CITY OF LOS ANGELES

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
ROOM 395, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST

(Article IV – City CEQA Guidelines)

LEAD CITY AGENCY:	**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**	**DATE:**
City of Los Angeles, Planning Department	14	March 18, 2010

RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES:
None.

PROJECT TITLE/NO.:	**CASE NO.:**
Occidental College, Swan Hall Renovation and addition	CPC-2010-652-CU ENV-2010-653-EAF

PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.:	
Rezoning from R-4 to R-1, September 2001 Hameetman Science Center CUP, July 16, 2002 Residence Hall, CUP, November 10, 2005	**X DOES have significant changes from previous actions.** **□ DOES NOT have significant changes from previous actions.**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Occidental College is proposing to renovate the 16,340 square foot (sq. ft.), three-story Swan Hall and construct a, 22,700 sq. ft. addition. (No change in student or faculty population is anticipated as a result of the project.) The project requires Conditional Use Authorization for an educational use in a residential zone. The project would meet LEED Silver standards. Swan Hall is one of the original Myron Hunt designed structures on the campus. It was constructed in 1914 and is a contributory structure to an identified Historic District.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:
The Occidental College Campus is located substantially in a single-family residential neighborhood. North: Single-family residential land uses are located north of the project site, along the northern boundary of Campus Road. A community recreation center is also located immediately northeast of the project site. South and East: Single-family residential land uses are located south of the project site along Campus Road and along the campus boundary. West: Directly west of the project site (across Campus Road) is additional single-family residential land uses. Further east of the project site along Eagle Rock Boulevard, multiple-family residential and commercial land uses such as restaurants and retail stores are located.

PROJECT LOCATION:
The Occidental College Campus is located at 1600 Campus Road, in the Eagle Rock area of the City of Los Angeles. North of York Boulevard, east of Eagle Rock Boulevard, south of Yosemite Drive, West of Townsend Avenue.

PLANNING DISTRICT:	**STATUS:**
Northeast Los Angeles Community Planning Area	**□ PRELIMINARY** **□ PROPOSED** **X ADOPTED:** June 15, 1999

EXISTING ZONING:	**MAX. DENSITY ZONING:**	**X DOES CONFORM TO PLAN**
R-1		
EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATION:	**MAX. DENSITY PLAN:**	**□ DOES NOT CONFORM TO PLAN**
Low Density Residential		
SURROUNDING LAND USES:	**PROJECT DENSITY:**	**□ NO DISTRICT PLAN**
Low Density/Single-family residential Open space.		

□ DETERMINATION (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis 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.

□ I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

X 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.

SIGNATURE	**City Planner**

Notes on the Following 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 a lead agency cites 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 the lead agency has 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." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, 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.
b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of 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.
c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures 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.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). 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, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whichever format is selected.
9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
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 on the following pages.

□ Aesthetics	□ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	□ Public Services
□ Agricultural Resources	□ Hydrology/Water Quality	□ Recreation
□ Air Quality	□ Land Use/Planning	□ Transportation/Traffic
□ Biological Resources	□ Mineral Resources	□ Utilities/Service Systems
X Cultural Resources	□ Noise	□ Mandatory Findings of Significance
□ Geology/Soils	□ Population/Housing	

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by the Lead City Agency)

□ **BACKGROUND**

PROPONENT NAME: Occidental College	**PHONE NUMBER:** 323-259-2691
PROPONENT ADDRESS: 1600 Campus Road, Los Angeles, CA 90041	
AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST: City of Los Angeles Planning Department	**DATE SUBMITTED:** March 18, 2010
PROPOSAL NAME (If Applicable): Swan Hall Renovation and Addition	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	*(Explanations of all potentially and less than significant impacts follow the checklist.)*			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	X	☐
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?	X	☐	☐	☐
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	X	☐
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	X	☐
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	X
b. Conflict the existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	☐	☐	☐	X
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	X
III. AIR QUALITY. The significance criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project result in:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD or Congestion Management Plan?	☐	☐	☐	X
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	X	☐
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment (ozone, carbon monoxide, & PM 10) under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	X	☐
d. Does the project create or contribute to a non-stationary source "hotspot"?	☐	☐	X	☐
e. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	X	☐
f. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	X	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. 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 ?	☐	☐	X	☐
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in the City or regional plans, policies, regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ?	☐	☐	☐	X
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) Through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	X
d. 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?	☐	☐	☐	X
e. 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)?	☐	☐	X	☐
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA §15064.5?	☐	X	☐	☐
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA §15064.5?	☐	X	☐	☐
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	X	☐	☐
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	X	☐	☐
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. 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.	☐	☐	X	☐
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	X	☐
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	X	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – (cont.):				
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	X	☐
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	X	☐
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?	☐	☐	X	☐
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?	☐	☐	X	☐
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	X
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials	☐	☐	X	☐
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?	☐	☐	X	☐
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	X
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?	☐	☐	☐	X
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?	☐	☐	☐	X
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?	☐	☐	☐	X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X
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?	☐	☐	X	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposal result in:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	X	☐
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 pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	X	☐
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?	☐	☐	X	☐
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?	☐	☐	X	☐
e. 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?	☐	☐	X	☐
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	X	☐
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	X	☐
h. Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	X	☐
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	X	☐
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	X	☐
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	X
b. Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	X	☐
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES – (cont.):				
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	X
XI. NOISE. Would the project:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise in levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	X	☐
b. Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	X	☐
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	X	☐
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	X	☐
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?	☐	☐	X	☐
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	X	☐
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	X
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X
c. Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X
XIII. 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?	☐	☐	☐	X
b. Police protection?	☐	☐	X	☐
c. Schools?	☐	☐	☐	X
d. Parks?	☐	☐	☐	X
e. Other governmental services (including roads)?	☐	☐	☐	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION.				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	X
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X
XV. 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)?	☐	☐	☐	X
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	X
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?	☐	☐	☐	X
d. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	X
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	X
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	X
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	X
XVI. UTILITIES. Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	X
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	X	☐
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	X	☐
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	X	☐
e. 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?	☐	☐	X	☐

XVI. UTILITIES – (cont.):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	X	☐
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	X
XVII. 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?	X	☐	☐	☐
b. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).	X	☐	☐	☐
c. Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	X	☐

□ DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

I. Aesthetics

a) Does the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The term *views* generally refers to visual access to, or the visibility of, a particular sight from a given vantage point or corridor. *Focal views* focus on a particular object, scene, setting or feature of visual interest; *panoramic views* or vistas provide visual access to a large geographic area, for which the field of view can be wide and extended into the distance. Examples of focal views include natural landforms, public art/signs, individual buildings, and specific, important trees. Panoramic views are usually associated with vantage points looking out over a section of urban or natural areas that provide a geographic orientation not commonly available.

The City of Los Angeles General Plan, Conservation Element, Section 15: Land Form and Scenic Vistas identifies scenic views or vistas as "the panoramic public view access to natural features, including views of the ocean, striking or unusual natural terrain, or unique urban or historic features. Public access to these views is from park lands, private and publicly owned sites and public rights-of-way."

The proposed project site is located within an urbanized area in the community of Eagle Rock, in the City of Los Angeles. The vicinity of Occidental College is not identified as including a scenic vista in the City of Los Angeles General Plan. Furthermore, the project site is not located near or within the viewshed of a scenic vista, therefore impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Does the project have the potential to 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?

The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a city-designated scenic highway. CEQA mandates identification and protection of scenic resources. The City contains only one officially designated scenic highway, and 9 eligible state scenic highways, which are identified below:[1]

Highway	Location
State Route-2 (OD[2])	State Route 210 in La Canada Flintridge to State Route 138 via Wrightwood
State Route-1 (E[3])	State Route-187 near Santa Monica to State Route-101 near El-Rio
State Route I-5 (E)	I-210 near Tunnel Station to State Route-126 near Castaic
State Route-27 (E)	State Route-1 to Mulholland Drive

1 California Department of Transportation, 2001.

2 OD = Officially Designated State Scenic Highway.

3 E = Eligible State Scenic Highway.

Highway	Location
State Route-39 (E)	State Route 210 near Azusa Road to State Route-2
State Route-57 (E)	State Route-90 to State Route-60 near the City of Industry
State Route-118 (E)	State Route-23 to Desoto Avenue near Browns Canyon
State Route-126 (E)	State Route-50 near Santa Paula to I-5 near Castaic
State Route-210 (E)	I-5 near Tunnel Station to State Route-134

Viewer sensitivity or concern is based on the visibility of the scenic resource, the proximity of viewers to the resource, the relative elevation of viewers to the resource, the frequency and duration of views, the number of viewers, and the types and expectations of the individuals and viewer groups. Generally, visual sensitivity increases with an increase in the total number of viewers, the frequency of viewing, and the duration of views. However, visual sensitivity is higher for views seen by people who are driving for pleasure, engaging in recreation activities, or who are homeowners, and sensitivity is lower for people commuting to and from work.

Occidental College is not located in proximity to any of these scenic highways and would not affect aesthetic resources within a scenic highway. The closest officially designated or eligible state scenic highway is the State Route 210 (Foothill Freeway) from I-5 (Golden State Freeway) near Tunnel Station to State Route 134 (Ventura Freeway), which is located approximately 3 miles northeast of the project site.

Implementation of the Swan hall Renovation and addition project may result in the loss of eucalyptus and Brazillian pepper trees on campus. Swan hall is an historic building that is a contributing building to an historic district; changes to Swan Hall and the addition have the potential to affect the appearance of Swan Hall and context of Swan Hall and other historic buildings. This issue is potentially significant and will be discussed further in a focused EIR.

c) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The purpose of the proposed project is to enhance and upgrade the quality of the campus by remodeling a dysfunctional building in a manner that harmonizes with the surrounding environment.

Implementation of the proposed project would include new construction as well as renovation and reuse of Swan Hall. The intent of the project is to contribute to the coherent campus form and enhance the visual image of the campus. Other than as it relates to historic resources impacts to visual character would be less than significant.

d) Does the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The two major causes of light pollution that could generate adverse impacts are glare and spill-over light. Glare occurs when the human eye sees a bright object against a dark background. Spill-over light is caused by misdirected light that illuminates areas outside the area intended.

Light and glare impacts are determined through a comparison of the existing light sources to the proposed new lighting sources. Occidental College is located in an area developed with existing college buildings. Surrounding development includes single-family homes, a high school and a park. External and internal illumination is already in place within the college grounds, and along the local roadways in the vicinity of the project site. Interior and exterior lighting, including security nighttime lighting throughout the campus, streets and parking lot areas currently exist.

Due to the project site's location, on the interior of the campus away from surrounding residential development, any new accent lights would not create a significant impact. In accordance with the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan, the proposed project would be required to install on-site lighting along all pedestrian walkways and walk-throughs as well as shield and direct on-site lighting to illuminate driveways and walkways in order to minimize adverse impact on adjacent areas. Impacts would be less than significant.

II. Agricultural Resources

a) Does the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

The proposed project would not be located on existing Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (farmland), as defined by the California Resources Agency. The proposed project also is not located within the immediate vicinity of agricultural operations. The proposed project would not have the potential to affect any farmlands or other agricultural operations. No impacts to agricultural resources would result from the proposed project.

b) Does the project conflict the existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

The proposed project would not be located on land zoned for agricultural purposes, or on land that is under a Williamson Act contract. No impacts on agricultural resources would result from the proposed project.

c) Does the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

The proposed project would not be located on existing farmland, or on land within the immediate vicinity of agricultural operations. Therefore, the project would not have the potential to affect any farmlands or other agricultural operations. No impacts on agricultural resources would result from the proposed project.

III. Air Quality

a) Does the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD or Congestion Management Plan?

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD or Congestion Management Plan. The project site is located within the 6,600-square-mile South Coast Air Basin (Basin). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is required, pursuant to the Clean Air Act, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Basin is in non-attainment (i.e., ozone and particulate matter less than 10 microns -- PM_{10}). The project would be subject to the regulations of SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).[4] The AQMP contains a comprehensive list of pollution control strategies directed at reducing emissions and achieving ambient air quality standards. The project would not increase student or faculty population on the campus and therefore would not increase vehicle trips; the project would be energy efficient and would meet LEED Silver Standards. No impacts are expected.

b) Does the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

The proposed project is located in the SCAB within the SCAQMD. The SCAQMD has established standards for air quality constituents generated by construction and by operational activities for the following pollutants: Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2), and PM_{10}.

Construction emissions would be short-term in nature and would be limited only to the time period when construction activities are taking place. The footprint of the proposed addition is less than 6,000 square feet, and while excavation for the proposed basement would result in increased dust (PM10 and PM2.5), such emissions would be of short duration and sensitive receptors (other than the College itself) are located more than 400 feet from the excavation site and therefore would not experience high concentrations. The applicant anticipates approximately 1,500 cubic yards of soil export (approximately 100 truck trips anticipated to be spread over 10 days or more). Construction emissions would not add to long-term air quality degradation. As a result of the size of the project, and assuming compliance with SCAQMD regulations including Rule 403 dust suppression requirements as well as standard conditions of approval, construction related emissions are not anticipated to exceed SCAQMD daily emissions thresholds. Impacts due to temporary construction emissions would be less than significant.

The project would not result in additional vehicle trips and the project building would be energy efficient (LEED Silver level); therefore operational impacts would be less than significant.

c) Does the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment (ozone, carbon monoxide, & PM 10) under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

The proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable increases in criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment. The project area and the whole of the Los Angeles

4 South Coast Air Quality Management District, *2007 Air Quality Management Plan*.

metropolitan area are located within SCAB, which is characterized by relatively poor air quality. SCAB is currently in non-attainment for several criteria pollutants. Activities associated with construction of the proposed project would result in temporary increases in air pollutant emissions, which are not anticipated to individually or cumulatively exceed established thresholds for these criteria pollutants and would therefore result in less than significant impacts.

d) Does the project create or contribute to a non-stationary source "hotspot"?

Since the proposed project would not generate any new permanent vehicle trips, it would not have the potential to create or contribute to a non-stationary source "hotspot". Temporary emissions from construction would be minor and would not have the potential to substantially contribute to a hot spot. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Does the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Construction emissions would be temporary and are anticipated to be below thresholds of significance and therefore less than significant. The project would generate no new operational vehicle trips. The new building would be energy efficient (LEED Silver) and would therefore minimize emission from operational use of the building.

f) Does the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Emissions from construction equipment, architectural coating, and paving activities may generate minor odors typical of construction activity. This impact would be less than significant.

IV. Biological Resources

a) Does the project 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?

The majority of the 120-acre campus is developed with buildings, parking lots, sports fields and other facilities and includes substantial ornamental landscaping throughout the campus. Due to surrounding development and the disturbed nature of the site, the project site does not provide suitable habitat to support special-status biological resources. The area where the proposed Addition would be located is currently occupied by grass and ornamental trees (eucalyptus, cypress and Brazilian pepper trees). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Does the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in the City or regional plans, policies, regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Occidental College is located within an urbanized and built-out environment. No significant riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community exists in proximity to the Swan Hall development site. Implementation of the project would not have the potential to affect any riparian or sensitive natural community habitats. No impacts would occur.

c) Does the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Occidental College is located within an urbanized and built-out environment. No significant wetlands exist in proximity to the Swan Hall project site. Implementation of the project would not have the potential to directly or indirectly affect any wetland areas. No impacts would occur.

d) Does the project 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?

Occidental College provides typical urban wildlife habitat, and these species will be able to relocate and utilize similar habitats on the campus outside of the proposed construction areas. The campus does not provide wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites. No impact would occur.

e) Does the project 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)?

The proposed project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including the City's tree protection ordinance. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the loss of ornamental trees (eucalyptus, Brazilian pepper and cypress); these trees would be replaced with native trees such as oak trees. Any impacts would be less than significant.

f) Does the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Occidental College is located in Zone 3 Santa Monica Mountains-Eagle Rock of the Habitat-Oriented Biological Assessment Planning Zones, and within the Los Angeles Biological Resources Area.[5] Since the project is already developed with college uses, the project would not conflict with the regulations outlined in these biological planning documents. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan or other approved local or regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impacts would occur.

V. Cultural Resources

a) Does the project cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA §15064.5?

The Occidental College campus history began with the significant role of Myron Hunt as the master planner for the original College site plan and architect for numerous buildings (including Swan Hall) until 1940. It also includes Beatrix Farrand's role as a landscape architect for a series of key spaces, including the main quadrangle (in front of Swan Hall). These influences formed the campus principal

[5] Jones and Stokes, *Occidental College Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration*, March 2002.

design direction and environment, and make the campus an important historical artifact. This was recognized in the identification of the campus as a historical district.[6]

As such, the proposed project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource. Implementation of the proposed project could include substantial alteration to an historic property (Swan Hall) and the context of Swan Hall and the historic district in general on the Occidental College campus. The Occidental College Historic District meets the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 3 because taken together the historic resources within the Occidental College Historic District retain a very high degree of integrity of materials, location, setting, workmanship, feeling and association. In fact, 19 buildings designed by Myron Hunt (including Swan Hall) still exist on the campus. [7] These buildings traditionally formed the core of the campus and continue to do so until today. On the whole, the buildings have been largely unaltered over time.

There is a potentially significant impact to historical resources as a result of the project and this issue will be discussed in a focused EIR.

b) Does the project cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA §15064.5?

The proposed project is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource. Based on a record search at the South Central Coastal Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), archival research, and a field reconnaissance survey conducted in early November 2001 by a qualified archaeologist, no significant pre-historic or historic archaeological resources were identified within the project area that could be adversely affected by the proposed project.

However, buried cultural resources that were not identified during field surveys could be inadvertently unearthed during ground-disturbing activities. The following mitigation measure would reduce impacts to a less than significant level:

Measure CR-1: If buried cultural resources, such as chipped or ground stone, historic debris, building foundations, or human bone, are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work shall cease in that area and within 100 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with Occidental College, the City, and other appropriate agencies. Treatment measures typically include development of avoidance strategies, capping with fill material, or mitigation of impacts through data recovery programs such as excavation or detailed documentation.

c - d) Does the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature and/or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

The proposed project is located in an urbanized area that has been substantially previously disturbed by previous grading. Some of the site is located on imported fill material. Because of previous earthmoving activities, the project site is not considered to have a high sensitivity for paleontological

6 Jones and Stokes, *Environmental Assessment*, September 2003.

7 *Ibid*.

or unique geologic resources. Additionally, Occidental College, for the most part, is underlain by bedrock and is not expected to contain any significant cultural resources. Implementation of the proposed project would not likely disturb any known paleontological resources.

Based on a record search at the South Central Coastal Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), archival research, and a field reconnaissance survey conducted in early November 2001 by a qualified archaeologist, there are no previously recorded prehistoric sites associated with human burials located within the project area and no evidence of human remains was identified on the surface. In addition, during archival research, no historic period cemeteries were identified within the project area. However, buried human remains that were not identified during field surveys could be inadvertently unearthed during excavation activities, which could result in damage to these human remains. The following mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level:

Measure CR-2: In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains on the site, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of Los Angeles County has been contacted, per Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. If the coroner determines that the human remains are of Native American origin, it is necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (Public Resources Code Section 5097). If any human remains are discovered or recognized in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:

a. The coroner of the County has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and

b. If the remains are of Native American origin,

    1. The descendants of the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or

    2. The Native American Heritage Commission was unable to identify a descendant or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.

Measure CR-3: A qualified paleontologist monitor shall be present during earthmoving activities to salvage paleontological resources should these resources be unearthed. Arrangements to monitor grading and salvage paleontological resources shall be made at a pre-grading meeting between the paleontologist, grading contractor, and City of Los Angeles personnel, and shall also be coordinated with the County Museum. The paleontologist monitor shall be responsible for specimen preparation, curation, and a report of findings according to standards of the County Museum Curator of Earth sciences.

VI. Geology and Soils

a) Does the project cause 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.

Fault rupture is caused by the actual breakage of the ground surface overlying a fault as a result of seismic activity. This can range in offsets from less than 1 inch up to 20 feet, depending on the fault and earthquake magnitude. Under the Alquist-Priolo Act, the California state geologist identifies areas in the state that are at risk from surface fault rupture. The main purpose of the Act is to prevent construction of buildings used for human occupancy where traces of active faults are evident on the earth's surface. These zones are known as Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Impacts resulting from fault rupture generally occur within the immediate vicinity overlying the fault. The zones vary in width, but average about ¼ mile wide.

The proposed project site does not fall within an Alquist-Priolo special study zone and is not anticipated to be impacted directly by a fault. No active or potentially active faults are located on the Occidental College Campus. Although the proposed project site is not within a special Alquist-Priolo special study zone, this does not preclude the local faults from serving as a potential seismic hazard. The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the California Building Code seismic safety requirements and would implement the recommendations of a project-specific geologic report. The project is being proposed, in part, to provide seismic reinforcement to Swan Hall and therefore the building will be safer in the event of shaking on a nearby fault. Therefore the project will have a less-than significant impact on this issue.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Southern California is a seismically active region and prone to earthquakes, which may result in hazardous conditions to people within the region. Earthquakes and ground motion can affect a widespread area. The potential severity of ground shaking depends on many factors, including the distance from the originating fault, the earthquake magnitude and the nature of the earth materials beneath the site.

The proposed project site is located at the toe of a west-facing slope at the southern end of the San Rafael Hills between the Los Angeles River and Arroyo Seco. Regionally, this area is in the Transverse Ranges geomorphic province near the boundary of the Peninsular Ranges geomorphic province. The most serious impacts associated with ground shaking would occur if the proposed structures were not properly constructed according to seismic engineering standards. The proposed buildings and structures would adhere to Title 24 of the California State Building Code in order to reduce the risk of structural collapse. These necessary compliance strategies would reduce impacts to less than significant.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

The potential for liquefaction depends on the levels of shaking, groundwater conditions, the relative density of soils, and the age of geologic units. Seismic induced liquefaction occurs when a saturated, granular deposit of low relative density is subject to extreme shaking and loses strength or stiffness due to increase pore water pressure. The consequences of liquefaction are expected to be predominately characterized by settlement, uplift on structures, and increase in lateral pressure on buried structures. If building foundations are not designed properly, the effects of severe liquefaction during seismic conditions could produce failure, leading to substantial structural damage and injury or loss of life.

The City of Los Angeles is located in an area that has varying potential for liquefaction. The proposed project is not located within a liquefaction hazard zone, as mapped by the State of California (California Department of Conservation, 2001). [8] Additionally, the native soils at the project site consist of very dense silty sand underlain by hard conglomerate bedrock of the Topanga Formation. The potential for liquefaction is minimal because the more dense the soil is, the potential for liquefaction decreases. In addition, the project site is within a hillside area, elevated above the local groundwater basin. Groundwater was not observed under the campus to depths up to 65 feet below surface, although groundwater seepage was observed on campus. [9]

Due to the depth to groundwater (greater than 50 feet) and the dense to very dense sedimentary formation underlying the project site, liquefaction related hazards are not anticipated, and further analysis is not necessary.[10]

Strong earthquakes can cause other secondary seismically induced ground failures including lateral spreading and ground lurching. Lateral spreading is horizontal displacement of weak soils or fill triggered by strong earthquake shaking and most commonly occurs when weak, saturated soils are bordered by steep embankments or slopes. Ground lurching occurs as earthquake-triggered horizontal movements on relatively steep embankments or slopes result in the cracking of the ground surface. Because the project site is located in the City of Los Angeles Slope Stability Study Area and is classified as being within a Hillside Area, the potential for lateral spreading or ground lurching is considered moderate. [11] However, the massive nature of the bedrock and the favorable geologic structure preclude large scale, deep-seated mass movement of the on-site slopes that could cause a public safety hazard.

Recommendations of a site-specific geologic report will be applied in the seismic design and construction of the proposed structures, the proposed project would not expose people and/or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects resulting from seismic-related ground failure. The project is being proposed, in part, to provide seismic reinforcement to Swan Hall and therefore the building will be safer in the event of shaking on a nearby fault. Therefore the project will have a less-than significant impact on this issue.

---

8 Law Gibb Group, *Geotechnical Investigation Report,* August 29, 2001.

9 *Ibid*.

10 *Ibid*

11 *Ibid*

iv.) Landslides?

According to the City of Los Angeles Safety Element and the County of Los Angeles Seismic Safety Element, the project site is classified as being within a "Hillside Area." The project site is also located in a City of Los Angeles Slope Stability Study Area, as designated by the City of Los Angeles Planning Department.[12] There are no known landslides near the Swan Hall project site nor is the Swan Hall project site located in the path of any known or potential landslide.[13] Therefore any impacts would be less than significant.

b) Will the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

The proposed Swan Hall Renovation and Addition is located on a gently sloping site. Since the proposed building would be located on generally previously developed land, substantial loss of topsoil would be a less than significant impact. Construction activity associated with the project components may result in minor wind and water driven erosion of soils. This is considered short-term in nature, as the project site would be landscaped and would contain hardscape surfaces and turf upon completion. Furthermore, construction of the proposed project would involve excavation and hauling materials off the site (up to 5,000 cubic yards). These activities may result in soil erosion impacts on off-site areas, such as sediment on nearby streets and storm drains. However, implementation of project components would be subject to state codes and requirements for erosion control. Compliance with standard Best Management Practices (BMPs), would result in erosion impact being less than significant.

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

Most of the project site is mantled by artificial fill, which is underlain by residual and colluvial soils, which in turn are underlain by sedimentary bedrock of Miocene Age Topanga Formation.[14] Artificial fill found at the project site ranges in thickness from 1 to 49 feet. The fill materials generally consist of brown and gray clayey sand, silty sand and sandy clay. Deeper fill could be present at the site, particularly near the center of the former ravine. The residual soil/colluvium present at the project site consists of sand, silty sand, clayey sand and sandy clay and ranges from approximately 4 to 16.5 feet thick.[15]

The massive nature of the bedrock and the favorable geologic structure preclude large scale, deep-seated mass movement of the surface and subsurface foundation that could cause structural collapse and lateral spreading. Furthermore, compliance with the recommendations of the site specific geologic report in the seismic design and construction of the proposed structures would ensure that the proposed project would not expose people and/or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects resulting from seismic-related ground failure. This impact would be less than significant.

---

12 Law Gibb Group, *Geotechnical Investigation Report,* August 29, 2001.

13 *Ibid*.

14 *Ibid*.

15 Law Gibb Group, *Geotechnical Investigation Report,* August 29, 2001.

d) Will the project site 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?

The site specific geotechnical investigation reports that will be required for each new structure will specify recommendations for geotechnical issues associated with the proposed project. All geotechnical recommendations shall be incorporated into the project design and adhered to during the construction of the project. The project is not located in an area that has been identified as having a high potential for soil expansion.[16] Thus, less than significant impacts resulting from expansive soil hazards are anticipated.

e) Would the project site have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

The proposed project would be served by domestic sewer systems similar to the existing on-site uses and would not require usage of septic tanks. Thus, analysis of the soil to determine whether it can support the use of septic tanks or other disposal systems is not required. No impacts would occur.

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a) Could the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

The proposed project is not expected to store, transport, generate, or dispose of large quantities of hazardous materials and/or hazardous waste. The building may contain asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead based paint that could become exposed during demolition stages. However, the demolition and transportation of materials will be done according to state and federal regulations, including compliance with SCAQMD's Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities), and will mitigate any significant adverse impact. Less than significant impacts are expected.

b) Could the project 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?

Implementation of the proposed project would not involve the use, storage, or disposal of explosive or hazardous substances that could result in an upset and accident condition. Some minimally hazardous substances that are typically used in construction may be used. Typically, college land uses generate, store, dispose of, and transport minor quantities of hazardous substances associated with routine maintenance and cleaning as well as campus teaching. All hazardous substances are governed by the Campus Health and Safety Plan, which is subject to review by the Fire Department. The college does not involve any dangerous activities that could expose on-site people or the surrounding community to any substantial health hazards. Hazardous materials associated with the operation of the college involve minor quantities of substances associated with science laboratories, chemicals and fuels required for pest control, and vehicle and equipment operation. All hazardous materials are required to be stored, handled, and disposed of in accordance with local, county, and state laws that protect public

[16] Jones and Stokes, *Environmental Assessment*, September 2003.

health safety. Adherence to these regulations would minimize the potential for hazardous materials impact. Less than significant impacts are expected.

c) Could the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

The proposed project is located on a college site and would not emit hazardous emissions. As noted above, routine hazardous materials are used by the College for maintenance, cleaning as well as in the course of teaching. No impacts would occur.

d) Could the project 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?

The project is located within the Occidental campus. The college campus is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites. [17] No impacts would occur.

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, could the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public use airport. The closest airports to the college include Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport located 10 miles northwest, and Van Nuys Airport located 17 miles west of the proposed project site. No impacts would occur.

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?

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not have the potential to expose people to associated safety hazards. No impacts would occur.

g) Could the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The proposed project would not impair implementation of or interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan. Occidental College and individual classrooms currently have an emergency response and evacuation plan that would be implemented in the event of an emergency. Furthermore, the proposed project would conform to all City emergency access standards to allow adequate emergency access. No impacts are expected to occur.

h) Could the project 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?

The proposed project area is located within the Occidental College campus. Occidental College is surrounded by an urbanized environment and not within the vicinity of wildlands. A small area located

[17] Jones and Stokes, *Environmental Assessment*, September 2003.

in the eastern portion of the campus contains areas with flammable brush, grass, and trees. However, this area is surrounded by an urban environment, including residential development and irrigated landscaping. Any impacts would be less than significant.

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality

a) Could the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

The proposed project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The proposed project would not directly discharge into surface waters or alter surface water quality in any water body. However, site runoff during construction and operation of the proposed project would discharge into area storm drains, which ultimately discharge into surface water bodies. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Stormwater permit would be required for the proposed project and would incorporate specific discharge limitations for point-source discharges to ensure that dischargers meet permit conditions and protect state-defined water quality standards. Compliance by the project proponent with the NPDES program would minimize potential impacts during construction. Impacts on water quality during construction would be less than significant.

b) Could the project 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 pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)?

The Occidental College Campus does not substantially contribute to groundwater recharge.[18] Based on hydrological investigation of groundwater, groundwater was located to at least 65.5 feet below the surface.[19] Furthermore, the proposed project is within a hillside area and elevated above the regional groundwater basin. The depth of groundwater would be well below the depth required for excavation for the project components. Water in the project site vicinity is supplied by several local and regional sources. The college currently consumes a negligible amount of the region's total water supply. As no increase in students or staff is expected to be added to the campus as a result of the proposed project, potable water consumption would not increase substantially. Implementation of the proposed project would not create a substantial demand upon groundwater sources and would not substantially change the amount of groundwater pumped from local wells. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Could the project 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?

The proposed project site is located in a developed area with no water bodies on-site or the immediate surroundings. Drainage patterns may be slightly altered to accommodate the proposed structures and circulation facilities for project components. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that alterations in drainage associated with project components would have a minor impact on the overall drainage of the campus and would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site. The project site could generate minor additional runoff during and following storm events that would

---

18 Jones and Stokes, *Environmental Assessment*, September 2003.

19 *Ibid*.

include various types of compounds commonly found in an urban environment, such as petroleum products, fertilizers, pesticides, etc. Because the project site is substantially developed with structures and has been substantially graded in the past, the project would result in minimal change in the content of storm runoff from the project site. No significant impacts would result from changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff for the proposed project. No stream or river courses would be altered due to the proposed project as the project site is not located near a stream or river.

Potential short-term erosion effects could occur during construction and site preparation activities. Construction of the proposed project would involve excavation and hauling of materials off-site. These activities would have the potential to result in soil erosion that could affect off-site storm drains. The NPDES permit would incorporate specific discharge limitations for point-source discharges to ensure that dischargers meet permit conditions and protect state-defined water quality standards. The construction contractor would be required to comply with conditions of the required NPDES permit, including BMPs. Adherence to permit conditions and with City ordinances regulating drainage improvements, as they relate to construction of on-site improvements, would reduce the potential of siltation in the drainage system during construction and would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

d) Could the project 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?

The project site and area is currently developed with existing college buildings and landscaping. Impervious surfaces such as buildings and parking lots can increase runoff rates through impeding infiltration of rainfall and increasing overland flow velocities. The project would add a three-story addition to the Swan Hall building in an area currently covered with grass and ornamental trees. Thus, the quantity of impervious surfaces would increase compared to existing conditions. As a result, the proposed project would have a runoff volume slightly greater than the site's current runoff volume that. A drainage plan would be prepared for the site to ensure no impact to the surrounding storm drains.

The project applicant would comply with City ordinances regulating drainage improvements and grading plans as they relate to construction of on-site improvements and grading plans as they relate to construction of on-site improvements that affect drainage. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that that the proposed project would not adversely affect the local drainage system in a manner that would result in substantial flooding on- or off-site. In addition, the project applicant would incorporate BMPs as stated above, to the extent feasible. This impact would therefore be less than significant.

e) Could the project 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?

The proposed project would incrementally add impervious surfaces to the campus. A drainage plan for the site would be prepared to ensure that the proposed project would not contribute to runoff water in excess of the capacity of the existing off-site stormwater drainage system.

The proposed project would contribute minimally to additional sources of polluted runoff. Pollutants commonly found in stormwater runoff include heavy metals, pesticides, herbicides, animal excrement, trash, food wastes and synthetic organic compounds such as fuels, waste oils, solvents, lubricants and grease. During wet weather conditions, these pollutants could be transported to the stormwater drainage system. In 2000, the Los Angeles County adopted the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSWMP) as part of its municipal stormwater program to address pollution from new development and redevelopment by the private sector. The SUSWMP outlines the necessary BMPs that must be incorporated into project design plans.

Construction of the proposed project would involve excavation and hauling of materials off-site. These activities have the potential to result in short-term soil erosion that could affect off-site storm drains. As described above, construction contractors for the proposed project would be required to comply with the NPDES conditions that would apply to the proposed project, including any BMPs. Adherence to permit conditions would greatly reduce the potential for siltation in the drainage system during construction. Less than significant impacts would be anticipated.

f) Could the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

The proposed project is an area that is already developed and producing non-point-source pollutants. The proposed project would conform to BMPs as well as NPDES requirements relative to runoff from on and off-site facilities. Furthermore, a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would be required that must include (1) a site description, (2) BMPs for erosion and sediment controls, (3) BMPs for construction waste handling and disposal, (4) implementation of approved local plans, (5) proposed post-construction controls, and (6) provisions for non-storm water management. Compliance with these existing regulations would ensure a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

g - h) Could the project place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map and /or place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Occidental College and the surrounding area are not located within a Flood Hazard area so there are no potentially significant impacts associated with inundation hazards to the proposed project site or surrounding vicinity. Any impacts would be less than significant.

i) Could the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

A review of the City of Los Angeles Inundation and Tsunami Map indicates that the project site lies within an inundation boundary of Eagle Rock Reservoir. The measures taken by the City to control water levels in dams and reservoirs, to conduct earthquake retrofits, implement the City's Safety Element programs and adhere to the 1972 State Dam Safety Act have reduced potential impacts on the proposed project site to less than significant levels. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding from failure of a dam or levee. Any impacts would be less than significant.

j) Could the project site be exposed to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by large-scale, short-duration submarine earthquakes. Tsunami waves are capable of traveling great distances (over 1,000 miles) and damaging low-lying coastal regions. According to the City of Los Angeles Safety Element, the Occidental College is not located in an area that would be subject to inundation from a tsunami.

Seiches are waves formed from oscillations in enclosed or restricted bodies of water. Seiches can cause water to overtop reservoirs and lakes. As discussed above, measures taken by the City to control water levels in dams and reservoirs, and to conduct earthquake retrofits for dams have significantly reduced potential impacts.

Mudflows are the downslope movement of soil or rock under the influence of gravity. They are generally caused by a combination of slope failure and high volumes of water caused by rain in hilly areas of the City. While the proposed project is classified as being within a "hillside area", there are no known landslides near the project site nor is the project site located in the path of any known or potential landslide.

Thus, overall impacts would be less than significant.

IX. Land Use and Planning

a) Does the project physically divide an established community?

Implementation of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. The proposed project is within the interior of the Occidental College Campus. The proposed project is a college use and is designated as an Educational Institution by Section 12.03 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). The City General Plan designates the project site as well as the surrounding land uses as low-density residential. The proposed project would not divide any established communities, and would not displace existing residential uses. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b) Does the project conflict with applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially conflict with an existing land use plan. The proposed project requires Conditional Use authorization from the City of Los Angeles. Occidental College is located within the community of Eagle Rock in the City of Los Angeles. The City regulates land use within its jurisdiction through the general plan and zoning ordinance. Occidental College is located within the Northeast Los Angeles Community Planning area. The general plan land use designation for the entire college campus is low-density residential. This designation permits between four and nine dwelling units per net acre. In accordance with City of Los Angeles Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan Policy 6-1.1, Occidental College would "coordinate with the City Planning Department to ensure compatibility of master planning and construction activities with surrounding

neighborhoods." [20] Because the proposed project would comply with and implement the policies outlined in the General Plan, no impacts would occur.

In September 2001, the City re-zoned the Occidental College property from R-4 to R-1, decreasing the intensity of residential uses from multiple residential to one-family dwelling units. The R-1 designation allows a variety of single-family and two-family living quarters and accessory buildings. Educational institutions are permitted subject to issuance of a conditional use permit within an R-1 zone. Therefore the project would have a less than significant impact on land use plans and policies.

c) Does the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Occidental College is not within the jurisdiction of any known habitat conservation plan or known natural communities conservation plan.

X. Mineral Resources

a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

The Occidental Campus is located in two designated Mineral Resources Zones (MRZs) MRZ-1 and MRZ-3. The boundary of these zones places the western portion of the campus in MRZ-1 and the eastern portion (including the site) within MRZ-3. [21] MRZ-1 is defined as areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence. No mineral resources that would be of value to the region or residents of the state have been identified in the vicinity of Occidental College. The College has not been designated as a Significant Mineral Aggregate Resources Area by the State Department of Conservation.

MRZ-3 is defined as areas containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot presently be evaluated from available data. Because the State does not identify the area of the site as a significant resource area, and because the site is relatively small within an existing developed urban area, no significant impacts resulting from the loss of mineral resources would occur. The project site is not designated as a Significant Mineral Aggregate Resources Area by the State Department of Conservation. Thus, no impacts resulting from the loss of mineral resources are anticipated.

b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

According to local plans, the proposed project is not located in an area designated by the City's General Plan or the Department of Conservation as containing locally important mineral resources. Thus, no impacts are anticipated.

---

[20] City of Los Angeles General Plan, *Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan*, pg III-20, retrieved July 17th, 2006.

[21] Jones and Stokes, *Environmental Assessment*, September 2003.

XI. Noise

a) Could the project cause exposure of persons to or generation of noise in levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

The project would create elevated noise levels on a short-term basis during construction from equipment and personnel. Long-term operational impacts in the area would not change as vehicle trips in the area would not change and any change in noise from heating and ventilation equipment would be negligible.

Noise levels during construction would be typical of a construction site in Los Angeles. The noise would be substantially shielded from off-campus uses. Therefore this impact would be less than significant.

b) Could the project cause exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

The proposed project could result in minor exposure of persons and (historic) buildings to groundborne vibration and noise, but these impacts would be confined to the campus, since vibration impacts only occur in close proximity to the source of the vibration (movement of heavy equipment). Demolition and excavation activities may result in some minor amounts of ground-borne vibration for limited durations. Typical construction equipment, such as bulldozers, loaded trucks, jackhammers, and drills would generate ground-borne vibration during construction activities. Since Swan Hall would be the subject of the renovation activities, less than significant impacts are anticipated to the structure as a result of groundborne vibration. Other historic buildings would be too far away from vibration sources to experience significant impacts. Therefore the project would have a less than significant impact on groundborne noise and vibration.

c - d) Could the project cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project and/or a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Long-term operational impacts in the area would not change as vehicle trips in the area would not change and any change in noise from heating and ventilation equipment would be negligible. Therefore this impact is less than significant.

e - f) 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, could the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels and/or for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The proposed project would not result in the exposure of people in the project vicinity to excessive noise levels due to proximity to an airport. The proposed project site is not located within the immediate vicinity of a public or private airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area or people visiting the project site to excessive noise levels from airports. Any impacts would be less than significant.

XII. Population and Housing

a) Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The proposed project is designed to accommodate existing demand for educational and support facilities at Occidental College. The proposed project would not increase the number of students, faculty, or staff at Occidental College; rather, it would better accommodate the existing population. The proposed project therefore would not be growth inducing. The surrounding area is primarily developed and is currently served by major infrastructure facilities, including sewers, storm drains, water, roadways, utilities, etc. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce population growth into the area. No impacts would occur.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed project would not displace single-family residential units surrounding the project site. No impacts are expected.

c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts are expected.

XIII. Public Services

a) Could 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:

i. Fire protection?

The Los Angeles Fire Department currently provides fire emergency services to the project site. Specifically, Fire Station 55 of the Los Angeles Fire Department currently serves Occidental College in a fire emergency, and is located approximately 0.5 miles south from the campus. The proposed project would not increase the number of students or staff on campus, or population in the surrounding area. The design of the proposed project would provide sufficient emergency access during and after construction, and fire suppression flows in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department. No impact is expected.

ii. Police protection?

Occidental College maintains its own Campus Safety Department, which handles all campus security and safety issues. The Los Angeles Police Department provides police protection and law enforcement services for the proposed project site. The proposed project is located within the Northeast Community Plan. The Northeast Police Station is the closest to the project site, located approximately 7 miles south

of the campus. The Northeast Division receives additional support, including information access and direct activity assistance, from the Burbank, Glendale, and South Pasadena police departments. The proposed project would not increase the number of students or staff on campus, or population and housing in the surrounding area. Implementation of the project is not expected to significantly affect the existing service capacity of the LAPD. Less than significant impacts would occur.

iii. Schools?

The proposed project would involve improvements to the existing Occidental College campus. The closest school is Eagle Rock High School, located approximately 0.25 miles northeast of the proposed project site. The proposed project will not physically affect the high school nor generate students utilizing the high school. Thus, the proposed project would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered school facilities in and around the proposed project area. No impacts on existing or future schools would occur.

iv. Parks?

The demand for parks is generally associated with the increase of housing or population in an area. The proposed project would not increase the number of students or staff on campus, or population and housing in the surrounding area. The closest park is located adjacent to the Yosemite Recreation Center, approximately 0.25 miles north of the proposed project site. This is a city owned and maintained park. The proposed project would involve improvements to the existing Occidental campus college which includes recreation facilities. The project would not affect nearby parks or recreation facilities. No impacts would occur.

v. Other governmental services?

The proposed project site is currently served by existing public utilities and infrastructure, including roadways. The project implementation would not require new or altered maintenance services substantially above the existing conditions. No impacts are anticipated.

XIV. Recreation

a) Could the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

There are several recreational facilities within the vicinity of Occidental College, including parks and recreational centers. The increase in use of recreational facilities is generally spurred by population growth in the area. The proposed project is intended to respond to the needs of Occidental College and would not increase population on-campus or in the area. Therefore, the project would not increase the use of, or accelerate the deterioration of, nearby public recreational facilities. No impacts would occur.

b) Could the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The proposed project would include renovation of a college building and a relatively small addition. Therefore, the project would not increase the use of, or accelerate the deterioration of, existing recreational facilities. No impacts would occur.

XV. Transportation and Circulation

a) Could the project 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)?

The Occidental College Campus is located at 1600 Campus Road, in the Eagle Rock area of the City of Los Angeles. It is bounded North of York Boulevard, east of Eagle Rock Boulevard, south of Yosemite Drive, West of Townsend Avenue. The proposed project would not change the amount or the pattern of traffic in the area; therefore no impacts would occur.

b) Could the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

The proposed project would not change traffic in the area, either cumulatively or individually. Therefore no impacts would occur to levels of service.

c) Could the project 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?

The proposed project is not located in close vicinity of a public or private airstrip that would 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. No impacts are expected.

d) Could the project substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The proposed project would not change emergency access. The project would comply with applicable City Fire Department, and the California Building Code. The project sponsor would be required to provide the Fire Department with a full site plan for review, including all buildings, fences, drive gates, retaining walls or other features that might affect local Fire Department access, with unobstructed fire lanes for access identified. This review process, in addition to compliance with the applicable regulations and standards stated above, would ensure that adequate emergency access would be provided. This impact would be less than significant.

e) Could the project result in inadequate emergency access?

The proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature (such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections). No impacts are anticipated.

f) Could the project result in inadequate parking capacity?

The proposed project would not change the demand for parking. Therefore no impacts would occur.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

The proposed project would comply with all City-adopted alternative transportation-related policies, plans, or programs. No impacts are expected to result from implementation of the proposed project.

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems

a) Could the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

The proposed project is not expected to substantially change wastewater generation on campus and therefore would not change treatment requirements. Wastewater discharges from the campus enter the City's sewer system and flow to the Hyperion Wastewater Treatment Plant, where it is treated and eventually discharged into the ocean. The domestic wastewater flow from the project would not cause the Hyperion Wastewater Treatment Plant discharge to exceed Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) wastewater treatment requirements. No impacts would occur.

b) Could the project 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?

The project would not increase students on-campus, the increase in building area could result in minor incremental increased demand for water. However, new water facilities would not be required nor would existing facilities require expansion to accommodate the project. Water would be used during project construction for dust suppression purposes. Potable or reclaimed water from the Department of Water and Power would be used as necessary to control fugitive dust at the construction site. Construction impacts to water facilities are not considered significant. The Occidental College campus currently has existing local water supply facilities and wastewater connections. Implementation of the proposed project would require connection to and supplies from the existing water and wastewater supply systems. Less than significant impacts would occur.

c) Could the project 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?

The project is located in a developed urban area. Stormwater drainage facilities are provided throughout Occidental College campus project areas. It is anticipated that storm drainage from the project would produce slightly greater amounts of runoff from the site compared to the existing site. A drainage plan for the site would ensure less than significant impacts would occur.

d) Could the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

The only substantial use of water during project construction would be for dust suppression purposes. Potable or reclaimed water from the Department of Water and Power would be used as necessary to control fugitive dust at the construction site. Construction impacts to water supplies are not considered significant. The use of reclaimed water for dust suppression purposes would decrease the demand for potable water. The proposed project is located within Occidental College campus with existing local water supply facilities and connections that serve the project area. Implementation of the proposed project would require connection to and supplies from the existing water supply system. The proposed project would comply with local, regional and state water conservation policies and would comply with the following BMPs to reduce water consumption:

- Health and Safety Code (Section 17921.3 and Section 11685), which requires all boilers sold and installed in California be low water consumption or use low-consumption hardware.
- Government Code (Section 65591 et.al.), which requires the adoption of local water efficient landscape ordinances throughout the state.
- California Plumbing Code (Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, Part 5), which contains the plumbing standards of adopting agencies.

Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Could the project 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?

The proposed project would not increase the number of students or staff on the college campus. The increase in building area is anticipated to incrementally increase wastewater generation. Impacts to wastewater infrastructure are anticipated to be less than significant.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

The proposed project would not be expected to substantially change operational solid waste generation. Demolition and construction activities would result in the generation of solid waste such as inert waste, scrap lumber, concrete, residual wastes, packing materials, and plastics. Collection and recycling of materials during demolition and construction activities would conform to City polices. Excavated earth materials and debris resulting from demolition and construction activities will be likely disposed of at Scholl Canyon Landfill in Glendale.[22] This landfill has capacity to handle Occidental College project construction (and operation) waste.[23] Construction material that cannot be reused or recycled would be taken to a public or private landfill with existing operational permits and available capacity to accept the material. Demolition/building materials that may contain asbestos would be handled and disposed in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. Typically, construction waste occurs over a short period of time and ceases following completion of the construction phase. Therefore, construction impacts on the existing local landfill capacities are considered less than significant. There would be no increase in student or staff on campus therefore there would be no substantial increase in municipal solid waste currently being generated on campus; impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

g) Could the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The proposed project would comply with all applicable laws and regulations related to solid waste generation, collection, diversion, reduction, recycling and disposal in the City of Los Angeles, including the California integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939). The project would comply with all statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No impacts would occur.

---

22 Jones and Stokes, *Environmental Assessment*, September 2003.

23 *Ibid*.

XVII. 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?

The project area is primarily urban with substantial landscaping. Typical urban wildlife is contained on-site. Less than significant impacts are anticipated to biological. The proposed project site lies in an area that contains significant historical resources. The proposed project has the potential to adversely impact Swan Hall and the Historic District within which it is located. This is a potentially significant impact requiring further discussion in a focused EIR.

b) Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).

The Initial Study identifies impacts to historic resources as potentially significant and as such these impacts could be cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects in the area, the effects of other current projects in the area and the effects of probable future projects in the area. Cumulative impacts to historic resources will be discussed further in the EIR as potentially significant impacts could occur.

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

The project is anticipated to result in less than significant environmental impacts from construction and operation.

PREPARED BY	TITLE	TELEPHONE #	DATE
Hadar Plafkin	City Planner	213-978-1357	March 18, 2010