

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE

**ADDENDUM TO THE 1998 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN EIR AND THE 2009 SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR**

THE 2012-2018 EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE

(March 2013)

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: 2012-2018 East Los Angeles College Facilities Master Plan Update

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Los Angeles Community College District
770 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90017

3. Contact Person(s): Thomas Hall
Director, Facilities Planning & Development
Los Angeles Community College District

Phone Numbers: (213) 891-2000

4. Project Location: East Los Angeles Community College; 5.5 miles east of Downtown Los Angeles at 1301 Avenida Cesar Chavez in the City of Monterey Park, County of Los Angeles.

INTRODUCTION & PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The East Los Angeles College (“ELAC” or “the college”) is part of the Los Angeles Community College District (“District”). A 1998 Facilities Master Plan EIR (“1998 EIR”) was prepared for the college and certified by the District on February 20, 2002. The 1998 Facilities Master Plan (“1998 FMP”) consisted of the addition of 433,149 square feet of space to ELAC, including the modernization of three existing campus buildings and the addition of four new parking structures. The 1998 FMP also included plans for air conditioning, infrastructure upgrades, landscaping and security upgrades. Under the 1998 FMP, the service area for ELAC included nine communities covering an area of approximately 77 square miles, and student enrollment was projected to reach 25,000 students by 2015.

The District approved an Addendum to the 1998 EIR on December 15, 2004. The 2004 Facilities Master Plan Update (“2004 Update”) consisted primarily of changes to the location of proposed buildings, the addition and removal of facilities not proposed under the 1998 FMP, and revisions to the proposed parking structures. Changes to the total net square footage for the proposed buildings were minimal. The total number of parking spaces proposed under the 1998 FMP was 5,336 spaces, including existing. With the 2004 Update, a total of 4,744 parking spaces were proposed. A transportation center/bus terminal (Transit Center) was also proposed. The Transit Center, which included six bus bays was revised on July 26, 2006 to include one additional bus bay.

A Second Addendum to the 1998 EIR (“2008 Addendum”) was prepared in January 2008 to evaluate the modernization and expansion of the existing Dr. Helen Miller Bailey Library, an improvement that was not included in the 1998 FMP or the 2004 Update. Under the 2008 Addendum, the existing library would be expanded to 57,100 gross square feet (“gsf”), an increase of 11,700 gsf. In addition, the proposed improvements included the removal of the existing bridge that connected the library building to the Campus Center building and the addition of an elevator to Building F5 to provide access for the disabled to the second level.

Thereafter, the District determined that the college’s service area had increased from 77 square miles to 100 square miles and that enrollment was expected to exceed the planned 25,000 students to reach 27,000 by 2015. In response, the District prepared and certified a Supplemental EIR (“2009 SEIR”) to the 1998 EIR for the 2009 Facilities Master Plan Update (“2009 Update”). The 2009 Update included the addition of approximately 126,093 net gsf of new facilities and demolition of existing buildings not originally proposed for demolition, and the addition of three campus marquees.

Presented in this 2012-2018 Facilities Master Plan (“2012 Update” or “proposed project”) are the projects that carry forward the concepts of providing state-of-the-art learning environments, enhanced infrastructure, improved safety, and adequate convenient parking. The 2012 Update does not include the addition of any new facilities or demolition work.

The 2009 SEIR and this 2012 Update continue to include the facilities required to implement the 2012-2018 Technology Master Plan and its prior iterations. The 2012-2018 Technology Master Plan provides for maintaining and expanding wireless and other online and technology features, such as online portal systems and increased speeds and mobile efficiency, which do not require physical facilities and are supported by the facilities contained in the Facilities Master Plan as a whole.

The following table lists the 2009 Update projects and updates their status:

2009 Facilities Master Plan Projects	Status
Administration Building	Project completed
Campus Student Center/Bookstore Complex	Project in construction
Health Careers Center	Project on hold
Helen Bailey Library - Modernization	Project completed
Language Arts Building/ Student Success and Retention Center	Project in construction
Parking Structure 4 & Maintenance Center	Maintenance Center ON HOLD; Parking Structure 4 – Project completed
Public Service Careers Building	Project on hold
Science Career & Mathematics Building	Project in construction

Student Services Building	Project completed
Weingart Stadium - East End Zone Terrace Modernization	Project in construction

Other items of interest that were briefly addressed in the 2009 Update include: South Gate Educational Center, Rosemead Educational Center, a commitment to expand green areas, a new general classroom building, restoration of recreational areas, and assessment of the feasibility to construct an Observatory/Planetarium.

Briefly addressed 2009 FMP Projects	Status
South Gate Educational Center	Revision of separate EIR in process
Rosemead Education Center	Lease to expire in 2013
Expansion of green areas	Extended to current Facilities Master Plan
Recreational area restoration	Extended to current Facilities Master Plan
Feasibility study on constructing an Observatory/Planetarium	Non-funded

In the previous Facilities Master Plans, and again in the 2009 Update, the college proposed goals intended to (1) make the campus inviting and enjoyable, (2) make the campus environment friendly and safe, and (3) make the campus a community landmark. The 2012 Update carries forward those goals. Previous FMP goals and objectives which are yet to be accomplished but remain essential for the achievement of academic success, technological advancement and campus safety are again targeted for completion in this proposed project.

CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR AN ADDENDUM:

If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of an EIR or negative declaration, the lead agency may: (1) prepare a subsequent EIR if the criteria of State CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a) are met, (2) prepare an addendum, or (3) prepare no further documentation. (State CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15162(a), 15164(a).) When only some changes or additions are necessary and none of the conditions described in section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred, CEQA allows the lead agency to prepare and adopt an addendum. (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15164(a).)

Under Section 15162, a subsequent EIR is required only when:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the EIR due to the involvement of any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the EIR was adopted, shows any of the following:
- (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Thus, if the proposed project does not result in any of the circumstances listed in section 15162 (i.e., no new or substantially greater significant impacts), an addendum to the 1998 EIR and 2009 SEIR is appropriate.

ANALYSIS:

According to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15164, an Addendum to a previously adopted EIR may be prepared if only some changes or additions are necessary and none of the conditions described in Section 15162 requiring the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred. The CEQA Guidelines require that a brief explanation be provided to support the findings that no subsequent EIR is needed for further discretionary approval. These findings are described below:

1. *Required Finding: No substantial changes are proposed for the project that require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new, significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.*

In addition to the facilities analyzed in the 1998 EIR, the 2009 Update consisted of the addition of approximately 126, 093 net gsf of new facilities and demolition of existing buildings not originally proposed for demolition, and the addition of three campus marquees. These changes were analyzed in the 2009 SEIR. The proposed project does not include the addition of any new facilities or demolition of any additional structures that were not previously analyzed. The 2012 Update is intended to provide the status of all previously proposed and evaluated projects.

Aesthetics and Lighting

As stated in the 2009 SEIR, the project site is surrounded to the north, south and west by single- and multi-family residences and low-rise commercial development to the east. These circumstances persist. As with the 1998 EIR and 2009 SEIR, the facilities that have yet to be constructed will be consistent in scale and massing with the existing buildings on campus, and the to-be-constructed athletic fields, buildings, and parking that were analyzed in the 2009 SEIR would continue to have less-than-significant impacts to light and glare by incorporating all previously identified design elements. Parking structure 4, which was identified in the SEIR as a potentially significant impact requiring mitigation, has since been completed. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would occur.

Air Quality

Construction Emissions

The 1998 EIR concluded that construction activity would result in a significant regional PM₁₀ impact. Mitigation Measures AQ1 through AQ12 were included to reduce fugitive dust emissions but the mitigated impact remained significant and unavoidable. The 1998 EIR did not find any other significant impacts related to air quality.

The Addendum for the 2004 Facilities Master Plan Update concluded that no unavoidable significant impacts would occur with regard to air quality. No additional mitigation measures were required.

The 2009 SEIR determined that regional and localized construction emissions would result in significant impacts. With mitigation, which would continue to be incorporated in the proposed project for those facilities that are either currently under construction or are scheduled to begin construction, regional NO_x emissions from construction, and localized construction impacts from NO_x, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ would continue to exceed SCAQMD thresholds and result in significant and unavoidable impacts.

For the 2012 Update, construction of the football and soccer fields, women's athletic field, lighting and retaining wall for the baseball field, campus student store/bookstore complex, language arts building and health care careers building, vocational/general classroom building has yet to begin. Therefore, any grading activity and much construction activity requiring diesel-powered equipment has not yet occurred. However, because all previously identified mitigation would be incorporated, and because no changes have been made to the facilities as they were analyzed in the 2009 SEIR, and also in the 1998 EIR for those facilities introduced before the SEIR, the severity of the significant construction impacts would not be increased and no new significant impacts would be introduced. Construction on the remaining facilities has either already been completed, or has begun. As such, impacts have already occurred or may be reduced for these facilities, and construction impacts from these facilities would not increase in severity. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would occur.

Operational Emissions

The 2009 SEIR concluded that Mitigation Measures AQ30 through AQ33 [concerning public transit, electric car charging stations, and ride sharing] would reduce operational emissions. Further, approximately 80 percent of VOC and CO emissions would result from mobile sources. A large portion (45%) of operational NO_x emissions would be generated by the proposed project's central plant. The central plant facility is a high-efficiency heating, cooling and electricity generating station for the campus. The facility includes design features meant to reduce emissions, such as low NO_x burners for

the boilers and ultra-low emission micro turbines. Its operation would help reduce campus demands on the existing energy grid. Operation of the central plant would also help reduce overall regional operational emissions, as maintenance on much larger and more expensive generators and energy transfer lines would not be necessary to power the proposed project. In addition, the central plant would provide heating and cooling for campus buildings, improving the overall energy efficiency.

Nonetheless, according to the SEIR, operational emissions would still exceed the SCAQMD regional significance threshold for NO_x, and localized significance thresholds for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. Operation of the projects under the 2009 SEIR was determined to result in an unavoidable significant air quality impact. All other operational emissions impacts would be less than significant. No changes would be made to the facilities proposed in the 1998 EIR and 2009 SEIR by the 2012 Update. All previously identified mitigation and design elements would continue to be implemented. As such, there would be no increase in the severity of previously identified significant operational air quality impacts and no new significant impacts would be caused by the 2012 Update.

Cultural Resources

The 1998 EIR concluded that no unavoidable significant impacts would occur with regard to cultural resources. No historical or prehistoric archaeological sites are located within a one-half-mile radius of the campus. No State or National historic places or points of interest are located within the area, and a search conducted by the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of any Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. In addition, no buildings of historic value were identified.

The Addendum for the 2004 Update concluded that no unavoidable significant impacts would occur with regard to cultural resources since no cultural resources exist on-site.

The 2009 SEIR concluded that no buildings eligible for the California Register, nor any Native American resources, are present on the project site. As such, no significant impacts to cultural resources would result.

Because the 2012 Update does not propose any additional facilities or demolition work, and no additional or different areas would be disturbed by construction, no new or substantially greater significant impacts to cultural resources would occur.

Land Use and Planning

The ELAC campus encompasses approximately 82 acres and is located in the City of Monterey Park, approximately five miles east of Downtown Los Angeles. The ELAC campus is bounded by Avenida Cesar Chavez to the south, Collegian Avenue to the east, Bleakwood Avenue to the west, and Floral Drive to the north. The major streets serving the campus are Avenida Cesar Chavez in the east-west direction and Atlantic Boulevard and Eastern and Garfield Avenues in the north-south direction. In addition, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Gold Line Atlantic Station, located one-half mile to the south of the ELAC campus, serves the area.

The ELAC campus is located in a fully developed, predominantly residential urban environment. The surrounding neighborhood consists primarily of residential land uses with commercial/retail uses along Atlantic Boulevard. Land uses to the immediate north of the ELAC campus consist primarily of

multifamily residential units along College View Drive with single-family residences beyond. Land uses adjacent to the west of the ELAC campus consist of single-family residences. An elementary school and large multi-family residential development begins three blocks west of the campus. Land uses adjacent to the east of the ELAC campus along the Atlantic Boulevard frontage consist of seven large commercial/retail centers. Single-family residences extend to the east beyond the commercial frontage. Land uses to the immediate south of the ELAC campus consist primarily of two to three blocks of single and multi-family residential units with the State Route 60 beyond.

The Monterey Park General Plan Land Use Element designates the ELAC campus as a public facility. The ELAC campus is zoned R-1 (single-family residential). The Zoning Code does not contain an institutional or educational designation. Institutional uses are permitted in residential zones with a conditional use permit.

The EIR for the 1998 Facilities Master Plan concluded that no significant impacts would occur with regard to land use and planning and that no mitigation was required. The Addendum for the 2004 Facilities Master Plan Update concluded that mitigation was necessary to resolve the building height inconsistency of the new clock tower identified under the 2004 Update with the Monterey Park zoning Ordinance.

The 2009 SEIR and 1998 EIR concluded that the facilities identified therein would not physically divide an established community. All required zoning exemptions have been approved for the planned facilities, and the project site is not within the jurisdiction of a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. The EIR and SEIR also concluded that the facilities analyzed in those documents would result in compatible land uses with the surrounding community.

Because the 2012 Update does not propose any new facilities and will not result in any additional, unanalyzed demolition, the proposed project will continue to be consistent with all applicable land use plans and will have no other land use impacts. No new or substantially greater significant land use impacts will result.

Noise

The 1998 EIR concluded that construction activity and operation of Weingart Stadium would result in significant noise impacts. Mitigation Measures N1 through N14 were included to reduce noise exposure. These mitigation measures reduced the operational noise impact to a less-than-significant level but the mitigated construction noise impact remained significant. The Addendum for the 2004 Update concluded that no additional significant impacts would occur with regard to noise. No additional mitigation measures were required.

Construction

The 2009 SEIR concluded that noise and vibration impacts from construction would be significant without mitigation at multiple residences and the Robert Hill Lane Elementary School, and that on-site noise impacts would be potentially significant as well. However, with mitigation, noise levels would be reduced by approximately 3dBA, and by 5dBA for nearby sensitive receptors. However, construction noise would result in an unavoidable significant impact because sensitive receptors would still be exposed to ambient noise levels that exceed the 5 dBA significant threshold. Vibration impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation.

For the 2012 Update, construction for the football and soccer fields, women's athletic field, lighting and retaining wall for the baseball field, campus student store/bookstore complex, language arts building and health care careers building, vocational/general classroom building has yet to begin. Therefore, any noise impacts from construction of these facilities have not yet occurred. However, because all previously identified mitigation would be incorporated, and because no changes have been made to the project or equipment as analyzed in the 2009 SEIR, and also in the 1998 EIR for those facilities introduced before the SEIR, the severity of the significant construction impacts would not be increased and no new significant impacts would be introduced. Construction on the remaining facilities has either already been completed, or has begun. As such, some of the previously-identified impacts from certain grading equipment or otherwise has already occurred. Construction noise impacts from these facilities as well would not increase in severity or result in new significant impacts. Furthermore, no additional sensitive receptors have been introduced in the surrounding area which would be subjected to unacceptable noise or vibration levels. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would occur.

Operational

The 2009 SEIR determined that mobile noise generated by the project would not cause the ambient noise level measured at the property line of the affected uses to increase by 3 dBA CNEL to or within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category or any 5 dBA or more increase in noise level. Mobile noise would be less than significant. However, operation of the central plant facility could result in a significant impact, but would be mitigated to a less than significant level. All other noise impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The 2012 Update would not result in any additional uses and would incorporate all previously-identified mitigation measures. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result.

Transportation and traffic

The 1998 EIR concluded that no unavoidable significant impacts would occur with regard to transportation and traffic. Mitigation measures were identified for potential impacts at three intersections, construction effects to an adjacent elementary school, and special event parking. Mitigation Measures T1 through T3 were introduced to reduce the potential intersection impacts identified at three study intersections. Mitigation Measures T4 through T7 would reduce the construction-related impacts on the adjacent Lane Elementary School to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure T8 would reduce the impact from special event parking at Weingart Stadium to a less-than-significant level.

The Addendum for the 2004 Update concluded that no unavoidable significant impacts would occur with regard to transportation and traffic. Two additional mitigation measures, Mitigation Measures A-T1 and A-T2, would maintain the previously identified three intersection impacts in the Final EIR at less-than-significant levels. Mitigation measures applicable to transportation and traffic included in the 1998 EIR were applicable to the 2004 Addendum.

The 2009 SEIR determined that the additional facilities proposed therein would generate 4,633 additional daily vehicle trips, and would demand 2,916 new parking spaces. However, the parking structure proposed in the SEIR with the existing parking would more than accommodate this increase. These vehicle trips would significantly impact two intersections: Ford Blvd/I-710 Northbound On Ramp

and Floral Drive, and Bleakwood Avenue and Floral Drive. Implementation of mitigation measures would mitigate impacts to these intersections to a less than significant level. Lastly, the SEIR also concluded that the facilities would not generate 150 or more additional peak hour trips to any freeway segment.

The 2012 Update does not propose any additional construction or demolition beyond that which has already been proposed and analyzed. Also, the 2012 Update does not propose to accommodate any additional student enrollment, or faculty or staff and as such would not result in increased vehicle trips or parking need. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result.

- 2. Required Finding: Substantial changes have not occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, that would require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.*

The physical and environmental circumstances under which the 2012 Update would be implemented have not substantially changed since the preparation of the 1998 EIR and/or the 2009 SEIR. No substantial changes have occurred on the ELAC campus or in the immediate vicinity. Accordingly, no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that would require revisions of the 1998 EIR and/or 2009 SEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

- 3. Required Finding: No new information has been provided that would indicate that the proposed project would result in one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR.*

The 2012 Update does not propose any additional facilities or demolition, nor any additional student enrollment or faculty/staff. Furthermore, no new information exists that would indicate that the project would result in a new significant impact or an increase in the significance of a significant impact. Therefore, an addendum to the 1998 EIR and 2009 SEIR would be appropriate under this criteria.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS NOT CONSIDERED FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS

Impacts to the following impact categories were previously found to be less than significant and so were not included for detailed analysis in the 2009 SEIR: agricultural and forest resources, biological resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems. The physical and environmental circumstances under which the 2012 Update would be implemented have not substantially changed since the preparation of the 1998 EIR and/or the 2009 SEIR. No substantial changes have occurred on the ELAC campus or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, these impacts remain less than significant and so they are not included for detailed analysis in this Addendum.

CONCLUSION:

Accordingly, and based on the findings and information contained in the 1998 EIR and 2009 Supplemental EIR, and the CEQA statute and State CEQA Guidelines, including sections 15162, 15164,

and 15168, the 2012-2018 Facilities Master Plan and Technology Plan Update will not result in any additional effects on any environmental resources located on or near the project site and the potential environmental effects of the proposed project have been adequately addressed in the 1998 EIR and 2009 Supplemental EIR, as modified by this Addendum. Therefore, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15164, the Board hereby adopts this Addendum to the 1998 Facilities Master Plan EIR and the 2009 Supplemental EIR for the 2012-2018 Facilities Master Plan and Technology Plan Update.

Approved:

Signature: _____

Date: April ____, 2013

Attachments:

- Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the East Los Angeles College Facilities Master Plan Update, May 2010.
- Final Environmental Impact Report for the East Los Angeles College Facilities Master Plan, 1998.