FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

for

Campus Plan 2002

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

Clearinghouse No. 2003031103

August 2003

PCR

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

for

Campus Plan 2002
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

Clearinghouse No. 2003031103

Prepared For:

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
400 W. Washington Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90015

Prepared By:

PCR Services Corporation
233 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 130
Santa Monica, California 90401
TEL 310.451.4488
FAX 310.451.5279

August 2003

PCR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

I--Introduction

I. INTRODUCTION

Section 15132 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall consist of: "(a) the Draft EIR or a revision of the draft; (b) comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary; (c) a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR; and (d) the responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process." The Final EIR for the Los Angeles Trade Technical College ("College") Campus Plan 2002 project is comprised of the Draft EIR dated May 2003, and this document dated August 2003.

The Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and circulated for public review on May 7, 2003. The 45-day comment period required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 concluded on June 20, 2003. A public meeting on the Draft EIR was held before the Los Angeles Community College District ("District") Board of Trustees on May 29, 2003. No formal comments requiring written responses were received during the public meeting. Two public hearings on the Draft EIR were held on the College campus, one on May 15 and one on June 12, 2003. Public comments received during the hearings are reproduced in Section II., Comments Received During the Public Hearings on the Draft EIR, of this document. The comments received during the public hearings have been assigned a "letter" in order to provide a corresponding response from the District. For example, the first comment is listed as Comment A-1, and this corresponds to Response A-1 from the District. Transcripts of the proceedings are presented in Appendix A.

The District received a total of four (4) comment letters. These letters included submissions from State, regional, and city agencies. Copies of the original comment letters are provided in Section III., Comment Letters, of this document. The text contained in the original letters is reproduced in Section IV., Response to Comments, of this document, and each of the comments contained in the letters is also responded to in Section IV of this document. The comments contained in each letter and the corresponding response from the District have been assigned a number. For example, the first comment contained in Letter 1 from the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, is listed as Comment 1.1, and this corresponds to Response 1.1 from the District. A list of all the letters received, along with a summary of the general issues raised in each letter, is contained in Table I-1 on page 3. Issues identified as "other" relate to non-CEQA issues or issues that do not address adequacy or content of the Draft EIR. Comments received that did not address CEQA issues, but expressed general support or opposition to the project are identified as such. Section V., Additions and Corrections to the Draft EIR, provides a description of all changes or additions made to the Draft EIR as a result of comments received. Section VI., Final Executive Summary, of this document contains the Summary of Project

Impacts and Mitigation Measures table, which has been revised to reflect changes made to the Draft EIR as a result of comments received. None of the changes made to the Draft EIR affect the original conclusions related to potential environmental significance that were drawn in the Draft EIR. Lastly, Section VII., Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, presents the full text of each mitigation measure together with the action required, timing of implementation, the agency or party responsible for the action, and the agency or party responsible for verifying the completion of the action.

Table I-1

Summary of Written Comments

	Letter No.	Response Page No.	Project Description	Air Quality	Historic Resources	Noise	Transportation/Circulation	Alternatives	Mitigation Measures	Long-Range Implications	Acknowledgement of Receipt	Other
FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES												
State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse 1400 Tenth Street, P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044	1	21									♦	
State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse 1400 Tenth Street, P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044	2	23									♦	
REGIONAL AND LOCAL AGENCIES												
Southern California Association of Governments, Main Office 818 West Seventh Street, 12th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017-3435	3	24									♦	
City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation 221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 500 Los Angeles, California 90017	4	26					♦		♦			

II--Comments Received During the Public Hearings on the Draft EIR

II. COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE DRAFT EIR

PUBLIC HEARING ON MAY 15, 2003

The first public hearing was held on May 15, 2003. Following is a list of attendees:

Coomy Bilimoria

Mary Ann Breckell

Maria Carvajal

Dr. Daniel Castro

Mary Catlin

Jim Favaro

Jerry Hostalek

Ron Johnson

Deba P. Mohapatra

Sally Salavea

Sam Shabot

Amy Shellhorn

Patricia Shoemaker

Each comment offered during the public hearing held on May 15, 2003 is presented below followed by a response. A complete transcript of the proceedings is provided in Appendix A.

STATEMENT BY MR. SAM SHABOT

Comment A-1

My name is Sam, S-a-m, last name Shabot, S-h-a-b-o-t, student at Trade-Tech, Los Angeles Trade-Tech College, also West Los Angeles College. I am strongly in favor of the full retention of the historic building. I wanted to ask, what was the cost of removal and did you consider that and also consider the drastic reduction in space?

Response A-1

The eight-volume Campus Plan 2002 presents in detail the proposed removal of certain buildings and structures, including Building C, as well as the proposed construction of new buildings and landscape improvements together with the associated costs. Section II., Project Description, of the Draft EIR presents the proposed physical changes associated with the 5-year plan.

Section 15131(b) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires that an EIR explain the reason for determining that the effect is significant where economic or social effects have been used to determine that a physical change is significant. The cost of demolition would be considered an economic effect. Economic effects were not used to determine the significant effects of the Project on Building C. Rather, Building C's potential value as a local historic resource was used to determine the significant effects of the Project on Building C. Accordingly, the cost of demolition need not be explained within the Draft EIR.[1]

Building C consists of approximately 35,728 gross square feet (GSF) of building space. The Project would remove Buildings C, E, M, N, R, PTA, and Apffel's Coffee Company, totaling approximately 167,994 GSF, of which an estimated 97,701 GSF is currently a part of the College's inventory of instructional and support space. Proposed new construction would add about 181,366 GSF of building space, consisting of the North Building (57,765 GSF), South Building (68,950 GSF), additions to existing Buildings D, H, K, and L (40,651 GSF), and construction of a new Child Development Center (14,000 GSF). The existing campus provides about 779,400 GSF of building space. Overall, the proposed Project would increase the building space on campus to 850,000, resulting in a net increase of approximately 70,600 square.

[1] *CEQA Guidelines Section 15131(b) states "…Where an EIR uses economic or social effects to determine that a physical change is significant, the EIR shall explain the reason for determining that the effect is significant."*

Comment A-2

I understand there is a need for open space, but this building, just taking it out, it doesn't seem -- even though the need for open space, it's basically a working building and it seems that taxpayers' money is being spent to remove a functional building that might even have historical value to it is just being taken out. I understand there's other space being created elsewhere, and I wanted to know what the cost of that was in relation to the total amount of money spent on all these projects, different projects?

Response A-2

The Project-Specific Objectives include the desire to "increase landscaped areas, open space and recreational areas to 55 percent …" (Draft EIR page 25). The proposed Project would achieve this objective by removing certain buildings, thereby increasing open space from 355,316 SF (30 percent) to 682,344 SF (55 percent). The buildings proposed for removal are generally "buildings that contribute minimal instructional and office space to the campus inventory yet consume a lot of its available land."[2] Removal of Building C and the adjacent Building E would open the core of the north campus for creation of the North Quad. The proposed North Quad would shape a part of the tranquil space around which college life would center, and provide the means to reinforce campus and community connectivity by creating a physical and visual opening to the South Campus.

Although Building C is currently occupied with classrooms and computer laboratories, it is inefficient and underutilized due to its configuration and infrastructure (mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and data systems). Although the College considered renovation of Building C, it ultimately determined removal of the building necessary for the following reasons:

- Building C has serious deficient structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and therefore the cost-benefit ratio of its remodel to provide useful instructional and support space for the College was deemed too high.

- In consideration of the life-cycle costs, operations and maintenance costs of Building C were deemed an unnecessary burden on the College in relation to its operational benefits. Specifically, Building C offers low quality space with high maintenance and operations costs.

- The anticipated long-term operations and maintenance cost-savings associated with removal of Building C would be invested in the creation of state-of-the-art instructional and/support facilities in a more efficient, sustainable arrangement with

[2] *Los Angeles Trade Technical College, Campus Plan 2002, Appendix I, page i.*

better life-cycle costs performance over time and in a more beneficial location on campus.

- One-story Building C was constructed in 1936, when the density and intensity of land development within the downtown area of Los Angeles was considerably lower than that of the existing urban setting. In 2003, a one-story building in downtown Los Angeles, where (i) there are many buildings of eight stories and more and (ii) real estate is expensive, would be considered an inefficient and costly use of a limited and valuable resource—land. For the College, Building C represents an inefficient and costly use of land.

- Given its proximity to four surrounding buildings, the position of Building C within the overall campus is detrimental to the quality of the educational environment such that the campus environment, whose purpose is to support the educational mission of the College, suffers.

- Recognizing its limited real estate holdings and the scarce availability of real estate adjacent to the existing campus, the College considers an increase in the intensity of its building space (floor area ratio) the most reasonable, practicable solution to meeting its Project objectives. In order to create and preserve an acceptable college campus environment, an increase in open space must accompany the increase of intensity; hence the overriding priority of creating meaningful, generous open spaces in locations beneficial to the larger campus community, specifically, the Building C site.

STATEMENT BY MS. MARY CATLIN

Comment B

I notice the public hearing was scheduled for an evening. Is it possible that the public hearing, maybe one, can be held during the daytime while students are on campus?

Response B

In accordance with the Los Angeles Community College District Regulation B-24, the College must conduct two public hearings during the public review period for the Draft EIR. In order to facilitate the broadest possible participation, both hearings were held toward the end of the day, beginning at 6:00 P.M. and ending at 8:00 P.M. The meeting announcements were published within the Los Angeles Times and La Opinion newspapers, and posted at locations on the campus and on the College's official website. Meeting announcements were also sent by direct mail to residents and businesses within 1,000 feet of the College campus. This method of public outreach is consistent with District Regulation B-24.

To date, the District and College have conducted 14 meetings on the proposed Campus Plan 2002, three of which were specifically on the Draft EIR. The meeting dates and forums include:

- October 15, 2001, Planning Advisory Committee
- October 22, 2001, Town Hall Meeting
- December 17, 2001, Presentation at the Garden Room
- January 22, 2002, Oversight Committee
- February 11, 2002, Planning Advisory Committee
- March 11, 2002, Oversight Committee
- March 20, 2002, Town Hall Meeting
- July 23, 2002, Grand Theater
- March 26, 2003, Board of Trustees
- March 26, 2003, OINC Committee
- May 15, 2003, Draft EIR Public Hearing

- May 28, 2003, Board of Trustees
- May 28, 2003, OINC Committee
- June 12, 2003, Draft EIR Public Hearing

PUBLIC HEARING ON JUNE 12, 2003

The second public hearing was held on June 12, 2003. Representatives of the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College and the Project Team were in attendance, including:

Mary Ann Breckell

Maria Carvajal

Dr. Daniel Castro

James Favaro

Jerry Hostalek

Ron Johnson

Hector Semiden

Patricia Shoemaker

No other persons were in attendance and no comments were offered (received) during the public hearing held on June 12, 2003. A transcript of the proceedings is provided in Appendix A.

III--Comment Letters

Letter 1

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

State Clearinghouse

Gray Davis
Governor

Tal Finney
Interim Director

June 23, 2003

Mary Ann Breckell
Los Angeles Community College District
400 West Washington Blvd
Building A, Room A-108
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Subject: Los Angeles Trade-Technical College (LATTC) Campus Plan 2002
SCH#: 2003031103

Dear Mary Ann Breckell:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on June 20, 2003, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. 1.1

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

ACG & AVA
Los Angeles Community College District
Proposition A Bond Program

JUN 27 2003

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2003031103
Project Title Los Angeles Trade-Technical College (LATTC) Campus Plan 2002
Lead Agency Los Angeles Community College District

Type EIR Draft EIR

Description Campus Plan 2002 is a 5-year master plan that identifies specific construction, demolition, renovation and other facility improvements, resulting in a net gain of 70,000 square feet of building space and 1,100 parking spaces. Several buildings would be removed; open space would be reconfigured and expanded; two five-story classroom buildings and a new child development center would be built; two levels of subterranean parking and a six-level garage would be developed; and the remaining buildings would be renovated, modernized and expanded. The Project would accommodate an anticipated increase in enrollment from a current level of approximately 15,000 to a future level of approximately 21,300.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Mary Ann Breckell
Agency Los Angeles Community College District
Phone 213-763-7040 **Fax**
email
Address 400 West Washington Blvd
Building A, Room A-108
City Los Angeles **State** CA **Zip** 90015

Project Location

County Los Angeles
City Los Angeles, City of
Region
Cross Streets Grand Ave., Washington Blvd., Flower St., 23rd St.
Parcel No.
Township **Range** **Section** **Base**

Proximity to:

Highways 110, I-10
Airports
Railways MTA Metro Rail
Waterways
Schools LAUSD School
Land Use Land Use-College Campus;
Zoning-Multi-family Residential, Commercial, and Industrial
Plan Designation-Institutional

Project Issues Archaeologic-Historic; Noise; Traffic/Circulation; Growth Inducing; Cumulative Effects

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Integrated Waste Management Board; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission

Date Received 05/07/2003 **Start of Review** 05/07/2003 **End of Review** 06/20/2003

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

Letter 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

State Clearinghouse

Gray Davis
Governor

Tal Finney
Interim Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT

DATE: May 9, 2003

TO: Mary Ann Breckell
Los Angeles Community College District
400 West Washington Blvd
Building A, Room A-108
Los Angeles, CA 90015

RE: Los Angeles Trade-Technical College (LATTC) Campus Plan 2002
SCH#: 2003031103

This is to acknowledge that the State Clearinghouse has received your environmental document for state review. The review period assigned by the State Clearinghouse is:

Review Start Date: May 7, 2003
Review End Date: June 20, 2003

We have distributed your document to the following agencies and departments:

California Highway Patrol
Caltrans, District 7
Department of Conservation
Department of Fish and Game, Region 5
Department of Parks and Recreation
Department of Toxic Substances Control
Integrated Waste Management Board
Native American Heritage Commission
Office of Historic Preservation
Public Utilities Commission
Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4
Resources Agency

2.1

The State Clearinghouse will provide a closing letter with any state agency comments to your attention on the date following the close of the review period.

Thank you for your participation in the State Clearinghouse review process.

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044
(916)445-0613 FAX(916)323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS
Main Office
818 West Seventh Street
12th Floor
Los Angeles, California
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800
f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

May 21, 2003

Ms. Mary Ann Breckell
Vice President, Administration
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
400 W. Washington Blvd., Bldg. A, Room A-108
Los Angeles, CA 90015

RE: SCAG Clearinghouse No. I 20030262 Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Campus Plan 2002

Dear Ms. Breckell:

Thank you for submitting the **Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Campus Plan 2002** for review and comment. As areawide clearinghouse for regionally significant projects, SCAG reviews the consistency of local plans, projects and programs with regional plans. This activity is based on SCAG's responsibilities as a regional planning organization pursuant to state and federal laws and regulations. Guidance provided by these reviews is intended to assist local agencies and project sponsors to take actions that contribute to the attainment of regional goals and policies.

We have reviewed the **Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Campus Plan 2002**, and have determined that the proposed Project is not regionally significant per SCAG Intergovernmental Review (IGR) Criteria and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Section 15206). Therefore, the proposed Project does not warrant comments at this time. Should there be a change in the scope of the proposed Project, we would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment at that time. 3.1

A description of the proposed Project was published in SCAG's **May 1-15, 2003** Intergovernmental Review Clearinghouse Report for public review and comment.

The project title and SCAG Clearinghouse number should be used in all correspondence with SCAG concerning this Project. Correspondence should be sent to the attention of the Clearinghouse Coordinator. If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 236-1867. Thank you.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY M. SMITH, AICP
Senior Regional Planner
Intergovernmental Review

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

WAYNE K. TANDA
GENERAL MANAGER

JAMES K. HAHN
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
221 N. FIGUEROA ST. SUITE 500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
(213) 580-1177
FAX (213) 580-1188

ACG & AVA
Los Angeles Community College District
Proposition A Bond Program

JUN 19 2003

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Grand Ave & Washington Bl

June 18, 2003

Mary Ann Breckell
Vice President, Administration
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
400 W. Washington Boulevard, Building A, Room A-108
Los Angeles, CA 90015

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR) FOR THE LOS ANGELES TRADE TECHNICAL COLLEGE LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF GRAND AVENUE AND WASHINGTON BOULEVARD

The Department of Transportation (DOT) has reviewed the DEIR prepared by PCR Services Corporation, dated May 2003, and supporting traffic study prepared by traffic consultant, KAKU Associates, for the proposed Los Angeles Trade Technical College project located on the southwest corner Grand Avenue and Washington Boulevard. The project is located on the block bounded by Washington Boulevard on the north, 23rd Street on the south, Grand Avenue on the east, and Flower Street on the west. The study analyzed fifteen intersections and determined that six of the fifteen study intersections would be significantly impacted by project related traffic. The DEIR does not include data as to the adequacy of the proposed parking structure to meet the campus needs. Since there may be parking impacts of the proposed expansion plan, this oversight may affect the adequacy of the DEIR. Except as noted, the DEIR adequately evaluated the project's traffic impacts on the surrounding community.

4.1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is a five-year master plan, which includes the removal of some existing facilities, new building construction, renovations and additions to existing buildings, new landscape and open space construction, and other modification to the campus. The project would increase the total building gross square feet (GSF) on the campus from 780,000 GSF to 850,600 GSF and increase the open space from 355,316 square feet (SF) to 682,344 SF. The improvements are designed to accommodate an increase of student enrollment from 15,000 to 21,300 students. In addition, a 700 space subterranean parking lot is proposed on campus below the track and field and a 400 space, six level, parking structure is proposed on the east side of Grand Avenue. The build out year is expected to be in 2007. The project will have some significant street changes including the street vacation of 21st Street, 22nd Street, Hope Street, and the realignment of 23rd Street.

The project will result in a net increase of 463 AM peak hour trips and 842 PM peak hour trips.

SIGNIFICANTLY IMPACTED INTERSECTIONS

The proposed project will have a significant traffic impact at the following intersections: 4.2

1. Grand Avenue and Santa Monica Freeway WB Ramps/17th Street
2. Grand Avenue and Washington Boulevard
3. Grand Avenue and 22nd Street
4. Grand Avenue and 23rd Street
5. Adams Boulevard and Harbor Freeway NB Off-Ramps
6. Adams Boulevard and Grand Avenue

MITIGATION MEASURES

Grand Avenue and Santa Monica Freeway WB Ramps/17th Street

The proposed mitigation to restripe the westbound approach to provide an additional through lane is not acceptable to LADOT.

Grand Avenue and Washington Boulevard

LADOT concurs that no physical or operational mitigation measure was feasible at this intersection. 4.3

Grand Avenue and 22nd Street

LADOT has no objection to the street vacation of the west leg of this intersection. This will become the main entrance for the campus. If the installation of the new traffic signal is found to be warranted by LADOT in the next five years, then all cost for the design and installation of the new traffic signal would be the responsibility of the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College. 4.4

Grand Avenue and 23rd Street

LADOT has no objection to the proposed re-alignment of the west leg of 23rd Street and the installation of an eastbound left turn only lane. 23rd Street is currently a jogged intersection at Grand Avenue and the realignment will simplify the intersection. However, due to proximity of the proposed driveway serving the proposed 23rd Street parking structure, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College must dedicate additional right-of-way beyond the street standards to provide for a westbound right-turn-only lane to the subterranean parking structure. 4.5

Adams Boulevard and Harbor Freeway NB Off-Ramps

The proposed mitigation to provide a right-turn only lane on the "mixed flow" portion of the northbound Harbor Freeway off-ramp is acceptable to LADOT. However, the freeway ramp is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The developer should contact Caltrans to coordinate the proposed improvements at the freeway ramp. 4.6

Adams Boulevard and Grand Avenue

LADOT concurs that no physical or operational mitigation measure was feasible at this intersection. 4.7

Unless otherwise specified, the proposed mitigation measures and improvements shall be implemented through the Bureau of Engineering's (BOE's) B-Permit process and Caltrans encroachment permit process. Construction of the improvements to the satisfaction of LADOT, BOE, and Caltrans must be completed before issuance of any certificate of occupancy. Should any improvement not receive required approval, the City may substitute an alternative measure of an equivalent cost and effectiveness. Prior to setting the bond amount, BOE shall require that the developer's engineer or contractor contact LADOT B-Permit Coordinator, telephone (213) 580-5336, to arrange a pre-design meeting to finalize the proposed design needed for the project. 4.8

COMMENT

Grand Avenue and 21st Street, 22nd Street, and Hope Street

LADOT has no objection to the street vacation of 21st Street, 22nd Street, and Hope Street, which are local streets. 4.9

HIGHWAY DEDICATION AND STREET WIDENING REQUIREMENTS

23rd Street is classified as a Collector Street, which requires a 22-foot half-width roadway on a 32-foot half-width right-of-way. The voluntary realignment of 23rd Street will require additional right-of-way to mitigate impacts at the 23rd Street garage entrance.

Flower Street is classified as a Secondary Highway, which requires a 35-foot half-width roadway on a 45-foot half-width right-of-way.

Grand Avenue is classified as a Major Class II Highway, which requires a 40-foot half-width roadway on a 52-foot half-width right-of-way. Grand Avenue is currently improved to a 28-foot half-width roadway on a 40-foot half-width right-of-way. DOT recommends a 12-foot dedication and widening along the project frontage to accommodate left turn channelization into the expanded campus. 4.10

Washington Boulevard is classified as a Major Class II Highway, which requires a 40-foot half-width roadway on a 52-foot half-width right-of-way.

It appears that additional highway dedication may be required for streets fronting the proposed project. The developer must check with the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) Land Development Group to determine the highway dedication, street widening and sidewalk requirements for the project.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

DOT recommends that a construction work site traffic control plan be submitted to DOT for review and approval prior to the start of any construction work. The plan should show the location of any roadway or sidewalk closures, traffic detours, haul routes, hours of operation, protective devices, warning signs and access to abutting properties. DOT also recommends that all construction related traffic be restricted to off-peak hours. 4.11

DRIVEWAY ACCESS

The review of this study does not constitute approval of the driveway access and circulation scheme. Those require separate review and approval and should be coordinated as soon 4.12

as possible with DOT's Citywide Planning Coordination Section (201 N. Figueroa Street, 4th Floor, Station 25) to avoid delays in the building permit approval process. All driveways should be Case 2 driveways and 30 feet wide. 4.12

If you have any questions, please contact Ed Chow of my staff (213) 240-3074.

Sincerely,

Allyn D. Rifkin, Principal Transportation Engineer
Department of Transportation

cc: Council District No. 9
Kaku Associates
Steve Buswell, Caltrans
Central District, LADOT
Design Division, LADOT
Offstreet Parking Division, LADOT
Citywide Planning Coordination Section, LADOT
Land Development Group, BOE
Community Redevelopment Agency

Letters/LA_TradeTech_College.doc

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF FIRE

200 NORTH MAIN STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

WILLIAM R. BAMATTRE
FIRE CHIEF

(213) 485-6003
FAX: (213) 485-8247

http://www.lafd.org

April 11, 2003

Los Angeles Trade-Technical Community College
400 W. Washington Blvd., Bldg. A, Room A108
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Attn: Mary Ann Brekell
Vice President, Administration

Subject: **COLLEGE CAMPUS PLAN 2002**

PROJECT LOCATION

The Project is located on the existing campus of the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College and on the adjoining property at 2115 S. Grand Avenue. The existing campus is in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, and is generally bounded by Washington Boulevard on the north; Flower Street on the west; 23rd Street on the south and Olive Street on the east.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Campus Plan 2002 is a 5-year master plan that identifies specific construction, demolition, renovation and other facility improvements to be achieved using the funds allocated by Proposition A. The Project would accommodate an anticipated increase in enrollment from a current level of approximately 15,000 students to a future level of approximately 21,300 students. The Project would result in a net gain of 70,000 square feet of building space and 1,100 parking spaces. Several existing buildings would be removed; the remaining buildings would be renovated and expanded; two five-story classroom buildings and a new child development center would be added; campus open space would be reconfigured and expanded; and two levels of subterranean parking and a six-level parking garage would be developed.

A. Fire Flow

The adequacy of fire protection for a given area is based on required fire-flow, response distance from existing fire stations, and this Department's judgment for needs in the area. In general, the required fire-flow is closely related to

Letter XX

ACG & AVA
Los Angeles Community College District
Proposition A Bond Program

APR 14 2003

DOCUMENT CONTROL

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS
Main Office
818 West Seventh Street
12th Floor
Los Angeles, California
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800
f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

April 9, 2003

Ms. Mary Ann Breckell
Vice President, Administration
Los Angeles Trade-Technical Community College
400 W. Washington Blvd. A, Room A-108
Los Angeles, CA 90015

RE: SCAG Clearinghouse No. I 20030178 Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Campus Plan 2002

Dear Ms. Breckell:

Thank you for submitting the **Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Campus Plan 2002** or review and comment. As areawide clearinghouse for regionally significant projects, SCAG reviews the consistency of local plans, projects and programs with regional plans. This activity is based on SCAG's responsibilities as a regional planning organization pursuant to state and federal laws and regulations. Guidance provided by these reviews is intended to assist local agencies and project sponsors to take actions that contribute to the attainment of regional goals and policies.

We have reviewed the **Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Campus Plan 2002**, and have determined that the proposed Project is not regionally significant per SCAG Intergovernmental Review (IGR) Criteria and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Section 15206). Therefore, the proposed Project does not warrant comments at this time. Should there be a change in the scope of the proposed Project, we would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment at that time.

A description of the proposed Project was published in SCAG's **March 16-31, 2003** Intergovernmental Review Clearinghouse Report for public review and comment.

The project title and SCAG Clearinghouse number should be used in all correspondence with SCAG concerning this Project. Correspondence should be sent to the attention of the Clearinghouse Coordinator. If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 236-1867. Thank you.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY M. SMITH, AICP
Senior Regional Planner
Intergovernmental Review

land use. The quantity of water necessary for fire protection varies with the type of development, life hazard, occupancy, and the degree of fire hazard.

Fire-flow requirements will vary from 2,000 gallons per minute (G.P.M.) in low Density Residential areas to 12,000 GPM. In high-density commercial or industrial areas. A minimum residual water pressure of 20 pounds per square inch (P.S.I.) is to remain in the water system, with the required gallons per minute flowing. The required fire-flow for this project has been set at 4,000 G.P.M. from four fire hydrants flowing simultaneously.

B. Response Distance

The Fire Department has existing fire stations at the following locations for initial response into the area of the proposed development:

Fire Station No. 10
1335 S. Olive Street
Los Angeles, CA
Task Force Truck and Engine Company
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance
EMT Rescue Ambulance
Staff – 14
Miles – 0.6

Fire Station No. 15
915 S. Jefferson Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Task Force Truck and Engine Company
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance
EMT Rescue Ambulance
Staff – 14
Miles – 1.4

Fire Station No. 9
430 E. 7th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90014
Task Force Truck and Engine Company
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance
Battalion 1 Headquarters
Staff – 13
Miles – 1.8

The above distances were computed to 400 W. Washington Blvd.

C. Firefighting Access, Apparatus, and Personnel.

Based on these criteria (response distance from existing fire stations), fire protection would be considered adequate.

Adequate off-site public and on-site private fire hydrants may be required. Their number and location to be determined after the Fire Department's review of the plot plan.

Submit plot plans indicating access road and turning area for Fire Department approval.

Standard cut-corners will be used on all turns.

During demolition, the Fire Department access will remain clear and unobstructed.

Fire lane width shall not be less than 20 feet. When a fire lane must accommodate the operation of Fire Department aerial ladder apparatus or where fire hydrants are installed, those portions shall not be less than 28 feet in width.

Where access for a given development requires accommodation of Fire Department apparatus, minimum outside radius of the paved surface shall be 35 feet. An additional six feet of clear space must be maintained beyond the outside radius to a vertical point 13 feet 6 inches above the paved surface of the roadway.

No building or portion of a building shall be constructed more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road, or designated fire lane.

Where access for a given development requires accommodation of Fire Department apparatus, overhead clearance shall not be less than 14 feet.

Adequate public and private fire hydrants shall be required.

The Fire Department may require additional vehicular access where buildings exceed 28 feet in height.

Where fire apparatus will be driven onto the road level surface of the subterranean parking structure, that structure shall be engineered to withstand a bearing pressure of 8,600 pounds per square foot.

CONCLUSION

The proposed project shall comply with all applicable State and local codes and ordinances, and the guidelines found in the Fire Protection and Fire Prevention Plan, as well as the Safety Plan, both of which are elements of the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles C.P.C. 19708).

For additional information, please contact Inspector Michael Theule of the Construction Services Unit at (213) 482-6509.

WILLIAM R. BAMATTRE
Fire Chief

Alfred B. Hernandez, Assistant Fire Marshal
Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety

ABH:MT:gm
c:College Campus Plan 2002

Letter XX

M. Carbajal

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

WILLIAM J. BRATTON
Chief of Police

JAMES K. HAHN
Mayor

P.O. Box 30158
Los Angeles, Calif. 90030
Telephone: (213) 485-4101
TDD: (877) 275-5273
Ref #: 1.1.2

ACG & AVA
Los Angeles Community College District
Proposition A Bond Program

APR 16 2003

DOCUMENT CONTROL

RECEIVED
03 APR 11 PM 3:53
ADMINISTRATION OFFICE
LATTC

April 10, 2003

Ms. Mary Ann Breckell
Vice President, Administration
Los Angeles Trade-Technical Community College
400 West Washington Boulevard, Bldg. A, Room A-108
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Ms. Breckell:

PROJECT TITLE: LOS ANGELES TRADE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

The proposed project involves the Los Angeles Police Department's (LAPD) Newton Area. Enclosed are Area and individual Reporting District population, average crime rate per thousand persons, predominant crimes, response time to emergency calls for service, and Area personnel statistics and information. The Department's response is based on information received from the Area in which the project is located, LAPD's Information Technology Division, and input from Crime Prevention Unit (CPU) personnel.

In review of this project it is noted that the time span for completion of this development would transpire over a 5-year period. With the added increase of approximately 63,000 students from the current level of approximately 15,000 students, it is determined that a project of this size would have a moderate impact on police services in Newton Area. Also, appropriate security measures should be practiced during the construction phase of this project. The LAPD's Community Relations Section, CPU, is available to advise you on crime prevention features appropriate to the design of the property involved. The LAPD strongly recommends that developers contact CPU personnel to discuss these features.

Upon completion of the project, you are encouraged to provide the Newton Area commanding officer with a diagram of each portion of the property. The diagram should include access routes and any additional information that might facilitate police response.

Questions regarding this response should be referred to Sergeant John Amendola, Community Relations Section, at (213) 485-4101.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM J. BRATTON
Chief of Police

FRED BOOKER, Lieutenant
Officer in Charge
Community Relations Section
Office of the Chief of Police

FILE

Enclosures

NEWTON AREA

The Los Angeles Trade Technical College project is located in Newton Area, in Reporting District (RD) 1321. The Newton Area covers 9.79 square miles and the station is located at 3400 S. Central Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90011, (323) 846-6547.

The service boundaries of Newton Area are as follows: Washington Boulevard, Maple Avenue, 9th Street, San Pedro Street, and 7th Street to the north; Florence Avenue to the south; the Harbor Freeway (110) to the west; and the Los Angeles River to the east.

The boundaries for RD 1321 are as follows: Washington Boulevard to the north; Figueroa Street to the west; Adams Boulevard to the south; and Maple Avenue to the east.

The average response time to emergency calls for service in Newton Area during 2002 was 9.5 minutes. The Citywide average during 2002 was 10.2 minutes. There are approximately 269 sworn officers and 22 civilian support staff deployed over three watches at Newton Area. There were 65 crimes per 1000 persons in Newton Area in 2002. Individual RD crime statistics, population and crimes per 1000 persons are listed on the attached RD information sheet. The predominant crimes in Newton Area are aggravated assaults, burglary from vehicles, and vehicle thefts.

Prepared by:
Crime Prevention Unit
Community Relations Section

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
CRIMES BY REPORTING DISTRICT OF OCCURRENCE

PROJECT NAME: LOS ANGELES TRADE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

TYPE OF CRIME	RD * 1321	NEWTON AREA	CITYWIDE
Burglary from Business	44	407	5,407
Burglary from Residence	7	493	15,155
Burglary Other	4	206	4,758
Street Robbery	31	893	11,259
Other Robbery	10	294	5,998
Murder	0	46	655
Rape	3	68	1,400
Aggravated Assault	29	1,993	32,491
Burglary from Vehicle	81	1,388	29,135
Theft from Vehicle	20	762	13,467
Grand Theft	10	502	12,408
Theft from Person	2	71	1,006
Purse Snatch	1	22	348
Other Theft	19	609	22,890
Bicycle Theft	0	8	306
Vehicle Theft	112	2,057	34,123
Bunco	0	2	133
TOTAL	373	9,821	190,939

CRIMES PER 1000 PERSONS

REPORTING DISTRICT	CRIMES	/	POPULATION X 1000	CRIMES PER 1000 PERSONS
NEWTON	9,821	/	150,734	65/1000
CITYWIDE	190,939	/	3,865,000	49/1000

* All statistical information is based on 2002 Los Angeles Police Department Selected Crimes and Attempts by Reporting District from the Police Arrest and Crime Management Information System 2 report.

IV--Response to Comments

IV. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

LETTER NO. 1

Date Received: May 20, 2003

State of California
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

RE: Los Angeles Trade-Technical College (LATTC) Campus Plan 2002 SCH#: 2003031103

Comment 1.1

This is to acknowledge that the State Clearinghouse has received your environmental document for state review. The review period assigned by the State Clearinghouse is:

Review Start Date: May 7, 2003
Review End Date: June 20, 2003

We have distributed your document to the following agencies and departments:

California Highway Patrol
Caltrans, District 7
Department of Conservation
Department of Fish and Game, Region 5
Department of Parks and Recreation
Department of Toxic Substances Control
Integrated Waste Management Board
Native American Heritage Commission
Office of Historic Preservation
Public Utilities Commission
Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4
Resources Agency

The State Clearinghouse will provide a closing letter with any state agency comments to your attention on the date following the close of the review period.

Thank you for your participation in the State Clearinghouse review process.

Response 1.1

This comment indicates that the State Clearinghouse of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research received the Draft EIR. Since this comment is not directed at the adequacy or conclusions in the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

LETTER NO. 2

Date Received: June 27, 2003

Terry Roberts, Director, State Clearinghouse
State of California
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

Subject: Los Angeles Trade Technical College (LATTC) Campus Plan 2002
SCH#: 2003031103

Comment 2.1

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above-named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on June 20, 2003, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Response 2.1

This comment indicates that the State Clearinghouse of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research submitted the Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review and that no state agencies submitted comments by the date the review period closed (June 20, 2003). Furthermore, the comment acknowledges that the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, have been met.

Since this comment is not directed at the adequacy or conclusions in the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

LETTER NO. 3

Date Received: May 30, 2003

Jeffrey M. Smith, AICP
Senior Regional Planner Intergovernmental Review
Southern California Association of Governments, Main Office
818 West Seventh Street, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017-3435

RE: SCAG Clearinghouse No. 1 20030262 Los Angles Trade-Technical College Campus Plan 2002

Comment 3.1

Thank you for submitting the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Campus Plan 2002 for review and comment. As areawide clearinghouse for regionally significant projects, SCAG reviews the consistency of local plans, projects and programs with regional plans. This activity is based on SCAG's responsibilities as a regional planning organization pursuant to state and federal laws and regulations. Guidance provided by these reviews is intended to assist local agencies and project sponsors to take actions that contribute to the attainment of regional goals and policies.

We have reviewed the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Campus Plan 2002, and have determined that the proposed Project is not regionally significant per SCAG Intergovernmental Review (IGR) Criteria and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Section 15206). Therefore, the proposed Project does not warrant comments at this time. Should there be a change in the scope of the proposed Project, we would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment at that time.

A description of the proposed Project was published in SCAG's May 1-15, 2003 Intergovernmental Review Clearinghouse Report for public review and comment.

The project title and SCAG Clearinghouse number should be used in all correspondence with SCAG concerning this Project. Correspondence should be sent to the attention of the Clearinghouse Coordinator. If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 236-1867. Thank you.

Response 3.1

This comment indicates SCAG's determination that the proposed Project is not regionally significant per SCAG Intergovernmental Review Criteria and CEQA Guidelines (Section 15206), and based on that determination has no comments to offer at this time. SCAG requests the opportunity to review and comment should there be a change in the scope of the proposed Project.

Comment 3.1 is noted. Since the comment is not directed at the adequacy or conclusions in the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

LETTER NO. 4

Date Received: June 18, 2003

Allyn D. Rifkin, Principal Transportation Engineer
City of Los Angeles
Department of Transportation
221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 500
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Comment 4.1

The Department of Transportation (DOT) has reviewed the DEIR prepared by PCR Services Corporation, dated May 2003, and supporting traffic study prepared by traffic consultant, KAKU Associates, for the proposed Los Angeles Trade Technical College project located on the southwest corner Grand Avenue and Washington Boulevard. The project is located on the block bounded by Washington Boulevard on the north, 23rd Street on the south, Grand Avenue on the east, and Flower Street on the west. The study analyzed fifteen intersections and determined that six of the fifteen study intersections would be significantly impacted by project related traffic. The DEIR does not include data as to the adequacy of the proposed parking structure to meet the campus needs. Since there may be parking impacts of the proposed expansion plan, this oversight may affect the adequacy of the DEIR. Except as noted, the DEIR adequately evaluated the project's traffic impacts on the surrounding community.

Response 4.1

Parking for the proposed Project is discussed in Draft EIR ("DEIR") Section II., Project Description, on pages 38, 40, 44 and 48. The parking analysis is presented on pages 156 and 157 of the DEIR, Section V.D.2.g., Parking.

Those sections of the DEIR note there are 1,690 parking spaces within and around the campus. Of the 1,690 parking spaces, about 840 are within surface parking lots on the campus, approximately 550 are within off-campus lots, and about 300 are metered street parking spaces. Based on the spaces available and the current enrollment of 15,000, the current ratio of parking availability to demand is about 0.113 spaces per student. The proposed Project includes construction of 700 new parking spaces in the proposed subterranean garage and 400 new parking spaces in the garage and lot on the east side of Grand Street. In addition, the physical changes to the campus would remove 192 existing spaces. After completion of the Project, the total number of parking spaces available to the College would be 2,598. Based on this number of spaces anticipated to be available and a future enrollment of 21,300 students, the future ratio

of parking availability to demand would be about 0.122 spaces per student, a slight increase in availability.

On DEIR page 156, the analysis indicates that the demand for parking would be reduced compared to typical suburban community college campuses due to heavy transit presence adjacent to the Project. Paragraph 3 of page 156 informs the reader that the empirical count of trip rates generated by the College were only 67 percent of the trip rates for Community College campuses,[3] and therefore the Project would only generate 67 percent of the parking demand of a typical Community College Campus. The parking ratios for the Los Angeles Southwest College and Los Angeles Pierce College are 0.141 and 0.182 spaces per student, respectively. The proposed parking plan for the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College would increase the parking ratio from 0.113 to 0.122 spaces per student. Based on the expected level of parking demand for the Project and the empirical evaluation of parking demand for other Community Colleges, the analysis concludes the Project parking supply would be adequate.

DEIR Section V.D.2.g., Parking, also presents information on the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) parking requirements. LAMC Section 12.21.A.4(c)(7) specifies the minimum number of parking spaces for a community college type of use. One (1) space is required for each 50 square feet of floor area contained within classrooms and assemble areas or one parking space for each five fixed seats contained with classrooms and assembly areas, whichever is greater. For classroom areas in which heavy equipment is used in training, one parking space is required for each 500 square feet of floor area.

In paragraph 5 of DEIR page 156, the discussion notes the proposed Project would result in approximately 288,320 SF of classroom space and approximately 259,600 SF of classroom space in which heavy equipment would be used,[4] and that based on the LAMC parking regulations, the College would need 6,286 parking spaces. The College currently provides 1,439 parking spaces to serve its estimated 780,000 GSF of building floor area. The proposed Project would increase the building floor area by approximately 70,600 GSF for a total of 850,600 GSF. Of the 70,600 GSF approximately 56,480 SF would be usable square feet.[5] Using the LAMC parking criteria, 1,130 parking spaces would be needed for the Project's increase in usable building floor area. The proposed Project would provide 1,100 parking spaces more than exists on the campus, for a total of 2,598 parking spaces, excluding off-campus metered parking along streets surrounding the College, as noted on page 157 of the DEIR.

---

[3] *Trip Generation, 6th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1997).*

[4] *Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, Campus Plan 2002, Appendix II—Campus-wide Departmental Space Inventory and Distribution Map.*

[5] *The "usable" or assignable square feet (ASF) estimate excludes corridors, elevators, storage rooms, mechanical equipment spaces, and other similar spaces.*

Lastly, the second paragraph on DEIR page 157 concludes that although the proposed Project would result in less parking than required by the LAMC parking standards for a college use, the impact of this deviation from the LAMC would not be significant because: 1) as summarized on DEIR page 139, the traffic study determined, using historical demand rates, that the parking provided by the Project would be adequate; 2) the City allows variances from its normal code rates where warranted by evidence of shared uses or other circumstances; and 3) a parking variance would not be required if the District's governing board elects to exempt the Project from local planning and zoning requirements.

The analyses presented within DEIR Section V.D.2.g., Parking, and Appendix D, Traffic Study, provide sufficient data relative to the potential effects of the proposed Project on parking supply and demand, and based on that information reasonably concludes the Project would cause no significant effects on parking. No further response is required.

Comment 4.2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is a five-year master plan, which includes the removal of some existing facilities, new building construction, renovations and additions to existing buildings, new landscape and open space construction, and other modification to the campus. The project would increase the total building gross square feet (GSF) on the campus from 780,000 GSF to 850,600 GSF and increase the open space from 355,316 square feet (SF) to 682,344 SF. The improvements are designed to accommodate an increase of student enrollment from 15,000 to 21,300 students. In addition, a 700 space subterranean parking lot is proposed on campus below the track and field and a 400 space, six level, parking structure is proposed on the east side of Grand Avenue. The build out year is expected to be in 2007. The project will have some significant street changes including the street vacation of 21st Street, 22nd street, Hope Street, and the realignment of 23rd Street.

The project will result in a net increase of 453 AM peak hour trips and 842 PM peak hour trips.

SIGNIFICANTLY IMPACTED INTERSECTIONS

The proposed project will have a significant traffic impact at the following intersections:

1. Grand Avenue and Santa Monica Freeway WB Ramps/17th Street

2. Grand Avenue and Washington Boulevard

3. Grand Avenue and 22nd Street

4. Grand Avenue and 23rd Street

5. Adams Boulevard and Harbor Freeway NB Off-Ramps

6. Adams Boulevard and Grand Avenue

MITIGATION MEASURES

Grand Avenue and Santa Monica Freeway WB Ramps/17th Street

The proposed mitigation to restripe the westbound approach to provide an additional through lane is not acceptable to LADOT.

Response 4.2

In 2007, Grand Avenue and Santa Monica Freeway westbound (WB) ramps at 17th Street is projected to operate at level of service (LOS) "A" during the A.M. peak hour and LOS "D" during the P.M. peak hour (refer to DEIR Appendix D, Table 8 on page 41). With the proposed Project, the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio would increase by 0.028 in the A.M. peak hour and 0.042 in the P.M. peak hour, however the intersection would continue to operate at LOS "A" during the A.M. peak hour and LOS "D" during the P.M. peak hour. Because the Project traffic and the incremental change in the V/C ratio is estimated to be greater than 0.020, the Project impact on the Grand Avenue and Santa Monica Freeway WB ramps at 17th Street would be considered significant (DEIR page 153). The proposed mitigation to re-stripe the westbound approach to provide an additional lane would improve future conditions at this intersection to a V/C ratio of 0.725 and to LOS "C."

Based on information provided by LADOT, implementation of the proposed re-striping mitigation measure would involve relocation of an existing heavily used school bus loading area along 17th Street. Considering the LADOT determination that no suitable alternate site for the school bus loading area exists in the vicinity, the proposed re-striping mitigation measure has been identified as not feasible. As no other feasible mitigation has been identified which would reduce the project impacts at the Grand Avenue and Santa Monica Freeway WB ramps at 17th Street, Sections V.D.4 and V.D.5 on pages 158 and 159 of the DEIR, respectively, are hereby modified to the following effect:

- Mitigation Measure No. 1 ("Grand Avenue and I-10 westbound Ramps/17th Street– The westbound approach would be re-striped to provide an additional through lane") will be deleted (DEIR Section V.D.4, page 158); and

- The discussion under the subheading *Level of Significance After Mitigation* will find the impacts at the intersection of Grand Avenue and Santa Monica Freeway WB Ramps/17th Street to be significant (DEIR Section V.D.5, page 159).

These modifications to Sections V.D.4 and V.D.5 of the DEIR would not substantially change the DEIR conclusions relative to the potential traffic-related impacts of the proposed Project, specifically: 1) after implementation of mitigation measures, significant traffic impacts would still be experienced at Project study area intersections; 2) no physical or operational mitigation measures were considered feasible to mitigate the anticipated traffic impacts of the Project; and 3) significant cumulative traffic conditions not addressed by mitigation would be considered significant unavoidable impacts.

Comment 4.3

Grand Avenue and Washington Boulevard

LADOT concurs that no physical or operational mitigation measure was feasible at this intersection.

Response 4.3

The comment is noted for the record. No further response is required.

Comment 4.4

Grand Avenue and 22nd Street

LADOT has no objection to the street vacation of the west leg of this intersection. This will become the main entrance for the campus. If the installation of the new traffic signal is found to be warranted by LADOT in the next five years, then all cost for the design and installation of the new traffic signal would be the responsibility of the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College.

Response 4.4

The comment is noted for the record. The following clarifying language is hereby added to Traffic Mitigation Measure No. 2 on page 158 of the DEIR:

> Grand Avenue and 22nd Street – A traffic signal would be installed when it is found warranted by LADOT. All costs for the design and installation of the new traffic signal would be the responsibility of the College. Design and installation of the new traffic signal would be coordinated through the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering B-Permit process.

Comment 4.5

Grand Avenue and 23rd Street

LADOT has no objection to the proposed re-alignment of the west leg of 23rd Street and the installation of an eastbound left turn lane. 23rd Street is currently a jogged intersection at Grand Avenue and the realignment will simplify the intersection. However, due to proximity of the proposed driveway serving the proposed 23rd Street parking structure, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College must dedicate additional right-of-way beyond the street standards to provide for a westbound right-turn-only lane to the subterranean parking structure.

Response 4.5

The comment is noted for the record. The following clarifying language is hereby added to the Mitigation Measure for Grand Avenue and 23rd Street (refer to DEIR page 158):

> Grand Avenue and 23rd Street – The offset on 23rd Street would be eliminated by realigning the west leg of 23rd Street northerly to align with the east leg of the intersection. In addition, a left-turn lane would be provided on the eastbound approach, requiring the dedication by the College of a small area of right of way, and a westbound right-turn-only lane to the subterranean parking structure would be provided, also requiring dedication of right-of-way by the College. These improvements would be coordinated through the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering B-Permit process.

Comment 4.6

Adams Boulevard and Harbor Freeway NB Off-Ramps

The proposed mitigation to provide a right-turn only lane on the "mixed flow" portion of the northbound Harbor Freeway off-ramp is acceptable to LADOT. However, the freeway ramp is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The developer should contact Caltrans to coordinate the proposed improvements at the freeway ramp.

Response 4.6

The comment is noted for the record. No further response is required.

Comment 4.7

Adams Boulevard and Grand Avenue

LADOT concurs that no physical or operational mitigation measure was feasible at this intersection.

Response 4.7

The comment is noted for the record. No further response is required.

Comment 4.8

Unless otherwise specified, the proposed mitigation measures and improvements shall be implemented through the Bureau of Engineering's (BOE's) B-Permit process and Caltrans encroachment permit process. Construction of the improvements to the satisfaction of LADOT, BOE, and Caltrans must be completed before issuance of any certificate of occupancy. Should any improvement not receive required approval, the City may substitute and alternative measure of an equivalent cost and effectiveness. Prior to setting the bond amount, BOE shall require the developer's engineer or contractor contact LADOT B-Permit Coordinator, telephone (213) 580-5336, to arrange a pre-design meeting to finalize the proposed design needed for the project.

Response 4.8

This comment identifies the Bureau of Engineering's B-Permit process and the Caltrans encroachment permit process as the means for implementing mitigation measures and improvements identified within the Project environmental documentation. This comment is noted for the record. No further response is required.

Comment 4.9

COMMENT

Grand Avenue and 21st Street, 22nd Street, and Hope Street

LADOT has no objection to the street vacation of 21st Street, 22nd Street, and Hope Street, which are local streets.

Response 4.9

This comment is noted for the record. No further response is required.

Comment 4.10

HIGHWAY DEDICATION AND STREET WIDENING REQUIREMENTS

23rd Street is classified as a Collector Street, which requires a 22-foot half-width roadway on a 32-foot half-width right-of-way. The voluntary realignment of 23rd Street will require additional right-of-way to mitigate impacts at the 23rd Street garage entrance.

Flower Street is classified as a Secondary Highway, which requires a 35-foot half-width roadway on a 45-foot half-width right-of-way.

Grand Avenue is classified as a Major Class II Highway, which requires a 40-foot half-width roadway on a 52-foot half-width right-of-way. Grand Avenue is currently improved to a 28-foot half-width roadway on a 40-foot half-width right-of-way. DOT recommends a 12-foot dedication and widening along the project frontage to accommodate left turn channelization into the extended campus.

Washington Boulevard is classified as a Major Class II Highway, which requires a 40-foot half-width roadway on a 52-foot half-width right-of-way.

It appears that additional highway dedication may be required for streets fronting the proposed project. The developer must check with the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) Land Development Group to determine the highway dedication, street widening and sidewalk requirements for the project.

Response 4.10

This comment provides information regarding the existing right-of-way and the roadway classification and corresponding right-of-way for streets adjacent to the Project site. Section V.D.1.a of the DEIR (page 147) presents a description of the street system serving the project site. The roadway classification and existing right-of-way information for streets within and abutting the Project site provided within Comment 4.10 is acknowledged together with the following findings:

- The re-alignment of 23rd Street at Grand Avenue would provide a 22-foot half-width roadway on a 32-foot half-width right of way plus additional width for westbound

right-turn lane. The proposed alignment would mitigate the impact at Grand Avenue and 23rd Street;

- Flower Street is currently a 35-foot half-width roadway on a 45-foot half-width right-of-way and meets current Secondary Highway standards;

- Dedication of right-of-way and widening to improve Grand Avenue to current Major Class II Highway standards is not needed to mitigate project environmental impacts; and

- Dedication of right-of-way to improve Washington Boulevard to current Major Class II Highway standards is not needed to mitigate project environmental impacts.

Comment 4.11

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

DOT recommends that a construction work site traffic control plan be submitted to DOT for review and approval prior to the start of any construction work. The plan should show the location of any roadway or sidewalk closures, traffic detours, haul routes, hours of operation, protective devices, warning signs and access to abutting properties. DOT also recommends that all construction related traffic be restricted to off-peak hours.

Response 4.11

For the safety of its students, faculty, and staff, and the contract construction crews, the College fully intends to identify traffic control measures for implementation during construction. To that end, the College agrees to transmit its construction traffic control plan to LADOT for its information. The following action is hereby incorporated into the FEIR:

> The College will provide a construction work site traffic control plan to the Los Angeles Department of Transportation for its information prior to the start of any construction work. The plan will show the location of any roadway or sidewalk closures, traffic detours, haul routes, hours of operation, protective devices, warning signs and access to abutting properties.

Comment 4.12

DRIVEWAY ACCESS

The review of this study does not constitute approval of the driveway access and circulation scheme. Those require separate review and approval and should be coordinated as soon as possible with DOT'S Citywide Planning Coordination Section (201 N. Figueroa Street, 4th Floor, Station 25) to avoid delays in the building permit approval process. All driveways should be Case 2 Driveways and 30 feet wide.

If you have any questions, please contact Ed Chow of my staff (213) 240-3074.

Response 4.12

This comment provides procedural guidance regarding City of Los Angeles review of driveway access and circulation. The comment is noted. No further response is required.

V--Additions and Corrections to the Draft EIR

V. ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

In response to comments received during the public review period from various agencies and organizations, the following additions and corrections to the Draft EIR are provided. Modifications to the Draft EIR are listed under Section titles as presented within the Draft EIR.

SUMMARY

F. SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS

- Table S-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures included within the Draft EIR has been revised to reflect changes made to the Draft EIR as a result of comments received. Please refer to Section VI., Final Summary, of this document for the revised version of Table S-1 (Table VI-1 of this document). Revisions and additions are noted by redline/strikeout text.

IV. EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

M. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Revise paragraph 5 on page 63 to read as follows:

> The Project site is adequately protected by existing facilities of the Los Angeles Fire Department and proposed structures would comply with appropriate fire and safety building codes and building interiors would be appropriately sprinklered. City of Los Angeles Fire Stations 9, 10, and 15 are located within 1.8 miles of the Project site. Correspondence from the City of Los Angeles Department of Fire dated April 11, 2003, indicates fire protection would be considered adequate based on the response distance (up to 1.8 miles) from existing fire stations. The Project site is located within the City of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), Reporting Area 1321, in the Newton Area. Correspondence from the LAPD dated April 10, 2003, indicates the average response time to emergency calls for the Newton Area during 2002 was 9.5 minutes, which is below the Citywide average response time of 10.2 minutes for the same year. The Project would be adequately protected by the existing facilities

of the Community College Bureau of the Los Angeles Special Districts (Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department) and by the City of Los Angeles Police Department. The Project is not expected to introduce any new population to the region that would require instruction or service from the public school system (other than those being served by the Project itself) or the public library system. Therefore, the Initial Study determined that no new or physically altered public services or facilities would be necessary to meet additional demands generated by the proposed Project.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

A. AIR QUALITY

1. Revise paragraph 2 on page 81 to read as follows:

Emissions modeled for the regional on-road air quality analysis were compiled using the URBEMIS 2001 emission inventory model. This computer model projects emission rates for motor vehicles based on a desired year of analysis, a projected vehicle fleet mix, projected vehicle speeds, and whether these emissions are expected to occur during the summer or winter months. Assumptions used in preparing the model analysis were consistent with those recommended in SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (Appendix to Chapter 9). The regional on-road emissions were based on average daily trips as presented in Section V.D., Transportation & Circulation, of this Draft EIR.[14] Project emissions were calculated for the Project buildout, as shown in Table 8 on page 81. As shown in Table 8, Project-related daily emissions are expected to exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold for NO_X, ROC and CO. As such, operational emissions would result in a significant regional air quality impact without incorporation of mitigation measures. Daily emissions for SO_X and PM_{10} would be considered adverse, but less than significant, since levels of these emissions would fall below SCAQMD significance thresholds.

[14] *This analysis assumed an average daily trip rate of 1.14 trips per student. This was obtained by assuming P.M. peak hour traffic represents 10% of average daily traffic.*

B. HISTORIC RESOURCES

1. Revise paragraph 3, (c) Building E-Student Health Center, on page 117 as follows:

> Constructed in 1925, Building E was originally the Science Building prior to significant modifications to its exterior for its new purpose as a classroom building which houses the Electronics Department and the Student Health Center (Figure 13). The three-story building is designed as an unadorned utilitarian educational structure. The reinforced concrete building is "L"-shaped in plan, flat-roofed, with a non-original rough gunite finish. Most windows are tall, recessed, multipane, double-hung sash. Non-original exterior metal staircases are attached to the west and north elevations within the "L." Other alterations and modifications over the years have erased any notable character-defining features that once might have existed on the building.

D. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

1. Revise the construction related impacts discussion on page 155 to read as follows:

f. Construction Related Impacts

> Construction of the subterranean parking structure within the South Campus area would involve removal of approximately 135,488 cubic yards (cy) of earth from the Project site. To remove this amount of earth from the Project site, approximately 9,033 trucks with a carrying capacity of about 15 cy would be used. This activity would be scheduled in 2005 during daytime hours and, to the extent possible, during non-traffic peak periods. Accordingly, less than significant impacts are expected to occur.

2. According to information provided by LADOT on the Grand Avenue and the Santa Monica Freeway westbound (WB) ramps at 17th Street, implementation of the proposed re-striping of 17th Street at that location (DEIR page 158) would involve relocation of an existing heavily used school bus loading area along 17th Street. Considering the LADOT determination that no suitable alternate site for the school bus loading area exists in the vicinity, the proposed re-striping mitigation measure for the intersection at Grand Avenue and the Santa Monica Freeway westbound ramps at 17th Street has been identified as not feasible. In addition, because of the physical and economic constraints posed by the existing right-of-way and the existing buildings located on Adams Boulevard at the I-110 NB off-ramp, the potential mitigation measure identified for the I-110 NB off-ramp at Adams Boulevard has been determined not feasible.

Based on this information, the mitigation measures listed in Section IV.D.4 on page 158, and the findings concerning the level of significance after mitigation stated within Section IV.D.5 on page 159 are revised to read as noted below. These modifications to Sections V.D.4 and V.D.5 of the DEIR would not substantially change the DEIR conclusions relative to the potential traffic-related impacts of the proposed Project, specifically: 1) after implementation of mitigation measures, significant traffic impacts would still be experienced at Project study area intersections; 2) no physical or operational mitigation measures were considered feasible to mitigate the anticipated traffic impacts of the Project at identified intersections; and 3) significant cumulative traffic conditions not addressed by mitigation would be considered significant unavoidable impacts.

4. MITIGATION MEASURES

a. Intersections

As described above, the Project would generate significant traffic impacts at six of the 15 study intersections. The following mitigation measures are proposed for two of these intersections:

1. Grand Avenue and 22nd Street – A traffic signal would be installed when it is found warranted by LADOT. All costs for the design and installation of the new traffic signal would be the responsibility of the College. Design and installation of the new traffic signal would be coordinated through the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering B-Permit process.

2. Grand Avenue and 23rd Street – The offset on 23rd Street would be eliminated by realigning the west leg of 23rd Street northerly to align with the east leg of the intersection. In addition, a left-turn lane would be provided on the eastbound approach, requiring the dedication by the College of a small area of right of way, and a westbound right-turn-only lane to the subterranean parking structure would be provided, also requiring dedication of right-of-way by the College. These improvements would be coordinated through the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering B-Permit process.

5. LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

After implementation of the above described mitigation measures, significant impacts would still be experienced at four intersections—Grand Avenue and Santa Monica Freeway westbound (WB) ramps at 17th Street, I-110 NB off-ramp and Adams Boulevard, Grand Avenue at Washington Boulevard, and Grand Avenue at Adams Boulevard. No physical or operational mitigation measures were considered feasible to mitigate the anticipated impact of the Project. In addition, significant cumulative conditions not addressed by the above described mitigation would be considered significant unavoidable impacts.

VI. ALTERNATIVES

B. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

1. Revise paragraph 3 on page 164 to read as follows:

Alternative 1-No Action/No Project would not generate the daily emissions associated with the proposed Project, which would be expected to exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold for ROC, CO and NO_x during construction, resulting in a significant regional air quality impact without incorporation of mitigation measures; and adverse but less than significant operational impacts relative to SO_x and PM_{10} (refer to Table 8 on page 82). This Alternative would not cause localized air quality impacts related to mobile source emissions. In contrast, the proposed Project would result in such localized mobile source emissions, however the findings of the local area CO dispersion analysis conclude the impacts would be less than significant (refer to page 83 of this EIR).

2. Revise paragraphs 2 and 3 on page 168 to read as follows:

With the retention of Building C, Alternative 2 would involve less demolition and construction than that of the proposed Project. As a result, the average construction-related emissions generated by this Alternative would be somewhat lower than the average construction-related emissions generated by the Project. In both cases (Alternative 2 and the Project), daily emissions for CO, ROC, SO_x, and PM_{10} would be considered adverse but less than significant because levels of emissions would fall below the SCAQMD significance thresholds (refer to Table 7 on page 81).

The worst-case day construction-related emissions would be comparable to the Project. In both cases (Alternative 2 and the Project) construction-period emissions would be expected to exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold for NO_x.

With a similar increase in student enrollment, regional and localized operational impacts would be comparable to the proposed Project. Daily emissions associated with Alternative 2 would be expected to exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold for ROC, CO and NO_x; thus resulting in a significant regional air quality construction-related impact without incorporation of mitigation measures. The daily emissions of SO_x and PM_{10} associated with Alternative 2 would be considered adverse but less than significant because levels of these operational emissions would fall below the SCAQMD significance thresholds (refer to Table 8 on page 82). Comparable to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 is expected to result in localized air quality impacts related to mobile source emissions, however, the findings of the local area CO dispersion analysis conclude the impacts would be less than significant (refer to page 83).

3. Revise paragraphs 3 and 4 on page 171 to read as follows:

Alternative 3 would feature the same physical improvements to the Campus as in the proposed Project. As such, the extent of the construction-related emissions generated by this Alternative would be identical to the Project. The average daily construction-related emissions of CO, ROC, SO_x, and PM_{10} associated with Alternative 3 would be considered adverse but less than significant because levels of emissions would fall below the SCAQMD significance thresholds (refer to Table 7 on page 81). The worst-case day construction-related emissions are expected to exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold for NO_x.

With only a 20 percent increase in student enrollment, the regional and localized operational emissions associated with Alternative 3 would be substantially less than the emissions estimated for the proposed Project. Alternative 3 would generate daily operational emissions which would be expected to exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold for CO, NO_x and ROC resulting in a significant regional air quality impact without incorporation of mitigation measures; and adverse but less than significant impacts relative to SO_x and PM_{10}. Both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project would result in localized mobile source emissions, however the findings of the local area CO dispersion analysis conclude the impacts

would be less than significant for the proposed Project (refer to page 83 of this EIR,) and for Alternative 3. Because the student enrollment for Alternative 3 (18,000) would be substantially less than for the proposed Project (21,300), the localized mobile source emissions associated with Alternative 3 are expected to cause less than significant impacts.

APPENDIX A NOTICE OF PREPARATION

1. Revise page 5 of Table A-1 to read as follows:

Alfred B. Hernandez Assistant Fire Marshal Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety City of Los Angeles Department of Fire 200 No. Main Street Los Angeles, CA 90012	City	A. Fire Flow The adequacy of fire protection for a given area is based on required fire-flow, response distance from existing fire stations, and this Department's judgment for needs in the area. In general, the required fire-flow is closely related to land use. The quantity of water necessary for fire protection varies with the type of development, life hazard, occupancy, and the degree of fire hazard. Fire-flow requirements will vary from 2,000 gallons per minute (GPM) in low Density Residential areas to 12,000 GPM in high-density commercial or industrial areas. A minimum residual water pressure of 20 pounds per square inch (psi) is to remain in the water system, with the required gallons per minute flowing. The required fire-flow for this project has been set at 4,000 GPM from four fire hydrants flowing simultaneously. B. Response Distance The Fire Department has existing fire stations at three locations for initial response into the area of the proposed development. C. Firefighting Access, Apparatus, and Personnel Based on these criteria (response distance from existing fire stations), fire protection would be considered adequate. Recommends adequate fire hydrants, Fire Department access, and design features (bearing pressure of 8,600 pounds per square foot) for the road surface of the subterranean parking structure. Conclusion The proposed project shall comply with all applicable State and local codes and ordinances, and the guidelines found in the Fire Protection and Fire Prevention Plan, as well as the Safety Plan, both of which are elements of the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles, C.P.C. 19708.	Based upon the Initial Study for the proposed Project, the potential impacts on fire protection were determined to be less than significant. The College will consider the recommendations contained within this comment letter during the environmental process and project design and construction phases.

Fred Booker, Lieutenant Officer in Charge Community Relations Section Office of the Chief of Policy Los Angeles Police Department 200 No. Main Street Los Angeles, CA 90012	City	Determined that the project would have a moderate impact on police services in Newton Area. Also, appropriate security measures should be practiced during the construction phase of the project. LAPD is available to advise on crime prevention features appropriate to the design of the property involved. The LAPD strongly recommends that the developers contact CPU personnel to discuss these features. Upon completion of the project, provide the Newton Area commanding officer with a diagram of each portion of the property. The diagram should include access routes and any additional information that might facilitate police response.	Based upon the Initial Study for the proposed Project, the potential impacts on police protection were determined to be less than significant. The letter incorrectly notes the increase in student enrollment. The proposed project assumes an increase of 6,300 students, bringing the total student enrollment to 21,300 by the year 2007. The College will consider the recommendations contained within this comment letter during the environmental process and project design and construction phases.

VI--Final Summary

VI. FINAL SUMMARY

The Los Angeles Community College District ("District" or LACCD) in collaboration with the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College ("College") propose to implement the Campus Plan 2002, 5-year plan (the "Project") of development for the College campus located at 400 W. Washington Boulevard, Los Angeles, California. Currently the campus encompasses approximately 23 acres bounded by Washington Boulevard, Grand Avenue, 23rd Street and Flower Street. Regional access to the site is provided either from the Harbor Freeway or Santa Monica Freeway to Grand Avenue or Flower Street.

A. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The College is a comprehensive public community college that is part of the District. Through an intellectually rigorous, technologically current and socially relevant curriculum, the College places an emphasis on developing technical skills and work experience necessary for students to succeed in the job market and to provide students with a foundation for further advanced education. The various programs of study are designed to culminate in a certificate of completion, a skills certificate or an associate degree. Within the next five years, enrollment is expected to grow to 21,300 from a current enrollment of around 15,000 students, a 47 percent increase in the student body.

Instruction is currently offered in over 65 different occupational areas including accounting; architecture and design technology; automotive repair and related technology; business administration; child development; construction technologies; computer applications and information systems; computer repair; cosmetology; culinary arts; electronics; English; fashion design; management and marketing; finance, journalism; machine tools; and nursing. In addition to classroom instruction, the College offers non–traditional formats including apprenticeship training, cooperative work experience programs, and directed study. The College also offers opportunities for participation in intercollegiate athletics, campus clubs and other student organizations.

The College is faced with the need to expand and improve its facilities in order to fulfill its educational mission and better serve its growing student body. In 2001, a Bond measure (Proposition A) was approved by the voters of Los Angeles County for the remodeling, renovation and new construction of facilities at the campuses of the District. Funds from this bond, $138 million, will be made available to the College with the expectation that these funds be expended within a 5-year period.

In response to this opportunity, the College has developed Campus Plan 2002, a 5-year master plan (the "Project") and 30-year vision for the campus. The 5-year plan identifies those projects to be funded through Proposition A. The 30-year vision presents possible future projects, though no funds are yet available or identified for the realization of this long-term vision. The 5-year plan includes specific construction, demolition, renovations and other facility improvements that, as a defined project, is subject to the CEQA and therefore is assessed in this Final EIR. The 30-year vision included in the Campus Plan 2002 represents a conceptual future perspective for the College that helps to explain the intent of the transformations proposed in the 5-year plan. In years to come, this vision may blossom into subsequent specific improvement projects that would themselves be subject to CEQA but it is not appropriate at this time to evaluate potential impacts of this vision in its current speculative form.[6]

The Project involves three distinct elements: 1) the expansion, renovation, modernization, and demolition of existing buildings (Building Projects); 2) the increase in open space (Landscaping and Open Space Plan); and 3) the implementation of non-structural upgrades (Utilities and Infrastructure Projects). The Project also involves the acquisition of property for additional building construction. Implementation of the Project would increase the total building GSF on the campus from 780,000 GSF to 850,600 GSF (including new central receiving areas), and increase the amount of open space from 355,316 SF to 682,344 SF.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines (21080.4), the District circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Draft EIR notifying responsible agencies and interested parties of the proposed Project and soliciting their input and comments. As part of the NOP, an Initial Study (IS), including an Environmental Checklist, was prepared to identify those environmental issue areas that would not be impacted by the proposed Project and which would not need to be further analyzed in the Final EIR. The NOP/IS was circulated from March 19, 2003 to April 21, 2003. Based on the IS and NOP comments, the Draft EIR included the analysis of the following environmental issues:

- Air Quality
- Historic Resources
- Noise

[6] *Topanga Beach Renters Association v. Department of General Services, (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 712: "Evaluation of future environmental effects must await the future decisions that could cause the effects."*

- Transportation and Circulation

The Draft EIR dated May 2003, was distributed to State, regional, County, and City agencies. Notices of availability were sent to property owners and residents within 1,000 feet of the College site. Copies of the Draft EIR were made available for review in the Los Angeles Central Library and three locations on the College campus—the Office of Dr. Daniel A. Castro, President; the Office of Mary Ann Breckell, Vice President of Administration; and the Library, Building L, all of which serve the community.

The Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and circulated for public review on May 7, 2003. The 45-day comment period required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 concluded on June 20, 2003. A public meeting on the Draft EIR was held before the Los Angeles Community College District ("District") Board of Trustees on May 29, 2003. No formal comments requiring written responses were received during the public meeting. Two public hearings on the Draft EIR were held on the College campus, one on May 15 and one on June 12, 2003.

C. AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Potential areas of controversy specific to the proposed Project include demolition of known historic structures on the College campus, construction-related impacts, and traffic-related impacts.

D. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Consistent with the requirements of Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, a range of alternatives to the proposed Project were considered and evaluated in this Draft EIR. These alternatives, which were developed in the course of project planning and environmental review, consist of:

- Alternative 1 - No Action/No Project
- Alternative 2 - Full Retention of Building C
- Alternative 3 - Reduced Future Enrollment

The purpose of describing and analyzing Alternative 1-No Action/No Project is to allow the decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed Project with the impacts

of not approving the Project. Alternative 2-Full Retention of Building C was selected for detailed evaluation because it would achieve some of the basic objectives of the proposed Project while reducing impacts on cultural resources. Alternative 3-Reduced Future Enrollment was selected for detailed evaluation because it would achieve most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project while reducing impacts on air quality, noise, and transportation and circulation.

E. SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

A summary of the identified significant environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation is provided in Table VI-1 on page 54.

Table VI-1

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential Environmental Impacts	Proposed Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY		
Construction-period emissions of NO_x would exceed SCAQMD thresholds.	· Exposed pits (i.e., gravel, soil, dirt) with 5 percent or greater silt content shall be watered twice daily, enclosed, covered or treated with non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications. · All other active sites shall be watered as often as necessary to remain visibly moist. · All grading activities shall cease during second stage smog alerts and periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 25 mph) if soil is being transported to off-site locations and cannot be controlled by watering. · All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials off-site shall be covered or wetted or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between the top of the load and the top of the trailer). · All construction roads internal to the construction site that have a traffic volume of more than 50 daily trips by construction equipment, or 150 total daily trips for all vehicles, shall be surfaced with base material or decomposed granite, or shall be paved. · Streets shall be swept hourly if visible soil material has been carried onto adjacent public paved roads. · Construction equipment shall be visually inspected prior to leaving the site and loose dirt shall be washed off with wheel washers as necessary. · Water or non-toxic soil stabilizers shall be applied, according to manufacturers' specifications, as needed to reduce off-site transport of fugitive dust from all unpaved staging areas and unpaved road surfaces. · Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall not exceed 15 mph. · All equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. · General contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. During construction, trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues would be kept with their engines off, when not in use, to reduce vehicle emissions. Construction emissions should be phased and	Mitigation measures would reduce and control construction related emissions. However, Project construction would continue to generate NO_x emissions in excess of SCAQMD thresholds. Impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table VI-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential Environmental Impacts	Proposed Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	scheduled to avoid emissions peaks and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts.	
During operational phase, emissions of NO_x, ROC and CO would exceed SCAQMD thresholds.	No mitigation measures are considered feasible.	Impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
HISTORIC RESOURCES		
Renovation of the exterior and interior of the Building A.	Rehabilitation Work Any maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, preservation, conservation or reconstruction of any portion of Building A shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (the Standards), Weeks and Grimmer (1995). Project plans for the rehabilitation/restoration of Building A shall be submitted to and reviewed by an independent consulting historic preservation professional to evaluate preliminary and final plans to ensure continued compliance with the Standards. Photography and Recordation Prior to the rehabilitation of Building A, a photographic documentation report shall be prepared of the significance of the building and its physical conditions, both historic and current. Identification of Character-Defining Features Prior to completion of project design and prior to the rehabilitation/ restoration of Building A, an inventory of significant, character-defining features and materials of the historic resource shall be made by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect. These features and materials shall be retained in-place and repaired as part of the overall rehabilitation/restoration project proposed for Building A.	Impacts would be greatly reduced, but not eliminated.

Table VI-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential Environmental Impacts	Proposed Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Compatibility of New Construction Where new construction is proposed near or adjacent to Building A, the Standards shall be followed.	
The removal of Building C, which has been identified as a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA.	Recordation Prior to demolition of Building C for the implementation of the proposed Project, a Historic Structures Report/Historic American Buildings Survey (HSR/HABS) shall be prepared. Demolition Coordination The demolition of Building C shall be coordinated with the construction of the new educational facilities on the campus. Therefore, Building C shall not be demolished until all project plans for the North Quad project (Campus Plan 2002, Appendix VII, page 9) are final and approved by the District and the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department. Interpretive Education Program An interpretive educational program or display shall be incorporated into the development of the new campus, specifically adjacent to or within the Building A.	Demolition of a historic resource is considered a significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant.
The removal of the Apffel's Coffee Company Building, which is considered a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA.	Recordation Prior to the demolition of the Apffel's Coffee Company building for the implementation of the proposed Project, a HSR/HABS shall be prepared. Relocation As part of the acquisition process currently underway, the District will provide relocation assistance to the Apffel's Coffee Company as required by law. The Company has acquired a relocation site in Santa Fe Springs, California. Subject to the consent of the Coffee Company, the District will provide funds to assist in relocating the existing Coffee Company museum, located in the current building's lobby, to the new facility.	Demolition of a historic resource is considered a significant adverse impact. However, because of the nature of the building's significance as it relates to its economic history as a long time Los Angeles business versus architectural merit, and given that the business has previously relocated twice in Los Angeles before settling into its current building, implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.

Table VI-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential Environmental Impacts	Proposed Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
The removal of the PTA Building. The building as a whole is not considered a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA; however, the building's auditorium is of special interest because of its distinguishing International Style architectural design.	Recordation Prior to the demolition of the Parent Teacher Building, specifically the Auditorium portion of the building, for the implementation of the proposed Project, a Historic Structures Report/Historic American Buildings Survey (HSR/HABS) shall be prepared.	Impact would be less than significant.
Potential construction impacts to the mature Morten Bay Fig Tree.	Any new landscaping proposed shall respect the historic character of the identified landscape features and the historic building(s), if any, in which it is adjacent to. Any maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, preservation, conservation or reconstruction of any portion of fig tree shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (the Standards), Weeks and Grimmer (1995).	Impact would be less than significant.
NOISE		
Construction noise.	During all Project site preparation, grading, and construction activities, the Project contractor(s) shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained noise mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards. An eight-foot temporary sound barrier (e.g., plywood) shall be erected along the site boundary to block the line of sight between construction activity and off-site receptor locations.	Reduced, yet impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION		
I-10 westbound Ramps/17th Street would experience a significant traffic impact during the P.M. peak hour.	No physical or operational mitigation measures considered feasible.	Impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table VI-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential Environmental Impacts	Proposed Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Grand Avenue and 22nd Street would experience a significant traffic impact during both the A.M. and the P.M. peak hours.	A traffic signal would be installed when it is found warranted by LADOT. All costs for the design and installation of the new traffic signal would be the responsibility of the College. Design and installation of the new traffic signal would be coordinated through the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering B-Permit process.	Impact would be less than significant.
Grand Avenue and 23rd Street would experience a significant traffic impact during the P.M. peak hour.	The offset on 23rd Street would be eliminated by realigning the west leg of 23rd Street northerly to align with the east leg of the intersection. In addition, a left-turn lane would be provided on the eastbound approach, requiring the dedication by the College of a small area of right of way, and a westbound right-turn-only lane to the subterranean parking structure would be provided, also requiring dedication of right-of-way by the College. These improvements would be coordinated through the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering B-Permit process.	Impact would be less than significant.
I-110 NB off-ramp and Adams Boulevard would experience a significant traffic impact during the P.M. peak hour.	No physical or operational mitigation measures considered feasible.	Impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
Grand Avenue and Washington Boulevard would experience a significant traffic impact during the P.M. peak hour.	No physical or operational mitigation measures considered feasible.	Impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
Grand Avenue and Adams Boulevard would experience a significant traffic impact during the P.M. peak hour.	No physical or operational mitigation measures considered feasible.	Impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
The incremental addition to the traffic at intersections operating without the Project at Level of Service F [Grand and 21st and Grand and 22nd].	A traffic signal would be installed at Grand and 22nd Street. Western leg of 21st Street at Grand Avenue would be eliminated as part of the Project.	Impact would be less than significant.

Table VI-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential Environmental Impacts	Proposed Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
The incremental addition to the traffic on the Harbor Freeway and the Santa Monica Freeway.	Mitigation measures to address significant cumulative conditions are beyond the ability of individual projects to implement.	Impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

VII--Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

VII. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

As of January 1, 1989, CEQA requires a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for projects where mitigation measures are a condition of their approval and development. This program has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of Section 21081.6 of CEQA. The Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Los Angeles Trade Technical College Campus Plan 2002 Project identifies the potential significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project and specifies a series of measures designed to mitigate adverse impacts to the environment. Table VII-1 on page 61 lists all the mitigation measures adopted in connection with approval of the proposed Project. The MMRP describes the procedures the Applicant will use to implement the mitigation measures and identifies at what point the mitigation measure is to be monitored. Monitoring refers to the observation of mitigation activities at the Project site, in the design of plans or in the operation of the proposed Project. Table VII-1 also identifies the agency or party responsible for implementation of the mitigation, and the monitoring agency or party.

Table VII-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
AIR QUALITY				
(a) Land Clearing/Earth-Moving				
1. Exposed pits (i.e., gravel, soil, dirt) with 5 percent or greater silt content shall be watered twice daily, enclosed, covered or treated with non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications.	Water exposed pits twice daily, enclosed, covered or treated with non-toxic soil stabilizers.	During grading and construction activities.	Construction Contractor	District/College
2. All other active sites shall be watered as often as necessary to remain visibly moist.	Water all other active construction areas.	During grading and construction activities.	Construction Contractor	District/College
3. All grading activities shall cease during second stage smog alerts and periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 25 mph) if soil is being transported to off-site locations and cannot be controlled by watering.	Water all other active construction areas.	During grading activities.	Construction Contractor	District/College
4. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials off-site shall be covered or wetted or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between the top of the load and the top of the trailer).	Inspect each haul truck prior to its leaving the construction site.	During excavation and grading activities.	Construction Contractor	District/College
(b) Paved Roads				
1. All construction roads internal to the construction site that have a traffic volume of more than 50 daily trips by construction equipment, or 150 total daily trips for all vehicles, shall be surfaced with base material or decomposed granite, or shall be paved.	Surface on-site construction access routes with base material, decomposed granite, or pavement.	During construction	Construction Contractor	District/College

Table VII-1 (Continued)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
2. Streets shall be swept hourly if visible soil material has been carried onto adjacent public paved roads.	Conduct street sweeping on adjacent public roads, as needed.	During construction (grading and excavation phase).	Construction Contractor in coordination with LADOT	District/College
3. Construction equipment shall be visually inspected prior to leaving the site and loose dirt shall be washed off with wheel washers as necessary.	Inspect each haul truck prior to its leaving the construction site.	During excavation and grading activities.	Construction Contractor	District/College
(c) Unpaved Roads				
1. Water or non-toxic soil stabilizers shall be applied, according to manufacturers' specifications, as needed to reduce off-site transport of fugitive dust from all unpaved staging areas and unpaved road surfaces.	Apply water or non-toxic soil stabilizers to unpaved staging areas and road surfaces.	During construction.	Construction Contractor	District/College
2. Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall not exceed 15 mph.	Instruct construction crews not to exceed traffic speeds of 15 mph on unpaved construction access routes.	During construction.	Construction Contractor	District/College
(d) Construction Equipment				
1. All equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications.	Use properly tuned and maintained construction equipment.	During construction.	Construction Contractor	District/College

Table VII-1 (Continued)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
2. General contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. During construction, trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues would be kept with their engines off, when not in use, to reduce vehicle emissions. Construction emissions should be phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts.	Instruct truck and vehicle operators in loading and unloading queues to keep engines off when not in use.	During construction.	Construction Contractor	District/College
	Discontinue heavy construction activities (excavation) during second-stage smog alerts.	During construction.	Construction Contractor	District/College
HISTORIC RESOURCES				
(a) Building A				
1. Rehabilitation Work. Any maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, preservation, conservation or reconstruction of any portion of Building A shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (the Standards), Weeks and Grimmer (1995). Project plans for the rehabilitation/restoration of Building A shall be submitted to and reviewed by an independent consulting historic preservation professional to evaluate preliminary and final plans to ensure continued compliance with the Standards.	Review project plans for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.	Prior to DSA review of design plans.	Independent consulting historic preservation professional[7]	District/College

[7] *A qualified independent consulting historic preservation professional is one who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for History and Architectural History, as per 36 CFR 61.*

Table VII-1 (Continued)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
2. Photography and Recordation. Prior to the rehabilitation of Building A, a photographic documentation report shall be prepared. This report will document the significance of the building and its physical conditions, both historic and current through photographs, text, and completion of appropriate State of California Historic Inventory forms (DPR 523). Photographic documentation noting all elevations and additional details of the building's architectural features should be taken utilizing 35-mm black and white film. The photographer should be familiar with the recordation of historic resources. Photographs should be prepared in a format consistent with Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) standards for field photography. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the California Office of Historic Preservation, the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, the Los Angeles Public Library (Main Branch), and the Los Angeles Conservancy.	Prepare HABS.	Prior to or during design phase.	Independent consulting historic preservation professional	District/College
	File HABS with California Office of Historic Preservation, the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, the Los Angeles Public Library (Main Branch), and the Los Angeles Conservancy.	Prior to DSA review of design plans.	District/College	District/College
3. Identification of Character-Defining Features. Prior to completion of project design and prior to the rehabilitation/restoration of Building A, an inventory of significant, character-defining features and materials of the historic resource shall be made by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect. These features and materials shall be retained in-place and repaired as part of the overall rehabilitation/restoration project proposed for Building A	Prepare inventory of significant, character-defining features and materials.	Prior to or during design phase.	Independent consulting historic preservation professional	District/College
	Review project plans for repair of the character-defining features and materials.	During design phase.	Independent consulting historic preservation professional	District/College

Table VII-1 (Continued)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
4. Compatibility of New Construction. Where new construction is proposed near or adjacent to Building A, the Standards shall be followed. Consistent with the Standards, the proposed new construction shall be differentiated from Building A, but compatible in size, scale, massing, and proportions. Following the Standards, materials, design, color, and texture proposed for the new construction may complement that of Building A.	Review project plans for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.	During design phase.	Independent consulting historic preservation professional	District/College
(b) Building C				
1. Recordation. Prior to demolition of Building C for the implementation of the proposed project, a Historic Structures Report (HSR) shall be prepared. This document shall record the history of building and its contextual relationship to Los Angeles Polytechnic High School and Los Angeles Technical Trade College. Its physical condition, both historic and current, should be noted in the document through the use of site plans, original as-built drawings, historic maps, 35-mm photographs, and written data and text. Photographs should be 35-mm black and white format, and taken by a professional photographer familiar with the recordation of historic buildings. Photographs should be archivally prepared in a format consistent with Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) standards for photography. Archival copies of the report shall be submitted to the California Office of Historic Preservation, the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, the Los Angeles Public Library (Main Branch), and the Los Angeles Conservancy.	Prepare and file a HSR/HABS with the California Office of Historic Preservation, the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, the Los Angeles Public Library (Main Branch), and the Los Angeles Conservancy.	Prior to submittal of a demolition permit application to the City.	Independent consulting historic preservation professional	District/College

Table VII-1 (Continued)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
2. Demolition Coordination. The demolition of Building C shall be coordinated with the construction of the new educational facilities on the campus. Therefore, Building C shall not be demolished until all project plans for the North Quad project (Campus Plan 2002, Appendix VII, page 9) are final and approved by the District and the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department.	Defer demolition of Building C until all project plans for the North Quad project are final and approved by the District and the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department.	During design and permitting process for construction of the new educational facilities on the campus.	Independent consulting historic preservation professional	District/College
3. Interpretive Education Program. To assist the students, faculty, parents, and others interested parties in understanding the history of LATTC (Los Angeles Polytechnic High School) an interpretive educational program or display shall be incorporated into the development of the new campus, specifically adjacent to or within the Building A. This interpretative program shall be created with the assistance of a qualified historic preservation professional in coordination with the Applicant. Content and design of the interpretive program should be specific to the educational history and architectural of Los Angeles Polytechnic High School and its eventually evolution into the Los Angeles Trade Technical College. The program may include, but not be limited to: commemorative signage, plaques, historic photographs, salvaged material, models, exhibit display, tour or special event, and/or published material in the form of a brochure, pamphlet, video, electronic media, etc.	Prepare an interpretive program specific to the educational history and the architecture of Los Angeles Polytechnic High School.	Prior to submittal of a demolition permit application to the City.	Independent consulting historic preservation professional	District/College

Table VII-1 (Continued)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
(c) Morten Bay Fig				
1. Preservation and maintenance. Significant existing designed historic landscape features, such as the Morten Bay Fig Tree located with the main courtyard behind (south) Building A, shall be retained and preserved. Any new landscaping proposed shall respect the historic character of the identified landscape features and the historic building(s), if any, in which it is adjacent to.	Review landscape plans for consistency with the Standards.	Prior to implementation of landscape plans.	Independent consulting historic preservation professional	District/College
Any maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, preservation, conservation or reconstruction of any portion of fig tree shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (the Standards), Weeks and Grimmer (1995).	Conduct maintenance and repair in a manner consistent with the Standards.	During maintenance and repair activities.	District/College	District/College
(d) PTA Building				
1. Recordation. Prior to the demolition of the Parent Teacher Building, specifically the Auditorium portion of the building, for the implementation of the proposed project, a Historic Structures Report (HSR) shall be prepared. This document shall record the social and architectural history of building. Its physical condition, both historic and current, should be noted in the document through the use of site plans, historic maps, 35-mm photographs, and written data and text. Photographs should be 35-mm black and white format, and taken by a professional photographer familiar with the recordation of historic buildings. Photographs	Prepare HSR/HABS.	Prior to or during design phase.	Independent consulting historic preservation professional	District/College
	File HSR/HABS with California Office of Historic Preservation, the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, the Los Angeles Public Library (Main Branch), and the Los Angeles	Prior to submittal of a demolition permit application to the City.	District/College	District/College

Table VII-1 (Continued)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
should be archivally prepared in a format consistent with Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) standards for photography. Archival copies of the report shall be submitted to the California Office of Historic Preservation, the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, the Los Angeles Public Library (Main Branch), and the Los Angeles Conservancy.	Conservancy.			
(e) Apffel's Coffee Company				
1. Recordation. Prior to the demolition of the Apffel Coffee Company building for the implementation of the proposed project, a Historic Structures Report (HSR) shall be prepared. This document shall record the history of the Apffel Coffee Company business and its contextual relationship to the area. The building's physical condition, both historic and current, should be noted in the document through the use of site plans, original as-built drawings, historic maps, 35-mm photographs, and written data and text. Photographs should be 35-mm black and white format, and taken by a professional photographer familiar with the recordation of historic buildings. Photographs should be archivally prepared in a format consistent with Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) standards for photography. Archival copies of the report shall be submitted to the California Office of Historic Preservation, the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, the Los Angeles Public Library (Main Branch), and the Los Angeles Conservancy.	Prepare HSR/HABS.	Prior to or during design phase.	District/College	District/College
	File HSR/HABS with California Office of Historic Preservation, the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, the Los Angeles Public Library (Main Branch), and the Los Angeles Conservancy.	Prior to submittal of a demolition permit application to the City.	District/College	District/College

Table VII-1 (Continued)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
2. Relocation. As part of the acquisition process currently underway, the District will provide relocation assistance to the Apffel Coffee Company as required by law. The Company has acquired a relocation site in Santa Fe Springs, California. Subject to the consent of the Coffee Company, the District will provide funds to assist in relocating the existing Coffee Company museum, located in the current building's lobby, to the new facility.	Provide relocation assistance to the Apffel Coffee Company.	Prior to demolition.	District/College	District/College
NOISE				
(a) Construction				
1. During all Project site preparation, grading, and construction activities, the Project contractor(s) shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained noise mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards.	Equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained noise mufflers.	Prior to site preparation, grading, and construction activities.	Construction Contractor	District/College
2. An eight-foot temporary sound barrier (e.g., plywood) shall be erected along the site boundary to block the line of sight between construction activity and off-site receptor locations.	Erect an eight-foot temporary sound barrier to block the line of sight between construction activity and receptor locations (i.e., South Campus project, child care center).	Prior to site preparation, grading, and construction activities.	Construction Contractor	District/College

Table VII-1 (Continued)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION				
(a) Grand Avenue and 22nd Street				
1. A traffic signal would be installed when it is found warranted by LADOT. All costs for the design and installation of the new traffic signal would be the responsibility of the College. Design and installation of the new traffic signal would be coordinated through the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering B-Permit process.	Conduct signal warrant analysis.	October 2010 or when enrollment reaches 21,300 students, whichever occurs first.	District/College, in consultation with LADOT.	District/College
(b) Grand Avenue and 23rd Street				
1. The offset on 23rd Street would be eliminated by realigning the west leg of 23rd Street northerly to align with the east leg of the intersection. In addition, a left-turn lane would be provided on the eastbound approach, requiring the dedication by the College of a small area of right of way, and a westbound right-turn-only lane to the subterranean parking structure would be provided, also requiring dedication of right-of-way by the College. These improvements would be coordinated through the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering B-Permit process.	Design and construct improvements at Grand Avenue and 23rd Street.	During design and construction phases of the project.	District/College, in consultation with Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering.	District/College

Table VII-1 (Continued)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Summary Table

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
(c) I-110 NB off-ramp and Adams Boulevard				
1. An exclusive right-turn lane would be provided on the "mixed-flow" portion of the northbound off-ramp. Widening, including acquisition, of minor area of right of way may be necessary based upon review of improvement by Caltrans. Implementation of this mitigation measure will be coordinated with Caltrans via the Encroachment Permit process.	Coordinate the design of improvements at I-110 NB off-ramp and Adams Boulevard with Caltrans.	October 2010 or when enrollment reaches 21,300 students, whichever occurs first.	District/College, in consultation with Caltrans and LADOT.	District/College

Appendix A--Transcript of the Public Hearings on the Draft EIR

LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECHNICAL COLLEGE

CAMPUS PLAN 2002

PUBLIC MEETING

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2003

6:45 P.M.

REPORTED BY TIMIANNE BOURELL, CSR NO. 2845

Public Hearing conducted by the Los Angeles Community College District and the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, at Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, Building L, Room 110, on Thursday, May 15, 2003, commencing at 6:45 p.m., before TimiAnne Bourell, CSR No. 2845.

* * *

PRESENTATIONS: PAGE

ATTENDEES:

Coomy Bilimoria

Mary Ann Breckell

Maria Carvajal

Dr. Daniel Castro

Mary Catlin

Jerry Hostalek

Ron Johnson

Deba P. Mohapatra

Sally Salavea

Sam Shabot

Amy Shellhorn

Los Angeles, California; Thursday, May 15, 2003

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

Building L, Room 110

6:45 p.m.

MS. SHOEMAKER: On behalf of the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, we would like to welcome you to the first of two public hearings for the Campus Plan 2002 5-year plan. We have two presentations for you, followed by an opportunity to provide comment.

We are recording this entire session, so when you approach the dais or speak from your seat, just remember to speak your name very clearly so it can be recorded along with your comments. We are also soliciting comments in writing. We provided some information forms for you to take home or fill out here and leave behind with us.

We are pleased that you are here and we would like to start with the presentation of the Campus Plan. That will be provided by Jim Favaro, the campus master planner.

MR. FAVARO: Thank you, Patricia.

Good evening, everybody.

Tonight is about the EIR, Environmental Impact Report, which is a State of California-mandated

process that any project of this size has to go through. And what it does is it studies the impacts of a project, such as the one I'm going to describe to you.

I'm only going to be describing really the visual and functional aspects of the project and Patricia is going to talk about all the impacts of the project to the surrounding environment, and that's what the EIR is for. But in order to do any EIR, you have to have a project to analyze, so that's what I'm going to describe right now.

This is what we call a 5-year plan, which, if all goes well, we are going to have this thing completed in five years. Right now, I just want to show you where we're starting from, which is the existing campus.

And just to orient you, Washington Boulevard is in the foreground, Grand Avenue would be south, it's on the left, Flower is on the right, and 23rd Street is up there at the top of the track and field down there at the south end of the campus. There is Building A. And we are in the LRC, which is right in the middle of the image.

We can go to the next.

This is a plan diagram of the existing campus, two different scales.

The diagram on the left shows the campus in the context of the larger neighborhood, so what you can barely see here is the Santa Monica Freeway going east-west or up and down in this drawing and the Harbor Freeway going north-south or left to right in this drawing, the intersection is right up in the upper right, and the Staple Center is just a little bit further to the right. The campus sits in an amazing location in downtown L.A., which is at the southeast corner of that intersection. It's a great location.

The diagram on the right shows buildings that are on the existing campus, and you will see that there's lots of building happening on the north side of campus. The only open space on the south side of campus is the existing track and field, which has, as you know, been filled up with basketball courts and tennis courts and parking lots and equipment and things like that. Over the years, the campus has built itself out, so that is why it feels like there is no room left on the campus.

Please go to the next one.

So before I describe what the 5-year plan is going to end up looking like, I want to describe what facilities are going to be removed as a result of that 5-year plan. That's the most important first step.

And they are, most significantly, the two 30-year-old temporary structures we call the M Building and R Building along Grand Avenue, which are holding student services and facilities management; the removal of the C Building and the E Building, electronics and the learning assistance center and print shop and all that; in the center of the north campus just south of A, just north of LRC, the snack shop and L-ramp will be removed; and the track and field and the 21st/22nd Street Loop will be removed; and the PTA building will be removed. And pretty soon, as soon as they get control of the coffee building, they are going to remove that, as well, which means all that coffee smell will disappear one day.

So we can go to the next.

And this is what the campus will then look like after we remove those buildings and build the new ones.

So if you compare the left and the right, you can tell how the major space is being formed on the north campus, the north quad, as a result of the removal of C and E; and the new vestibule public square that will accept students arriving via bus and public transportation at the corner of Grand Avenue and Washington Boulevard.

The most important significant change to campus is the turning of the track and field in a north-south direction and the construction of two five-story classroom and laboratory and student services buildings facing onto Grand Avenue.

Beneath that track and field will be a two-level subterranean parking structure holding 700 cars.

Across the street will be a six-story parking structure holding 400 cars.

The intent of the college is to remove its dependency on that parking that's underneath the freeway, the 10 Freeway, about a quarter mile north.

The dark orange buildings show what's new and the lighter colors show what's existing.

We can go to the next one.

So the major projects are renovation of the H Building or the new restaurant facing out onto that public square at the intersection of Washington and Grand; turning the book store around so that it faces the street; putting the student union, pulling it up out of the basement and putting it along the north face of the K Building so that it faces that public square.

This will become a highly active place where the book store, cafe, restaurant and student union

all converge, so it's a very active vestibule to the campus at that important intersection.

The D Building further south will have an expansion of the art gallery and the creation of an outdoor sculpture garden as an extension of that building.

The LRC, the building we're in now, where the library, as I like to refer to it, will get 15,000 square feet of new construction underneath the overhangs here and the exterior will be completely renovated plus miscellaneous interior renovations.

And then the major project, the south campus project, the two-level subterranean parking garage and the two five-story instructional buildings.

You can go to the next now.

In order to get to that point, we went through a 10-month process with the college, and through a series of analytical techniques, drawings, helped the college to envision how it could use the occasion of the bond measure, $138 million investment, to basically correct a lot of the problems of the last 40 years.

The most important of which, really impacting the quality of the environment, were the lack of open space, meaningful open space in a proper location on campus spacious enough to have meaning and

to actually influence positively the quality of the educational environment, and what to do with the vehicles. And that's a two-prong issue.

They don't have enough parking and, on top of that, they have cars traversing across the campus in the unfortunate ways that also deteriorate the quality of the campus.

So these diagrams, the two upper ones, are both called land use diagrams. Very simple technique. You just apply color to each use. So in that diagram in the upper right, blue means parking and streets, red means service, orange means athletic fields, green means green space, gray means buildings.

On the left is the 5-year plan and you see right away how, first of all, the blue has been vacated from the center of campus altogether and green has taken the heart of campus now.

The two diagrams on the bottom, they are simpler diagrams than the ones on the top. They just look at one aspect of the campus, which is the green space, open space, landscaping and open space. Here is the existing condition, all chopped up, no real significant open space; there is a lot of little places, but it's all fragmented. There's no place that's room outside that belongs to everyone in the community, in

the college community.

And that has really been a large part of the intention of the 5-year plan, to use that track and field as an occasion to build a great open space on the south campus and evacuation of C and E to create a great open space on the north campus, and that's how we refer to them, as the north quad and the south quad.

Go to the next.

This shows what's happening from the existing condition to the 5-year plan in terms of how we are accommodating the vehicles. Just to remind us all, right now what's happening is the south campus is basically being chewed up a lot by streets and parking, and the F-Ramp, which is along the south side of the LRC, is aggravating that, so you essentially have the north campus and the south campus completely divided from each other.

What we've done is, in the new plan, we are going to take the F-Ramp, which is along the south side of the LRC, and turn it 90 degrees and put it parallel to Flower and then evacuate completely the surface streets. So what that does right away is you don't have vehicles crossing across the beltline of the campus any more, so you can walk easily from the north to the south side, thus making your 23 acres completely

experienceable. It will feel that much more spacious, because you won't have cars obstructing the experience of walking from the north end to the south end.

And then what's shown here in the dotted line are the two levels of subterranean parking. They are underneath the athletic field so you won't see them at all. There are 700 cars there, more than what's under the freeway. And the entrance is arranged such that two new instructional buildings bracket that entry. There is a ramp down into the garage. So that's your formal entry. That's where everyone knows to go.

If they don't know, if they've never been to campus, that will be the address, they can just drive to the front door and there will be someone there to tell them where to go. But it also has two other entrances on 23rd Street.

So the moving of the F-Ramp, people coming off of Flower with the two ramps on 23rd Street, we have access on 23rd Street, we have access on Grand Avenue, thus we're distributing in-and-out traffic around the perimeter streets rather than bringing everyone to one point, which is what's happening right now with this intersection right here.

This is the aerial of what we started with, the existing and what the 5-year plan is on the

left. And what is amazing, we're building more -- you are getting more classroom and office space and you're doubling the landscape and the open space.

Please go to the next.

This is a summary of really the gains of that $138 million investment over the five years. We are literally doubling the amount of open space on the campus, building 160,000 square feet of new instructional space. Now, the net gain is actually 70,000, because, as you recall, we're removing some of the buildings. We're removing about 90 and building 160, so the net gain is about 70,000 square feet. We're getting about 100 new parking spaces. We're getting a new entry to the campus. We're getting a coherent overall organization.

Equally important to the college has been, well, this is all nice and fine, but what is it all going to look like? So that's been an integral part of the master planning process and these are some of the drawings that were done to support some of the ideas that we're talking about.

This is that important intersection of Washington and Grand Avenue, the renovation of the H Building, the removal of the student services building, and the creation of the great public square

there at that intersection.

You can go to the next.

This is the LRC existing condition on the right, the north quad, the north side between the A Building and the LRC. With the removal of C and E, it will be a great, spacious outdoor room. It will belong to every one of you in college. It's where you run into each other as you are going from class to class. And the LRC will be completely redone on the exterior.

And we have a shot of the south side of the LRC. This is the new athletic field with the parking underneath it. But the north as compared to what you get now, which is a bunch of parking and the vehicular ramp.

That's the interesting thing that has emerged out of the master plan, which is now the library, which should be the most important building in any educational institution, has actually the most important location. It's at the center of campus. It faces onto both of the main spaces of the campus. The entire educational experience revolves around this building, the library.

Go to the next.

This is a shot of looking down 21st Street and Building D. 21st Street is right there and this

will become -- right away, 21st Street going east-west will become a pedestrian walk, again, no longer occupied by vehicles, and that is that important dividing line between the south campus and the north campus.

Go to the next.

And that's the way, in terms of implementation, now the college is really seen. We are starting with the south campus project.

Go to the next.

In this area here, we'll be building the two new classroom buildings along Grand Avenue, parking structure and athletic fields.

Go to the next.

This is an early illustration of what that project would look like. They've completed programming now, so they know the functions that are going to go into those buildings, which are a mixture of all sorts of technological programs, student services and administration.

Go to the next.

And that explains why that south campus project is so important in the order of things. You look at this phasing diagram going Phase 1, 2, 3, 4, not much happening in Phase 1 until the south campus gets built. Once the south campus gets built, then all sorts

of things fall into place.

We can start moving all of those functions out of north campus into the new buildings on south campus. You can then start demolishing C and E and suddenly the campus takes shape. So that's why that big project is so important in the order of things.

Go to the next one.

These are some previews of some study models for the development of those two buildings, which are slightly beyond the scope of this conversation tonight, but I just thought I'd show you what they are starting to look like.

Please go to the next. Was that the last one? Oh, great.

Patricia.

MS. SHOEMAKER: My name is Patricia Shoemaker. I'm with PCR Services Corporation, and this is Sally Salavea. We would like to begin by providing a brief overview of the environmental process and documentation for the campus plan.

The environmental process that was initiated a few months ago is based on the California Environmental Quality Act, the Public Resources Code Section 21000, a set of guidelines that have been approved by the state for preparing environmental

documentation, and also the Los Angeles Community College District's regulations in terms of process, procedure and, to a certain extent, the content.

The process was initiated in March with a notice of preparation, which establishes the scope of the environmental document for the project. That notice of preparation was issued on March 19th. There is a 30-day review period during which we received comments on the scope and content of the document.

Right now, we are within that 45-day review period for the Draft Environmental Impact Report, and I'll explain a little bit about the documentation in a moment. This 45-day review period will include two public meetings, this one and a second meeting on June 12th. It will be in the same location, same time.

And the purpose of that meeting and this one is to receive comments from the public with respect to the project and the environmental documentation for the project.

The review period, the environmental review period for the Draft EIR will be followed by responses to comments. So we will take each comment provided by the public, either in writing or through these public forums, respond to them in writing, and all of the information will then be presented to the

District Board of Trustees along with the project for consideration and action. And that is expected to occur in October of this year.

The documentation -- and I'm not sure, but we do have copies here in this room and also in several locations, the main library in downtown Los Angeles, the library here on campus, in the president's and vice president's administration offices. It's also available on the college's web site.

The document and the purpose of the documentation is to identify significant effects that will occur that are associated with construction of the project and then long-term operations of the project.

We also need to identify any mitigation measures that are necessary and are feasible to either avoid the significant impacts that are identified through analysis or to minimize those impacts.

And, lastly, to identify alternatives that would do the same thing, that would either avoid impacts or minimize impacts. And you will find an analysis of three alternatives, which I will cover in a moment.

Through the notice of preparation, which included an initial study, four topics or environmental impacts were identified as potentially resulting from the implementation of the project, and they are air

quality, cultural resources, noise, and transportation and circulation. Those are the four topics that are covered and thoroughly evaluated in the environmental document, the Draft EIR that I just mentioned. The alternatives are also included in the environmental document.

As you've seen and just received a presentation, the project description in the Draft EIR is the campus plan, the 5-year plan.

Also assumed is that the project will be completed in 2007, so all construction will be completed and the facilities would be occupied.

The other assumption is that student enrollment would increase from the current number of approximately 15,000 up to 21,300. So those are assumptions that are on the basis of the analysis.

Air quality. The analysis identified significant impacts relative to construction emissions, and that's basically dust, emissions from vehicle and heavy equipment usage. Also during post-construction or occupation of the project when the facility is completely built, the number of students on campus and/or the enrollment is realized and that would also result in some air emissions associated with vehicular use.

Mitigation measures have been identified which reduce the impacts, specifically during construction. However, even with those mitigation measures implemented, there would still be some significant impacts associated with implementation of the project.

Historic resources are evaluated in the document. If you look on this diagram, the striped areas are buildings that are of particular interest because of their eligibility for designation on the existing local ordinance and/or should receive special consideration from a planning perspective. These buildings, some would be removed and others would be modified through renovation and implementation activities.

Of the buildings that were shown on the previous diagram, Building C is of particular interest and significance, largely because of its association with the Los Angeles Polytechnic High School and its current use here on the property. Also, its Moderne architectural style, and it was constructed originally in 1936.

For this particular topic, there are significant impacts associated with the project, as I've already mentioned, some of the building's features will

be removed or modified through impacts. Some of those impacts could be lessened and/or avoided. However, with the removal of Building C, there are significant impacts even after mitigation.

Noise. There will be noise impacts, as well as some noise associated with the increased vehicular use and access to the property or to the college campus. Mitigation measures include temporary sound barriers to mask some of the construction noise and the use of heavy equipment. With the mitigation, the impacts are expected to be less significant, so that is an issue that is completely dealt with.

The traffic study that was prepared for the project, we've got 15 intersections and they are shown here on this diagram in blue. Of these 15 intersections, the ones shown in green are about four intersections that require mitigation.

There are two ramps, freeway ramps, one at the northbound 110 and also to the westbound Santa Monica Freeway. Those ramps would be improved with additional lane capacity.

The intersection at Grand and 23rd will be realigned slightly to improve its function and capacity, and also a signal would be added to Grand Avenue and 22nd.

With those mitigation measures, there would be two intersections that would continue to function at -- that would be impacted by the standards to a significant level. However, the intersection as shown here at Adams and Grand Avenue would continue to function at acceptable levels per city requirements. The intersection at Washington and Grand would operate at unacceptable levels at the afternoon peak hours.

Considering the impacts that have just been described, three alternatives were evaluated. The Alternative 1, the no action/no project, is required to be evaluated under state law. That alternative assumes that there would be no increase in the student enrollment, so the campus would continue to operate with 15,000 students, and also that minor improvements would be made to accommodate and/or correct any deficiencies related to fire/life safety, the Uniform Fire Code, Uniform Building Code and other requirements. So some construction would occur; however, not the implementation of the campus plan, the 5-year plan.

Alternative 2 assumes that Building C would be retained in its current condition, possibly with some modifications within the building, but it would remain in place. Under the project, it would be removed to create a portion of the north quad.

Alternative 3, the reduced future enrollment is proposed and evaluated to determine whether or not there is a major difference between the impact that would be created on campus of 18,000 students versus the proposed enrollment of 21,300.

When we compare, the analysis shows that the difference between the three alternatives when compared to the project varied.

Under Alternative 1, generally no impact because of the very minor nature of the construction activities that would occur, basically renovation, rehabilitation of existing buildings.

Under Alternative 2, the impact in air quality and noise and circulation and transportation would be essentially the same; however, there would be less than significant impact regarding the resources simply because of the retention of Building C.

Under Alternative 3, with the reduced future enrollment, some of the impact would be at the same level as with the proposed project, and those are historic resources and noise; however, under air quality and transportation, we concluded that there would be less impact associated with Alternative 3.

As I mentioned at the beginning of our presentation, the opportunities for public participation

are during this review period for the Draft Environmental Impact Report, which is a 45-day period. The next meeting, again, is on June 12th, as well as a District Board of Trustees meeting that will occur on May 28th, and there are two meetings that will occur, the dates have not been set, and those meetings will be in October.

And we will set those meetings when the board will receive all the public comments, the environmental documentation, including all public comments and responses, as well as the campus plan for action.

At this time, we invite you to offer comments, either verbally or in writing. This session is not designed to be a response/question forum. What we do want is to hear from you in the form of questions and/or statements and they will be recorded and written responses will be provided.

Please state your name.

SAM SABOT. My name is Sam, S-a-m, last name Shabot, S-h-a-b-o-t, student at Trade-Tech, Los Angeles Trade-Tech College, also West Los Angeles College.

I am strongly in favor of the full retention of the historic building.

I wanted to ask, what was the cost of

removal and did you consider that and also consider the drastic reduction in space?

I understand there is a need for open space, but this building, just taking it out, it doesn't seem -- even though the need for open space, it's basically a working building and it seems that taxpayers' money is being spent to remove a functional building that might even have historical value to it is just being taken out.

I understand there's other space being created elsewhere, and I wanted to know what the cost of that was in relation to the total amount of money spent on all these projects, different projects?

MS. SHOEMAKER: Your questions and your comments will be responded to in the document that is prepared and submitted to the board. Thank you.

Would anyone else like to offer a comment?

We will be here until 8 o'clock this evening. Please feel free to take a comment form, complete it here and mail it back or just provide it to us before you leave.

Again, the purpose of this forum is to receive comments. We do want to respond in writing and with accuracy and that's the purpose of not providing a response tonight, but rather reviewing your comment

and/or comments received this evening and providing an accurate and thorough response.

SAM SHABOT: But my comment will be noted in the record?

MS. SHOEMAKER: Absolutely, yes, along with a response.

SAM SHABOT: Thank you.

MS. SHOEMAKER: That concludes the formal presentation. We will be here to receive comments. And also feel free to review the document if you have a few moments this evening to do that.

Yes?

MARY CATLIN: I notice the public hearing was scheduled for an evening. Is it possible that the public hearing, maybe one, can be held during the daytime while students are on campus?

MS. SHOEMAKER: We will certainly consider that.

MARY CATLIN: You can contact Mary Catlin, ASO president, at the ASO office, Extension 7209.

MS. SHOEMAKER: Thank you.

(Whereupon the public meeting was adjourned at 7:19 p.m.)

* * *

LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECHNICAL COLLEGE

CAMPUS PLAN 2002

PUBLIC MEETING

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 2003

6:10 P.M.

REPORTED BY TIMIANNE BOURELL, CSR NO. 2845

Public Hearing conducted by the Los Angeles Community College District and the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, at Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, Building D, Room D-120, on Thursday, June 12, 2003, commencing at 6:10 p.m., before TimiAnne Bourell, CSR No. 2845.

* * *

ATTENDEES:

James Favaro

Mary Ann Breckell

Maria Carvajal

Dr. Daniel Castro

Jerry Hostalek

Ron Johnson

Hector Semiden

Los Angeles, California; Thursday, June 12, 2003

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

Building D, Room D-120

6:10 p.m.

MS. SHOEMAKER: My name is Patricia Shoemaker with PCR Services Corporation. On behalf of the Los Angeles Community College District and Los Angeles Trade Technical College, we would like to welcome you to this public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Campus Plan 2002 5-year plan.

This public hearing was advertised for 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 12.

As we have no participants from the public attending this session at this time, we will not move forward with our scheduled presentation and, in lieu of that presentation, will allow until 6:30 for participants from the public to arrive, at which time the public hearing will be closed. Comments after that point will be welcome in writing via the comments sheet or letters in writing provided by the individuals.

(Break taken at 6:12 p.m.)

(Meeting commenced at 6:30 p.m.)

MS. SHOEMAKER: It is now 6:30. No members of the public have arrived. We are formally closing the public hearing. That concludes the June 12, 2003 hearing for the Los Angeles Trade Technical College Campus Plan 2002 Draft Enviornmental Impact Report.

* * *

PCR Santa Monica
233 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 130
Santa Monica, California 90401
TEL 310.451.4488
FAX 310.451.5279
EMAIL info@pcrnet.com

PCR Irvine
One Venture
Suite 150
Irvine, California 92618
TEL 949.753.7001
FAX 949.753.7002
EMAIL info@pcrnet.com