18 Mandatory Findings of Significance..... 66

References..... 68
List of Preparers..... 70

Appendices

Appendix A Aesthetic Resources Photographic Documentation
 Appendix B Air Quality Data Sheets
 Appendix C Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum
 Appendix D Traffic Impact Study

Tables

1	Status of Projects Proposed under the 2002 Los Angeles Pierce College Facility Master Plan	7
2	Existing and Projected Student Enrollment at Pierce College	10
3	Proposed Revisions since the 2010 Master Plan Update	13
4	Forecast of Regional Construction Emissions (2010 Master Plan Update Estimates).....	19
5	Forecast of Mitigated Regional Construction Emissions	20
6	Forecast of Localized Construction Emissions	21
7	Forecast of Regional Operational Emissions.....	22
8	Forecast of Localized Operational Emissions.....	23
9	Estimate of Revised Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Metric Tons per Year (2010 Master Plan Update Estimates)	34
10	Proposed Project Consistency with Climate Action Team Strategies.....	36
11	Community Noise Exposure Levels (Exterior) and Land Use Compatibility.....	49
12	Noise Measurements at Noise Sensitive Uses.....	49
13	Los Angeles Department of Transportation Threshold Criteria.....	56
14	Existing (Year 2013) Intersection Levels of Service.....	57
15	Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Cumulative Base and Cumulative-Plus- Project Conditions.....	59
16	Projected Wastewater Generation Based on FTE Enrollment.....	63

Figures

1	Regional Location Map	2
2	Project Vicinity Map.....	4
3	Locations of 2002 Master Plan Projects	5
4	Locations of Los Angeles Pierce College 2014 Facility Master Plan Update Projects.....	11

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AB 32	Assembly Bill 32
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ATCS	Adaptive Traffic Control System
ATSAC	Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control
Basin	South Coast Air Basin
BAU	Business as Usual
BMP	best management practice
C4-D2	Commercial
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CAT	Climate Action Team
CBC	California Building Code
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CH ₄	methane
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	carbon dioxide equivalent
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
dBA	A-weighted decibels

DBH	diameter at breast height
DOE	Determination of Eligibility
FEIR	Final Environmental Impact Report
FTE	full-time enrollment
GHG	greenhouse gas
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning
LADOT	Los Angeles Department of Transportation
LADWP	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
LASD	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
LAUSD	Los Angeles Unified School District
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LOS	level of service
LST	Localized Significance Threshold
LUST	leaking underground storage tank
M&O	Maintenance and Operations
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram
MMT	million metric tons
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NO _x	nitrogen oxides
NRHP	Natural Register of Historic Places
O ₃	ozone
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OS	Open Space
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PF	Public Facilities
PM ₁₀	particulate matter
PM _{2.5}	fine particulate matter
PVC	polyvinyl chloride
RCP	Regional Comprehensive Plan
ROCs	reactive organic compounds
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SO _x	oxides of sulfur
SF	square feet
SUSMP	Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan
TPH	total petroleum hydrocarbons
UBC	Uniform Building Code
USTs	underground storage tanks
USTs	underground storage tank
V/C	volume to capacity
ZIMAS	Zoning Information and Map Access System

2014 ADDENDUM TO THE 2002 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

1. **Project Title**
Los Angeles 2014 Pierce College Facility Master Plan Update
2. **California Environmental Quality Act Lead Agency Name and Address**
Los Angeles Community College District
770 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90017
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number**
Dr. Kathleen F. Burke, President, Los Angeles Pierce College
Phone: (818) 719-6408

4. **Purpose of Addendum**

This "Addendum" to the *2002 Los Angeles Pierce College Facility Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report* (2002 FEIR) discusses potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the *Los Angeles Pierce College 2014 Master Plan Update* (2014 Master Plan Update). The 2002 FEIR evaluated the impacts of implementation of the *2002 Los Angeles Pierce College Facility Master Plan* (2002 Master Plan). The 2002 Master Plan was previously updated in 2010 (*Los Angeles Pierce College 2010 Master Plan Update* [2010 Master Plan Update]) and proposed six modified construction projects and four renovation projects. The 2010 Master Plan Update built upon the 2002 Master Plan and established a framework for Los Angeles Pierce College's (Pierce College or College) future, aligning its physical environment with its mission and academic plan. The "2010 Addendum" to the 2002 FEIR, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), was prepared for the 2010 Master Plan Update modifications.

The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, as described in this Addendum, would not result in any of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines that would require preparation of a subsequent environmental impact report (EIR). The 2014 Master Plan Update consists of five key project actions, including construction of one new building and renovation and adaptive reuse of existing campus buildings, with a projected reduction in floor area relative to the 2002 Master Plan and a 20–30% reduction in floor area relative to the 2010 Master Plan Update. In addition, due to changes in available funding and lowered student enrollment projections, the 2014 Master Plan Update proposes to eliminate several of the construction projects that were included in the 2010 Master Plan Update (i.e., the Green Technologies building, a new Horticulture building, and four greenhouses). Other 2014 Master Plan Update components include vacating the current Facilities Maintenance Yard; demolition of the Facilities Maintenance Yard buildings, including the Exposition Hall Quonset hut to accommodate the relocated Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Addition; and relocating the Central Plant Extensions to the existing Central Plant complex. Student capacity would not increase and proposed development area would be reduced by approximately 127,000 square feet (SF).

These modifications would not result in any new significant impacts, and no previously examined significant effects would be substantially more severe than evaluated in the 2002 FEIR. Thus, an addendum to the certified 2002 FEIR is the appropriate CEQA environmental documentation for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

5. **Project Location**

The project is located in the western San Fernando Valley, in the City and County of Los Angeles. Regional access to Pierce College is provided by the Ventura Freeway (U.S. 101) and the San Diego Freeway (Interstate 405). The Ventura Freeway is approximately 0.5 mile south of the campus, and the San Diego Freeway is approximately 6 miles east of the campus. Figure 1 provides a map of the Los Angeles region in which Pierce College is located.

Figure 1: Regional Location Map



The Pierce College campus address is 6201 Winnetka Avenue, and it is bounded by Victory Boulevard to the north, Oxnard Street to the south, Winnetka Avenue to the east, and De Soto Avenue to the west; it lies east of the Warner Center Business District. The college is within the community of Woodland Hills and land uses are governed by the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan, representing one of 35 community plan areas in the City of Los Angeles. Figure 2 shows the project site and the surrounding area.

Although the College is located in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, the 426-acre campus setting includes 2,200 trees, numerous rose bushes, a nature preserve, a botanical garden, and a forest area that boasts giant redwoods. Most of the College's educational buildings are located in the core area of the campus. Other important campus areas include the athletic/recreational and horticultural areas. Approximately 226 acres are devoted to an agricultural laboratory/farm that features an equestrian center and small herds of cattle, sheep, and goats.

The Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan Area covers 17,887 acres, approximately 6% of the land in the City of Los Angeles. According to the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan (adopted), approximately 59% of the total land uses in this community plan area are residential uses. Open space uses make up approximately 12% of the total uses; commercial uses, 5%; and industrial uses, 4%. Approximately 12% of the land uses are open space-related uses, while 19% are street uses (City of Los Angeles 2009).

6. Project Sponsor's Name and Address

Los Angeles Pierce College
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91371

7. Assessor's Parcel Number: 2149007902

8. General Plan Designation: Open Space and Public Facilities

9. Zoning: Open Space (OS-1XL), Public Facilities (PF-1XL)

10. Background

Pierce College, founded in 1947, is one of nine 2-year community colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) and is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Pierce College offers courses in 100 disciplines and has a student population of approximately 21,000 each semester (Los Angeles Pierce College 2014). The campus educational and administrative facilities, agricultural land and facilities, surface parking lots, athletic fields and sports facilities, and open space areas occupy approximately 426 acres. Within this area, approximately 226 acres provide space for a farm, which is used as part of the College's agricultural program.

The LACCD-approved 2002 Master Plan established a physical framework for the College and supported the school's mission to expand its facilities to meet the future demand that was projected at that time. Project objectives of the 2002 Master Plan included creating a more active and productive College, improving the image of the school, enhancing land resources, creating public/private partnerships, developing new educational programs, and providing new facilities to meet the anticipated increases in enrollment by 2010. The 2002 Master Plan proposed 33 projects (Figure 3) grouped into the following four types:

- New construction.
- Reconstruction and renovation.
- Demolition.
- Public/private partnership projects.

Figure 2: Project Vicinity Map



Figure 3: Locations of 2002 Master Plan Projects



[this page intentionally left blank]

Table 1 shows the status of projects proposed under the 2002 Master Plan.

Table 1. Status of Projects Proposed under the 2002 Los Angeles Pierce College Facility Master Plan

No.	Project Name	Construction Schedule as of 2002	Current Status May 2014
New Construction Projects			
1	Agriculture/Science/Nursing Building (renamed Center for the Sciences)	March 2004–Aug. 2005	Completed
2	Technology Center (renamed the Green Technologies Building under the 2010 Master Plan Update)	May 2004–May 2005	Cancelled in this update
3	Child Development Center	Feb. 2004–Jan. 2005	Completed
4	Central Maintenance and Operations Facility (renamed the Maintenance and Operations Facility under the 2010 Master Plan Update)	Nov. 2005–Nov. 2007	Completed
5	New Gardner’s Maintenance and Operations Facility (renamed the Maintenance and Operations Facility under the 2010 Master Plan Update)	May 2004–Dec. 2004	Maintenance and Operations Facility Completed
6	New Refrigeration Plant Maintenance and Operations Facility (renamed the Maintenance and Operations Facility under the 2010 Master Plan Update)	March 2005–Feb. 2006	Maintenance and Operations Facility Completed
7	Automotive Maintenance and Operations Facility, Student Food Services Facility (renamed the Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Facilities under the 2010 Master Plan Update)	Sept. 2006–Sept. 2007	Construction from Oct 2016 through Aug 2016
8	Horticulture Classroom Building and Greenhouse (renamed the Horticulture/ Animal Science Lab under the 2010 Master Plan Update)	Dec. 2003–Dec. 2004	Demolition from Jan. 2015–March 2015; Construction from July 2016 through Sept 2017
NA	Water Reclamation Facility	Aug. 2004–Dec. 2005	Cancelled
9	Campus Police Station	On hold	Completed
10	Equestrian Education Center	Feb. 2004–Aug. 2004	Completed
11	Admissions/Counseling/Student Services Building	Sept. 2004–Feb. 2006	Completed
Reconstruction, Renovation, and Modernization Projects (Proposition A Bond Projects)			
12	Life Science/Chemistry/Physics Building	Sept. 2005–March 2006	Construction from Oct. 2014 through Oct 2015
13	Administration Building (lobby renovation, exterior renovation, interior renovation)	Aug. 2002–Aug. 2006	Initial Lobby renovation completed; exterior renovation, interior renovation; remaining construction from Oct 2014–Oct 2015.
14	Campus Center	Sept. 2008–Sept. 2009	Construction from Oct 2014 through October 2015
15	Computer Science/Computer Learning Center	May 2005–Jan. 2006	Construction from Feb 2016 through Feb 2017.
16	Library	Apr. 2004–Oct. 2006	New building completed; Demolish former library from Mar 2017 through May 2017.
17	Behavioral Science, Social Science, Math, Business Education, English	Feb. 2004–Oct. 2004	Remaining North of Mall construction of site work and interior finishes from Feb 2016 through Feb 2017.
18	Facility Offices	Jan. 2004–Sept. 2004	Completed
19	Fine Arts and Music	March 2005–Nov. 2005	Completed

Table 1. Continued

No.	Project Name	Construction Schedule as of 2002	Current Status May 2014
20	Theatre Building (proposed performing arts and Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] improvements)	Sept. 2003–July 2006	In construction, to be completed in Aug 2014.
21	Animal Science Facilities		Completed
22	Life Science/Natural Resources Management	Aug. 2003–Jan. 2004	Cancelled
23	Physical Education Facilities	On hold	Partially completed. Interior renovations from Feb 2016 through Dec 2016.
24	Roadway, Walkway, Grounds, Parking Lot, and Entrance Improvements	Sept. 2003–Jan. 2010	Campus-wide improvements (fencing) completed. Horticulture intersection at Brahma Dr. completed. Traffic mitigation cancelled. FTA Bus Rapid Transit extension and entrances completed. Early Release Package and Brahma Dr. completed
NA	Restroom/ADA Renovations	Jan. 2003–Sept. 2009	Construction from Jan 2018 through July 2018.
Proposition A Bond Projects—Demolition Projects			
NA	Remaining Bungalows/Trailers	Jan. 2004–March 2004	Completed
NA	Child Development Center	Contingent on Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) agreement	Completed
NA	Business Office/Student Store	Prior to construction of new Technology Center	Completed
NA	Cafeteria/Associated Student Organization Trailer	Upon finding a partner for Student Dormitory Partnership	Cancelled
NA	Small Structures in Canyon de Lana	Aug. 2003–Jan. 2004	Cancelled
NA	Agricultural Sciences Building and Plant Facilities	Prior to construction for Phase II of Exhibition/Events Center and Sciences Partnership Building	Cancelled
NA	Storage Structure in Horticulture Area	Dec. 2003–Dec. 2004	Cancelled
Public/Private Partnerships Projects			
25	Agriculture Education Experiences and Programs	Begin in Jan. 2003	Construction from June 2017 through July 2018
26	Produce Stand	Begin in Jan. 2003	In Progress
27	Agricultural Fields	Begin in Jan. 2003	In Progress
28	Sciences Partnership Building	Feb. 2007–July 2008	Cancelled
29	Horticulture Partnership	May 2003–Dec. 2004	Cancelled
30	Viticulture Partnership	Jan. 2004–Oct. 2004	Cancelled
31	East Student Dormitory	Sept. 2008–Aug. 2009	Cancelled
32	Student Housing Partnership	Sept. 2006–Aug. 2007	Cancelled
33	Life-Long Learning Residences Partnership	Aug. 2008–Aug. 2009	Cancelled
Source: Swinerton Consulting 2009, 2010; ICF International 2014.			

The 2002 FEIR was prepared by ICF Jones & Stokes (then Myra L. Frank & Associates) to identify environmental impacts related to implementation of the 2002 Master Plan. The level of impact after mitigation was considered significant for the following issue areas: aesthetics, air quality, historic resources, and transportation (Myra L. Frank & Associates 2002). All other impacts were considered less than significant or less than significant with implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

In November 2008, Measure J was passed and authorized LACCD to issue general obligation bonds to fund specific projects certified by the Board of Trustees. Under Measure J, projects may include acquiring or leasing land and/or facilities, improving and repairing security and infrastructure, expanding education to meet the needs of the community, or acquiring furnishings and equipment for modernization, renovation, improvement, and new construction projects.

In 2010, LACCD revised the 2002 Master Plan in response to Measure J as well as to accommodate changes pertaining to student enrollment projections, which were declining, and related facility requirements. The 2010 Master Plan Update built upon the 2002 Master Plan and established a framework for the College's future, aligning its physical environment with its mission and academic plan. Six modified construction projects and four renovation projects were proposed under the 2010 Master Plan Update. LACCD completed a CEQA addendum to the 2002 FEIR to determine whether the then proposed 2010 Master Plan Update would result in a new significant effect on the environment that was not previously identified in the 2002 FEIR. The 2010 addendum found that there would be no additional significant environmental effects, and a subsequent EIR was not required.

The LACCD is currently proposing the 2014 Master Plan Update, which would further modify the 2002 Master Plan and reflects the cancellation, modification, or other changes to individual projects that were proposed in 2002, but are not yet completed. These changes in proposed facilities at the campus are related to a reduction in Measure J Bond funds allocated to Pierce College.

Five key project actions are proposed in the 2014 Master Plan Update, including construction of one new building and renovation and adaptive reuse of existing campus buildings, with a projected 20–30% reduction in floor area relative to the 2010 Master Plan. These Master Plan–related projects are in response to changes in enrollment as well as curricular changes that occurred subsequent to adoption of the 2002 Master Plan. In addition, the 2014 Master Plan Update would eliminate several construction projects in the 2010 Master Plan Update (i.e., the Green Technologies building, and a new Horticulture building and its four proposed greenhouses). Other 2014 Master Plan Update components include vacating the current Facilities Maintenance Yard; demolition of the Facilities Maintenance Yard buildings, including the Exposition Hall Quonset hut to accommodate the relocation of the addition to the Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Facilities, and the relocation of the Central Plant Extension to the existing Central Plant complex (Figure 4).

This Addendum has been prepared in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063, to determine whether the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would result in a new significant effect on the environment that was not previously identified in the 2002 FEIR or exacerbate a significant effect disclosed in the 2002 FEIR. LACCD is the lead agency for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

11. Project Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update is to allow the College the flexibility to account for changing conditions, including student enrollment projections. The 2014 Master Plan Update emphasizes the following objectives:

- Maintain alignment with the Pierce College Strategic Master Plan and Educational Master Plan.
- Optimize building utilization rates and maximize student engagement.
- Balance planning with funding availability by reducing the scales of the Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Facilities and Horticulture building

projects, integrating more shared, general use classrooms, and incorporating Green Technologies into existing classroom capacity.

12. Project Description

Pierce College, like other agencies funded by the State of California, has experienced major budget cuts. The result has been a reversal of the enrollment growth trends that occurred over the past 5 years. The California community colleges have been encouraged to reduce their course offerings substantially, and LACCD has responded by directing all nine colleges to meet significantly reduced enrollment targets.

It was noted in the 2002 Master Plan that Pierce College had a full-time-equivalent (FTE) student enrollment of 13,591. Under the 2002 Master Plan, 2010 was used as the buildout year. In the 2002 Master Plan, the estimated FTE enrollment for 2010 was 15,960. The 2013–2014 FTE student enrollment is 13,772. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update’s buildout year is 2019. The estimated FTE student enrollment for 2018–2019 is 13,450.

Table 2 shows the FTE levels for 2002, the 2010 Master Plan Update, existing conditions (2014), and project buildout (2019).

Table 2. Existing and Projected Student Enrollment at Pierce College

Year	Student Enrollment (FTE)	Student Headcount
2002 Master Plan EIR		
2002 (baseline)	13,591	
2010 (buildout year)	15,960	22,880
<i>2010 Master Plan Update</i>		
2008–2009	16,079	22,164
2010 (projected)	14,500	21,610
2015 (buildout year)	15,500	22,931
2014 Master Plan Update		
2013–2014 (existing)	13,772	20,850
2019 (buildout year)	13,450	21,300
Source: Los Angeles Pierce College 2014. FTE = full-time equivalent.		

Figure 4: Locations of Los Angeles Pierce College 2014 Facility Master Plan Update Projects



[this page intentionally left blank]

The 2014 Master Plan Update would not accommodate any increase in student capacity. Total proposed development would be reduced by approximately 127,000 SF as compared to the 2010 Master Plan Update. Specifically the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include the following:

- Horticulture—Demolish existing greenhouse and utility buildings prior to the renovation of the Horticulture building. One new greenhouse would be constructed.
- Central Plant Extensions—Change in location only, square footage remains the same. Proposed change would allow expansion of service to Measure J facilities.
- Expanded Automotive and Technical Education Facilities—Demolish utility buildings, minor renovation to existing Automotive Technical Complex (33,000 SF), construction of a new addition to the Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Facilities (20,000 SF), reroute roadway.
- Digital Arts and Media Building—Demolish existing library, proposed new (building reduction from 70,000 SF to ~28,000 SF), new ADA access linking Campus North/South.
- Exposition Hall Quonset hut—Demolish.

Table 3 provides a comparison of 2010 and 2014 Master Plan Updates. See Figure 4 for location of 2014 Master Plan Update projects.

Table 3. Proposed Revisions since the 2010 Master Plan Update

Project Component	2010 Master Plan Update Projects	2014 Master Plan Update Projects	Notes
Digital Arts and Media Building	New 70,000-square-foot building at central campus.	Construct new 26,000-square-foot building at central campus, demolish existing library, create new ADA access to link with larger campus ADA network north/south, improve Parking Lots 4 and 6 East.	Preliminary projection of 60% reduction from original square footage.* A portion of ADA path-of-travel may be completed separately from building this project.
Horticulture	New 15,451-square-foot building with four greenhouses at existing horticulture area.	Renovate existing horticulture building, demolish existing greenhouse and utility buildings, and construct one new greenhouse, up to 5,000 SF.	Preliminary projection of 20-30% reduction from original square footage.*
Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Facilities	Renovation and addition to existing Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Facilities.	Same renovation and addition. Demolish utility buildings. Construct new Automotive Technical building addition on west side of Mason Avenue, vacate Mason Avenue, and relocate traffic.	Demolition of Exposition Quonset hut and relocation of addition.
Green Technologies Building	New 70,000-square-foot building proposed west of Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Facilities.	No building.	Reduction in LACCD funding makes project infeasible. Of programmed functions, existing 3800 Building architecture/ engineering programs would use existing campus surplus lab/lecture space.*
Central Plant Expansion	Satellite facility.	Consolidate into an addition to the existing plant while expanding plant capacity to service new Measure J facilities.	Only location changes; square footage would remain the same.
Off-site Traffic Mitigation	Included.	Delete mitigation measure because significant impact would not occur as a result of changed circumstances (i.e., reduced enrollment/related traffic).	No significant impact would occur based on new traffic data. Mitigation measure is no longer needed.

Source: Gonzalez Goodale Architects 2014.

* Reduction follows LACCD defunding actions. Final percentage reduction to follow capacity-to-load ratio for subject disciplines during the last 2 academic years, done in accordance with Education Planning Committee academic program policy.

ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act.

13. Construction Phasing

With the required approvals and permits in place, construction activities would be expected to begin in 2014 and end in 2019.

14. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

As stated above, the College is in a developed area of the City of Los Angeles. The area immediately surrounding the College is mostly residential uses to the north, south, southeast, and southwest. The Warner Center Business District is immediately west of the College. The Metro Orange Line includes a station at the College along Winnetka Avenue and a second station at De Soto Avenue and Victory Boulevard.

15. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval May Be Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)

- State of California
 - Division of the State Architect
 - Department of Food and Agriculture
 - Department of General Services
 - Department of Toxic Substances Control
 - State Fire Marshal
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit)
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (stationary-source permits)
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- County of Los Angeles
 - Department of Health Services
 - Department of Public Works
- City of Los Angeles
 - Department of Water and Power
 - Fire Department
 - Public Works Department (grading permit)
 - Bureau of Engineering
 - Bureau of Sanitation

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below (☒) could be affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “potentially significant impact,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing		

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

No Impact (designated scenic vistas). A review of the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan indicates that no officially designated scenic vistas or views have been identified in the immediate vicinity of Pierce College. The nearest designated scenic vistas are along the Mulholland Scenic Parkway and the Ventura/Cahuenga Boulevard corridor; however, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not affect views from these referenced scenic vantage point locations because of the moderate nature of the design changes that would occur, the separating distance, the elevated configuration of the Ventura Freeway, and intervening development and topography. Therefore, no impact on any officially designated scenic vistas would occur as a result of the 2014 Master Plan Update (proposed project).

Less-than-Significant Impact (unofficial on-campus scenic vistas). Detailed visual analysis of the Pierce College campus and its visual setting was provided in the 2002 FEIR. That analysis identified several unofficial scenic views at the Pierce College campus that are considered scenic resources of the neighboring communities but concluded that impacts on such views, occurring as a result of 2002 Master Plan project components, would be less than significant. Scenic resources include the undeveloped rolling hills in the southern portion of the campus and the agricultural fields in the northwest corner of the campus adjacent to De Soto Avenue and Victory Boulevard. The southwest portion of the campus offers panoramic views of other areas of the campus, the San Fernando Valley, and the Santa Susana Mountains to the north. In contrast to the 2002 Master Plan (e.g., previously proposed Viticulture Partnership), the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not locate any facilities on the undeveloped open space in the southern portion of the campus. Construction of the Maintenance and Operations (M&O) Facility was completed under the 2010 Master Plan Update. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include renovation of the Horticulture Building and construction of one 5,000-SF greenhouse; demolition of the existing Library and construction of a new Media Art Center; and the renovation and expansion of the Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Facilities—which would include the construction of a new building addition on the west side of Mason Avenue. This area is characterized by nearly flat-to-rolling terrain that transitions to a steep grade along the southern border of the campus. The existing dense vegetation, consisting of trees and tall shrubbery, serves to largely (but not

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

completely) block views across this portion of the campus, as well as views south and southeast to off-campus locations, and views north toward the campus.

The 2014 Master Plan Update projects would not significantly modify the agricultural fields in the northwest corner of the campus. The extensive agricultural fields to the north and south of El Rancho Drive would, therefore, remain intact, and the open space character of the setting would not be significantly changed because of the relatively small scale and massing of the proposed features in contrast to the expansive character of most informal views across the campus. Therefore, these views of campus open space would continue to be available to the general public, students, and faculty who use the adjacent pedestrian trails. In addition, informal views of key off-campus visual resources, such as the Chalk Hills to the south or to the more distant Santa Susana Mountains and Simi Hills (approximately 5–6 miles to the north and northwest, respectively), would not be adversely affected by the projects proposed as part of the 2014 Master Plan Update (Appendix A, Photos 1–6). Therefore, the visual impact would remain less than significant.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. As described above in response 1(a), the nearest scenic highways are Mulholland Scenic Parkway and the Ventura/Cahuenga Boulevard corridor, which are located approximately 2.5 miles and 0.6 mile, respectively, south of the College. Given the distance from Pierce College, topographic differences, mature vegetation, and intervening development, including the elevated configuration of the Ventura Freeway through Woodland Hills, the possibility of unencumbered sightlines of development under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update occurring from scenic highways would be precluded. No impacts would occur.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include the retention and renovation of existing classroom buildings, including the onsite replacement and/or expansion of a small number of classroom buildings. It would not introduce new buildings, student activity spaces, or parking facilities in the undeveloped open space in the southern portion of the campus. As described in response 1(a), above, the southern portion of the College is considered a scenic resource for the neighboring communities. In addition, the 2014 Master Plan Update would not significantly modify the agricultural fields in the northwest corner of the campus. The approximately 480-acre expanse of agricultural land to the north along Victory Boulevard would remain intact, as would the agricultural fields/open space to the south across El Rancho Drive. New construction is proposed primarily within the central campus, an area where there is no uniformity in scale or architectural design among the extant buildings. As with existing development, any proposed development in the central campus would be oriented along the campus' existing northwest-to-southeast spine and sited to improve circulation and integrate exterior and interior campus spaces. Such development would take full advantage of the varied surrounding landscape and topographic features. Although development would not be uniform in terms of height or massing, all new development would be integrated and compatible with existing campus development in terms of scale, architectural style, color, materials, and landscape design. Additionally, as previously stated, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include less development than under the 2002 Master Plan and the 2010 Master Plan Update. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. This would remain a less-than-significant impact.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2002 FEIR identified less-than-significant impacts related to light and glare resulting from construction and operation of projects identified in the 2002 Master Plan. In addition to the renovation of existing buildings, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include the construction of new buildings, parking

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

lots, as well as the installation of new landscape elements, in a manner that would be compatible with the existing campus environment. New sources of nighttime lighting would be added and, in limited instances, would be visible from outside the campus; however, the proposed project's lighting design features (i.e., Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design [LEED]-based efficient designs and cut-off shielded fixtures angled to be at least 45 degrees below horizontal) and the sizeable intervening distances that separate sensitive viewers from light sources would preclude significant impacts and/or render such lighting only negligibly noticeable. New signage and lighting along walkways and in parking areas would incorporate LEED-certified, energy-efficient units with filtering devices. In addition, fixtures would be positioned and directed toward the ground to avoid spillover and sky-glow lighting effects. Most of the new lighting would be for the central part of the College and located far away from nearby residential uses. As such, the potential for spillover and glare impacts on adjacent residential properties would be low. New buildings and structures would be designed with appropriate colors and textures, as well as non-reflective materials. These would be integrated into the adjoining landscape so as not to produce significant glare, spillover light, or sky-glow effects. This would remain a less-than-significant impact.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that approximately 12–13 acres of land designated as Prime or Unique Farmland would be converted for the development of projects such as the Equestrian Education Center, the Child Development Center, and the new M&O Facility. This development would affect less than 5% of the designated Prime and Unique Farmland on campus. It was concluded that, given the relatively small amount of farmland that would be developed and the fact that the proposed facilities would fulfill the master plan goal of enhancing land resources and would be consistent with the College's agricultural educational mission, the overall impact would not be significant.

A number of the projects identified in the 2002 FEIR were carried forward under the 2010 Master Plan Update. However, the water reclamation facility, which, previously, could have been placed on Prime or Unique Farmland, was not carried forward under the 2010 Master Plan Update, thereby reducing the previously estimated impacts. No new projects included under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would be placed on Prime or Unique Farmland. Impacts would remain less than significant.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. There is no Land Conservation Act (i.e., Williamson Act) contract for the site. The College is zoned as Open Space and Public Facilities. Therefore, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not conflict with any Williamson Act contract or agricultural zoning. No impact would occur.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would enhance the land resources of Pierce College. Many of the projects are geared toward the agricultural character of the school and would benefit the agricultural uses on campus. As was the case with the 2002 Master Plan, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would also fulfill the College's goal of enhancing land resources and would be consistent with the College's agricultural educational mission. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

3. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is required, pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment (i.e., ozone [O₃], particulate matter [PM₁₀], and fine particulate matter [PM_{2.5}]). As such, the project would be subject to SCAQMD’s Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP contains a comprehensive list of pollution control strategies to reduce emissions and achieve ambient air quality standards. These strategies are developed, in part, according to regional population, housing, and employment projections prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

SCAG is the regional planning agency for Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Imperial Counties. It addresses regional issues related to transportation, the economy, community development, and the environment. With respect to air quality planning, SCAG has prepared the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), including the Land Use and Housing, and Transportation chapters, which form the basis for the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. These documents are used in the preparation of the air quality forecasts and consistency analyses included in the AQMP. Both the RCP and AQMP are based, in part, on projections that originated from county and city general plans.

The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would involve the renovation and expansion of an existing development. The proposed project is consistent with both the general plan designation and local zoning.

Because the project is consistent with the local general plan, pursuant to SCAQMD guidelines, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update is considered consistent with the region’s AQMP. As such, proposed 2014 Master Plan Update-related emissions are accounted for in the AQMP, which is crafted to bring the Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Potentially Significant (Potentially Significant in the 2002 FEIR). As discussed in response 3(a), the project site is located within the Basin. State and federal air quality standards are often exceeded in many parts of the Basin. A discussion of the project’s potential short-term construction-period and long-term operational-period air quality impacts is provided below.

Regional Construction Impacts

Construction of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update has the potential to generate air quality impacts due to the use of heavy-duty construction equipment on the project site, construction workers traveling to and from the project site, and deliveries of building materials to the project site. Combustion emissions, primarily nitrogen oxides (NO_x), would emanate from the use of on-site construction equipment, such as graders, wheeled loaders, and cranes. During the finishing phase of construction, the application of architectural coatings (i.e., paints) and other materials could release emissions from reactive organic compounds (ROCs).

The quantity (i.e., development square footage), duration, and intensity of construction activity would have a substantial effect on the amount of construction emissions, as well as related pollutant concentrations, occurring at any one time. As described in the Project Description, total development proposed under this 2014 Master Plan Update would be reduced by approximately 127,000 SF, when compared to the level of development approved under the 2010 Master Plan Update. While the quantity and duration of construction activity would be less, “typical day” intensity of construction activity (and related air pollutant emissions) would be similar to those emissions presented in Table 4, which presents construction air quality impacts estimated for the 2010 Master Plan Update. As shown therein,

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact

short-term emissions during construction would be expected to exceed SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for NO_x. As such, impacts would be significant without incorporation of mitigation measures, but the 2014 Master Plan Update would not exacerbate the significant impact that was disclosed in the 2002 FEIR and the 2010 Addendum.

Table 4. Forecast of Regional Construction Emissions (2010 Master Plan Update Estimates)

Construction Phase	Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
	ROC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM10	PM2.5
Single Project						
Demolition ^a	3	28	14	<1	22	6
Site Grading	3	25	14	<1	11	3
Structure Erection/Finishing	12	9	8	<1	1	1
Six Concurrent Projects						
Demolition ^a	3	28	14	<1	22	6
Site Grading	18	150	81	<1	66	19
Structure Erection/Finishing	70	55	47	<1	4	3
Maximum Regional Project Emissions	70	150	81	<1	66	19
SCAQMD Regional Emissions Threshold (lbs/day)	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceed Threshold?	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
2014 Master Plan Impact greater than 2010 Master Plan Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

^a Demolition occurs only for one project and is therefore not factored in the “concurrent” emissions estimates.
CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = oxides of sulfur.
URBEMIS 2007 outputs are provided in the air quality appendix.
Source: ICF Jones & Stokes 2009, 2014.

Mitigation Measures

The following measure, as required in the 2002 FEIR, shall be implemented to reduce emissions from equipment. As described in the 2002 FEIR, this measure would reduce emissions by approximately 10%. (However, as described in the 2002 FEIR, construction-period air quality impacts were considered significant and unavoidable because of the larger building program than that in the 2010 Master Plan Update or in the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.)

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

AQ-1 Turn off equipment when not in use for longer than 5 minutes.

In addition to the mitigation above, which was included in the 2002 FEIR, the following measure shall be employed to further reduce emissions of NO_x, ROC, PM10, and PM2.5 in all off-road equipment:

AQ-2 Use EPA Tier 3 emissions-compliant on-site construction equipment or cleaner (i.e., Tier 4 compliant).

Residual Impacts

Implementation of mitigation measure AQ-1 would result in a reduction of all criteria pollutant emissions by approximately 10%. Implementation of mitigation measure AQ-2 would, on average, reduce NO_x emissions from

Issues				
	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact

construction equipment operating on site by at least 55%, ROC emissions by at least 77%, and combustion-source particulate emissions (PM10 and PM2.5) by at least 55%.

As shown in Table 5, with implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1 and AQ-2, regional NO_x emissions would be reduced to a level below the respective SCAQMD threshold. In addition, mass regional ROC, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions would be reduced to levels below their previous less-than-significant levels.

Table 5. Forecast of Mitigated Regional Construction Emissions

Construction Phase	Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
	ROC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM10	PM2.5
Single Project						
Demolition ^a	2	25	14	<1	21	5
Site Grading	1	11	14	<1	10	3
Structure Erection/Finishing	11	4	8	<1	<1	<1
Six Concurrent Projects						
Demolition ^a	2	25	14	<1	21	5
Site Grading	4	68	81	<1	62	15
Structure Erection/Finishing	65	27	47	<1	2	2
Maximum Regional Project Emissions	65	68	81	<1	62	15
SCAQMD Regional Emissions Threshold (lbs/day)	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

^a Demolition occurs only for one project and is therefore not factored in the “concurrent” emissions estimates.

URBEMIS 2007 outputs are provided in the air quality appendix.

Source: ICF Jones & Stokes 2009.

Localized Construction Impacts

When quantifying mass emissions for localized analysis, only emissions that occur onsite are considered. Consistent with SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (LST) methodology guidelines, emissions related to off-site delivery/haul truck activity and employee trips are not considered in the evaluation of localized impacts (South Coast Air Quality Management District 2003). As shown in Table 6, localized emissions for all criteria pollutants would remain below their respective SCAQMD LST. As such, localized impacts that may result from construction-period air pollutant emissions would remain less than significant. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.

Issues				
	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact

Table 6. Forecast of Localized Construction Emissions

Construction Phase	Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
	ROC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM10	PM2.5
Pierce College						
Demolition	<1	3	5	<1	20	4
Site Grading	1	11	13	<1	10	3
Structure Erection/Finishing	11	4	5	<1	<1	<1
Worst Case On-site Total^a	11	11	13	<1	20	4
SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (lbs/day) ^b	—	212	1,510	—	35	8
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

^a Maximum concurrent localized project emissions for ROC, NO_x, and CO occur during the 1-month period when construction, architectural coating, and paving overlap. Maximum PM10 emissions occur during the 1-month demolition phase. All other maximums occur during grading/excavation.

^b These localized thresholds were taken from tables provided in the SCAQMD LST methodology guidance document, which are based on the following: 1) The project site is located in SCAQMD Source Receptor Area No. 6, 2) sensitive receptors are located within 50 meters of construction activity, and 3) the maximum site area to be disturbed is 5 acres.

URBEMIS 2007 outputs are provided in the air quality appendix.
Source: ICF Jones & Stokes 2009.

Regional Operational Impacts

SCAQMD has also established significance thresholds to evaluate potential impacts associated with long-term project operations. Regional air pollutant emissions associated with project operations would be generated from the consumption of electricity and natural gas for building lighting, temperature control, water conveyance/heating, etc.; and the operation of on-road vehicles related to student and employee trips, and commercial trips. Pollutant emissions associated with energy demand (i.e., electricity generation and natural gas consumption) are classified by SCAQMD as regional stationary-source emissions. Electricity is considered an area source because it is produced at various locations inside and outside of the Basin. Because it is not possible to isolate where electricity is produced, these emissions are conservatively considered to occur within the Basin and be regional in nature. Criteria pollutant emissions associated with the production and consumption of energy were calculated using emission factors from SCAQMD’s *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (appendix to Chapter 9) (South Coast Air Quality Management District 1993).

As described in the Project Description, total development proposed under the 2014 Master Plan Update would be reduced by approximately 127,000 SF, when compared to the level of development under the 2010 Master Plan Update; and the FTE enrollment estimate for the 2014 Master Plan buildout has been reduced by 2,510 students, from 15,960 to 13,450. Because operations-period emissions are a function of building square footage (energy demand-related emissions related to lighting and temperature control) and number of students (mobile-source emissions related to student trips), total emissions under the 2014 Master Plan Update would be less than the emissions estimates presented in Table 7 and Table 8, which disclose operations-period emissions for the 2010 Master Plan Update.

The qualitative analysis prepared for the 2014 Master Plan Update concluded that emissions would be similar to or less than 2010 Master Plan emissions. The 2010 Master Plan analysis (in the 2010 document) demonstrated that emissions would be lower than 2002 EIR emissions. As shown in Table 7, while regional emissions under the 2014 Master Plan Update would likely exceed most regional SCAQMD thresholds, emissions are expected to remain below emission levels previously calculated for the 2002 Master Plan and the 2010 Master Plan Update. Therefore, regional operational emissions would not result in more severe significant long-term regional air quality impacts.

Issues		Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact

Table 7. Forecast of Regional Operational Emissions

	Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
	ROC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM10	PM2.5
Pierce College						
2010 Master Plan Update	117	99	1,379	1	83	76
2002 Master Plan	170	108	1,506	1	90	83
SCAQMD Regional Emissions Threshold (lbs/day)	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceed Threshold?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
More Severe Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No
<p>^a Mobile emissions calculated using the URBEMIS 2007 emissions model. Model output sheets are provided in the air quality appendix.</p> <p>^b Emissions due to project-related electricity generation based on guidance provided in SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. Worksheets are provided in the air quality appendix.</p> <p>URBEMIS 2007 outputs are provided in the air quality appendix.</p> <p>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes 2009.</p>						

Local Operational Impacts

Within an urban setting, vehicle exhaust is the primary source of CO. Consequently, the highest CO concentrations are generally found close to congested intersections. Under typical meteorological conditions, CO concentrations tend to decrease as the distance from the emissions source (i.e., congested intersection) increases. For purposes of providing a conservative worst-case impact analysis, CO concentrations are typically analyzed at congested intersections, because if impacts are less than significant close to the congested intersections, impacts will also be less than significant at more distant locations.

Project traffic during the operational phase would have the potential to create local CO impacts. SCAQMD recommends a hot-spot evaluation of potential local CO impacts when volume-to-capacity ratios are increased by 2% at intersections with a level of service (LOS) of C or worse. Given these criteria and information provided in the traffic impact study prepared by project traffic consultant (Fehr and Peers 2014), no intersections meet these criteria. As such, there would be no potential for project-related traffic volumes to result in a material increase in localized CO concentrations.

Because significant impacts would not occur at those intersections with the highest traffic volumes, which are located adjacent to sensitive receptors, no significant impacts are anticipated to occur at any other location in the study area. This is because the conditions that yield CO hot spots would not be any worse than those that would occur at the analyzed intersections. Consequently, sensitive receptors included in this analysis would not be significantly affected by the CO emissions from the net increase in traffic that would occur under the project. Because the project would not cause an exceedance or exacerbate an existing exceedance of an ambient air quality standard, the project's localized operational air quality impacts would remain less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

With respect to the proposed project's localized (on-site) mass emissions, Table 8 shows that on-site operational-period emissions would be below SCAQMD's LSTs. Impacts from emissions of these criteria pollutants would remain less than significant.

Issues				
	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact

Table 8. Forecast of Localized Operational Emissions

	Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
	ROC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM10	PM2.5
On-site Area-Source Emissions	2	3	4	<1	<1	<1
SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (lbs/day) ^a	—	212	1,510	—	9	2
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

aThese localized thresholds were taken from tables provided in the SCAQMD LST methodology guidance document, which is based on the following: 1) The project site is located in SCAQMD Source Receptor Area No. 6, 2) sensitive receptors are located within 50 meters of the project, and 3) the maximum site to be disturbed is 5 acres.
 URBEMIS 2007 outputs are provided in the air quality appendix.
 Source: ICF Jones & Stokes 2009.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. SCAQMD’s approach for assessing cumulative impacts is based on the AQMP forecasts of attainment of ambient air quality standards, in accordance with the requirements of the federal and state Clean Air Acts. As discussed earlier in response 3(a), the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would be consistent with the AQMP, which is intended to bring the Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants. In addition, the mass regional emissions calculated for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update in response 3(b) show no new impacts. As such, the proposed project would not result in a new cumulative impact. No additional mitigation measures are required.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described in response 3(b), above, after mitigation, construction and operation of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not result in any substantial localized air pollution impacts and therefore would not expose any nearby sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. According to the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting sites, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding facilities (South Coast Air Quality Management District 1993). The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Therefore, it would not be expected to produce objectionable odors.

Potential odor sources during construction include asphalt paving material and architectural coatings and solvents. SCAQMD Rules 1108 and 1113 limit the amount of volatile organic compounds from cutback asphalt and architectural coatings and solvents, respectively. In compliance with SCAQMD rules, no construction activities or materials would be proposed that would create a significant level of objectionable odor. As such, potential impacts during short-term construction would be less than significant.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Biological surveys of Pierce College were conducted in 2002 during the preparation of the 2002 FEIR. In addition, an updated survey was conducted by an ICF Jones & Stokes biologist on August 3, 2009. While not observed during the 2009 survey, large numbers of Canada geese are known to feed and roost (rest) in the agricultural fields in the western portion of the campus during the winter months (generally November to March). Also, while not included on any list of sensitive species, Canada geese are considered to be a locally sensitive species because of the lack of feeding and resting habitat for this species in coastal southern California.

None of the projects included in the 2002 Master Plan that were proposed for the agricultural fields in the western portion of the campus were constructed (see Table 1 for status of 2002 projects). Similar to the 2010 Master Plan Update, the 2014 Master Plan Update does not propose any substantial projects in the agricultural fields; therefore, the potential to affect Canada geese is limited. However, should any construction activities occur in the agricultural fields, the mitigation measure in the 2002 FEIR, and included below, would be implemented. Implementation of mitigation measure BR-1 would mitigate significant impacts (through habitat modifications) to the same level of less than significant.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

BR-1 To avoid significant impacts on Canada geese, a locally sensitive species, Pierce College shall attempt to avoid construction activities in the agricultural portions of the campus during the winter months when geese are present. If construction activities in agricultural areas during winter cannot be avoided, then several months prior to the scheduled initiation of construction activities, Pierce College shall plant low-growing herbaceous crops (alfalfa, grains) or wild grass favored by Canada geese in portions of the agricultural fields that would not be affected by construction activities to provide alternative feeding habitat for the geese. Human disturbance in the enhanced area shall be prohibited until the geese migrate from the area or until construction activities in the agricultural fields are complete. In addition, because the project includes permanent removal of some feeding and roosting habitat for geese, a mitigation plan shall be developed to minimize permanent impacts on the Canada geese population at the campus. The plan shall be developed by campus biology instructors who are familiar with the areas on campus used by Canada geese in conjunction with experts who are familiar with successful management of the wintering geese populations at Sepulveda Basin, the Salton Sea, and/or Central Valley. The plan shall include the following measures:

- An evaluation of the extent of use by geese of agricultural areas that are to be removed from agricultural use as part of the master plan. The number of acres to be enhanced for geese shall be directly proportional on a 1:1 basis to the number of acres to be removed from agricultural production. Such acreage will have been used by geese during one or more of the past 5 years.
- An evaluation of the remaining agricultural areas on campus that would be appropriate to enhance for roosting (resting) and foraging for geese. The enhancement areas shall be appropriate for maintaining limited human disturbance, for planting crops known to be used in other areas of California for geese foraging (rye grass, corn, sorghum, millet), and for providing a sufficient take-off area for geese so they don't feel boxed in.
- A planting plan that specifies the timing of planting, pre-planting, and post-planting methods (e.g., harvesting crops to prepare them for geese foraging) to maximize use by geese; methods for limiting human disturbance; and methods for limiting encroachment by geese into areas outside

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

the enhancement site where they may suffer mortality because of campus traffic or other campus uses.

- Monitoring and reporting methods so that the success of the enhancement can be measured for a minimum of 5 years following the first planting. Monitoring shall be conducted a minimum of once monthly during each winter, and a monitoring report shall be prepared once annually. Population monitoring shall take into account the wide fluctuations in the geese population on campus that has occurred over the last several decades.

As with the 2002 Master Plan and the 2010 Master Plan Update, the facilities as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would result in the removal of trees and other vegetation that could support nesting birds and raptors protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and/or California Fish and Game Code. Direct impacts on active nests would be considered a significant impact on special-status species. Implementation of mitigation measure BR-2, identified in the FEIR prepared for the 2002 Master Plan (and provided below), would mitigate this impact to the same level of less than significant.

BR-2 To avoid violations of the MBTA or California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, Pierce College shall attempt to limit grubbing and the removal of trees and buildings during the bird breeding season (approximately March 1 to September 1 [as early as February 1 for raptors]). If the bird breeding season cannot be avoided, Pierce College shall retain a qualified ornithologist to initiate surveys of the construction zone 30 days prior to the initiation of construction and weekly thereafter, with the last survey not more than 3 days prior to the initiation of construction, to minimize the potential for nesting following the survey and prior to construction. If the ornithologist detects any occupied nest or nests of native birds within the construction zone, Pierce College will conspicuously flag off the area(s) supporting bird nests, providing a minimum buffer of 300 feet between the nests and limits of construction (500 feet for raptors). The construction crew will be instructed to avoid any activities in this zone until the bird nests are no longer occupied, per a subsequent survey by the ornithologist.

No new impacts or mitigation measures for biological resources are necessary or proposed under the 2014 Master Plan Update. The findings of the 2002 FEIR remain valid.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. ICF International conducted a field inspection on August 3, 2009, to identify any changes in the existing environmental setting compared with that of the 2002 FEIR. No changes to the environmental setting were observed. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update does not include any improvements or development within Canyon de Lana, which is the only area on the project site that was found during the 2009 survey to support riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. Components of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update may remove only agricultural uses, including trees and shrubs. Therefore, no impacts on riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities would occur as a result on the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2002 FEIR stated that the pond renovation work in the Canyon de Lana area may result in a significant impact if proposed renovation required the discharge of fill material into the streambed of Canyon de Lana. Pierce College will obtain an individual permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act if needed. A Streambed Alteration Agreement will be obtained by Pierce College if activities associated with pond renovation

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

result in a violation of Section 1600 of the Fish and Game Code or significant impacts on protected wetlands. The 2002 FEIR included mitigation measure BR-4 to avoid violations of wetland laws. The mitigation required Pierce College to retain a qualified wetland specialist to conduct wetland delineations as necessary.

Similar to the 2010 Master Plan Update, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update does not include any improvements or development within Canyon de Lana, which is the only area on the subject property that was found during the 2009 survey to support areas that have the potential to be regulated under the Clean Water Act. Therefore, the potential for indirect impacts (including from dust, noise, or runoff) would be low. Components of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not result in significant impacts on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. The eastern portion of the Pierce College campus is primarily developed with educational and recreational facilities and does not serve as a wildlife corridor. The western portion of the campus is currently sparsely developed and supports open agricultural fields, grasslands, and Canyon de Lana. This area would provide a local corridor for wildlife on the campus; however, the campus is surrounded by development and therefore does not provide a connected corridor for wildlife to undeveloped areas offsite. Furthermore, the limited amount of proposed development within the western portion of the campus would not interfere substantially with the movement of wildlife within or through the campus. Native wildlife nursery sites do not occur within or immediately adjacent to the subject property; therefore, their use would not be impeded as a result of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. This would remain a less-than-significant impact.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is located in the City of Los Angeles. The City's Protected Tree Ordinance (Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 46.00, Ordinance No. 153,478) regulates the relocation or removal of all native oak trees (excluding scrub oak), California black walnut trees, California sycamore trees, and California bay trees of at least 4 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH). These tree species are defined as "protected" by the City of Los Angeles. The ordinance prohibits, without a permit, the removal of any regulated protected tree, including "acts that inflict damage upon root systems or other parts of the tree..." and requires that all regulated protected trees that are removed be replaced on at least a 2:1 basis with trees that are of a protected variety.

Native trees, including oaks and sycamores, occur within the Canyon de Lana area and the Arboretum area. Similar to the 2010 Master Plan Update, construction of facilities under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update is not anticipated to result in impacts on trees protected by the City's Protected Tree Ordinance. Therefore, impacts related to local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources would remain less than significant.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural conservation community plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The project site is not located within the jurisdiction of any approved habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impact would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-significant impact. An intensive-level historical resources survey of Pierce College was conducted in 2002 during preparation of the 2002 FEIR. After a review of the survey and the 2010 Master Plan Update, it was determined that adverse changes related to the significance of historical resources would not be expected to occur as a result of the update. The 2010 Master Plan Update did not include any substantial level of remodeling or demolition of existing key campus buildings.

ICF International prepared a Cultural Resources Technical Report for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update (June 2014). The June 2014 Cultural Resources Technical Report analyzed actions proposed as part of the College's 2014 Master Plan Update, including the proposed demolition of the Facilities Maintenance Yard in which the Exposition Hall Quonset hut is located, and the expansion and renovation of the Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Facilities.

The results of the June 2014 Cultural Resources Technical Report pertaining to historical resources are included in Appendix C and summarized below.

The research and field survey conducted as part of the analysis to identify architectural-historical resources identified no additional properties that appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR); one previously identified California Historical Landmark property already listed in the CRHR, and; one property previously found potentially eligible for the CRHR.

During the early history of the College, the Exposition Hall Quonset hut was one of a number of metal Quonset huts located on the campus (McHargue). The Quonset hut was deemed a potential historical resource in 2002 solely because of its close association with the daily activities at the College during its first 2 or 3 years of operation as an agricultural school. Exposition Hall was re-evaluated on the basis of the research completed as part of the 2010 Master Plan Update environmental analysis and the 2011 *Exposition Hall Quonset Hut Feasibility Study and Preservation Plan* prepared by ARG. The building was also inspected during a June 2013 field survey of the project area. On the basis of the evidence compiled from these three sources, it was concluded that the building is no longer a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. This finding is based on the building's loss of design integrity due to its continued physical deterioration and the marginal integrity it possessed at the time it was evaluated by ARG in 2011 (at that time, only two of the seven aspects of integrity, per National Register Bulletin 15, were fully present). In addition, the Quonset hut's association with its original use during the school's early history is difficult to discern. The current use of the Quonset hut does not convey a sense of earlier uses that would connect it to the history of the College, and its physical deterioration, coupled with its various alterations and additions, has diminished its ability to convey its former history as a key exhibition space, student assembly space, and classroom space during the early years of the College. Considered together, these factors combine to make its retention and rehabilitation for historical interpretive purposes appear infeasible. Therefore, the Quonset hut's demolition would be considered a less-than-significant impact and Mitigation Measure HR-1, shown below in italics and strikethrough is now unnecessary.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measure (no longer required):

~~*HR-1 The Exposition Hall Quonset hut shall be moved to a new location on campus where its original association with the College's early agricultural/animal husbandry education curriculum can best be interpreted. Appropriate potential locations include the Agricultural Education complex, the Equestrian Center, or the agricultural fields south of El Rancho Drive in the vicinity of the Feed Mill Quonset hut. Prior to relocating Exposition Hall, the College shall prepare a preservation plan to ensure the preservation and maintenance of the building. The preservation plan shall describe the history of the resource and its character-defining design/structural features, document its current condition and the feasibility of moving the building, and outline what actions must be taken, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, to competently relocate and rehabilitate the building. It shall also include an interpretive plan component that will provide the step-by-step*~~

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

strategy the College will use for interpreting the history of the resource for the educational benefit of Pierce College students. Plan approval for the Green Technologies Building by the Office of the State Architect shall be made contingent upon the completion of the preservation plan and its adoption by the LACCD Board of Trustees.

The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update was found not to pose an adverse effect on the only identified designated historical resource located at Pierce College: Trapper's Lodge (CHL #939), a folk art installation adjoining the Agriculture Sciences Building. No work is proposed under the 2014 Master Plan Update in proximity to Trapper's Lodge that would have the potential to adversely affect this resource (i.e., result in demolition or alteration or cause significant adverse changes to the design setting). The closest project component under the 2010 Master Plan Update (the Green Technologies Building) is no longer under consideration.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. An intensive archaeological resources survey of Pierce College was conducted in 2002 during preparation of the 2002 FEIR. No archaeological resources were identified during that survey. However, areas of sensitivity were defined, one in the southwestern corner of the College at Canyon de Lana where a water source was found and the other, a nature trail area, in the southeastern corner of the College where prehistoric Native American artifacts have reportedly been found in the past (Horne 2002). Pierce College indicated that, according to its records, the water source in Canyon de Lana is not naturally occurring. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would reduce impacts in areas of sensitivity through the elimination of several projects that lie outside of the developed central campus. No projects are scheduled for Canyon de Lana; however, renovation of the horticulture building is still planned for the southeastern corner of the College under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

On July 29, 2009, an archaeological field inspection of Pierce College was conducted by ICF Jones & Stokes personnel. No cultural resources were observed within the project area during this effort. Conditions described in the 2002 survey report were essentially the same in 2009. For this reason, the same mitigation measures as specified in the 2002 FEIR were included to reduce impacts associated with the 2010 Master Plan Update to a less-than-significant level.

The results of the cultural resources literature and records search included in the June 2014 Cultural Resources Technical Report indicated that no prehistoric or historical archaeological sites or isolated artifacts have been previously recorded within the boundaries of Pierce College or within a 1/2-mile radius of the project area. In addition, no prehistoric or historical archaeological sites are listed on the Archaeological Determination of Eligibility (DOE) list.

The lack of archaeological resources identified within the project area does not preclude the possibility of identifying subsurface archaeological material during construction activities. However, the project area has been heavily disturbed by past construction activities, including the construction and installation of utilities, roads, and College buildings; therefore, the likelihood of encountering intact, subsurface archaeological material within the project area is low. However, the 2002 FEIR mitigation measures would be included to reduce impacts under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. These mitigation measures are listed below.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

AR-1 If buried cultural resources are discovered during construction, all work must be halted in the vicinity of the archaeological discovery until a qualified archaeologist can visit the site of discovery and assess the significance of the archaeological resource. In areas of archaeological sensitivity, such as in the vicinity of the water sources in the Canyon de Lana and the Chalk Hills in the southeastern corner of the campus, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources shall monitor project-related ground-disturbing activities. Specifically, monitoring is

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

recommended during construction of the horticulture/animal science and maintenance and operations facility.

AR-2 Provisions for the disposition of recovered prehistoric artifacts shall be made in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.

AR-3 In the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains, the procedures specified in Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, CEQA Section 15064.5 (e), and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 shall be implemented.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Pierce College is situated on the edge of the Chalk Hills in the western San Fernando Valley. Flat portions of the campus are underlain by Quaternary alluvial fan deposits and scattered areas of artificial fill. The top few feet of these alluvial fan deposits are unlikely to contain significant vertebrate fossils, but the underlying alluvium of late Pleistocene age is known to contain vertebrate fossils. The hills in the southern part of the campus are made up of Late Miocene age Modelo Formation, which is composed of marine sedimentary rock that is likely to contain significant fossil resources. This bedrock is exposed at or near the ground surface.

A records search for paleontological resources was conducted in 2002 for the 2002 FEIR. This search indicated that fossil resources had not been identified on the Pierce College campus, but resources had been found in the same geologic formations nearby. Conditions at the College campus have not changed; therefore, the same mitigation measures specified in the 2002 FEIR would reduce impacts associated with the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update to a less-than-significant level. These mitigation measures are listed below.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

PR-1 The monitoring of excavation in areas identified as likely to contain paleontological resources shall be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor. The monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils and samples of sediments as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. Monitoring may be reduced if the potentially fossiliferous units, previously described, are not present or, if present, are determined by qualified paleontological personnel to have a low potential to contain fossil resources.

PR-2 Recovered specimens shall be prepared to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including the washing of sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates.

PR-3 Specimens shall be curated into a professional, accredited museum repository with permanent retrievable storage.

PR-4 A report of findings, with an appended itemized inventory of specimens, shall be prepared. The report and inventory, when submitted to Pierce College, would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts on paleontological resources.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. No human remains or cemeteries are known to be present on the Pierce College campus. An archaeological resources survey of Pierce College was conducted in 2002, and no human remains were found. If human remains are discovered during construction, the coroner and designated Native American representatives would be notified in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, Health and Safety

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Code Section 7050.5, and CEQA Section 15064.5(e), as specified in AR-3, above. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and that no known active faults cross through the project area or within the immediate vicinity of the project area (California Division of Mines and Geology 2001). With respect to the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, conditions on the project site have not changed; the impacts considered in the 2002 FEIR regarding ground rupture within the project area remain the same. Therefore, primary ground rupture is not anticipated, and impacts would remain less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that the project would be subject to ground shaking associated with earthquakes on faults of both the San Andreas and Transverse Ranges fault systems. The campus itself is located in the vicinity of many major active faults, including the Northridge thrust, Santa Susana, and San Fernando faults. These faults are considered potentially significant sources of ground shaking. However, these ground motion hazards are not unusual for the San Fernando Valley area. It was found in the 2002 FEIR that this hazard would represent a less-than-significant impact provided that design and construction conforms to all applicable provisions of the State of California, Division of the State Architect, and the guidelines set forth in the 1998 California Building Code (CBC). The CBC is based on the 1997 Uniform Building Code (UBC) and sets forth regulations concerning proper earthquake design and engineering. Construction would also conform to the 1997 UBC earthquake design criteria for Seismic Zone 4.

Impacts related to seismic ground shaking would remain the same under the 2010 Master Plan Update as those described in the 2002 FEIR. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include less new square footage than the 2002 Master Plan and the 2010 Master Plan Update and would also include proper design and construction guidelines, as required by the previous EIR, to reduce impacts from ground shaking. All proposed buildings would be constructed to latest CBC/UBC standards. Specifically, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include five key project actions, including construction of one new building and renovation and adaptive reuse of existing campus buildings, with a projected overall reduction relative to that in both 2002 and 2010. Impacts would remain less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which saturated granular sediments temporarily lose their shear strength during periods of strong earthquake-induced ground shaking. The susceptibility of a site to liquefaction is a function of the depth, density, and water content of granular sediments and the magnitude and frequency of earthquakes in the surrounding region. Saturated, unconsolidated silt, sand, and silty sand within 50 feet of the ground surface are most susceptible to liquefaction. Liquefaction-related phenomena may include lateral spreading, ground oscillation, loss of bearing strength, and subsidence. Lateral spreading comprises the movement of surficial blocks of sediment due to liquefaction and commonly occurs on gentle slopes of 0.3 to 3 degrees.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

The 2002 FEIR found that low-lying portions of the project area are within a California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) Seismic Hazard Mapping Program liquefaction hazard zone (California Division of Mines and Geology 1998). Additionally, it was found that, although no historical liquefaction had been reported in the Canoga quadrangle, there was evidence of lateral spreading in the Northridge and Reseda areas after the Northridge earthquake. Furthermore, localized areas of shallow groundwater and unconsolidated sediments may exist within the project site and could lead to liquefaction phenomena. However, it was concluded that much of the campus is underlain by bedrock, and the remainder of the campus is underlain by fine-grained alluvial/colluvial material that would not be susceptible to liquefaction phenomena. Consequently, liquefaction-related phenomena would not pose a significant problem.

With respect to the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, impacts from liquefaction would remain the same as those identified under the 2002 FEIR. As such, impacts would remain less than significant.

iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that impacts from landslides would not occur. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update site is not located in an area susceptible to landslide hazards. Because the location proposed for the project would not change from that described in the 2002 FEIR, it is concluded that no new impacts from landslides would occur under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. No impact would occur.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that impacts from soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would not occur because the area is fully developed. Similar to the 2010 Master Plan Update, because the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would occupy the same project site, it is concluded that no new impacts would occur from soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Additionally, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would reduce the amount of building square footage proposed. Specifically, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include the construction of one new building and renovation and adaptive reuse of existing campus buildings, with a projected 20–30% reduction in floor area below what was approved in 2010. As such, impacts would be less than those assumed under the 2002 Master Plan. There would be no new impacts.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 FEIR identified corrosion, compaction, and expansion as the soil characteristics that could have significant impacts on the design of new buildings and facilities. Corrosive soils could damage buried utilities and foundations. Loose alluvial soils and undocumented fill may be subject to compaction or settlement due to changes in foundation loads or in soil moisture content, which could result from rainfall, landscape irrigation, utility leakage, roof drainage, and/or perched groundwater. Potential impacts are related to unacceptable settlement or heave for structures, concrete slabs supported on grade, and pavement supported on the aforementioned types of soil. The 2002 FEIR provided that all earthwork and grading would meet the code requirements of the State of California and follow the recommendations of the geotechnical report created for the project. Further, mitigation measures were provided to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Similar to the 2010 Master Plan Update, with respect to the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, the impact from unsuitable soils would pose a less-than-significant impact provided that the same appropriate mitigation measures are implemented during design and construction. Impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

The six mitigation measures listed below from the 2002 FEIR would reduce impacts anticipated under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update to a less-than-significant level.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Construction Mitigation

To minimize hazards to construction workers from unstable temporary slopes, the following measures shall be implemented by the construction contractor(s):

- GE-1** All earthwork and grading shall meet the requirements of State of California codes and shall be performed in accordance with the recommendations in the geotechnical investigation conducted for each proposed project at the Pierce College campus, and
- GE-2** All excavation and shoring systems shall meet the minimum requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

Operational Mitigation

Because of the potential for strong seismic ground shaking, unsuitable soils, and soil liquefaction, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- GS-1** Geotechnical investigations shall be performed by qualified licensed professionals before final design of any structures, and recommendations provided in these reports should be implemented, as appropriate;
- GS-2** **Ground Shaking.** Design and construction of structures for the revised project shall conform to all applicable provisions of the State of California, Division of the State Architect, and the guidelines set forth in the 1998 California Building Code. The CBC is based on the 1997 Uniform Building Code and sets forth regulations concerning proper earthquake design and engineering. In addition, design and construction shall conform to the 1997 UBC earthquake design criteria for Seismic Zone 4.
- GS-3** **Liquefaction.** If liquefiable soils are identified by geotechnical investigations for project structures, then mitigation should be implemented. Appropriate mitigation, which could include the use of piles, deep foundations, dynamic densification, ground improvement, grouting, or removal of suspect soils, is dependent on site-specific conditions, which should be identified by the geotechnical investigation.
- GS-4** **Unsuitable Soil Conditions.** The geotechnical investigation of proposed facilities should fully characterize the presence and extent of corrosive, expansive, or loose compactable soil. After consideration of the collected data, appropriate mitigation can be designed. Mitigation options could include the following: removal of unsuitable subgrade soils and replacement with engineered fill, installation of cathodic protection systems to protect buried metal utilities, use of coated or nonmetallic (i.e., concrete or polyvinyl chloride [PVC]) pipes that are not susceptible to corrosion, construction of foundations using sulfate-resistant concrete, support of structures on deep-pile foundation systems, densification of compactable subgrade soils with in situ techniques, and placement of moisture barriers above and around expansive subgrade soils to help prevent variations in soil moisture content.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 FEIR found that the expansion potential of soil within the project area could vary from very low for soils in sandy materials to very high for soils on lean clay units. The alluvium in several areas on campus is moderately expansive. Expansive soils are characterized by their ability to undergo significant volume change (shrink and swell) due to variations in soil moisture content. Potential impacts are related to unacceptable settlement or heave for structures, concrete slabs supported on grade, and pavement supported on the aforementioned types of soil. The 2002 FEIR found that the impact from unsuitable soils would be less than significant provided that appropriate mitigation measures are implemented during design and construction of 2002 projects. This finding remains the same for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Mitigation measures that will be carried forward as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update are listed below.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

Construction Mitigation

To minimize hazards to construction workers from unstable temporary slopes, Mitigation Measures GE-1 and GE-2 shall be implemented by the construction contractor(s) (see response 6(c)):

Operational Mitigation

Because of the potential for strong seismic ground shaking, unsuitable soils, and soil liquefaction, 2002 FEIR mitigation measures GS-1 through GS-4 shall be implemented (see response 6(c)).

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR did not find any impacts associated with the incapability of soils to adequately support the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The project site would not change under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Therefore, impacts would be similar to those identified under the 2002 FEIR. No impact is anticipated to occur.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact. At present, a quantitative CEQA threshold does not exist that would be applicable to the proposed project. The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) *Technical Advisory on CEQA and Climate Change* (2008) suggests that in the absence of regulatory guidance or standards, lead agencies such as LACCD must undertake a project-by-project analysis that is consistent with available guidance and current CEQA practice to ascertain project impacts under CEQA.

It is unknown by what amount the proposed project would need to reduce project-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to provide its share of GHG reduction and meet the Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) statewide GHG reduction target of 1990-level GHG emissions by 2020. As such, LACCD has adopted a qualitative threshold of “a level of project-related GHG emissions that is less than ‘Business as Usual’ (BAU) as defined by OPR in the above-referenced technical advisory.”

Project-related GHG emissions were estimated for carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O) for 2020. GHG emissions were not specifically analyzed in 2002 as analysis of the emissions was not required at the time. The results, provided below in Table 9, are presented in units of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) and take into account the GHG emissions reductions that would occur as a result of the several LEED energy- and water-efficiency design features that would be incorporated into the proposed project.

Issues				
	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact

Table 9. Estimate of Revised Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Metric Tons per Year (2010 Master Plan Update Estimates)

Emission Source	2020 BAU Emissions	GHG Emissions Reductions Related to LEED Measures	2020 Emissions with LEED Efficiency Measures	Percent Reduction from BAU ^a
Mobile Source	40,657	—	40,657	—
Natural Gas Combustion	3,146	(315)	2,831	10.0%
Electricity Demand-Related	7,311	(731)	6,580	10.0%
Water Consumption-Related	53	(11)	42	20.0%
Total Revised Project	51,167	(880)	50,110	2.1%

^a LEED Silver Certification will require minimum energy and water use efficiencies of 10% and 20%, respectively, when compared to “business as usual” for new construction. Actual efficiency ratings could exceed these minimum requirements.
Source: ICF International 2010. Calculations are provided in the air quality appendix.

As shown above in Table 9, GHG emissions related to energy use and water consumption would be reduced by 10% and 20%, respectively, from BAU emission levels with adoption of LEED design measures. Overall proposed project-related GHG emissions, which include mobile-source emissions, would be reduced by 880 metric tons per year, or 2.1% below BAU. As such, proposed project GHG emissions would be less than significant.

The following mitigation measures were included with the 2010 Addendum and would remain the same for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

2010 Addendum Mitigation Measures

Construction Measures

- AQ-3** Require construction equipment to use the best available technology to reduce emissions.
- AQ-4** Minimize, reuse, and recycle construction-related waste.
- AQ-5** Minimize grading, earthmoving, and other energy-intensive construction practices.
- AQ-6** Landscape to preserve natural vegetation and maintain watershed integrity.
- AQ-7** Use recycled, low-carbon, and otherwise climate-friendly building materials, such as salvaged and recycled-content materials, for buildings, hard surfaces, and non-plant landscaping.

Operation Measures

- AQ-8** Increase exterior wall and attic/roof insulation beyond Title 24 requirements.
- AQ-9** Use light-colored roof materials to reflect heat.
- AQ-10** Use double-paned windows.
- AQ-11** Use energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights.
- AQ-12** Use energy-efficient and automated controls for lighting.
- AQ-13** Use energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

AQ-14 Use energy-efficient appliances.

AQ-15 Use solar or low-emission water heaters.

AQ-16 For vehicles that will serve the 2010 Master Plan Update on a frequent basis (e.g., forklifts), require use of alternative fuels and measures to maximize fleet efficiency.

Residual Impacts

Given the relatively small amount of GHG emissions that would be emitted from the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update during short-term construction and long-term operations, with implementation of the above-prescribed mitigation measures, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update’s GHG emissions, without considering other cumulative global emissions, would not be large enough to cause substantial climate change directly. Thus, proposed project emissions are considered less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. AB 32 identified a target level of GHG emissions in California for 2020 of 427 million metric tons (MMT) of CO₂e, which is approximately 28.5% less than the 2020 BAU emissions estimate of 596 MMT CO₂e (California Air Resources Board [CARB]). To achieve this GHG reduction, there will have to be widespread reductions in GHG emissions across California. Some of these reductions will come from changes in vehicle emission and mileage standards, the use of alternative sources of electricity, and higher energy efficiency standards for existing facilities, among other measures. The remainder of the necessary GHG reductions will need to come from lower carbon intensities, compared with BAU conditions, at new facilities. Therefore, this analysis uses a threshold of significance that is in conformance with the state’s goals.

On December 12, 2008, CARB adopted the AB 32 Scoping Plan, which details specific GHG emission-reduction measures that target specific GHG emissions sources. Proposed project-related GHG emissions would be reduced as a result of several AB 32 Scoping Plan measures. The Scoping Plan considers a range of actions, which include direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, and market-based mechanisms (e.g., cap-and-trade system), among other actions. Some pertinent examples include the following.

- Mobile-source GHG emission-reduction measures:
 - Pavley emissions standards (19.8% reduction),
 - Low-carbon fuel standard (7.2% reduction),
 - Vehicle efficiency measures (2.8% reduction); and
- Energy-production-related GHG emission-reduction measures:
 - Natural gas transmission and distribution efficiency measures (7.4% reduction),
 - Natural gas extraction efficiency measures (1.6% reduction),
 - Renewables (electricity) portfolio standard (33.0% reduction).

These reductions in mobile-source and energy-production GHG emissions would be in addition to those that would be utilized for the proposed project discussed above, which are related to LEED design measures that would reduce project-specific GHG emissions related to energy consumption and water use by 10% and 20%, respectively. Overall, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would be consistent with the AB 32 goal of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Project-related GHG emissions would be less than significant.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

A project's consistency with implementing programs and regulations to achieve the statewide GHG emissions-reduction goals established under Executive Order S-3-05 and AB 32 cannot yet be evaluated because the programs and regulations are still under development. Nonetheless, the Climate Action Team (CAT), established by Executive Order S-3-05, has recommended strategies for implementation at the statewide level to meet the goals of the executive order. In the absence of an adopted plan or program, the CAT's strategies serve as current statewide approaches to reducing the state's GHG emissions. Because no other GHG emissions plan or program has been adopted that would apply to the proposed project, consistency with the CAT's strategies is assessed to determine if the proposed project's contribution to cumulative GHG emissions is considerable.

In its report to the governor and the legislature, the CAT recommended strategies that could be implemented by various state boards, departments, commissions, and other agencies to reduce GHG emissions. The CAT strategies relevant to the proposed project, as well as the implementing agencies and the proposed project design features or mitigation measures which would be consistent with the strategies, are listed in Table 10. Given the analysis in Table 10, the proposed project would minimize its contribution to GHG emissions and global climate because of its consistency with these strategies.

Table 10. Proposed Project Consistency with Climate Action Team Strategies

CAT Strategy	Implementing Agency	Proposed Project Consistency
Vehicle Climate Change Standards	California Air Resources Board	The proposed project would be consistent with this strategy to the extent that new passenger vehicles and light trucks are purchased by the project's users, starting with the 2009 model year.
Hydrofluorocarbon Reduction Strategies	California Air Resources Board	Proposed project air-conditioning systems would comply with the latest standards for new systems. Consumer products containing hydrofluorocarbons would comply with CARB regulations, when adopted.
Building Energy Efficiency Standards in Place	Energy Commission	The proposed project will meet or exceed California energy standards or energy-efficient lighting requirements.
Appliance Energy Efficiency Standards in Place	Energy Commission	The proposed project will meet or exceed California energy standards or energy-efficient lighting requirements.
Water Use Efficiency	Department of Water Resources	The proposed project will meet or exceed California water use and conservation standards.
Source: California Climate Action Team 2006; compiled by ICF International, January 2010.		

With implementation of the design features, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would be consistent with applicable plans, policies, and regulations. Impacts from project construction and operation related to GHG emissions plans, policies, and regulations would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 FEIR determined that the impact from use and storage of hazardous materials at Pierce College would be less than significant if anticipated areas of construction and ground disturbance would not overlap with hazardous material storage and use areas and if specified mitigation measures pertaining to remediation of asbestos-containing material and lead-based paint would be completed before any new construction or demolition of existing buildings. According to records obtained by hazardous materials specialty firm Winzler & Kelley Consulting Engineers in August 2009, hazardous materials investigations have been conducted at the College. As a standard practice, the College and its hazardous materials subconsultant prepare hazardous materials studies for new building projects prior to construction, and the hazardous materials reports are

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

made part of the bid package and provided to the general contractor in advance of construction. Remediation is carried out as recommended by the hazardous materials consultant.

According to a report prepared in October 2005 by Leymaster Environmental Consulting, two underground storage tanks (USTs) and associated piping and fuel dispensers were removed from the College in March 2005. Both USTs were 10,000 gallons in volume. Seven soil samples were collected at the site on March 29, 2005. One of the samples from beneath the fuel dispenser contained 250 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) of total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) as diesel. Two additional soil samples were collected on September 27, 2005. These samples were collected from beneath the fuel dispenser at depths of 5 and 10 feet. (The previous March 25, 2005, sample was collected beneath the fuel dispenser at approximately 2 feet.) TPH as diesel was not detected from the September 27, 2005, samples. The report concluded that, based on the lack of detectable TPH in the deeper samples, the 250 mg/kg of TPH in the March 2005 sample did not constitute a threat to groundwater, and no further investigation was recommended at the site.

Only one other operational UST is known to exist at the College, which is used by the sheriff's station. Therefore, it is unlikely that proposed construction would encounter any additional USTs. If, during construction of the 2014 Master Plan Update projects, USTs are encountered, 2002 FEIR mitigation measures HM-1 and HM-2 will be implemented. Phase I studies conducted for the individual building projects included soil testing, and, to date, no herbicide or pesticide contamination has been reported. Nonetheless, soil testing for future 2014 Master Plan Update projects shall be undertaken in accordance with 2002 mitigation measure HM-3.

As a standard practice, the College conducts asbestos and lead-based paint surveys for its demolition projects. Asbestos and lead-based paint are handled and disposed of according to state and county standards. The College will continue to implement mitigation measure HM-4 for any future demolition, including that proposed in the 2014 Master Plan Update. This level of impact would remain the same under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Therefore, impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

The mitigation measures listed below will be carried forward from the 2002 FEIR as part the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. The measures must be completed prior to construction of each proposed project to allow development of appropriate worker protection and waste management plans that describe the proper handling, treatment, and storage of hazardous waste from the proposed projects.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

HM-1 Moderate Potential Sites. A thorough review of available environmental records, a thorough historical land use assessment, and a site-specific inspection shall be completed. A record review shall identify data that confirm remediation of on-site and off-site contamination of former leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites or agency-certified closure of the site. Tanks that are not reported shall undergo further record review to determine the status, condition, contents, and number of tanks. At sites with inactive or improperly abandoned underground storage tank (USTs), the tanks may be old and in poor condition and, therefore, shall be thoroughly evaluated for condition and possible leaks. A detailed site inspection of hazardous material storage areas in or near proposed project areas shall be performed to determine if leaks or spills may have caused potential environmental contamination. Results of the record review or visual inspection that indicate contamination may be present in a proposed project area shall cause sites with medium potential to be treated as sites with high potential.

Relocation of the plant facilities buildings and appurtenances will require removal and relocation of their two USTs. Removal of the active USTs in the plant facilities vehicle maintenance area shall be monitored by a qualified professional for evidence of leaks. If any evidence of leakage is noted, a site assessment shall be performed and appropriate remediation completed.

HM-2 High Potential Site. Current agency records of the site with high potential (P. L. Porter Company) shall be reviewed to assess and verify the extent of potential contamination of surface and underlying soil as well as shallow groundwater. If the review indicates contamination may have spread to the proposed project area on campus, an investigation shall be designed and performed to verify the presence and

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

extent of contamination at the site. A qualified and approved environmental consultant shall perform the review and investigation. Results shall be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division, or California Department of Toxic Substances Control prior to construction. The investigation shall include collecting samples for laboratory analysis and quantification of contaminant levels within the proposed excavation and surface disturbance areas. Subsurface investigation for sites with high potential shall determine appropriate worker protection and hazardous material handling and disposal procedures appropriate for the subject site.

Construction activities that require dewatering may require treatment of contaminated groundwater prior to discharge. Appropriate regulatory agencies, such as the California Environmental Protection Agency, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division, shall be notified in advance of construction, and discharge permits identifying discharge points, quantities, and groundwater treatment (if necessary) shall be identified and obtained.

Areas with contaminated soil determined to be hazardous waste shall be excavated by personnel who have been trained under the OSHA-recommended 40-hour safety program (29 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Section 1910.120), with an approved plan for excavation, control of contaminant releases to the air, and off-site transport or on-site treatment. Health and safety plans prepared by a qualified and approved industrial hygienist shall be developed to protect the public and all workers in the construction area. Health and safety plans shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate agencies, such as the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division, or California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

HM-3 Residual Pesticides/Herbicides. Soil samples shall be collected in construction areas where the land has historically or is currently being farmed to verify and delineate the possibility of and extent of pesticide and/or herbicide contamination. Excavated materials containing elevated levels of pesticide or herbicide require and shall undergo special handling and disposal procedures. Standard dust suppression procedures shall be used in construction areas to reduce airborne emissions of these contaminants and reduce the risk of exposure to workers and the public. Regulatory agencies for the State of California and County of Los Angeles shall be contacted to plan handling, treatment, and/or disposal options.

HM-4 Asbestos-Containing Material and Lead-Based Paint. Records of previously completed asbestos-containing material and lead-based paint remediation at the College shall be reviewed. A survey of buildings, structures, and pavement areas to be removed or demolished to assess the presence and extent of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint shall be conducted. A qualified and approved environmental specialist shall conduct this study prior to final project design. The investigation shall include collecting samples for laboratory analysis and quantification of contaminant levels in the buildings and structures proposed for demolition and in pavement disturbance areas. According to these findings, appropriate measures for handling, removal, and disposal of the materials can be developed. Regulatory agencies for the State of California and Los Angeles County shall be contacted to plan handling, treatment, and/or disposal options.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 FEIR determined that the impact from use and storage of hazardous materials at Pierce College would be less than significant if anticipated areas of construction and ground disturbance would not overlap with hazardous material storage and use areas and if specified mitigation measures pertaining to remediation of asbestos-containing material and lead-based paint would be completed before any new construction or demolition of existing buildings. This level of impact would remain the same under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. The mitigation measures (HM-1 through HM-4) described above under impact

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

response 8(a) would be carried forward. Therefore, impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Various types of hazardous materials and hazardous waste are stored on campus. These include paints, solvents, and small quantities of biological waste. Additionally, a number of different types of chemicals used for instructional purposes are stored on campus. The chemicals are safely stored and/or locked away. No new buildings are proposed that would result in the storage, transport, or use of hazardous wastes in substantial amounts compared to existing conditions.

The 2002 FEIR identified, within and surrounding the project, two hazardous sites with moderate potential and one site with high potential to affect the 2002 Master Plan project. The plant facilities building, located within the footprint of Pierce College, was regarded as a site with moderate potential to emit hazardous materials. Under the 2002 FEIR, the plant facilities building was to have been demolished and, therefore, would have created a significant impact. However, under the 2010 Master Plan Update, the plant facilities building was no longer proposed to be demolished and would, therefore, no longer create a significant impact. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include the construction of one new building and renovation and adaptive reuse of existing campus buildings, with a projected reduction in what was approved in both 2002 and 2010.

Mitigation measures were provided in the 2002 FEIR to prevent further contamination from the two remaining sites; such mitigation would continue to be required as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. These mitigation measures (HM-1 through HM-4) are described above under impact response 8(a). As such, no new impacts would be created. Impacts would remain the same if not less because of the removal of demolition of the plant facilities building from the list of master plan projects. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. In support of the analysis conducted for the 2002 FEIR, field reconnaissance of the project site and surrounding project area was conducted to verify current conditions. The field reconnaissance component of the study relied on a visual survey of surface conditions by an environmental geologist to identify sites where storage containers (e.g., chemicals, paint, oil) were present or evidence of stained soil or corroded pavement was visible, suggesting chemical spillage on the ground. This survey concentrated on the project site and sites identified in the 2002 FEIR Environmental Data Resources (EDR) database report. A site reconnaissance of the Pierce College campus was conducted in the presence of Pierce College personnel who were familiar with campus hazardous material use, storage, and disposal. Reconnaissance of the area surrounding the campus was limited to viewing properties from adjacent public streets and alleys; no attempt was made to gain access to any properties except the open parking lot areas. The 2002 Master Plan would not have placed housing or structures on top of any parcel designated by the EDR report as lying within an area susceptible to moderate or high hazardous impacts. However, there were three sites located within 0.25 mile of the project site that were included as part of the EDR report. Mitigation measures were prescribed as part of the 2002 FEIR to reduce any impacts on the project because of the proximity of these hazardous sites. These mitigation measures (HM-1 through HM-4) are described above under impact response 8(a). An update to the previous EDR report was produced. No new hazardous sites were found to occur on the site (EDR 2009). Therefore, impacts would remain as previously estimated, and mitigation measures HM-1 through HM-4 would be carried forward as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Therefore, impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR found no impact related to safety hazards from proximity to airports. Because the location of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not change and no new airports have been developed in the immediate vicinity, impacts would remain the same as those previously analyzed. No impact would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR found no impact related to safety hazards from proximity to airports. Because the project location discussed in the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update has not changed and no new airstrips have been developed within 2 miles, no impact would occur as a result of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 FEIR addressed issues related to potential impacts on emergency services in the Public Services section of the EIR. Specifically, it discussed the ability of the police and fire departments to arrive promptly at the scene of an emergency. The new events center would have increased the need for additional emergency services by increasing the number of visitors to the campus. The previous EIR included emergency response mitigation measures. These mitigation measures would be carried over as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. The master plan is designed to improve accessibility to the campus for the emergency provider through roadway and street improvements. It is also designed to increase the success of any applicable emergency plan. Impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Mitigation measure PPS-2 (see response 14(b)) related to emergency response that would be carried over to the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Public Services section of the 2002 FEIR addressed potential impacts from fires, including impacts related to the ability of the fire department to access the scene of a fire. According to the Zoning Information and Map Access System for the City of Los Angeles (ZIMAS), the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would be located in an area that is designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (City of Los Angeles 2014a). The previous EIR included measures to decrease the potential for fires to occur on campus as well as fire code and regulation compliance measures. These mitigation measures would be carried over as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Furthermore, in contrast to the previous master plan, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not include on-campus housing and, therefore, would not place housing within an area of high fire hazard. Impacts would be less than previously anticipated in the 2002 FEIR. The mitigation measures are as follows.

FPS-1 The College shall consult with the city engineer and the fire department regarding appropriate standards (e.g., lane widths, grades, cut corners, etc.) for private streets and entry gates to ensure adequate access for fire department vehicles and equipment.

FPS-2 All landscaping shall use fire-resistant plants and materials.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

FPS-3 Sprinkler systems shall be required throughout any structure to be built, in accordance with state codes and standards established by the State of California, Division of the State Architect, and State Fire Marshal.

FPS-4 The revised project shall comply with all applicable codes and regulations administered by the State of California, Division of the State Architect, and State Fire Marshal.

Impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Similar to the 2002 FEIR and the 2010 Master Plan Update, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include projects that would create new sources of runoff and water discharge. However, the projects would comply with Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act by implementing a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to decrease impacts from runoff.

Furthermore, the 2002 Master Plan included improvements such as detention basins and water quality ponds to reduce polluted runoff and meet water quality standards established for the region; these elements were carried forward as part the 2010 Master Plan Update.

Similar to the 2010 Master Plan Update, under the 2014 Master Plan Update, all new buildings would be certified under the LEED program, in accordance with the policy adopted by the Board of Trustees in May 2002. In addition, the 2014 Master Plan Update would continue to support a series of campus-wide strategies to improve water conservation, as described below. Wastewater, as a result of the 2014 Master Plan Update, would be treated similar to how wastewater is currently treated at the campus. However, some of the conservation methods incorporated into the design and campus planning would result in the reduction of water use and conservation of water over existing levels.

Maximizing Water Conservation

New buildings and landscape elements would incorporate appropriate water conservation strategies that focus on reducing the use of potable water. These strategies would include the use of efficient irrigation, low-maintenance and native plant species, low-flow plumbing fixtures, and automatic sensors. Reclaimed water would be used for irrigation should it become available at the campus.

Managing Stormwater

Stormwater management strategies would incorporate natural landscape elements to address issues related to water quantity and quality. Swales, bio-retention basins, green roofs, and permeable or porous paving materials would be used to manage stormwater by reducing runoff and the amount of contaminants.

No new impacts are anticipated, and impacts would remain as previously analyzed, less than significant with mitigation.

The following mitigation measures will be carried forward as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update:

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

SW-1 A Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan shall be developed in accordance with Los Angeles County stormwater permit requirements, and

SW-2 Water quality ponds shall be implemented, where feasible, as a best management practice (BMP) to capture and **treat** polluted runoff from parking lots.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

SW-3 Vegetated swales and retention areas along pedestrian circulation routes, in parking lots, and around buildings will be constructed to capture stormwater runoff and allow groundwater recharge.

SW-4 A campus-wide approach to stormwater catchment **and** appropriate plant ecology will be implemented to reduce infrastructure loads during rain events, increase groundwater availability, and reduce annual irrigation needs.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that building renovations, new building construction, and development of the agricultural fields would have no adverse effects on groundwater resources. The campus relies on water delivered by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) through existing pipelines, which were to be improved to meet the needs of the 2002 Master Plan. These improvements were carried forward as part of the 2010 Master Plan Update and would be carried forward under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. The College does not have any active wells on campus and therefore does not pump groundwater for its water needs. Because impacts on groundwater resources would not change under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, it is expected that impacts would remain the same as or be less than previously analyzed. There would be no impacts on groundwater.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, the existing drainage pattern would not be altered significantly. The 2002 FEIR found that the eastern portion of the campus has an existing storm drain network with a well-planned hierarchy of storm drain diameters to accommodate increased flow as the network collects additional runoff flowing toward the Los Angeles River (Psomas 2002). As discussed in the 2002 FEIR, improvements would be made through the addition of new storm drains that would increase runoff collection capacity and maintain an adequate level of service for this portion of campus. Under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, development would be reduced by approximately 127,000 SF. Therefore, impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

The mitigation measures previously described in the 2002 FEIR would be carried forward for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. The measures are as follows.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

FD-1 Detention basins or other appropriate drainage facilities shall be installed, and the storm drain system shall be improved to (a) meet anticipated increases in runoff from new facilities and impervious surfaces and (b) bring the western portion of campus up to an adequate level of service and reduce flooding; and

FD-2 Earth berms, channels, or vegetated swales shall be provided to capture runoff from agricultural fields to reduce topsoil runoff.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. See impact discussion under response 9(a). As stated above, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include projects that would create new sources of runoff and water discharge similar to projects approved under the 2002 Master Plan and the 2010 Master Plan Update. However, master plan parking lot development and or improvements (Lots 4 and 6) would comply with Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act by implementing a SUSMP to decrease impacts from runoff. Furthermore, the 2002 Master Plan included improvements such as detention basins and water quality ponds to reduce polluted runoff and meet water quality standards established for the region; these elements would be carried forward as part the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. As such, no new impacts are anticipated, and impacts would remain as previously analyzed, less than significant with mitigation.

The following mitigation measures will be carried forward as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update:

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

- SW-1** A Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan shall be developed in accordance with Los Angeles County stormwater permit requirements, and
- SW-2** Water quality ponds shall be implemented, where feasible, as a BMP to capture and treat polluted runoff from parking lots.

These mitigation measures would be adequate in reducing adverse effects on surface waters to levels below significant. No streams or rivers would be altered under the 2014 Master Plan Update.

e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. See impact discussion under response 9(a). As stated above, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include projects that would create new sources of runoff and water discharge similar to projects proposed under the 2002 Master Plan. However, with respect to parking lot improvements, the project would comply with Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act by implementing a SUSMP to decrease impacts from runoff. Furthermore, the 2002 Master Plan included improvements such as detention basins and water quality ponds to reduce polluted runoff and meet water quality standards established for the region; these elements were carried forward as part the 2010 Master Plan Update and would be carried forward under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. As such, no new impacts are anticipated, and impacts would remain as previously analyzed, less than significant with mitigation.

The following mitigation measures will be carried forward as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update:

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

- SW-1** A Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan shall be developed in accordance with Los Angeles County stormwater permit requirements, and
- SW-2** Water quality ponds shall be implemented, where feasible, as a BMP to capture and treat polluted runoff from parking lots.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 Master Plan included a public/private agricultural partnership that would have transformed 21–23 acres of underutilized fields into productive agricultural uses for the community and the College campus. This would have greatly increased the amount of water needed on campus as well as the amount of contaminated water from irrigation runoff. However, under the 2010 Master Plan Update, the College did not propose such substantial changes and, rather, maintained and enhanced the existing fields and operations. Similarly, these projects would not be included under the 2014 Master Plan Update. Therefore, impacts on water quality would be less than previously anticipated. Additionally, the mitigation measures carried forward and described under impact discussion 9(a) (SW-1 and SW-2) would further reduce any impacts on water quality. Impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. Proposed Pierce College development would not place residential structures in or near a 100-year floodplain. All construction and project operations occurring under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, as also found in the 2002 FEIR, would be within Zone X-delineated land. Zone X is defined as areas with a 0.2% chance of flooding in any year over a 500-year period. Therefore, the project would not create a significant level of risk to properties or people by placing them in a floodplain. No impact would occur.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. Proposed development on Pierce College would not place structures in or near a 100-year floodplain. All construction and project operations occurring under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, as also found in the 2002 FEIR, would be within Zone X-delineated land. Zone X is defined as areas with a 0.2% chance of flooding in any year over a 500-year period. Therefore, the project would not create a significant level of risk to properties or people by placing them in a floodplain. No impact would occur.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not place people in an area where they would be susceptible to loss, injury, or death from flooding. However, as concluded in the 2002 FEIR, deficient drainage conditions contribute to flooding on the western portion of campus. Although the proposed development would be reduced under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update compared to 2002 proposed development, similar impacts are assumed. As such, no new impacts are anticipated, and impacts would remain as previously analyzed, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

The following mitigation measures will be carried forward as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update:

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

- FD-1** Detention basins or other appropriate drainage facilities shall be installed, and the storm drain system shall be improved to (a) meet anticipated increases in runoff from new facilities and impervious surfaces and (b) bring the western portion of the campus up to an adequate level of service and reduce flooding.
- FD-2** Earth berms, channels, or vegetated swales shall be provided to capture runoff from agricultural fields to reduce topsoil runoff.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR did not address impacts related to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The College campus is not located in an area that would be subject to these types of occurrences. It is far enough inland from any coastline so that it would not incur impacts from tsunamis. No water bodies that could result in seiches or hazardous hillsides that are susceptible to mudslides are located in the vicinity of the campus. No impact is anticipated to occur.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed 2014 Master Plan improvements would not divide an already established community because the community and College have co-existed for a number of years; the College would not expand outside its existing footprint but would renovate and restructure its current layout and building uses. As noted in the 2002 FEIR, construction activities would include demolition of various existing structures, excavation and grading of specific sites on campus, construction of new facilities, and renovation and modernization of existing facilities. Four of the eight demolition projects originally planned under the 2002 Master Plan were not carried out under the 2010 Master Plan Update, thereby reducing previously analyzed impacts. Additionally, the 2014 Master Plan Update consists of only five key project actions, including construction of one new building and renovation and adaptive reuse of existing campus buildings, with a projected 20–30% reduction in floor area below what was approved in 2010. Construction activities proposed under the 2014 Master Plan Update would result in some temporary, localized, site-specific disruptions for land uses in the area. These would be related primarily to construction-related traffic from trucks and equipment in the area, possible partial and/or complete street and lane closures, disruptions related to access to facilities and parking, increased noise and vibration, and changes in air emissions (see the air quality, noise, and traffic and circulation analyses for further discussion). Therefore, impacts would remain less than significant.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. Applicable land use plans for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update are the City of Los Angeles General Plan and Zoning Code and the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan. The city’s general plan currently labels the project area with multiple land uses designations: Public Facilities, Open Space, and Neighborhood Office Commercial (City of Los Angeles 2014a). The zoning code is consistent with these designations; the project area is zoned for Commercial (C4-D2), Open Space (OS), and Public Facilities (PF) (City of Los Angeles 2014a). Educational facilities are an allowed use under the Public Facilities designation. With the open space that would be preserved under the proposed update, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would remain consistent with both the general plan and the community plan. Furthermore, the College has operated in this area for over 60 years. Previous updates and revisions to the general and community plans recognize that the project site is dedicated to Pierce College, and both plans acknowledge the benefit of the school to the area. As such, no new impacts are expected to occur. Within the community plan, Pierce College has been described as an important part of the history of the area. Its agricultural program is one of the few remaining connections to the community’s agrarian past. The community plan recognizes the need for continued development of equestrian, hiking, and bicycle trails in the area. No impacts were found within the 2002 FEIR and the 2010 Master Plan Update Addendum. As such, any impacts would be similar to those identified in the 2002 FEIR. No new impacts would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The College contains no substantive areas of native vegetation, aside from the Ecological Studies Preserve in Canyon de Lana in the southwest corner of the campus, which supports restored native vegetation planted during the 1960s, and the Arboretum in the southeastern portion of the College, which supports some planted tree species native to southern California. Otherwise, biological resources on campus are limited to agricultural fields and large areas of open space that are dominated by nonnative weedy vegetation, various (primarily nonnative) horticultural tree species, and ornamental shrubs. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans for which the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would be in conflict. As such, impacts would remain the same as those previously determined, and there would be no new impacts.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR did not identify any unique geological features or important mineral resources that would be affected within the campus boundaries. Additionally, similar to the 2002 Master Plan and the 2010 Master Plan Update, improvements proposed under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would continue to be limited to the boundaries of the Pierce College campus. Impacts would remain the same. There would be no impact.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. See impact discussion under response 11(a). The 2002 FEIR did not identify any mineral resources on the College campus. Implementation of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would occur on the same site. Therefore, impacts resulting from the loss of availability of an important mineral resource recovery site are not expected to occur.

12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 FEIR concluded the project would comply with City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance limits on temporary construction noise after implementation of construction noise mitigation measures. The noise ordinance specifies the maximum noise level for powered equipment or powered hand tools.¹ Any powered equipment or powered hand tool that produces noise exceeding 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from construction and industrial machinery is prohibited. However, the above noise limitation shall not apply where compliance is technically infeasible. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include less development than approved under the 2002 Master Plan.

Construction

The proposed 2014 Master Plan update would reduce the size and scope of the 2010 Master Plan Update. The buildings that were cancelled under the 2010 Master Plan Update, including the agricultural education experiences facility and the horticultural partnership facility are not included in the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update total development and construction would be reduced by an additional 127,000

¹ City of Los Angeles. *Los Angeles Municipal Code*, Section 112.05.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

SF. Two facilities under the 2010 Master Plan Update (the Horticulture Building and the Expanded Automotive and New Technical Education Facilities) which would be located within 500 feet of residential land uses have been revised under with the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, the existing Horticulture building would be renovated as opposed to a new 15,451-SF building proposed under the 2010 Master Plan Update. Furthermore, only one new 5,000 SF greenhouse would be designed as opposed to four greenhouses. Under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update the M&O facility would be renovated and expanded as approved under the 2010 Master Plan Update. An additional building would be constructed under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, which would be located on the west side of Mason Avenue. However, under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update the 70,000 SF Green Technologies building would not be constructed. Therefore the overall size and scope of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not include any significant changes that would result in increased construction in close proximity to noise-sensitive receivers.

Construction noise is regulated under Section 41.40 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Construction activity is prohibited from causing “loud noises to the disturbance of persons occupying sleeping quarters” at night (defined as 9 p.m. to 7 a.m.). In addition, construction within 500 feet of residential buildings is prohibited on Sunday and during nighttime hours (defined as 6 p.m. to 8 a.m.) on Saturday or holidays. All construction contractors will be required to comply with these work-hour limitations. The construction noise mitigation measures previously described in the 2002 FEIR would be carried forward for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

- N-1** Noise control devices, such as equipment mufflers, enclosures, and barriers, shall be used where feasible and appropriate based on the noise sources and the distance to the closest sensitive receptors.
- N-2** All sound-reducing devices and restrictions shall be maintained throughout the construction period.
- N-3** Construction schedules shall be coordinated with academic affairs personnel to minimize noise impacts on students and faculty.

Operations

Noise from equipment and operations is regulated under Section 112.02 of the Los Angeles Noise Ordinance. Daytime and nighttime noise levels at the boundaries of the closest parcels zoned for residential and commercial use are not allowed to exceed 5 dBA beyond ambient background levels. All noise-generating equipment installed at the campus would be required to comply with this regulation.

Regarding new facilities under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, permanent operational noise could be generated by heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) equipment and outdoor operations such as activity at loading docks. Under the 2010 Master Plan update, the Horticultural building, which was to be located within 500 feet of noise sensitive receivers was proposed to be demolished and reconstructed with a new 15,000 square-foot building along with 4 new greenhouses. Under the proposed 2014 Master Plan update, the existing horticultural building would be renovated and a new greenhouse not measuring more than 5,000 square feet would be constructed. As the existing horticultural building most likely has an HVAC system, this building would be considered an existing use and would not require mitigation. However the proposed greenhouse could require the inclusion of a new HVAC system. Should the greenhouse require a new HVAC system, mitigation measures included in the addendum for the 2010 Master Plan Update, presented as mitigation measure N-4 would be required to reduce operational noise associated with HVAC systems to be reduced to less than significant.

The following mitigation measures were included with the 2010 Addendum and would remain the same for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

2010 Addendum Mitigation Measure

- N-4** Exterior noise sources associated with an individual new building or facility shall be controlled to achieve an aggregate noise source level of 62 dBA at 50 feet. That allowable noise emission ensures compliance

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

with the daytime and nighttime exterior noise limits at the closest residential and commercial parcels outside the campus, as defined by Section 112.02 and Sections 111.02 and 111.03 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. The upper-bound noise limit was calculated using the following assumptions:

- the closest off-campus residential area is 370 feet from any proposed facility (the horticulture/animal science facility),
- the lower bound allowable nighttime noise level at that residential area is 45 dBA (based on default ambient noise levels specified by the city noise ordinance), and
- the allowable lower-bound noise emission rate at the horticulture/animal science facility (to achieve the lower-bound ambient noise limit) is 62 dBA at 50 feet, assuming a sound propagation rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance and not accounting for excess attenuation by barriers or ground absorption.

The EIR for the 2002 Master Plan included baseline noise monitoring at representative homes and businesses outside the campus. To support the 2010 Master Plan Update, noise monitoring was repeated at the same locations and at approximately the same time of day. Table 11 provides community noise exposure levels and land use compatibility. The results of the supplemental 2009 baseline monitoring are shown in Table 12, below. Noise levels measured in September 2009 were lower than the noise levels measured in 2002.

The baseline noise measurements taken in 2009 are considered comparable to the 2014 existing condition and are therefore used as the existing ambient baseline. The baseline noise monitoring consisted of short-term spot measurements taken during the mid-afternoon period when traffic noise levels are generally highest, while the land use compatibility categories are based on the 24-hour CNEL. Baseline noise measurements conducted for the 2010 Master Plan update indicated that the peak noise level L_{eq} are (and therefore the 24-hour CNEL) (Federal Transit Administration 2006) ranged between 67 to 71 dBA CNEL. In all cases, the existing noise levels, as of September 2009, would range from the Conditionally Acceptable to Normally/Clearly Unacceptable categories. Therefore, according to the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact would occur from a substantial traffic noise increase of 5 dBA CNEL in areas where the baseline noise level is less than 70 dBA (peak-hour L_{eq} or CNEL), or 3 dBA (peak-hour L_{eq} or CNEL) in areas where the baseline noise level is 70 dBA (peak-hour L_{eq} or CNEL) or more.

The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* indicates that a substantial noise increase would be triggered by either of the following conditions:

- If the noise level after project buildout triggers either the Normally Acceptable or Conditionally Acceptable categories, and the project-related noise increase is 5 dBA CNEL or greater; or
- If the noise level after project buildout triggers either the Normally Unacceptable or Clearly Unacceptable categories, and the project-related noise increase is 3 dBA CNEL or greater.

Issues				
	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact

Table 11: Community Noise Exposure Levels (Exterior) and Land Use Compatibility

Land Use	Community Noise Exposure Level, dBA			
	Normally Acceptable	Conditionally Acceptable	Normally Unacceptable	Clearly Unacceptable
Single-Family Residence	50–60	55–70	70–75	Above 70
Multi-Family Residence	50–65	60–70	70–75	Above 70
Hotel/Motel	50–65	60–70	70–80	Above 80
Auditorium	—	50–70	—	Above 65
Sports Arena	—	50–75	—	Above 70
Parks	50–70	—	67–75	Above 72
Office Building/Commercial	50–70	67–77	Above 75	—
Industrial/Manufacturing	50–75	70–80	Above 75	—

Normally Acceptable: Development is acceptable.
Conditionally Acceptable: Noise abatement should be considered as part of the development.
Normally Unacceptable: Development should generally be discouraged.
Clearly Unacceptable: Development should generally not be built.
Source: City of Los Angeles, L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, 2006.

Table 12: Noise Measurements at Noise Sensitive Uses

Site Number	Location and Land Use	Noise Level Measured in 2002 (L _{eq} , dBA)	Time and Duration of the Supplemental Measurement	Supplemental 2009/2014 Noise Levels (L _{eq} or CNEL, dBA) ^{1, 2}
R-1	De Soto Avenue, north of Victory Boulevard (Residential)	79	9/23/09, 16:50	69
R-2	Mason Avenue, north of Victory Boulevard (Residential)	76	9/23/09, 17:40	67
R-3	Victory Boulevard, east of Mason Avenue (Residential)	76	9/23/09, 18:10	69
R-4	Winnetka Avenue, at the Adult Technical School (Commercial)	78	9/23/09, 18:50	68
R-5	Winnetka Avenue, north of Oxnard Street (Residential)	80	9/23/09, 19:25	70
R-6	Oxnard Street, east of De Soto Avenue (Residential)	75	9/23/09, 20:20	71

L_{eq} = noise level equivalent.
¹ L_{eq} noise reading during the measurement duration.
² Mid-afternoon L_{eq} levels assumed to be similar to 24-hour CNEL levels.
Source: ICF Jones & Stokes 2009.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Traffic noise was the dominant noise source measured during noise measurements taken in 2009. The noise measurements were taken near the peak noise hour, and therefore can be assumed to be representative of the 24-hour CNEL (Federal Transit Administration 2006). Given that assumption, the measured L_{eq} noise levels can be used to determine land use noise compatibility categories at each measurement location. In all cases, the existing noise levels, as of September 2009, were high enough to trigger the Conditionally Acceptable or Normally/Clearly Unacceptable categories. Therefore, according to the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact would be triggered by a traffic noise increase of 3 dB (peak-hour L_{eq} or CNEL) or more. This is the same traffic noise impact criterion that was used for the 2002 FEIR.

With the inclusion of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, Mason Avenue would be vacated causing traffic accessing the campus to be redirected to other ingress/egress points. As referenced, a 3- or 5-dB increase in traffic noise would be considered a significant impact. In order to achieve a 3 dBA increase, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would have had to cause a project-related traffic volume increase of 100%. Based on the traffic study, none of the local roadways would experience an effective doubling of traffic even with the vacation of Mason Avenue. Furthermore the forecast traffic increases caused by the 2010 Master Plan Update would be lower, given, that the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include 127,000 less square feet of development and would not increase student capacity. Therefore, impacts would be considered similar or less than the impacts anticipated under the 2010 Master Plan Update. Given this analysis, the permanent increases in traffic noise would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 FEIR did not consider ground vibration or groundborne noise. However, a supplemental impact assessment prepared for the 2010 Master Plan Update, is summarized below.

The highest levels of ground vibration would be generated during temporary building demolition and building construction activity. It is anticipated that pile driving will not be required to construct new buildings. Given that assumption, vibration levels generated during building demolition and building construction are not expected to be discernible, even at nearby school buildings. The highest ground vibration levels are expected to be generated by jackhammers and hoe rams, which are used to demolish building foundations, and by vibratory rollers, which are used to level new parking lots. Ground vibration levels from such equipment generally dissipate to below discernible levels within 25 to 50 feet of the source.² It is unlikely that jackhammers and vibratory rollers would be used at such close distances for extended periods; therefore, in most cases, the vibration impacts would be indiscernible and less than significant. However, it is possible that a limited number of school buildings near future construction zones might contain research equipment that is exceptionally sensitive to vibration (e.g., electron microscopes). In those unusual circumstances, temporary ground vibration caused by construction activity might have the potential to disrupt research equipment. Vibration impacts from such unusual circumstances would be reduced to less-than-significant levels by implementation of mitigation measures.

The following mitigation measures were included with the 2010 Addendum and would remain the same for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

2010 Addendum Mitigation Measure

N-5 Use of vibration-generating construction equipment at new facilities shall be coordinated with Academic Affairs personnel to minimize potential vibration impacts on exceptionally sensitive research equipment. If requested by the Academic Affairs office, a construction vibration control study will be required for specific vibration-sensitive buildings. Vibration control measures could include the following:

- preparation of a vibration control plan;
- prediction of temporary vibration levels during construction, which will be compared to acceptable vibration levels for sensitive equipment;

² Federal Transit Administration, 2006.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- specification of low-vibration construction equipment;
- vibration monitoring before and during construction activity; and
- coordination with research staff to temporarily discontinue use of sensitive equipment during critical construction activity.

Operation of the new buildings would not cause discernible ground vibration at any nearby dwellings or existing school buildings. Passenger cars, delivery trucks, and HVAC equipment used during normal operations cause negligible ground vibration.³

There would be no impact from groundborne noise during construction or operation. This issue is typically important only in limited circumstances involving large (usually underground) vibration sources and exceptionally sensitive indoor use areas, (e.g., a new train tunnel underneath an existing concert hall). Construction and operation of the new buildings would not cause groundborne noise at nearby buildings.

The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would result in the same or less groundborne vibration and noise impacts as the 2010 Master Plan Update. Therefore, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not create a new significant groundborne vibration and noise impact.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. There are two issues related to this impact:

- Noise increases at existing on-site and off-site receptors caused by HVAC equipment and other outdoor noise sources at new buildings. Details on the impact assessment and proposed mitigation are provided in response 11(a). The impact would be less than significant after mitigation is incorporated; and
- Increased traffic noise along off-site public streets serving the campus. This impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. Details are provided below.

As discussed in threshold a), the EIR for the 2002 Master Plan and 2010 Master Plan Update concluded that the traffic volume increases would not be high enough to cause a significant increase in traffic noise.

Based on the results of the traffic study, the proposed 2014 Master Plan update would marginally increase traffic along local roadways. These increases would result in an incremental increase in traffic noise. However as this increase would not result in an effective 3-dB increase, traffic noise would not likely be audible even with the vacation of Mason Avenue. Given, that the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include 127,000 less square feet of development and would not increase student capacity, impacts would be considered similar or less than impacts anticipated under the 2010 Master Plan Update. Given this analysis, the permanent increases in traffic noise would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

As discussed above, new facilities proposed under the 2014 Master Plan Update, permanent operational noise could be generated by heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) equipment. Under the proposed 2014 Master Plan update, the existing Horticultural building will be renovated and a new greenhouse not measuring more than 5,000 square-feet will be constructed. As the existing horticultural building most likely has an HVAC system, this building would be an existing use and would not require mitigation. However the proposed greenhouse could require the inclusion of a new HVAC system. Daytime and nighttime noise levels at the boundaries of the closest parcels zoned for residential and commercial use are not allowed to exceed 5 dBA beyond ambient background levels as regulated under Section 112.02 of the Los Angeles Noise Ordinance.

³ Ibid.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Should the greenhouse require a new HVAC system, mitigation measure N-4 included in the 2010 Addendum would be required to reduce operational noise associated with HVAC systems to be reduced to less than significant.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Temporary short-term noise impacts at existing campus buildings could result during construction of new buildings as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. The 2002 FEIR concluded that this impact would be less than significant after implementation of construction noise mitigation. The conclusions of this supplemental analysis are the same. Details regarding the impact assessment and the required construction noise mitigation measures are presented in response 12(a).

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR did not consider potential impacts from airport noise. The campus is more than 5 miles west-southwest of the closest general aviation airport (Van Nuys Airport) and more than 12 miles west of the closest commercial airport (Bob Hope/Burbank Airport). The Van Nuys Airport runway is oriented north/south, and the campus is nearly due west of the airport. Therefore, there is no potential for campus buildings to be subjected to excessive aircraft noise. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The campus is more than 5 miles from the nearest general aviation airport (Van Nuys Airport). Therefore, the private airport would cause no noise impact at campus buildings. The impact level remains the same and no mitigation is required.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that the project would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly. During construction, the project would employ workers who would more than likely commute to and from the work site and not relocate their households. The Los Angeles metropolitan area has a large pool of construction labor from which to draw. With completion of the projects described in the 2002 FEIR, the number of College employees would increase by 168. The previously planned science partnerships would have also increased the number of employees; however, because these partnerships were no longer included in the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, impacts from increased population were determined to be less than what was previously described. The previously planned science partnerships would not be developed under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. The 2002 FEIR found that less-than-significant impacts related to population growth would occur; as such, impacts related to population under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that housing would not be displaced and that there would be no impacts. Similar to the 2010 Master Plan Update, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not change this conclusion because it also would not remove any type or form of housing. No impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that people would not be displaced and there would be no impacts. Similar to the 2010 Master Plan Update, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not change this conclusion because it also would not displace any persons from the project area, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing. There would be no impact. No mitigation is required.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 FEIR found that less-than-significant impacts related to fire services would occur from implementation of the 2002 Master Plan. According to the 2002 FEIR, the 2002 Master Plan proposed approximately 500,000 total gross square feet of new building space and 400 to 450 housing units. As stated in the Project Description, no increase in student capacity would occur under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Additionally, total proposed development would be reduced by approximately 127,000 SF compared to development approved in the 2010 Master Plan Update. Therefore, the 2014 Master Plan Update would provide less new building space when compared to the 2002 Master Plan.

Because buildout under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not increase the number of students beyond the number forecast under the 2002 FEIR (see Table 1) and because the science public/private partnership projects described in the 2002 FEIR would not be included as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, impacts would not be greater than what was described in the 2002 FEIR. Furthermore, the removal of the previously planned student housing projects would reduce the number of associated emergency calls to the fire department, calls that were originally anticipated as part of the 2002 Master Plan.

Temporary construction would affect fire department access to the College. This impact would remain under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update because of street closures or other access impairments. The mitigation measures described in the 2002 FEIR would be carried forward as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Because no new impacts would be created, impacts would remain less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures FPS-1 through FPS-4 (see response 8(h)).

b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Police protection services for the LACCD are provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD). The 2002 FEIR found that less-than-significant impacts related to police services would result from the master plan with mitigation incorporated. As noted in the response 14(a), above, student enrollment in the buildout year (2019) under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not be greater than the enrollment figure projected in the 2002 FEIR. Furthermore, removal of the previously planned student housing projects and the science public/private partnerships would reduce the number of associated emergency calls to the police department, calls that were originally anticipated as part of the 2002 Master Plan.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Temporary construction impacts would remain under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update because of street closures, which could diminish access. The mitigation measures previously described in the 2002 FEIR would be carried forward as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Because no new impacts would be created, impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

PPS-1 Pierce College shall implement security features (i.e., improved lighting, improved landscaping, and additional security phones) as part of the proposed projects described in the master plan.

PPS-2 Pierce College shall design and implement a Special Event Security Plan, in coordination with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and the Los Angeles Police Department, for the new events center. Issues addressed may include security needs, emergency evacuation procedures, and money handling issues.

c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. Pierce College is located in the Los Angeles Unified School District's (LAUSD's) District C, which covers an area of approximately 70 square miles. District C is in the southern portion of the west and central San Fernando Valley. District C includes the following communities: Encino, Reseda, Sherman Oaks, Tarzana, Van Nuys, Warner Center, and Winnetka as well as portions of Studio City, Valley Village, and Woodland Hills. The 2002 FEIR found that although increases in student enrollment would have occurred because of development expected as part of the 2002 Master Plan, they would not have significantly affected any one school within the district and would not have over-burdened the school system. The 2002 Master Plan included the development of 400–450 housing units, which were no longer carried forward as part of the 2010 Master Plan Update and are not part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Additionally, the science public/private partnerships, which were part of the 2002 Master Plan, would have increased the number of employees as well as residents in the project area. Because these partnerships were no longer being carried forward, these previously estimated impacts did not occur as part of the 2010 Master Plan Update and are not part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. As described in the Project Description, student capacity would not increase under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Therefore, impacts would be less than originally estimated in 2002 and would remain less than significant. No mitigation is required.

d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that although increased enrollment would occur, it would not negatively affect the recreational resources of the project area or surrounding area, and impacts would be less than significant. Through the removal of the student housing element and some of the public/private partnerships, impacts originally anticipated from increased student and employee use of parks were reduced under the 2010 Master Plan Update. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not include the development of student housing. As such, impacts would be less than previously anticipated in 2002 and would remain less than significant. No mitigation is required.

e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR provided no impact analysis pertaining to other public facilities. However, because the campus already provides libraries, health care facilities, student services, and other services, it is assumed that these facilities were regarded as incurring no impacts under the 2002 Master Plan. Because the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include removal of projects previously planned, and an overall reduction of square footage or upgrades to existing buildings, any potential impacts would be less than would have occurred under the 2002 Master Plan. Therefore, there would be no impact. No mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

15. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that despite increases in the number of students and employees, recreational facilities and parks located in the vicinity of Pierce College would not be overburdened and would not experience an increase in use that would accelerate deterioration. Implementation of the 2002 Master Plan would have included projects that would have renovated and modernized existing recreational and athletic facilities on the campus. Also, public/private partnerships would have enhanced existing areas of the campus, including the horticulture area and quad area (creating a new botanical garden), which would have provided students and employees with additional green spaces. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not reduce any of the existing recreational uses at the campus. Therefore, impacts would be similar to those previously anticipated and would remain less than significant. No mitigation is required.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that no significant impacts would occur from the renovation and modernization of the existing recreational and athletic facilities. Some of the public/private partnerships previously planned were not carried forward as part of the 2010 Master Plan Update and are not proposed under the 2014 Master Plan Update. No new or expanded recreational facilities are planned as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update; therefore, impacts would remain less than significant. No mitigation is required.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact. Fehr and Peers prepared a traffic and parking study for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update in June 2014. Because the traffic analysis prepared for the 2010 Master Plan Update analyzed projects only until 2015, a new traffic analysis was required to study impacts up to 2019, which is the horizon (or buildout) year for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. The 2014 traffic study is included in its entirety as an appendix to this document (Appendix D). The traffic study analyzed potential proposed project-generated traffic impacts on the street and highway system surrounding and serving the Pierce College campus. The following traffic scenarios were analyzed in the study:

- Existing (Year 2013) Conditions – The analysis of existing traffic conditions provided a basis for the remainder of the study. The existing conditions analysis included an assessment of streets, traffic volumes, operating conditions, transit services, and on-campus parking conditions.
- Baseline plus Project Conditions – The objective of this scenario was to identify potential impacts of the proposed project on adjusted existing traffic operating conditions with traffic expected to be generated by buildout of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update added to an adjusted base that does not include the FTE changes that have already occurred on the Pierce College campus between the 2002 Master Plan base and existing traffic.
- Year 2019 Cumulative Base (No Project) Conditions – The objective of this scenario was to project future traffic growth and operating conditions that could be expected to result from regional growth and related

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

projects in the vicinity of the project site, without consideration of the proposed project. In 2002, an environmental review was conducted to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the Pierce College Facilities Master Plan as proposed at that time (*Traffic and Parking Study for the Pierce College Facilities Master Plan Environmental Impact Report*, Kaku Associates 2002). The Pierce College Master Plan evaluated in 2002 is being updated and analyzed in this document. To accurately analyze the incremental effects of the entire project, the current analysis evaluates a 2019 cumulative base that incorporates conditions based on 2002 FTE. In addition to ambient growth and related projects, the incremental project trips generated by Pierce College based on changes in FTE between the 2002 Master Plan base year and 2013 are removed from the street network for 2019 cumulative base conditions.

- Year 2019 Cumulative plus Project Conditions – Buildout of the campus Master Plan is projected by 2019. Thus, the objective of this scenario was to identify potential impacts of the proposed project against projected year 2019 future traffic operating conditions with traffic expected to be generated by buildout of the proposed Master Plan added to the cumulative base traffic forecasts, incorporating all FTE change on the Pierce College campus between the 2002 Master Plan FTE base year and 2019.

The study evaluated the potential for traffic impacts at 32 intersections in the vicinity of the Pierce College campus during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The study relied on established Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) threshold criteria, which are used to determine if a project will have a significant traffic impact at a specific intersection. Level of service definitions for signalized intersections are provided in Table 13. According to LADOT criteria, a project impact would be considered significant if the conditions in Table 13 are met.

Table 13. Los Angeles Department of Transportation Threshold Criteria

Intersection Condition with Project Traffic		Project-Related Increase in V/C Ratio
LOS	V/C Ratio	
C	> 0.70–0.80	Equal to or greater than 0.04
D	> 0.80–0.90	Equal to or greater than 0.02
E, F	> 0.90	Equal to or greater than 0.01
Note: LOS = level of service; V/C = volume to capacity. Source: Fehr and Peers 2014.		

The City of Los Angeles typically uses LOS D as a standard, meaning that LOS D or better is considered to represent satisfactory conditions, while LOS E or F is generally considered to be substandard. LADOT requires that the “Critical Movement Analysis” (CMA) method of intersection capacity analysis be used to determine the intersection volume to capacity (V/C) ratio and corresponding level of service for the given turning movements and intersection characteristics at signalized intersections.

The CALCADB software package developed by LADOT was used to implement the CMA methodology in the traffic analysis. All of the study intersections are currently controlled by the City of Los Angeles’ Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) system. In accordance with LADOT procedures, a capacity increase of 7% (0.07 V/C adjustment) was applied to reflect the benefits of ATSAC control at these intersections.

Twenty-seven study intersections (all study intersections except for the three along Saticoy Street and the intersections of Vanowen Street with Mason Avenue and Winnetka Avenue) are currently controlled by the City of Los Angeles’ Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) system. In accordance with LADOT procedures, an additional capacity increase of 3% (0.03 V/C adjustment) was applied to reflect the benefits of ATCS control at these 27 intersections. Thus, a capacity increase of 7% was applied to five study intersections and a net capacity increase of 10% was applied at 27 study intersections.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact

Existing Conditions

Table 14 summarizes the existing AM and PM peak hour V/C ratios and corresponding LOS at each of the study intersections. As shown, 7 of the 32 intersections currently operate at LOS E or F during one or both of the AM and PM peak hours.

- De Soto Avenue & Saticoy Street
- Winnetka Avenue & Saticoy Street
- Topanga Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard
- De Soto Avenue & Victory Boulevard
- Winnetka Avenue & Victory Boulevard
- Tampa Avenue & Victory Boulevard
- Reseda Avenue & Victory Boulevard

The remaining study intersections operate at LOS D or better (fair to good) during both the AM and PM peak hours.

Table 14. Existing (Year 2013) Intersection Levels of Service

Intersection	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS
*1. De Soto Av and Saticoy St	0.903	E	0.894	D
*2. Mason Av and Saticoy St	0.859	D	0.727	C
*3. Winnetka Av and Saticoy St	0.817	D	0.908	E
**4. De Soto Av and Sherman Way	0.693	B	0.738	C
**5. Mason Av and Sherman Way	0.661	B	0.525	A
**6. Winnetka Av and Sherman Way	0.775	C	0.716	C
**7. De Soto Av and Vanowen St	0.720	C	0.782	C
*8. Mason Av and Vanowen St	0.841	D	0.711	C
*9. Winnetka Av and Vanowen St	0.743	C	0.770	C
**10. Shoup Av and Victory Blvd	0.801	D	0.763	C
**11. Topanga Canyon Blvd and Victory Blvd	0.697	B	0.940	E
**12. Canoga Av and Victory Blvd	0.583	A	0.795	C
**13. De Soto Av and Victory Blvd	0.905	E	0.908	E
**14. Mason Av and Victory Blvd	0.628	B	0.611	B
**15. Winnetka Av and Victory Blvd	0.920	E	1.045	F
**16. Topham St and Victory Blvd	0.712	C	0.753	C
**17. Corbin Av and Victory Blvd	0.823	D	0.796	C
**18. Tampa Av and Victory Blvd	0.935	E	1.089	F
**19. Wilbur Av and Victory Blvd	0.892	D	0.792	C
**20. Reseda Blvd and Victory Blvd	0.913	E	0.990	D
**21. De Soto Av and El Rancho Dr	0.457	A	0.399	A
**22. De Soto Av and Erwin St	0.645	B	0.468	A
**23. Winnetka Av and Calvert St	0.592	A	0.440	A
**24. De Soto Av and Oxnard St	0.687	B	0.635	B
**25. Winnetka Av and Oxnard St	0.674	B	0.597	A
**26. De Soto Av and Burbank Blvd West	0.547	A	0.519	A
**27. De Soto Av and U.S. 101 WB Ramps	0.692	B	0.661	B
**28. De Soto Av and U.S. 101 EB Ramps	0.431	A	0.596	A
**29. De Soto Av and Ventura Blvd	0.565	A	0.734	C
**30. Winnetka Av and U.S. 101 WB Ramps	0.500	A	0.508	A
**31. Winnetka Av and U.S. 101 EB Ramps	0.574	A	0.589	A
**32. Winnetka Av and Ventura Blvd	0.666	B	0.766	C

Notes:

* Intersection is currently operating under ATSAC system.

* * Intersection is currently operating under ATCS system.

EB = eastbound; WB = westbound.

Source: Fehr and Peers 2014.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

2019 Cumulative Base Conditions – Without Proposed 2014 Master Plan Update

The traffic analysis prepared for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update analyzed potential future traffic conditions under 2019 cumulative base conditions, assuming no growth on the Pierce College campus between the 2002 FTE baseline and 2019. Table 15 summarizes these results.

As shown, the following ten study intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or F during one or both peak hours under Year 2019 cumulative base conditions.

- De Soto Avenue & Saticoy Street
- Mason Avenue & Saticoy Street
- Winnetka Avenue & Saticoy Street
- Mason Avenue & Vanowen Street
- Topanga Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard
- De Soto Avenue & Victory Boulevard
- Winnetka Avenue & Victory Boulevard
- Tampa Avenue & Victory Boulevard
- Wilbur Avenue & Victory Boulevard
- Reseda Avenue & Victory Boulevard

This represents a slight deterioration in operating conditions from existing conditions. Thus, background traffic growth and traffic generated by related projects will have some impact on operating conditions in the study area even without consideration of potential changes on the Pierce College campus. The cumulative base conditions projected in Table 15 and discussed above include the subtraction of academic trips generated based on 2002–2013 FTE, contributing to slightly improved baseline LOS projections than if those volumes had been left in the cumulative base projections.

2019 Cumulative Conditions – With Proposed 2014 Master Plan Update

The traffic study analyzed cumulative-plus-project traffic volumes to determine potential future operating conditions and traffic impacts with the addition of incremental project-generated traffic associated with buildout of the master plan through 2019 (see Table 15). As indicated in Table 15, ten of the study intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or F during one or both peak hours under cumulative plus project conditions. Application of the City of Los Angeles’ significance criteria indicates that the project would create no significant traffic impacts under the cumulative plus project scenario. No mitigation measures would therefore be required to address cumulative plus project impacts.

The 2010 Addendum Mitigation Measure TR-1, shown below in italics and strikethrough would not be required for the 2014 Addendum:

2010 Addendum Mitigation Measure (no longer required):

~~***TR-1 – Winnetka Avenue and Victory Boulevard.** Intersection impacts may be mitigated during both peak periods with the provision of dual left-turn lanes on both the eastbound and westbound approaches on Victory Boulevard. This mitigation will require the acquisition of 4 feet of right-of-way from the north side of Victory Boulevard, east and west of Winnetka Avenue. The mitigation will also require the removal of approximately 32 on-street parking spaces along the eastbound approach and departure of Victory Boulevard on either side of Winnetka Avenue. This will result in changing existing lane configurations for both the westbound and eastbound approaches on Victory Boulevard at Winnetka Avenue from one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through/right-turn lane to two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one shared through/right-turn lane. (A figure to illustrate the proposed intersection mitigation is included in Appendix C.)*~~

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

The proposed mitigation is identified as cumulative mitigation in the Warner Center Specific Plan (WCSP) Transportation Improvement Mitigation Program (TIMP). The WCSP TIMP states that future intersection improvements are to be funded, in part, by Warner Center Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) fees from development within Warner Center (Kaku Associates 2000). However, these improvements are not fully funded by the Warner Center TIA fee because the WCSP determined that a portion of the need for these improvements would be generated by existing traffic and future development in the area outside of Warner Center (such as growth at Pierce College).

Table 15. Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Cumulative Base and Cumulative-Plus-Project Conditions

Intersection	Peak Hour	Cumulative Base 2019		Cumulative + Project 2019		Project Change in V/C	Significant Project Impact
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		
*1. De Soto Av and Saticoy St	AM	0.973	E	0.973	E	0.000	NO
	PM	0.963	E	0.963	E	0.000	NO
*2. Mason Av and Saticoy St	AM	0.915	E	0.915	E	0.000	NO
	PM	0.775	C	0.775	C	0.000	NO
*3. Winnetka Av and Saticoy St	AM	0.877	D	0.877	D	0.000	NO
	PM	0.969	E	0.969	E	0.000	NO
**4. De Soto Av and Sherman Way	AM	0.755	C	0.755	C	0.000	NO
	PM	0.806	D	0.806	D	0.000	NO
**5. Mason Av and Sherman Way	AM	0.709	C	0.709	C	0.000	NO
	PM	0.565	A	0.565	A	0.000	NO
**6. Winnetka Av and Sherman Way	AM	0.835	D	0.835	D	0.000	NO
	PM	0.771	C	0.771	C	0.000	NO
**7. De Soto Av and Vanowen St	AM	0.792	C	0.792	C	0.000	NO
	PM	0.849	D	0.849	D	0.000	NO
*8. Mason Av and Vanowen St	AM	0.901	E	0.901	E	0.000	NO
	PM	0.764	C	0.764	C	0.000	NO
*9. Winnetka Av and Vanowen St	AM	0.825	D	0.825	D	0.000	NO
	PM	0.837	D	0.837	D	0.000	NO
**10. Shoup Av and Victory Blvd	AM	0.893	D	0.893	D	0.000	NO
	PM	0.855	D	0.855	D	0.000	NO
**11. Topanga Cyn Blvd and Victory Blvd	AM	0.773	C	0.773	C	0.000	NO
	PM	1.094	F	1.094	F	0.000	NO
**12. Canoga Av and Victory Blvd	AM	0.653	B	0.653	B	0.000	NO
	PM	0.885	D	0.885	D	0.000	NO
**13. De Soto Av and Victory Blvd	AM	1.024	F	1.024	F	0.000	NO
	PM	1.020	F	1.020	F	0.000	NO
**14. Mason Av and Victory Blvd	AM	0.681	B	0.681	B	0.000	NO
	PM	0.674	B	0.674	B	0.000	NO
**15. Winnetka Av and Victory Blvd	AM	0.997	E	0.997	E	0.000	NO
	PM	1.144	F	1.144	F	0.000	NO
**16. Topham St and Victory Blvd	AM	0.773	C	0.773	C	0.000	NO
	PM	0.837	D	0.837	D	0.000	NO

Table 15. (Continued)

Intersection	Peak Hour	Cumulative Base 2019		Cumulative + Project 2019		Project Change in V/C	Significant Project Impact
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		
**17	AM	0.892	D	0.892	D	0.000	NO

Issues				
	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact

	Intersection	Peak Hour	Cumulative Base 2019		Cumulative + Project 2019		Project Change in V/C	Significant Project Impact
			V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		
	Corbin Av and Victory Blvd	PM	0.885	D	0.885	D	0.000	NO
**18	Tampa Av and Victory Blvd	AM	1.011	F	1.011	F	0.000	NO
		PM	1.197	F	1.197	F	0.000	NO
**19	Wilbur Av and Victory Blvd	AM	0.968	E	0.968	E	0.000	NO
		PM	0.880	D	0.880	D	0.000	NO
**20	Reseda Blvd and Victory Blvd	AM	0.995	E	0.995	E	0.000	NO
		PM	1.002	F	1.002	F	0.000	NO
**21	De Soto Av and El Rancho Dr	AM	0.517	A	0.517	A	0.000	NO
		PM	0.456	A	0.456	A	0.000	NO
**22	De Soto Av and Erwin St	AM	0.744	C	0.744	C	0.000	NO
		PM	0.559	A	0.559	A	0.000	NO
**23	Winnetka Av and Calvert St	AM	0.641	B	0.641	B	0.000	NO
		PM	0.478	A	0.478	A	0.000	NO
**24	De Soto Av and Oxnard St	AM	0.769	C	0.769	C	0.000	NO
		PM	0.712	C	0.712	C	0.000	NO
**25	Winnetka Av and Oxnard St	AM	0.741	C	0.741	C	0.000	NO
		PM	0.647	B	0.647	B	0.000	NO
**26	De Soto Av and Burbank Blvd West	AM	0.622	B	0.622	B	0.000	NO
		PM	0.583	A	0.583	A	0.000	NO
**27	De Soto Av and U.S. 101 WB Ramps	AM	0.787	C	0.787	C	0.000	NO
		PM	0.748	C	0.748	C	0.000	NO
**28	De Soto Av and U.S. 101 EB Ramps	AM	0.499	A	0.499	A	0.000	NO
		PM	0.679	B	0.679	B	0.000	NO
**29	De Soto Av and Ventura Blvd	AM	0.625	B	0.625	B	0.000	NO
		PM	0.801	D	0.801	D	0.000	NO
**30	Winnetka Av and U.S. 101 WB Ramps	AM	0.542	A	0.542	A	0.000	NO
		PM	0.551	A	0.551	A	0.000	NO
**31	Winnetka Av and U.S. 101 EB Ramps	AM	0.635	B	0.635	B	0.000	NO
		PM	0.640	B	0.640	B	0.000	NO
**32	Winnetka Av and Ventura Blvd	AM	0.726	C	0.726	C	0.000	NO
		PM	0.831	D	0.831	D	0.000	NO

Notes:

* Intersection is currently operating under ATSAC system.

** Intersection is currently operating under ATCS system.

Source: Fehr and Peers 2014.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. The traffic analysis prepared by Fehr and Peers (2014) identified four CMP arterial monitoring intersections where the proposed project may add trips.

- Topanga Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard
- Winnetka Boulevard & Victory Boulevard
- Reseda Boulevard & Victory Boulevard

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- Winnetka Boulevard & Ventura Boulevard

In addition, one CMP mainline freeway monitoring location was identified where the proposed project may add trips, the Ventura Freeway (U.S. 101) at Winnetka Avenue

The cumulative plus project traffic projections described in the traffic analysis, included in Appendix D, were used to track the locations where the incremental additional project-generated trips at buildout may exceed these thresholds. Based on this evaluation, less than 50 project trips are projected to traverse these intersections in the AM and PM peak hours and thus CMP analysis of these intersections is not required. In addition, less than 150 project trips are projected to traverse the freeway location in the AM and PM peak hours and thus CMP analysis of this segment is not required. This would be considered a less than significant impact. No mitigation is required.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include new construction and renovation and demolition projects. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not result in a change in air traffic patterns or result in any air safety risks. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update does not propose tall buildings that would require air traffic to be rerouted. No impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

d) Substantially increase hazards related to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e. g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. See response 16(c), above. Implementation of the new construction and renovation and demolition projects proposed under the 2014 Master Plan Update would not increase hazards related to a design feature or incompatible uses. No impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. Existing vehicular access to the Pierce College campus is available from four access points, as described below.

- Brahma Drive – Brahma Drive is an internal street that provides access from Winnetka Avenue on the east side of the campus. Brahma Drive intersects Winnetka Avenue opposite Calvert Street; its intersection with Winnetka Avenue/Calvert Street is controlled by a traffic signal. On campus, Brahma Drive provides access to Parking Lot 1 and connects to Stadium Way, which, in turn, ultimately connects to Mason Street.
- Mason Street – Mason Street is an internal street that provides access from Victory Boulevard on the north side of the campus. Mason Street intersects Victory Boulevard opposite Mason Avenue; its intersection with Victory Boulevard is signalized. On campus, Mason Street provides access to Parking Lot 7. It then intersects with Olympic Drive and El Rancho Drive and continues as Stadium Way, ultimately connecting with Brahma Drive.
- El Rancho Drive – El Rancho Drive is an internal street that provides access from a signalized intersection with De Soto Avenue on the west side of the campus. On campus, El Rancho Drive connects to Mason Street/Stadium Way.
- Lot 7 Driveway – In addition to the three signalized access points described above, there is an unsignalized driveway from Parking Lot 7, leading directly to Victory Boulevard east of Mason Avenue.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Additional internal streets that provide circulation on the campus include the following:

- Olympic Drive – Olympic Drive runs along the south side of Parking Lot 7 and has a security gate at the east end of the lot. Beyond the security gate, Olympic Drive continues into the central campus, becoming part of the internal system, with a second gate near the sheriff's substation.
- Stadium Way – Stadium Way is the primary through route around the south side of the central campus. It connects Brahma Drive with Mason Street and El Rancho Drive and provides access to Shepard Stadium and several student parking lots.

Proposed vehicular access under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not change the existing access, as described above. Similarly, emergency access to the campus would not change under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. However, as described earlier, diminished access to the College would occur temporarily during construction activities (see Public Services, responses 14(a) and 14(b), above). Projects included under the proposed update would comply with all applicable City of Los Angeles codes and regulations related to emergency access (see also Hazards and Hazardous Materials, response 8(g), for a mitigation measure related to emergency access.)

Additionally, a pedestrian plaza was recently constructed on the northeast corner of the Pierce College campus on the southwest corner of the intersection of Victory Boulevard & Winnetka Avenue. This plaza enhances pedestrian access to the campus for pedestrians and patrons of the Orange Line and other transit lines serving this location.

Implementation of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update is not anticipated to result in a permanent impact related to inadequate emergency access. Mitigation measures included in the 2002 FEIR have also been included in this document. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact. No additional mitigation is required.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. A traffic and parking impact analysis was conducted for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update by Fehr and Peers in June 2014 (Appendix D). According to this analysis, the current parking supply (4,308 spaces) would be adequate to accommodate the projected peak parking needs at buildout (2,502 spaces weekday daytime and 1,937 spaces weeknight). Surpluses of about 1,806 spaces (weekday) to 2,371 spaces (weeknight) are projected.

g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. Implementation of projects included under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would consist of new construction and renovation and demolition projects on the campus. The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not conflict with policies that support alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks). The proposed update would maintain the existing roadways on the project site and would not conflict with any policies adopted by the city that address alternative modes of transportation. No impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 FEIR found that although increased wastewater flows would occur, the flows would not be significant enough to exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Although a water reclamation facility was approved in the 2002 Master Plan, it was dependent upon the expansion of City of Los Angeles graywater distribution lines to the campus. Therefore, the 2002 FEIR analysis did not include the water reclamation facility in its wastewater calculations.

FTE enrollment under 2019 buildout conditions would be less than the FTE enrollment estimates under buildout conditions previously analyzed in the 2002 FEIR. Table 16 shows projected wastewater generation based on buildout-year FTE enrollment levels.

Issues				
	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact

Table 16. Projected Wastewater Generation Based on FTE Enrollment

Measured Item	Unit	Wastewater Generation Rate	Wastewater Flow (gallons per day [gpd])
2002 Master Plan EIR 2010 Buildout Year	15,960 students	1.8 gpd/student	28,728
2010 Master Plan Update 2015 Buildout Year	15,500 students	1.8 gpd/student	27,900
2014 Master Plan Update 2019 Buildout Year	13,450 students	1.8 gpd/student	24,210
Source: ICF International 2014.			

The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would follow the “green,” energy-efficient, sustainable design guidelines set forth under the LEED program. Proposed buildings would be LEED certified. In addition, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would include a series of campus-wide strategies to improve water conservation. These include strategies that focus on reducing the use of potable water. Other strategies include the use of efficient irrigation, low-maintenance and native plant species, low-flow plumbing fixtures, and automatic sensors. Stormwater management strategies and landscaping recommendations are also included.

Pierce College has already begun following green design guidelines in existing buildings and would apply such elements throughout the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. High-efficiency wastewater fixtures would be installed on campus as part of the proposed construction and renovation. These fixtures help to decrease the amount of sewage generated on the campus. As such, impacts would be less than previously anticipated and would remain less than significant. Although no significant impacts were anticipated, the mitigation measures prescribed in the 2002 Master Plan will be carried forward as part of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. These mitigation measures are described below.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

- WW-1** Existing campus sewer lines shall be flushed on a regular basis to mitigate negative effects of below-criteria velocity flows.
- WW-2** All new construction and renovation shall include water conservation measures, such as low-flush toilets.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response 17(a). The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update assumes a reduction in associated impacts because of the removal of student housing and the science public/private partnerships, which were part of the 2002 Master Plan. Impacts of the 2019 buildout conditions would be less than the impacts of the buildout conditions analyzed in the 2002 FEIR. Additionally, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would follow the “green,” energy-efficient, sustainable design guidelines set forth under the LEED program. The College has already begun implementing these design guidelines in existing buildings and will continue to apply such elements throughout the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. High-efficiency wastewater fixtures would be installed on campus during construction and renovation. These fixtures help to decrease the amount of sewage generated at the College. As such, impacts would be less than previously anticipated and would remain less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The 2002 FEIR found that significant impacts would occur at those storm drains that were, at the time, performing inadequately. The area south of Victory Boulevard and west of Mason Street would flood during large runoff events. As noted in the 2002 Master Plan's Preliminary Utility Evaluation Report, it was found that improvements and upgrades made as part of the Parking Lot 7 replacement project would help storm drains in that area to accommodate any increased storm flows that could have occurred due to development in the central part of the campus. These improvements, as required by the mitigation measure prescribed in the 2002 FEIR, would reduce impacts in the Victory Boulevard drainage area.

Following completion of the Parking Lot 7 replacement project, the 2010 Master Plan Update addendum assumed the 2010 project improvements would not result in new impacts related to stormwater drainage facilities.

The proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would reduce, rather than increase the amount of development anticipated under the 2002 Master Plan. Impacts on stormwater drainage facilities would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. It was found in the 2002 FEIR that the projected increase in water consumption would not exceed LADWP's available supplies. However, potential issues were raised about possible pressure loss due to pipe friction, which could decrease the amount of water the system would provide to a level below the anticipated demand of the College. Mitigation measures were presented as part of the 2002 FEIR to reduce these impacts. These mitigation measures were carried forward as part of the 2010 Master Plan Update and would be carried forward under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Finally, as noted earlier, student housing is no longer proposed and the impacts of the 2019 buildout conditions would not be greater than the impacts of the buildout conditions analyzed in the 2002 FEIR. Therefore, water demand would not be greater than the demand originally anticipated under the 2002 Master Plan.

Pierce College has already begun implementing "green" design elements based on the national LEED guidelines pertaining to sustainable standards for existing buildings and will continue to apply these design elements throughout the master plan process. The College intends to plant water-efficient landscaping, install high-efficiency fixtures, and possibly use gray water for non-potable applications. These strategies will help to reduce demands on the water supply and the system. However, due to the potential for impacts related to water system pressure loss, the mitigation measures are carried forward from the 2002 FEIR.

2002 FEIR Mitigation Measures

WS-1 A 12-inch pipeline shall be installed from the main campus along El Rancho Drive to a new 12-inch service line off of De Soto Avenue or an 8-inch service line shall be installed at Victory Boulevard along the east edge of parking lot 7, a 12-inch main line shall be installed along the east edge of parking lot 7, and either a new 12-inch service line off of De Soto Avenue or a new main line along El Rancho Drive from the main campus shall be installed to provide adequate fire service to the proposed equestrian education center.

WS-2 Three new 12-inch distribution lines shall be installed to convey fire flows to the vicinity of the proposed new facilities while providing tie points to the existing distribution piping.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response 17(a). As stated above, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would reduce the level of impact because of the removal of student housing and the science public/private partnerships, which were part of the 2002 Master Plan. Additionally, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would follow the “green,” energy-efficient, sustainable design guidelines set forth under the LEED program. Pierce College has already begun implementing these design guidelines in existing buildings and would continue to apply such elements throughout the implementation process for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. High-efficiency wastewater fixtures would be installed on campus during construction and renovation. These fixtures would help to decrease the amount of sewage generated at the College. As such, impacts would be less than previously anticipated and would remain less than significant.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2002 FEIR found that the projected increases in solid waste that could occur under the 2002 Master Plan would be negligible and that local area landfills would have adequate capacity to meet project demands. The 2002 FEIR assumed an FTE enrollment of 15,960 under the 2010 buildout year. Currently, a 13,450 FTE enrollment is assumed for the buildout year of 2019. This would result in a decrease in FTE enrollment under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Additionally, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not include the previously planned student housing or the science public/private partnerships; these changes would result in reduced level of solid waste generation. Additionally, the projects included under the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would follow “green,” energy-efficient, sustainable design guidelines as set forth under the LEED program. The College has, in fact, already started implementing these guidelines in existing buildings and has also implemented waste diversion practices. When appropriate, existing building equipment will be reused in the new and renovated facilities. A construction waste management plan will be considered to recycle or salvage construction, demolition, and land clearing waste. As such, impacts will remain less than significant. No mitigation is required.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The 2002 FEIR found no impacts related to complying with federal, state, and local statutes or regulations pertaining to solid waste. The College consistently diverts its solid waste (above the required 50% diversion rate) and will continue to do so throughout the master plan implementation process. Additionally, similar to the 2010 Master Plan Update, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would follow “green,” energy-efficient, sustainable design guidelines as set forth under the LEED program. The College has, in fact, already started implementing these guidelines in existing buildings and has also implemented waste diversion practices. When appropriate, existing building equipment will be reused in the new and renovated facilities. Finally, a construction waste management plan would be considered to recycle or salvage construction, demolition, and land clearing waste. As such, there would be no new impacts. No mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	-------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less-than-Significant Impact. The analysis in this addendum concludes that no new unavoidable significant impacts on the environment would occur and no previously examined unavoidable significant impacts would be more severe. In addition, most of the impacts from the 2014 Master Plan Update projects would be construction related and therefore temporary and short term. Once constructed, the buildings would be more energy efficient than the existing buildings on campus, including the ones they would replace, resulting in long-term benefits in terms of energy conservation and efficiency. Therefore, implementation of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update is not anticipated to degrade the quality of the environment. As discussed in this document, impacts to biological resources and cultural resources would be considered less than significant after implementation of mitigation measures. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less-than-Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update, in conjunction with related projects, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately but significant when viewed together. Cumulative impacts would be considered less than or similar to impacts determined in 2002 and 2010. All potential impacts of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update have been identified, and mitigation measures have been prescribed, where applicable, to reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. None of these potential impacts is considered cumulatively considerable significant, and implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this addendum would ensure that no cumulative impacts would occur as a result of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

As previously discussed,

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. All potential impacts of the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update have been identified, and mitigation measures have been prescribed, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. As previously described in this document, applicable 2002 FEIR mitigation measures, in addition to new mitigation measures imposed for operational noise associated with HVAC equipment (mitigation measure N-4) and temporary ground vibration impacts on sensitive equipment (mitigation measure N-5) would be adequate to mitigate any potential impacts related to the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Upon implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly.

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Impact. The proposed project would result in long-term benefits by designing the buildings and campus improvements to current codes and sustainability standards. Additionally, with the greater emphasis on reduction of GHG emissions at the District level, more sustainable practices and features are included in the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update than what existed in the 2002 Master Plan. The proposed project is also more in line with the enrollment trends at the College and better responds to the needs of the College curriculum. The proposed project would result in short-term disruptions due to construction activities on the campus, but in the long-term it would result in construction of energy-efficient and state-of-the-art facilities. Therefore, the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update would not result in any long-term environmental harm at the cost of short-term gains.

The proposed project would not result in new significant impacts or exacerbate previously identified significant impacts. Mitigation measures included in the 2002 FEIR in addition to added proposed mitigation measures would reduce all potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. None of the conditions described in Section 15162 requiring the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred. Therefore, this addendum is considered to be the appropriate environmental document for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update.

REFERENCES

All of the following references are incorporated herewith as though set forth in full. The references are available for review by contacting Shilpa Trisal, ICF International, Inc.

Printed References

ARG. 2011. *2011 Exposition Hall Quonset Hut Feasibility Study and Preservation Plan*

California Air Resources Board. 2008. *Climate Change Scoping Plan*. December.

California Climate Action Team. 2006. *Final 2006 Climate Action Team Report to the Governor and Legislature*. March.

California Division of Mines and Geology. 1998. *Seismic Hazard Zone Map, Canoga Quadrangle*.

———. 2001. *Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the Canoga 7.5-minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California*. Seismic Hazard Zone Report 007.

City of Los Angeles. 2014a. *Zoning Information and Map Access System*.

———. 2014b. *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*.

———. n.d. *Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan*. Department of City Planning. Available: <<http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/pdf/cpksumlu.pdf>>. Accessed: June 28, 2009.

Federal Transit Administration. 2006. *Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment*. Report No. FTA-VA-1003-06. May.

Fehr and Peers. 2014. *Traffic Study for the Pierce College Facilities Master Plan Update Environmental Impact Report*. June.

Kaku Associates, Inc. 2000. Draft Transportation Technical Report for the Warner Center Specific Plan Transportation Improvement and Management Program Restudy and Supplemental Environmental Impact Report. October.

———. 2002. *Traffic and Parking Study for the Pierce College Facilities Master Plan Environmental Impact Report*.

Gonzalez Goodale Architects. 2014. *Pierce College 2014 Draft Facilities Master Plan Update*. February.

Governor's Office of Planning and Research. 2008. *Technical Advisory on CEQA and Climate Change*. June.

Leymaster Environmental Consulting, LLC. 2005. *Supplemental Soil Sampling Report*. October 21.

Los Angeles County. 1990. *Los Angeles County General Plan, Safety Element*.

Los Angeles Pierce College. n.d. *About Pierce College*. Available: <http://www.piercecollege.edu/pierce_about.asp>. Accessed: June 10 and June 18, 2014.

Myra L. Frank & Associates. 2002. *Los Angeles Pierce College Facilities Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*.

Psomas. 2002. *Draft Preliminary Utility Evaluation for Pierce College Los Angeles Community College District*. February 11.

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*.

———. 2003. *Localized Significance Threshold Methodology for CEQA Evaluations*.

Winzler & Kelley Consulting Engineers. 2003. Hazardous materials survey reports (for various on-campus structures).

LIST OF PREPARERS

Lead Agency

Los Angeles Community College District

ICF International

Lee Lisecki, Project Director

Shilpa Trisal, Project Manager

Tamseel Mir, Senior Planner

Peter Hardie, Noise

Keith Cooper, Air Quality

Carson Anderson, Historic Resources

John Mathias, Editor

Tami Mihm, Editor

Debby Jew, Publications Specialist

Consultant

Fehr and Peers, Traffic

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
AESTHETIC RESOURCES PHOTOGRAPHIC
DOCUMENTATION

PHOTO 1: SWEEPING VIEW LOOKING NORTHWEST TOWARD SANTA SUSANA MOUNTAINS (from Equestrian Center)



Source: ICF Jones & Stokes. August 2009

PHOTO 2: SOUTH-FACING VIEW TOWARD CHALK HILLS (from El Rancho Road)



Source: ICF Jones & Stokes. August 2009

PHOTO 3: VIEW NORTHWEST FROM CHALK HILLS ACROSS THE CAMPUS (the Santa Susana Mountains Appearing as a Backdrop)



Source: ICF Jones & Stokes. August 2009

PHOTO 4: VIEW NORTHWEST FROM CHALK HILLS IN THE FAR SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE CAMPUS (Canyon de Lana)



Source: ICF Jones & Stokes. August 2009

PHOTO 5: VIEW NORTHWEST FROM CHALK HILLS



Source: ICF Jones & Stokes. August 2009

PHOTO 6: VIEW SOUTHWEST FROM EQUESTRIAN CENTER (Shows Close-in Development Blocking Some Views From/Into the Campus)



Source: ICF Jones & Stokes. July 2009

APPENDIX B

AIR QUALITY DATA SHEETS

A qualitative air quality analysis was prepared for the proposed 2014 Master Plan Update by ICF International in June 2014. This qualitative analysis concluded that proposed 2014 Master Plan Update emissions would be *similar to or less than* 2010 Master Plan emissions.

The 2010 Master Plan Update air quality analysis demonstrated that emissions would be lower than 2002 EIR emissions. The following data sheets are from the 2010 Master Plan Update air quality analysis.

APPENDIX C

CULTURAL RESOURCES TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

APPENDIX D
TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY
