SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND SCOPING MEETING FOR THE BUNDY CAMPUS MASTER PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT [CEQA Guidelines Section 15082] September 26, 2005

TO:All Interested Agencies, Parties, Organizations, and PersonsFROM:Santa Monica Community College District1900 Pico Boulevard, Santa Monica, CA 90405SUBJECT:Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact ReportPROJECT TITLE:Santa Monica College Bundy Campus Master PlanPROJECT PROPONENT/APPLICANT:Santa Monica Community College District

Santa Monica Community College District (SMCCD) has determined that a Program and Project-level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required for the Bundy Campus Master Plan. The SMCCD is the Lead Agency for this project and is requesting your Agency's input as to the scope and content of environmental information germane to your Agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the Proposed Project. Your Agency will need to use this EIR when considering any applicable approvals that may be required by your Agency. Interested parties, organizations and persons are also invited to participate in the NOP consultation and CEQA review process.

Project Location, Environmental Setting, and Description: See attached CEQA Initial Study Checklist materials.

Environmental Issues to be Analyzed in the EIR: The SMCCD, as Lead Agency, has determined that an EIR is required for this project and, through an Initial Study, has identified the following environmental issue areas to be included within the scope of the EIR: Air Quality, Aesthetics (Views, Light & Glare), Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use, Noise, Public Utilities (Water, Sewer, and Energy), Public Services, (Police and Fire Protection), Traffic and Circulation, Neighborhood Effects, and Mandatory Findings of Significance. (See CEQA Initial Study Checklist, attached.)

Draft Master Plan: Available on SMC's official website at: http://www.smc.edu/facilities_airport/default.html.

Scoping Meeting. A public scoping meeting will be held to present the Proposed Project and solicit public comments with regard to potential environmental impacts that may occur as a result of the Proposed Project. The scoping meeting will be held on **Monday, October 17, 2005** at **7:00 PM** at the following location:

Santa Monica College Bundy Campus Community Room 3171 S. Bundy Drive Los Angeles, California 90066

Request for Agency Consultation. Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. In order to receive consideration in the Draft EIR, comments are due by **Tuesday October 25, 2005**. Please address all comments to **Dr. Thomas Donner, Interim Superintendent/President, Santa Monica College at 1900 Pico Boulevard, Santa Monica, CA 90405**. Please provide the name of a contact person in your Agency.

Date

Dr. Thomas Donner, SMC Interim Superintendent/President

SANTA MONICA COLLEGE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

PROJECT TITLE	DATE:
Santa Monica College Bundy Campus Master Plan	September 26, 2005
LEAD AGENCY:	RESPONSIBLE/TRUSTEE AGENCIES:
Santa Monica Community College District	City of Santa Monica
1900 W. Pico Boulevard	City of Los Angeles
Santa Monica CA 90405	

PROJECT LOCATION

The Project Site consists of a 10.4-acre parcel of land located at Santa Monica College's Bundy Campus, at 3171 S. Bundy Drive, Los Angeles, California. Regional access to the Project Site is provided by the Santa Monica Freeway (I-10) and the San Diego Freeway (I-405). (See Project Location Map, attached.)

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles, and is surrounded by a mix of residential, commercial, and aviation land uses. The site is primarily bounded by commercial, restaurant, and airport-related industrial uses within the Santa Monica Airport to the north; S. Bundy Drive/Centinela Avenue to the east; residential development along Stanwood Place to the south; and residential development along Stewart Avenue to the west. The uses located north of the Project Site are located within the City of Santa Monica while the uses to the east, south, and west of the Project Site are located within the City of Los Angeles.

Site improvements to the existing Bundy Campus have already been approved and completed. An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was adopted by the Santa Monica College Board of Trustees on March 1, 2004 in connection with the renovation of the existing four-story West Building on the site. The Bundy Campus has since been converted to and is currently operating as a satellite campus offering day and evening community college courses. The existing Bundy Campus contains two structures: the occupied and recently renovated four-story West Building (approximately 64,000 sf) located in the center of the site and the vacant two-story East Building (approximately 30,000 sf) located on the east side of the site fronting S. Bundy Drive. Retaining and remodeling this building was determined infeasible as it is not accessible to individuals with disabilities and does not support the typical configuration required for a 30-seat classroom.

Access to the Bundy Campus is currently provided through a College-constructed driveway along the south side of the site to connect the upper/east and lower/west portions of the site. This driveway from Bundy Drive was the only vehicular access point to the Bundy Campus for the Summer 2005 session. Additional access points are discussed in more detail under "Project Description," below.

As of the July 2005 campus opening, the Bundy Campus provides surface parking for 609 vehicles. The majority of the students utilize the shuttle parking lot north of Airport Avenue and enter the campus via a pedestrian gate at the northwest corner of the property.

Much of the educational planning for the Bundy Campus is embodied in the already approved uses for the recently renovated four-story West Building. General Education, Continuing Education, and Non-Credit courses were available during the summer session that began on July 6, 2005. The 2005 Fall session added Early Childhood Development, Teacher Education, and Nursing classes to the course offerings. The SMC Faculty & Staff Steering Committee identified the future programs for the Bundy Campus based on the current programs that need to grow and/or modernize and their ability to function as primarily stand-alone programs at the Campus. The future programs would include three Communications programs: Cinema, Journalism, and TV Broadcasting. Fashion & Merchandising was also identified as a potential program candidate based on its need for additional, modernized space. The College concluded that the two buildings planned for the site would be sufficient to meet the long-range facility planning needs of the Bundy Campus.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The primary objective of the Bundy Campus Master Plan is to provide an essentially self-sustaining campus, largely operating independently of the SMC Main Campus and other satellite campuses. The vision for the Bundy Campus Master Plan is to implement and fulfill, in part, the Santa Monica College Master Plan for Education (2004 Update) goals and policies with respect to acquiring, planning, developing, and maintaining facilities and equipment to provide the best possible educational environment and promote the use of sustainable resources. The purpose of the Proposed Project is to identify long-term planning goals for the Bundy Campus. The Bundy Campus Master Plan would be adopted as an amendment to SMC's Master Facilities Plan (adopted in 1998) and would establish long range planning goals to guide

future development and operations at this satellite campus facility.

The Bundy Campus Master Plan calls for: (1) demolition of the existing two-story East Building with possible interim uses pending demolition; (2) construction of a New Building of similar size (approximately 30,000 sf) to be located to the immediate east of the existing four-story West Building; (3) provision of 678 parking spaces total (558 surface parking spaces and 120 subterranean parking spaces); (4) access improvements; (5) provision of a pedestrian parkway along Bundy Drive; (6) landscaping/open space elements; and (7) general site improvements. (See Proposed Site Plan, attached.)

Under the Master Plan, an additional 69 parking spaces would be provided on the Bundy Campus above that currently provided, for a total of approximately 678 parking spaces on the Bundy Campus at project buildout. The majority of the parking provided on site would be surface parking (558 spaces). In order to reduce the impact of additional parking, an underground parking garage containing 120 spaces is proposed. The College has completed a preliminary traffic study that has confirmed that proposed parking numbers are adequate to serve the Campus' needs. An additional study is being contracted for the Fall 2005 semester. Furthermore, the College programs will be scheduled to insure that adequate on-site parking will be provided at all times.

Under the Master Plan, the Bundy Campus will have up to five points of access. Vehicles would enter and exit the Bundy Campus from S. Bundy Drive. If egress continues to be provided, a right turn only or light allowing for left turns will be considered through discussions with Los Angeles Department of Transportation. The College intends to secure access from the site to Donald Douglas Loop South. Once access is secured, the two historical access points to Airport Avenue along the Bundy Campus' north edge would not be used on a regular basis. In addition, while the Bundy Campus has access to Stewart Avenue, the College will not use Stewart Avenue for faculty, staff, student, visitor, or vendor ingress or egress to the Bundy Campus. The Stewart Avenue access is controlled by a gate which shall only be opened in an emergency or when necessary to perform routine maintenance activities on the wall or parkway west of the wall. When the gate is opened for routine maintenance activities, the College will have personnel present to ensure that faculty, staff, students, visitors, or vendors do not enter or exit the Bundy Campus through the Stewart Avenue gate.

Under the Master Plan, the College proposes to plant approximately 100 additional trees throughout the Campus and to provide a 60-foot-wide greenspace area with a pedestrian sidewalk that will extend along the eastern boundary of the Bundy Campus fronting S. Bundy Drive.

On the ba	asis of this initial evaluation:
	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions on the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
\boxtimes	I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

DETERMINATION

SIGNATURE

Dr. Thomas Donner, SMC Interim Superintendent/President

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once it has been determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less that significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to "Less Than Significant Impact." Mitigation measures must describe and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analysis," cross referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of b) and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures c) Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) should be 6) incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form. However, the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whichever format is selected should be used.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and a)
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist below.

Air Quality

X

- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Aesthetics
- X Hydrology/Water Quality
- **Biological Resources** Cultural Resources
- Noise **Public Services**

X

- Geology/Soils Transportation/Circulation
- \mathbf{X} Utilities
- X Neighborhood Effects
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- SMC Bundy Campus Master Plan SMC CEQA Initial Study Checklist

EN	VIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	(Explanation provided on	ns of all pote the followin	ntially and less th g pages.)	an significant	t impacts are
			Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	AIR QUALITY. The significance crite the South Coast Air Quality Managemer (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make determinations. Would the project resu	ria established by at District the following lt in:				
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation SCAQMD or Congestion Management P	n of the Plan?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. With an increase in traffic to the Project Site. in the project vicinity. Potential imp Therefore, potential impacts related to	the development of t The increase in tr pacts related to the conflict with the a	he Proposed affic could p applicable pplicable air	Project, it is anti otentially result ir air quality plan a quality plan will	cipated that that the an increase in are unknown be analyzed in the second seco	here would be n air pollutants at this time. in the EIR.
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contri to an existing or projected air quality vio	bute substantially lation?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The the construction of a 30,000 square anticipated that development of the Procould potentially result in an increase in standard could be exceeded or that th concern. Therefore, potential impacts	demolition of the o foot New Buildin oposed Project wou n air pollutants in th e Proposed Projec related to complian	existing two- g could resuld resuld result in a ne project vic t could cont nce with air o	story East Buildi alt in the generat in increase in trafficient cinity. There is a ribute to an exist quality standards	ng and its rep ion of air po fic to the Proj- possibility tha ing or projec will be analyz	elacement with llutants. It is ect Site, which at an air quality ted air quality zed in the EIR.
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net criteria pollutant for which the air basin i (ozone, carbon monoxide, & PM 10) und federal or state ambient air quality standa	t increase of any s non-attainment ler an applicable rd?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. It is increase in traffic to the Project Site, v with other related projects in the vicinit in the EIR.	anticipated that d which could potenti y. Therefore, the p	evelopment ally result ir otential for c	of the Proposed an increase in ai umulative air qua	Project woul r pollutants in lity impacts w	d result in an n combination ill be analyzed
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations?	pollutant	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The commercial, restaurant, and airport-remissions and vehicle emissions, pot concentrations. Therefore, potential in analyzed in the EIR.	project vicinity i elated industrial u tentially exposing npacts related to th	s characteriz ses. The Pro residential ne exposure of	zed by single-far oposed Project w sensitive recepto of sensitive recep	nily residenti ould increase ors to substar tors to air pol	ial homes and e construction ntial pollutant lutants will be
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a sul of people?	bstantial number				\boxtimes
	No Impact. The Proposed Project wor with the potential to produce substanti landfills. No impact would occur and	ald provide classroo al odors, such as n no further analysis	om and instru nanufacturin s is required.	uctional space and g processes, sewa	l would not in age treatment	volve any uses facilities, and
II.	AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a sce	enic vista?	\boxtimes			

	_	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Potentially Significant Impact. The project vicinity is commercial, restaurant, and airport-related industrial uses two-story East Building, a recently renovated four-story We spaces. The Project Site is located in the vicinity of severa Boulevard, which could be considered scenic viewing poin Mountains. The Proposed Project would not result in new Site, but would demolish the existing two-story East Buil New Building in the center of the campus. This could re vistas. Therefore, potential impacts related to scenic vista	characteri The Proje st Building, Il public stron nts for view developme ding to be r sult in a po s will be ar	zed by single-fan ect Site is currently , and approximatel eets, including Bu ys of the Pacific O ent heights not alr replaced with a 30 tentially significa halyzed in the EIR	nily resident y occupied w y 609 paved indy Drive an ocean and the eady existing 0,000 square int impact re	tial homes and vith an existing surface parking and Grand View Santa Monica g on the Project foot two-story lated to scenic
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a city-designated scenic highway?				
	No Impact. The Project Site is not located within or adjace no historic or potentially historic structures or noteworthy. Therefore, development of the Proposed Project would no outcroppings, or historic buildings, within a City-designated analysis is required.	cent to a Cit land featur t have an a d scenic hig	ty-designated scer res have been ide iffect on scenic re shway. No impact	nic highway. ntified on the sources, such would occur	¹ Furthermore, e Project Site. h as trees, rock r and no further
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The project vicinity is commercial, restaurant, and airport-related industrial uses. vacant two-story East Building which was formerly used renovated for classroom uses, and approximately 609 pave replace former industrial uses with a new educational us Therefore, potential impacts related to the quality of the st	characteriz The Project for industrid surface passes, it could ite and its surface	zed by single-fan et Site is currently ial uses, a four-sto arking spaces. As d result in a poter urroundings will l	nily resident occupied wi ory West Bu the Proposed ntially signif be analyzed i	ial homes and th the existing, ilding recently Project would icant impact. in the EIR.
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The Project Site is located due to streetlights, airport lighting, and lighting associated the project area due to direct sunlight and reflective sur- surrounding streets, windows in buildings, and surfaces of Project would introduce some additional nighttime light introduce some additional glare through building surface resulting in a potentially significant impact. Therefore, pot be analyzed in the EIR.	d in an urba d with resid rfaces inclu f painted bu ing for sect es and wind ential impa	anized area with su dential uses. In ac uding automobile uildings in the pro- urity throughout dows as part of the cts related to nigh	ubstantial nig Idition, glare es traveling s ject vicinity. the Project S he proposed ttime lighting	shttime lighting e is common in and parked on The Proposed Site and would new building, g and glare will
e.	Create a new shadow that would adversely affect a shadow-sensitive use?				\boxtimes
	No Impact. The Proposed Project would construct a two-s	torv New B	Building approxim	atelv 28 feet	in height in the

¹ City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Los Angeles General Plan: Transportation Element, website: http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/transelt/TEMaps/E_Scnc.gif, March 21, 2005.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	center of the Project Site. The new building would be set nearest shade-sensitive uses in the project vicinity (i.e., sing Site, respectively). Due to this setback, the Proposed Pro- shading that would affect these single-family homes. No	back approx gle-family res ject would n impact woul	imately 90 feet n sidences located s ot have the poten d occur and no fi	orth and 280 south and wes atial to introdu urther analysi	feet east of the t of the Project uce substantial s is required.
III.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
	No Impact. The Project Site is located within an urban are to contain any species identified as candidate, sensitive, regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and G occur and no further analysis is required.	ea and is fully or special st ame or U.S.	y developed. The tatus by local or Fish and Wildlife	e Project Site regional plar e Service. No	is not expected as, policies, or a impact would
b.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
	No Impact. No resident or migratory fish or wildlife speedevelopment of the Proposed Project would not interfere impact would occur and no further analysis is required.	cies are expe with the mo	ected to occur on ovement of any f	the Project Si ish or wildlif	ite. Therefore, è species. No
c.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands)?				\boxtimes
	No Impact. No protected biological resources, such as of development of the Proposed Project would not conflict w resources. No impact would occur and no further analysis	bak trees, cu with any loca s is required.	rrently exist on t l policies or ordin	he Project Si nances protec	te. Therefore, ting biological
d.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				\boxtimes
	No Impact. The Project Site is not within an area design Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat c Project would not conflict with any such plan. No impac	nated by an a onservation p t would occu	adopted Habitat o blan. Therefore, o ir and no further	Conservation levelopment of analysis is re	Plan, Natural of the Proposed quired.
IV.	CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Section 15064.5?				\boxtimes

b.

c.

d.

V.

a.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
No Impact. The Project Site and surrounding area do a located in a historic preservation overlay zone (HPOZ). ² cause an adverse change in the significance of a historica is required.	not contain an Therefore, dev I resource. No	ny historic-cultu velopment of the o impact would o	ral monumen Proposed Pro occur and no f	ts and are not ject would not urther analysis
Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Section 15064.5?			\boxtimes	
Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site has be are known to have been encountered. If any archaeologica been disturbed by previous grading activities. If any arch found on the Project Site during construction activities, th and be addressed in accordance with applicable State and no further analysis is required.	een previously l resources we aeological res nen the signifie d federal laws	y developed and ere present on the sources that were cance of such res s. As impacts wo	no archaeolog Project Site, tl not previously ources would ould be less the	tical resources hey have likely y disturbed are be determined an significant,
Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			\boxtimes	
Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site has be are known to have been encountered. If any paleontolog likely been disturbed by previous grading activities. If disturbed are found on the Project Site during construction be determined and be addressed in accordance with applic significant, no further analysis is required.	een previously gical resource f any paleonte on activities, t eable State and	y developed and it is were present of ological resource hen the significa if federal laws. A	no paleontolog n the Project S es that were n nce of such re s impacts wou	gical resources Site, they have not previously sources would and be less than
Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			\boxtimes	
Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site has be to have been encountered. If any human remains were p by previous grading activities. If human remains that w during construction activities, then they would be address As impacts would be less than significant, no further an	en previously present on the ere not previoussed in accord allysis is requ	developed and n Project Site, the ously disturbed a lance with applic ired.	o human rema y have likely t re found on th able State and	ains are known been disturbed he Project Site I federal laws.
GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
Exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving :				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				

No Impact. The Project Site is located in the seismically active region of Southern California. However, the Project

² City of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Historic-Cultural Monuments and Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

³ City of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones & Fault Rupture Areas in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

Potentially	Significant Unless	Less Than	
Significant	Mitigation	Significant	No Imnact
Impact	Incorporated	Impact	

 \boxtimes

 \boxtimes

 \boxtimes

Site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.³ The closest fault to the Project Site is located approximately 4.7 kilometers (7.8 miles) away,⁴ therefore, the rupture of a known earthquake fault on the Project Site is unlikely. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. The closest fault to the Project Site is located approximately 4.7 kilometers (7.8 miles) away.⁵ Potential impacts from seismic ground shaking would be of comparable intensity at the Project Site as it would be for large parts of the City of Los Angeles and the seismically active Southern California region. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with existing applicable laws which reduce seismic risks to an acceptable level. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.



No Impact. The Project Site is not within a potentially liquefiable area.⁶ No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

iv. Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site is not immediately adjacent to any mountains or steep slopes and is generally topographically flat, with the exception of the eastern edge of the Project Site which slopes up approximately 30 feet to Bundy Drive. The Proposed Project would create a landscaped berm that would reduce risks associated with the slope. Furthermore, the Project Site is not in a delineated landslide inventory or hillside area.⁷ Therefore, the probability of landslides, including seismically induced landslides, is considered low at the Project Site. As such, impacts related to landslides would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Proposed Project has the potential to result in erosion of soils during site preparation and construction activities. The potential for soil erosion during the ongoing operation of the Proposed Project is relatively low due to the generally level topography of the area and the development of the entire Project Site. The Proposed Project would comply with all applicable laws which address grading, excavations, and fills. As such, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potential result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

⁷ City of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Landslide Inventory and Hillside Areas in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

⁴ City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Parcel Profile Report for 3200 S. Stewart Ave., 3171 S. Bundy Dr., and 3185 S. Bundy Dr., website: http://zimas.lacity.org/, January 25, 2005.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ City of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Areas Susceptible to Liquefaction in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

 \boxtimes

	Potentially		
Potentially	Significant Unless	Less Than	
Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
Impact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact

 \bowtie

 \square

Less Than Significant Impact. No impact would occur with respect to liquefaction and landslide potential, as evaluated in Checklist Questions 6(a) iii and iv, above. The Proposed Project would comply with all applicable laws which address safe construction, including building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. As such, impacts related to soil stability would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

> Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site is not known to be in an area susceptible to liquefaction.⁸ The Proposed Project would comply with all applicable laws which address safe construction, including building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. As such, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

 \square

Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of e. septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

> **No Impact.** The Project Site is located in a developed area of the City of Los Angeles, which is served by a wastewater collection, conveyance and treatment system operated by the City of Los Angeles. No septic tanks or alternative disposal systems are necessary, nor are they proposed. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

VI. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

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

> Less Than Significant Impact. Other than typical cleaning solvents used for classroom and janitorial purposes, no hazardous materials would be used, transported or disposed of in conjunction with the routine day-to-day operations of the Proposed Project that would create a significant hazard to the public. As such, impacts related to transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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

> Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would use minimal amounts of hazardous materials for classroom uses and routine cleaning. The Project Site was formerly owned an operated by BAE Systems, a major defense contractor. While the former uses on the Project Site would not be expected to result in upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, a potentially significant impact could occur associated with the former uses on the Project Site. Impacts related to release of hazardous materials will be analyzed in the EIR.

Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely c. \bowtie hazardous materials, substances, or waste within onequarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Potentially Significant Impact. No elementary, middle, or high schools are located within one-auarter mile of the

⁸ City of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Areas Susceptible to Liquefaction in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

	_	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Project Site, however, the Bundy Campus currently provid classrooms under the Proposed Project. The Proposed Pr materials for classroom uses and routine cleaning. While substantial potential for accident conditions involving the impact could occur associated with the former uses on the I accidentally release hazardous materials within one-quarte of hazardous materials in the vicinity of a school will be a	les communi oject would the Proposed release of h Project Site. r mile of the analyzed in t	ty college uses an use, at most, min d Project would n azardous materia Furthermore, the Proposed Project he EIR.	nd would prov imal amounts not be expected ils, a potentia Santa Monica t. Impacts rel	vide additional s of hazardous ed to pose any lly significant Airport could ated to release
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
	Potentially Significant Impact. The Project Site is listed database and is located within the American Society for number of hazardous materials sites listed by State and fede material sites will be analyzed in the EIR.	d on the Rig Testing Mat eral agencies.	ht-to-Know Faci erials (ASTM)-s ' As such, impac	lity Index Sys pecified sear ts related to lis	stem (FINDS) ch radius of a sted hazardous
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is the construction of the Proposed Project could result in a people working or attending classes on the Project Site. I the EIR.	located adjac potentially sign mpacts relate	cent to the Santa gnificant impact ed to public airpo	Monica Airpo related to safe rt safety will	ort. Therefore, ety hazards for be analyzed in
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area?				\boxtimes
	No Impact. The Project Site is not within the vicinity of a is a public airport. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occ	a private airs not result in a ur and no fur	trip; rather, the noise safety hazard for the analysis is r	earby Santa N r people residi equired.	Ionica Airport ng or working
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
	Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is the Proposed Project could result in a potentially signific emergency response plan. Impacts related to emergency re	s located adja cant impact v response plar	acent to the Santa with respect to in as will be analyze	a Monica Airp terference wi ed in the EIR.	oort. As such, th an adopted
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				

Arcadis Geraghty & Miller, Phase I/II Environmental Site Assessment, BAE Systems, 3171 South Bundy Dr., Los Angeles, CA, 2001.

 \boxtimes

	Potentially		
Potentially	Significant Unless	Less Than	
Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
Impact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact

No Impact. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles that does not contain wildlands or high fire hazard terrain or vegetation. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

VII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would

the proposal result in:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

No Impact. The Proposed Project would comply with the applicable federal, State and local regulations, Code requirements, and permit provisions. The Proposed Project would not include industrial discharge to any public water system and therefore would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Furthermore, the Project Site already includes an eco-friendly bio swale detention system consisting of seven drywells. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)?



Potentially Significant Impact. No water wells are included as part of the Proposed Project. Runoff currently is and, under the Proposed Project, would continue to be collected onsite and directed towards existing storm drains in the project vicinity. The Proposed Project would involve the demolition of the existing 30,000 sf East Building and the development of a new 30,000 sf building. The Proposed Project would also add landscaping throughout the Project Site, increasing the overall permeable surface area. Although the Proposed Project would not be expected to substantially alter groundwater recharge, a significant impact could occur. Impacts related to interference with groundwater recharge will be analyzed in the EIR.

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?



Potentially Significant Impact. No stream or river courses are located in the project vicinity. Runoff currently is and, under the Proposed Project, would continue to be collected onsite and directed towards existing storm drains in the project vicinity. The Proposed Project would involve the demolition of the existing 30,000 sf East Building and the development of a new 30,000 sf building. The Proposed Project would also add landscaping throughout the Project Site, increasing the overall permeable surface area. Although the Proposed Project would not be expected to substantially alter existing drainage pattern of the area, a significant impact could occur. Impacts related to altered drainage patterns will be analyzed in the EIR.

d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in an manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?



Potentially Significant Impact. No stream or river courses are located in the project vicinity. Runoff currently is and, under the Proposed Project, would continue to be collected onsite and directed towards existing storm drains in the project vicinity. The Proposed Project would involve the demolition of the existing 30,000 sf East Building and the development of a new 30,000 sf building. The Proposed Project would also add landscaping throughout the Proiect Site. increasing the overall permeable surface area. Although the Proposed Project would not be expected to

e.

f.

g.

h.

i.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
substantially increase surface runoff resulting in offsite fl to increased rate and amount of surface runoff will be and	looding, a sig alyzed in the	nificant impact c EIR.	ould occur.	Impacts related
Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	\boxtimes			
Potentially Significant Impact. Runoff currently is and, onsite and directed towards existing storm drains in the p demolition of the existing 30,000 sf East Building and the Project would also add landscaping throughout the Project the Proposed Project would not be expected to exceed the polluted runoff, a significant impact could occur. Impact: analyzed in the EIR.	under the Pro project vicini e developmen t Site, increas stormdrain c s related to st	pposed Project, we ity. The Proposed at of a new 30,000 ing the overall pe apacities in the vi ormdrain capacity	ould continu d Project wc) sf building rmeable surf cinity or gen y and pollute	e to be collected ould involve the . The Proposed ace area. While erate substantial ed runoff will be
Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				\boxtimes
No Impact. The Proposed Project does not include any degrade water quality. No impact would occur and no fu	additional po orther analysis	otential sources of s is required.	f contaminai	nts which could
Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				\boxtimes
No Impact. The Project Site is not in an area designated is located in a highly urbanized area and would not involimpede or redirect flood flows. No impact would occur a	l as a 100-yea lve substantia and no furthe	ar flood hazard ar al development su er analysis is requ	ea. ¹⁰ The Pr ich that it w ired.	oposed Project ould potentially
Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, inquiry or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				\boxtimes
No Impact. The Project Site does not lie in a potential waterways located on or near the Project Site. Flooding fand no further analysis is required.	al dam inunc rom other sou	lation area. ¹¹ Th arces is not expec	ere are no t ted. No imp	major dams or act would occur
Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				\boxtimes
No Impact. The Pacific Ocean is located approximately not lie in a potential tsunami zone. ¹² Furthermore, the immediately adjacent to a hillside area. Therefore, the Pr structures to risks as a result of tsunami, seiche, or mud required.	2.5 miles we Project Site roposed Proje Iflow. No im	st of the Project S is generally topo oct would not be e apact would occu	tite and the F ographically xpected to e r and no fur	Project Site does flat and is not xpose people or ther analysis is
	D. 11:- 7 - 11	6 Mana - 100	1500 V -	

City of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: 100 and 500 Year Flood Plains in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

¹¹ City of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Inundation & Tsunami Hazard Areas in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

¹² Ibid.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	NOISE. Would the project:				
a.	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise in level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. Construction activity we (LAMC), Chapter XI Noise Regulations (also known as a construction activities and prohibits loud, unnecessary residential zone. As the Project Site is bordered by single Place and Stewart Avenue, south and west of the Project S may exceed construction noise standards established by a impact. Therefore, the potential impacts related to noise I the EIR.	buld be subje the Noise Or and unusua e-family resi Site, respectiv he Noise Or evels that exc	ct to the City of L dinance) which li l construction no idential uses alon rely), the construct dinance, resulting ceed established s	Los Angeles M imits the hour bise within 50 g two sides (e ction of the Pr g in a potentia standards will	Iunicipal Code s of allowable 00 feet of any e.g., Stanwood oposed Project Ily significant be analyzed in
b.	Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The short-term grading require the daily use of heavy machinery and equipment whigh noise levels and result in a potentially significant is vibration and noise will be analyzed in the EIR.	g and constr vhich could 1 mpact. The	uction phase of t result in the temporefore, potential	he Proposed 2 orary exposur impacts from	Project would e of persons to groundborne
c.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The area surrounding the as well as commercial, restaurant, and airport-related in existing community college uses and vehicle traffic on th ambient noise levels in the vicinity, resulting in a potentia to permanent increases in ambient noise levels will be an	Project Site dustrial lanc e Project Site lly significan alyzed in the	is dominated by s l uses. The Prop e, which could cro t impact. Therefore EIR.	single-family r osed Project eate a perman ore, potential i	residential uses would expand ent increase in mpacts related
d.	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The construction of the noise increases during construction activities that may exc. Ordinance, resulting in a potentially significant impact. T in ambient noise levels will be analyzed in the EIR.	Proposed Proceed construct Therefore, po	roject would gene ction noise standa tential impacts re	rate temporar rds establishe lated to tempo	y and periodic d by the Noise orary increases
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
	Potentially Significant Impact. The Project Site is loc Proposed Project would have potential to expose students a land uses, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Th in the vicinity of an airport will be analyzed in the EIR.	ated adjacen ind employee erefore, pote	t to the Santa Mo es to excessive noi ntial impacts rela	onica Airport. ise levels from ted to excessi	As such, the airport-related we noise levels
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in				\boxtimes

	Potentially		
Potentially	Significant Unless	Less Than	
Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
Impact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact

the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The Project Site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

- IX. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
- a. Fire protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would demolish the existing two-story East Building on the Project Site and provide a 30,000 square foot New Building, in addition to expanded parking and landscaping. The nearest Los Angeles Fire Station (Station No. 62) is located 0.6 mile from the Project Site at 3631 South Centinela Avenue. Although the Proposed Project is not expected to substantially increase the demand for fire service, the Proposed Project would increase the activity and number of daily visitors on the Project Site, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Therefore, impacts related to fire protection will be analyzed in the EIR.

X

 \square

 \square

b. Police protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would demolish the existing two-story East Building on the Project Site and provide a 30,000 square foot New Building, in addition to expanded parking and landscaping. The College provides primary police services to the Bundy Campus. Supplemental police services are provided by LAPD's Pacific Community Police Station, located at 12312 Culver Boulevard. Although the Proposed Project is not expected to substantially increase the demand for police service, the Proposed Project would increase the activity and number of daily visitors on the Project Site, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Therefore, impacts related to police protection will be analyzed in the EIR.

X. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the project:

a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to ratio capacity on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would generate additional traffic in the project vicinity, resulting in a potentially significant impact on the surrounding street system. The increase in project-related traffic will be analyzed in the EIR.

b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?



Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would generate additional traffic in the project vicinity, which could result in a potentially significant impact on surrounding roads and highways designated by the County of Los Angeles Congestion Management Program (CMP). Therefore, the potential impacts that project traffic would have CMP intersections and roadways will be analyzed in the EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				\boxtimes
	No Impact . The Project Site is located adjacent to the sed development of the Proposed Project would not be expected Project does not include any aviation-related uses. No in	outhern bound ed to result in npact would o	dary of the Santa a change in air tra occur and no furt	Monica Airp affic patterns a her analysis is	ort. However, as the Proposed s required.
d.	Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project opening of between one and three access points on the r potential signalization of the Bundy Drive access point significant impact related to traffic design hazards. Potent will be analyzed in the EIR.	would involve north side of t . As such, the ial impacts res	e circulation imp the Project Site (e Proposed Proje sulting from these	rovements ind to Airport Av ect could have traffic design	cluding the re- renue) and the e a potentially improvements
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The Bundy Campus has use Stewart Avenue for faculty, staff, student, visitor, or v Avenue access is controlled by a gate and shall be opened to perform routine maintenance activities on the wall or have a potentially significant impact related to emergence this emergency access point will be analyzed in the EIR.	as access to St endor ingress with personne parkway wes y access, pote	ewart Avenue; h or egress to the E el present in an er t of the wall. As ential impacts res	owever, the C Bundy Campu mergency or v the Proposed sulting from th	ollege will not s. The Stewart when necessary Project could ne provision of
f.	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project Bundy Campus. It would provide 558 surface parking spa of 678 parking spaces on the Bundy Campus at project b needs of existing and future Bundy Campus students, sta be expected to result in inadequate parking capacity, a sign be analyzed in the EIR.	would provid ces and 120 su uildout. Thes ff, and visitor nificant impac	le a net increase ubterranean parki se spaces are exp s. Although the t could occur. In	of 69 parking ng spaces, rest ected to excee Proposed Pro pacts related	spaces on the ulting in a total ed the parking ject would not to parking will
g.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	\boxtimes			
	Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project Campus and would increase vehicle traffic on surrounding of the Bundy driveway on the east side of the Project S expected to conflict with adapted policies, plans or pro- significant impact could occur. Impacts to alternative tra-	would increas streets. The l ite. Therefor grams suppor ansportation v	se the number of Proposed Project e, while the Proj ting alternative t vill be analyzed i	daily visitors may require th posed Project ransportation in the EIR.	to the Bundy ne signalization would not be , a potentially
XI.	UTILITIES. Would the project:				
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				\boxtimes
	No Impact. Wastewater generated by the Proposed Proj requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Boa wastes into the wastewater system. No impact would oc	ect would con ard. The Prop cur and no fur	nply with all app bosed Project wo rther analysis is	licable wastev uld not dispos required.	vater treatment se of industrial

b.

c.

d.

e.

f.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
Potentially Significant Impact. The City of Los Ang Division (Bureau of Sanitation) provides sewer conveya project area. The City of Los Angeles Department of Wa the project area. Existing infrastructure and treatment implementation of the Proposed Project could result in generation, resulting in a potentially significant impact. will be analyzed in the EIR.	geles Departn nce infrastruc ater and Power t facilities add an increase ir Impacts relate	nent of Public W ture and wastewa r (DWP) provides equately serve th n on-site water co d to water and wa	orks, Bureau ter treatment water treatme e Project Site onsumption ar astewater treat	of Sanitation services to the ent services to e. However, nd wastewater ment facilities
Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
Potentially Significant Impact. Runoff currently is and, under the Proposed Project, would continue to be collected onsite and directed towards existing storm drains in the project vicinity. The Proposed Project would involve the demolition of the existing 30,000 sf East Building and the development of a new 30,000 sf building. The Proposed Project would also add landscaping throughout the Project Site, increasing the overall permeable surface area. Although the Proposed Project would not be expected to require new stormwater facilities, a significant impact could occur. Impacts related to stormwater facilities will be analyzed in the EIR.				
Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	\boxtimes			
Potentially Significant Impact. The DWP supplies w adequately serve the Project Site. However, implementa on-site water demand, resulting in a potentially significan in the EIR.	vater to the pr ation of the Pr at impact. Imp	roject area. DW roposed Project c pacts related to wa	P's existing v ould result in ter demand w	vater supplies an increase in ill be analyzed
Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
Potentially Significant Impact. The Bureau of Sanitat HTP for the existing uses on the Project Site. However, increase in on-site wastewater generation, resulting in a p treatment will be analyzed in the EIR.	ion currently I , implementation totentially sign	provides adequate ion of the Proposi ificant impact. In	e wastewater ti ed Project cou npacts related	reatment at the ild result in an to wastewater
Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			\boxtimes	
Less Than Significant Impact. Generally, solid wast	e generated in	n the City of Los	Angeles is d	isposed at the

Sunshine Canyon Landfill in Sylmar, Bradley Landfill in Sun Valley, or the Olinda Alpha Landfill in Orange County. These landfills have a maximum daily intake of 6.600, 10.000, and 8.000 tons per day, respectively. Both

	Potentially		
Potentially	Significant Unless	Less Than	
Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
Impact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact

 \square

the Bradley Landfill and the Sunshine Canyon Landfill are in the process of expanding their facilities to accommodate additional waste.¹³ The Proposed Project would generate as much as approximately 116,700 tons of construction and demolition debris over the 10-year construction period, or approximately 31.97 tons of debris per day.¹⁴ During operation, the Proposed Project would generate a net increase of approximately 210 pounds per day of solid waste.¹⁵ Both the daily construction and operational waste generated by the Proposed Project would comprise only a fraction of the permitted throughput at the Bradley, Sunshine Canyon, and Olinda Alpha Landfills and no new or expanded landfills would be required. The Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact associated with solid waste and no further analysis is required.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. Disposal of solid waste generated during the Proposed Project's construction and operational phases would be subject to the requirements of applicable statutes and regulations pertaining to solid waste. No impacts would occur and no further analysis is required.

XII. NEIGHBORHOOD EFFECTS.

a. Will the proposal have considerable effects on the project neighborhood?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Bundy Campus is currently offering classes in the renovated West Building. The Proposed Project would result in additional educational uses on the property in close proximity to single-family residences and commercial, restaurant, and airport-related industrial uses, resulting in a potentially significant impact related to neighborhood compatibility. Impacts related to neighborhood effects will be analyzed in the EIR.

XIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

No Impact. The Project Site is currently developed with and surrounded by urban and suburban uses. The Proposed Project would not reduce fish or wildlife habitat, threaten plant or animal communities, or reduce the number of endangered plant or animal species. There are no known historic or prehistoric resources on the Project Site. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

 \bowtie

¹³ Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Plan, 2002 Annual Report, February 2004.

¹⁴ Based on the following rate: 3.89 tons/sf/ year x 30,000 sf. Over a 10-year period this is equal to 31.97 tons/day. Source: United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Report No. EPA530-98-010: Characterizationof Building Related Construction and Demolition Debris in the United States, June 1998, website: http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/sqg/c&d-rpt.pdf, August 16, 2005.

¹⁵ Based on the following rate: 0.007 pounds/sf/ day x 30,000 sf. Source: Integrated Waste Management Board, Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates for Institutions, website: http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/wastechar/wastegenrates/Institution.htm, August 30, 2005.





Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would not have a significant impact with respect to biological resources, cultural resources, or geology/soils, as determined in Checklist Questions III through V of this Initial Study Checklist. As such, the Proposed Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts in any of these areas and no further analysis is required

The Proposed Project's impacts to air quality, aesthetics, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, noise, utilities, public services, transportation/circulation, and neighborhood effects were determined to be potentially significant in Checklist Questions I, II, and VI through XII of this Initial Study Checklist. As the Proposed Project may result in a potentially significant cumulative impacts in one or more of these areas, cumulative impacts related to air quality, aesthetics, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, noise, utilities, public services, transportation/circulation, and neighborhood effects will be analyzed in the EIR.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Potentially Significant Impact. This Initial Study Checklist has determined that the Proposed Project may have a potentially significant impact on air quality, aesthetics, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, noise, utilities, public services, transportation/circulation, and neighborhood effects. These effects and their impacts on human beings will be analyzed in the EIR.