

---

---

## V. GENERAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

---

---

### SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts which cannot be avoided. Specifically, Section 15126.2(b) states:

*Describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications and the reasons why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, should be described.*

Based on the analysis included in Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) of this Draft EIR, the Master Plan would result in impacts ranging from less than significant to significant and unavoidable, with significant and unavoidable impacts occurring for Noise (Construction) and Transportation and Traffic (Intersections and Street Segments).

Alternative designs to the Master Plan and their implications are discussed in Section VI (Alternatives to the Master Plan). As indicated therein, none of the Alternatives would reduce all of the significant unavoidable impacts associated with the Master Plan to a less-than-significant level, with the exception of the No Project Alternative (1), which would have impacts ranging from no impact to less-than-significant after mitigation for each of the environmental issue areas analyzed. No significant and unavoidable impacts would occur under the No Project Alternative (1).

The No Project Alternative (2) would have impacts ranging from less than significant to significant unavoidable for each of the environmental issue areas analyzed, with significant and unavoidable impacts occurring for Air Quality (Construction and Operation), Aesthetics (Views), Hazards (Airport Hazards), Noise (Construction), and Transportation and Traffic (Intersections and Street Segments). The impacts of this Alternative would be increased as compared to the Master Plan.

The No Project Alternative (3) would have impacts ranging from less than significant to significant and unavoidable for each of the environmental issue areas analyzed, with significant and unavoidable impacts occurring for Air Quality (Construction and Operation), Aesthetics (Views and Light), Hazards (Airport Hazards), Noise (Construction), and Transportation and Traffic (Intersections and Street Segments). The impacts of this Alternative would be increased as compared to the Master Plan.

The Relocated East Building Alternative would have impacts ranging from less than significant to significant and unavoidable with respect to each of the environmental issue areas analyzed, with significant and unavoidable impacts occurring for Transportation and Traffic (Intersections and Street Segments). The impacts of this Alternative would be reduced as compared to the Master Plan.

Of the 17 Access Alternatives (including the No Project Access Alternative), the preferred Access Alternative under the Master Plan would be Access Alternative B4, which would have significant and unavoidable impacts at four of the 27 analyzed intersections and significant and unavoidable impacts at

two of the 27 analyzed street segments. Access Alternative B4 may be combined with the Master Plan or with any of the other Alternatives discussed in Section VI (Alternatives to the Master Plan).

## **SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES**

Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that the “uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely.” Section 15126.2(c) further states that “irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.”

The implementation of the Master Plan would consume limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable resources. This consumption would occur during construction of the Master Plan and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. The development of the Master Plan would require a commitment of resources that would include (1) building materials to allow for the construction of the Master Plan; and (2) fuel and operational materials/resources during the operation of the Master Plan.

Construction of the Master Plan would require consumption of non-replenishable resources or resources which may renew slowly. These resources would include certain types of lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt (e.g., sand, gravel and stone), metals (e.g., steel, copper and lead), petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics) and water. Fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil, would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment.

Operation of the Master Plan would involve the use of non-replenishable resources including fuel to transport students, faculty, staff, and others to and from the Bundy Campus. The Master Plan would also slightly increase the amount of utilities and energy consumed on the Bundy Campus to allow for day to day operations (i.e., water, electricity, and natural gas). Finally, the Master Plan would increase classroom space, encouraging additional classroom materials to be introduced to the site, many of which would be composed of plastic and wood.

The commitment of the resources required for the Master Plan would limit the availability of these resources for future generations. However, this resource consumption would be consistent with growth and anticipated change in the greater Los Angeles region, and, as discussed in Section VI (Alternatives), would not represent the highest-density use that could potentially be developed on the site.

## **GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE MASTER PLAN**

Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed project could induce growth. This includes ways in which a project would foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

*Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.*

While the Master Plan would not directly induce housing or population growth, the Master Plan could arguably indirectly increase growth in the area through the introduction of new jobs and educational opportunities through the provision of expanded classroom and instructional space for Continuing Education and other non-credit programs at the Bundy Campus.

In terms of employment, approximately 53 faculty and staff are expected to be employed at the Bundy Campus under the proposed Master Plan. Based on staffing assignments, a total of approximately 35 faculty and staff were on the Bundy Campus at any given time during the Fall 2005 semester; therefore, implementation of the Master Plan would result in an additional 18 faculty and staff members. The Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) regional forecasts indicate an increase in employment in the City of Los Angeles from approximately 1,800,766 persons in 2005 to 1,994,358 persons in 2010. Thus, the Master Plan would not increase local employment within the City beyond those already projected by the SCAG.

The Master Plan would increase the student population of the Bundy Campus from approximately 409 students on campus at any given time during the Fall 2005 semester to approximately 876 students on campus at any given time at Master Plan buildout. Therefore, the Master Plan would introduce approximately 467 new students to the Bundy Campus at any given time. Nonetheless, many of these students are anticipated to be students who would otherwise be attending SMC classes at one of the other campuses, or students who are already residing in the region. Therefore, these additional classroom seats are not anticipated to encourage large numbers of students to relocate to the project area. Any roadway improvements or other infrastructure upgrades (e.g., water facilities, electricity transmission lines, natural gas lines, etc.) associated with the Master Plan would not be expected to induce growth because they would be limited in scope with the primary purpose of better serving the Bundy Campus. Overall, the Master Plan is not anticipated to create substantial growth-inducing impacts.