CHAPTER 9 - RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

9-1 INTRODUCTION

The Draft EIR for the proposed Los Angeles Valley College Facilities Master Plan was made available for public review for a period of 45 days beginning April 29, 2003. During this review period, a number of written comments were submitted to the lead agency. In addition, public workshops were held to provide information on the Master Plan and EIR process and to receive additional comments. The public workshops were held on May 7, 2003 and May 27, 2003 on the Valley College campus.

In accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), each of the comment letters are included in this Final EIR, as are the lead agency responses to any environmental concerns raised in the comments. Each comment letter is labeled with a reference letter and number corresponding to the list below. Individual comments are referenced in the margin and responses follow each letter.

The public agencies, organizations, and individual citizens that submitted comments on the Draft EIR during the public review period are listed below.

A. Public Agencies (arranged alphabetically by agency name)

<u>No.</u>	Agency	Name	Date
A1	City of Burbank Community Development Dept.	Roger Baker	5/27/03
A2	City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation	Adel Hagekhalil	6/5/03
A3	City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning	Con Howe	6/4/03
A4	County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works	James A. Noyes	6/11/03
A5	Southern California Association of Governments	Jeffrey M. Smith	5/21/03
A6	State of California Department of Transportation	Stephen Buswell	6/2/03
A7	State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research	Tal Finney	5/2/03
A8	State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research	Terry Roberts	6/13/03

B. Private Organizations

<u>No.</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Name</u>	Date
B1	Los Angeles Conservancy	Ken Bernstein	6/12/03
C. P	rivate Citizens/Individuals (arranged alphabetically	by individual's last name	e)
<u>No.</u>	Name		Date
C1	Thomas Brayton		5/6/03
C2	Soraya Dosaj		
C3	Soraya Dosaj		5/27/03
C4	Maureen Hanrahan		5/7/03
C5	Mickey Jannol		5/27/03
C6	Michael Randall		6/13/03
C7	Steve Reisch		4/4/03
C8	Burton & Marsha Roseman		5/7/03
С9	Daniel Tornello		5/7/03

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTM
275 East Olive Avenue, P.O. Box 6459, Burbank, California 91510-6 www.ci.burbank.
May 27, 2003
Cindy Sardo
Director of Public Relations
5800 Fulton Avenue
Valley Glen, CA 91401
Re: Los Angeles Valley College – Facilities Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Dear Ms. Sardo:
Thank you for sending a copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Los Angeles Valley College Facilities Master Plan to the City of Burbank for our review. The DEIR has been reviewed by the Planning and Transportation Divisions of the Community Development Department and the City Traffic Engineering Division of the Public Works Department. The staff from each of these departments had no comments on the DEIR.
Thank you again for the opportunity to review the DEIR.
Sincerely
Rogen Baler
Roger/Baker
Deputy City Planner
c. Art Bashmakian, Assistant CDD/City Planner Greg Herrmann, Assistant CDD/Transportation Ken Johnson, City Traffic Engineer
and a subscription of a second se A second secon

RESPONSES TO THE 5/27/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM THE CITY OF BURBANK (COMMENT LETTER A1)

Response to Comment A1-1

Comment noted.

			Comment Lett	er /
	CITY O	F LOS ANGELES		
BOARD OF		CALIFORNIA	DEPARTMENT OF	
PUBLIC WORKS		ELOS AN	PUBLIC WORKS	
COMMISSIONERS			BUREAU OF SANITATIO	N
		All and a		
ALERIE LYNNE SHAW		【樂冒》/	JUDITH A. WILSON	
		ADED THE		
ELLEN STEIN VICE PRESIDENT			RAYMOND J. KEARNE JAMES F. LANGLEY	
RONALD LOW	J	AMES K. HAHN MAYOR	JOSEPH E. MUNDINE ENRIQUE C. ZALDIVA	
DRIANA RUBALCAVA JANICE WOOD			ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	
		June 5, 2003	433 SOUTH SPRING ST., SUIT LOS ANGELES, CA 90013 TEL: (213) 473-7999 FAX: (213) 473-8100 TTY: (213) 473-8707	E 400 3
Ms. Cindy Sardo, I	Director of Public Relati	ons		
Los Angeles Valle				
5800 Fulton Avenu				
Valley Glen, CA 9	1401			
Dear Ms. Sardo:				
Sewer Services fo	r the Proposed Los An	geles Valley College Facil	ities Master Plan	
m 0'- 1			areas: the Hyperion Service 5 covers approximately 515	
Area (HAS) and the square miles and starea includes sevee TISA is approxim	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Ar	on. In addition, the service or wastewater service. The ageles Harbor area. Your	
Area (HAS) and the square miles and starea includes sevee TISA is approxim	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Ar	or wastewater service. The	
Area (HAS) and the square miles and starea includes seven TISA is approxim proposed projected	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Ar ervice area.	or wastewater service. The ageles Harbor area. Your	
Area (HAS) and the square miles and starea includes seven TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro-	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Ar ervice area. sponding flow generation	or wastewater service. The ngeles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing	
Area (HAS) and the square miles and starea includes seven TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro-	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Ar ervice area.	or wastewater service. The ngeles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing	A2
Area (HAS) and the square miles and searce includes seven TISA is approxim- proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles l is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Ar ervice area. Sponding flow generation and sewer lines capacity indi	or wastewater service. The ngeles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing	A2
Area (HAS) and the square miles and searce includes seven TISA is approxim- proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Ar ervice area. Sponding flow generation and sewer lines capacity indi	or wastewater service. The ngeles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing	A2
Area (HAS) and th square miles and s area includes seven TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line EXISTING SEWE	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles l is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an CR RATE: Academic Yo	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Ar ervice area. Sponding flow generation and sewer lines capacity indi- car 2002-2003	or wastewater service. The ngeles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing cates the following:	A2
Area (HAS) and the square miles and searce includes seven TISA is approxim- proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an CR RATE: Academic Yo Area / GSF	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Ar ervice area. sponding flow generation and sewer lines capacity indi- ear 2002-2003 Unit Flow Rate	or wastewater service. The ngeles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing cates the following: Flow Rate / GPD	A2
Area (HAS) and th square miles and s area includes seven TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line EXISTING SEWE	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles l is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an CR RATE: Academic Yo	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Arrervice area. sponding flow generation and sewer lines capacity indi- ear 2002-2003 Unit Flow Rate 80/1000 GSF	or wastewater service. The ageles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing cates the following:	A2
Area (HAS) and th square miles and s area includes seven TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line EXISTING SEWE	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an CR RATE: Academic Yo Area / GSF	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Arrevice area. sponding flow generation and sewer lines capacity indi- ear 2002-2003 Unit Flow Rate 80/1000 GSF Total	or wastewater service. The ngeles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing cates the following: Flow Rate / GPD	A2
Area (HAS) and th square miles and s area includes seven TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line EXISTING SEWE	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an CR RATE: Academic You Area / GSF 500,000	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Arrevice area. sponding flow generation ad sewer lines capacity indi- ear 2002-2003 Unit Flow Rate 80/1000 GSF Total Unit Flow Rate	or wastewater service. The ageles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing cates the following: Flow Rate / GPD 40,000 40,000	A2
Area (HAS) and th square miles and s area includes sever TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line EXISTING SEWE Building Type	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an CR RATE: Academic Yo Area / GSF	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Arrevice area. sponding flow generation and sewer lines capacity indi- ear 2002-2003 Unit Flow Rate 80/1000 GSF Total	or wastewater service. The ageles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing cates the following:	A2
Area (HAS) and th square miles and s area includes seve TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line EXISTING SEWE Building Type	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an CR RATE: Academic You Area / GSF 500,000 13,393	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Arrevice area. sponding flow generation ad sewer lines capacity indi- ear 2002-2003 Unit Flow Rate 80/1000 GSF Total Unit Flow Rate 18/student	r wastewater service. The ageles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing cates the following:	A2
Area (HAS) and th square miles and s area includes seve TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line EXISTING SEWE Building Type	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an CR RATE: Academic You Area / GSF 500,000 13,393	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Arrevice area. sponding flow generation ad sewer lines capacity indi- car 2002-2003 Unit Flow Rate 80/1000 GSF Total Unit Flow Rate 18/student 18/staff	r wastewater service. The ageles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing cates the following:	A2
Area (HAS) and th square miles and s area includes seve TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line EXISTING SEWE Building Type	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an CR RATE: Academic You Area / GSF 500,000 13,393	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Arrevice area. sponding flow generation ad sewer lines capacity indi- car 2002-2003 Unit Flow Rate 80/1000 GSF Total Unit Flow Rate 18/student 18/staff	r wastewater service. The ageles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing cates the following:	A2
Area (HAS) and th square miles and s area includes seve TISA is approxim proposed projected Review of the pro- existing sewer line EXISTING SEWE Building Type	services the majority of ral non-City agencies th nately 20 square miles I is located in the HAS s ojected flow, the corres s to the proposed site, an CR RATE: Academic You Area / GSF 500,000 13,393	the Los Angeles population at contract with the City for and services the Los Arrevice area. sponding flow generation ad sewer lines capacity indi- car 2002-2003 Unit Flow Rate 80/1000 GSF Total Unit Flow Rate 18/student 18/staff	r wastewater service. The ageles Harbor area. Your factor, wye-maps showing cates the following:	A2

Ms. Cindy Sardo, Director of Public Relations Los Angeles Valley College June 5, 2003 Page 2

SEWER RATE: Academic Year 2008-2009

Building Type	Area / GSF	Unit Flow Rate	Flow Rate / GPD
	756,000	80/1000 GSF	60,480
		Total	60,480
		Unit Flow Rate	
Students	15,693	18/student	282,474
Staff	315	18/staff	5,670
		Total	288,144

Total flow projected, using the academic year 2008-2009, is 288,144 gallon per day. Sewers are available along the College; there are an 18-inch sewer line in Fulton Avenue, 10-inch Sewer in Ethel Avenue, 8-inch sewer in Oxnard Avenue that flows into Ethel, and an 8-inch sewer in Coldwater canyon that flows into a 24-inch sewer line in Wittset.

Most of the flows are continued to a 48-inch diameter pipe that has a 50% capacity. The line is located in Chandler Boulevard.

Sewer capacity for your proposal is tentatively available. However, once this development gets underway and before a construction permit will be issued a sewer permit will be required by the Bureau of Engineering. This office may then conduct a sewer availability study to thoroughly evaluate the additional flow impact to the system concurrent with the Bureau of Engineering permit process and plan check of your proposal. This may necessitate re-gauging of the flow and calculating the capacities of the sewer line of the area. A final determination of adequate sewer capacity and approval for sewer connection could be given at that time.

If you have any questions, please call Belal Tamimi of my staff at (323) 342-6254.

Hagehkali 3> Sincerely, del

Adel Hagekhalil, Division Manager Wastewater Engineering Services Division Bureau of Sanitation

H:Sewer Serv for Proposed LA Valley Coll Ltr to Cindy Sardo (TN.Folder)

A2-1

cont'd

RESPONSES TO THE 6/5/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES BUREAU OF SANITATION (COMMENT LETTER A2)

Response to Comment A2-1

The text of the Draft EIR has been revised (see Chapter 3, Section 3-15) to reflect the City's wastewater flow estimates.

The comments that sewer capacity is tentatively available and that a final determination may be made prior to issuance of a sewer permit are noted.

Comment Letter A3 Department of City Planning Valley Office • 6255 Van Nuys Boulevard • Van Nuys, CA 91401 June 4, 2003 Cindy Sardo, Director of Public Relations Los Angeles Valley College 5800 Fulton Avenue Valley Glen, CA 91401 SUBJECT: Los Angeles Valley College Facilities Master Plan Comments on Draft EIR SCH No. 2003011110 Dear Ms. Sardo: The City of Los Angeles Planning Department, Community Planning Bureau, has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) issued for the Los Angeles Valley College Facilities Master Plan. The following comments are submitted for consideration: The physical design of the proposed Child Development Center should include features that insure 1. the safety of employees, children, and pedestrians interacting with vehicular traffic. Design A3-1 features may include, where feasible, additional setbacks from the street frontage, prescribed dropoff location(s) located interior to the site and directly adjacent to the building, designated employee parking areas, and reflective safety striping of crosswalks/parking areas. The selection of a design program for the southwestern corner of the project site, at the intersection 2. of Burbank Blvd. and Fulton Avenue, affords the opportunity to further enhance this area of the site. The design should consider walkway layout, landscaping, and signage that establish a strong visual A3-2 identity for the campus, while maintaining primary functions at this location (e.g., safe pedestrian/vehicular access to Lot A parking and the future Valley MTA station). Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide comments on the DEIR. Please contact our Valley Community Planning staff (Rita Schack, 818-374-5037) if you have any questions concerning these comments. Thank you. Yours truly, CON HOWE Director of Planning Linn K. Wyatt Senior City Planner CC: Robert Sutton Jane Blumenfeld **Rita Schack** N:\COMMPLAN\VALLEY\LACC Master Plans\LACCDEIRresponse.wpd

RESPONSES TO THE 6/5/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING (COMMENT LETTER A3)

Response to Comment A3-1

Comment noted. The design features recommended by the City will be considered and incorporated in the Child Development Center, as appropriate, to ensure the safety of employees, children, and pedestrians.

Response to Comment A3-2

Comments noted. The Master Plan improvements proposed for the southwestern corner of the campus will enhance the appearance of this area and create a stronger visual identity for the campus. These improvements will also take advantage of the opportunities that will be provied by the future MTA Bus Rapid Transit station proposed at this location.



Ms. Cindy Sardo June 11, 2003 Page 2

detection, and control and protection systems for affected enclosed buildings and structures. Our Environmental Programs Division must be contacted for issuance of cont'd necessary permits.

The Los Angeles County Building Code, Section 110.4 requires that buildings or structures adjacent to or within 200 feet (7,620 mm) of active, abandoned or idle oil or gas well(s) be provided with methane gas protection systems. The project site contains or appears to contain or lie within 200 feet of active, abandoned or idle oil or gas wells. This issue should be addressed and mitigation measure provided. Our Environmental Programs Division must be contacted for issuance of necessary permits.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Siya Araumi at (626) 458-4991.

Flood Maintenance

If the project requires flood control facilities to be maintained by Public Works, plan reviews will be required by Design and Flood Maintenance Divisions. At that point, we would be able to provide specific comments to the project.

Land Development

Grading and Drainage

The environmental document does not provide sufficient information to determine what drainage impacts, if any, the project may have towards area drainage. To properly assess any drainage and water quality impacts and to determine appropriate mitigation, a drainage concept/SUSMP report will be required. This project may affect Countymaintained storm drain facilities 9204 and Tujunga Wash. SUSMP reports are required for all projects involving 25 or more parking spaces and for projects with 100,000 square feet or more of commercial development. We recommend that the applicant prepare a drainage concept/SUSMP report showing the extent of drainage and water quality impacts, and if necessary, provide mitigation acceptable to the County. The analysis should address increases in runoff, any change in drainage patterns, treatment method proposed for SUSMP regulations, and the capacity of storm drain facilities. We recommend that a copy of the drainage concept/SUSMP report, once approved, be included in the environmental document.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Michael Hales at (626) 458-4921.

A4-2

1	
	Ms. Cindy Sardo
	June 11, 2003
	Page 3
	Traffic and Lighting
	We do not believe the project will have any significant impact to County and County/City
	roadways in the area. No further information is required.
	If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Patrick Arakawa (626) 300-4867.
	If you have any questions, please contact Mr. 1 allok Alakawa (020) 500 4001.
	Watershed Management
	The proposed project should include investigation of watershed management
	opportunities to maximize capture of local rainfall on the project site, eliminate
	incremental increases in flows to the storm drain system, and provide filtering of flows to
	capture contaminants originating from the project site.
	If you have any questions regarding the above comments or the environmental review
	process of Public Works, please contact Ms. Massie Munroe at the above address or at A
	(626) 458-4359.
	Very truly yours,
	JAMES A. NOYES
	Director of Public Works
	(m) in the test
	Veneral Nopress
F	Assistant Deputy Director
	Watershed Management Division
	MM:kk/dbm C:\MyFiles\Files From old C Drive\FILES\MISCTYPING\EIR329.doc

RESPONSES TO THE 6/11/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS (COMMENT LETTER A4)

Response to Comment A4-1

The Valley College campus is not located within 1,000 feet of any existing or closed landfills. This was confirmed by visual reconnaissance of the project area, review of environmental databases (EDR), and a review of the California Integrated Waste Management Board's web site <u>http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/</u>. The closest listed landfill is the closed Oxnard Street Dump, located more than ¹/₄-mile northeast of the campus. Furthermore, an organic vapor analyzer (OVA) was used to screen soil samples from four soil borings on the campus conducted by MACTECH Engineering and Consulting. According to the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* report (January 17, 2002) prepared by MACTECH, the OVA did not indicate the presence of volatile organic compounds. All of the OVA responses were zero with the exception of one OVA response of 10 parts per million. This concentration is not considered to be significant.

Response to Comment A4-2

The Valley College campus is not located within an oil or gas field and no oil or gas wells are located within 200 feet of the campus boundaries or any campus structures. A review of the Department of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) District 1 Well Location Database (see http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DOG/maps/d1_index_map.htm) indicates that the closest well to the project site is an abandoned wildcat well. This well is located approximately 735 feet west of the campus boundary, and thus no campus facilities or structures are or will be located within 200 feet of an active, abandoned, idle oil or gas well. Also, as mentioned in the response to Comment A4-1 above, testing of soil boring samples did not reveal the presence of any significant concentrations of volatile organic compounds.

Response to Comment A4-3

No flood control facilities are proposed on the campus that would require maintenance by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Response to Comment A4-4

The EIR adequately analyzes the proposed project's drainage impacts. Furthermore, a drainage concept/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) report will be prepared and submitted to the County. It is anticipated that the SUSMP report, which will identify design features to reduce polluted runoff from the campus, will be prepared subsequent to completion and certification of this EIR.

Also, it should be noted that the proposed Master Plan would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surfaces on the campus. Additionally, implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) in compliance with SUSMP requirements will reduce pollutants in stormwater runoff from the campus. Examples of BMPs are use of oil/water separators, infiltration basins, catch basins, and vegetated swales and strips.

Response to Comment A4-5

Comment noted.

Response to Comment A4-6

Please see the response to Comment A4-4 above.



RESPONSES TO THE 5/21/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (COMMENT LETTER A5)

Response to Comment A5-1

Comment noted.

		Comment Letter
STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOU	JSING AGENCY	GRAY DAVIS, Governor
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT 7, REGIONAL PLANNING		A.9.
IGR/CEQA BRANCH		(de la
120 SO. SPRING ST. LOS ANGELES, CA 90012		
PHONE (213) 897-6536 FAX (213) 897-1337		CLUDOR I
E-Mail:NersesYerjanian@dot.ca.gov		Flex your power!
		Be energy efficient!
Ms. Cindy Sardo,		
Los Angeles Community College Di 5800 Fulton Avenue	istrict	
Valley Glen, CA. 91401		
	IGR/CEQA # 030506NY	
	Los Angeles Valley College	
	Facilities Master Plan	
lune 2, 2002	LA/101/13.88	
June 2, 2003		
Thank you for including the Californ environmental review process for the	nia Department of Transportation e Los Angeles Valley College Fac	(Caltrans) in the cilities Master Plan.
Based on our review of the informat	ion received, we have the followi	ng comments:
Please reference the Department's T		
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/de	evelopserv/operationalsystems/re	
Apply the equitable share responsibility	ility formula on page 2 of Append	lix B (Methodology A6-1
for Calculating Equitable Mitigati	ion Measures) to set aside the Eq	uitable Share
Responsibility Funds for the future S	State Highway improvement proje	ects on Route 101.
If you have any questions, please ca IGR/CEQA # 030506NY.	ll Mr. Yerjanian at (213)897-6530	6 and refer to
Sincerely,		
- type the and		
STEPHEN J. BUSWELL IGR/CEQA Branch Chief		
Transportation Planning Office		
District 7		
*Caltrans in	mproves mobility across California"	

RESPONSES TO THE 6/2/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – DISTRICT 7 (COMMENT LETTER A6)

Response to Comment A6-1

The traffic study for the Draft EIR for the Valley College Facilities Master Plan was conducted in accordance with traffic study procedures established by the City of Los Angeles, which are generally similar to the Caltrans *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies* referenced in the comment.

Based on the traffic projections presented in the traffic study in support of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would add only about 32 trips during the AM peak hour and 20 trips during the PM peak hour to any given section of Route 101 (the Ventura Freeway). No significant direct project impacts to State highway facilities were identified in the Draft EIR. However, the Draft EIR determined that the project may contribute a small incremental addition of traffic to locations that are either currently experiencing congestion or would experience congestion under cumulative future conditions, thus constituting the potential for a contribution to significant cumulative impacts at these locations.

In the absence of a specific established program to collect funds for the implementation of specific improvements, simply setting aside "equitable share responsibility funds" towards an unspecified future improvement would not be a feasible or reasonable mitigation measure under CEQA, since there is no mechanism to ensure that any specific improvements are made. Moreover, the authority of one public agency to compel another to pay for offsite improvements is limited by recent court rulings. (See City of Marina v. Board of Trustees of the California State University, 2003 Cal. App. LEXIS 900, rehearing denied, opinion modified 2003 Cal. App. LEXIS 1076 (2003).)

Contraction of the local division of the loc	Comment	Letter A7
Ser is	anter	PLANNING
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
Charles and the second	Governor's Office of Planning and Research	SIA BE
CALIFORN'S	State Clearinghouse	CALIFORNIA
Gray Davis Governor	Tal	Finney
Governor		Director
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT	
-		1.00
DATE:	May 2, 2003	
TO:	Cindy Sardo	
10.	Los Angeles Community College District	
	5800 Fulton Avenue	
	Valley Glen, CA 91401	1
RE:	Los Angeles Valley College Facilities Master Plan	
	SCH#: 2003011110	
This is to as	denouslades that the State Cleaninghouse has exercised your environmental document	
	cknowledge that the State Clearinghouse has received your environmental document riew. The review period assigned by the State Clearinghouse is:	
101 State Tev	iew. The review period assigned by the state clearinghouse is.	
Rev	iew Start Date: April 29, 2003	
Rev	iew End Date: June 12, 2003	
We have dis	stributed your document to the following agencies and departments:	
Cali	formia Hirahway Batral	
	fornia Highway Patrol rans, District 7	
	artment of Conservation	1. A.
	artment of Fish and Game, Region 5	
	artment of General Services	A7-1
	artment of Health Services	
	artment of Housing and Community Development	
	artment of Parks and Recreation	
	artment of Toxic Substances Control	
	artment of Water Resources ve American Heritage Commission	
	ional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4	
	burces Agency	
	learinghouse will provide a closing letter with any state agency comments to your	
attention on	the date following the close of the review period.	
Thank you h	for your participation in the State Clearinghouse review process.	
	1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044 (916)445-0613 FAX(916)323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov	
	(910)+43-0013 FAA(910)525-3018 www.opr.ca.gov	

	Document Details Report State Clearinghouse Data Base
SCH# Project Title Lead Agency	2003011110 Los Angeles Valley College Facilities Master Plan Los Angeles Community College District
Туре	EIR Draft EIR
Description	Los Angeles Valley College has developed a Facilities Master Plan that proposes construction of new facilities, renovation of and additions to existing facilities, demolition of several existing buildings, and the development of new surface parking, landscaping, and open space. The proposed Facilities Master Plan would include new construction, renovation and modernization of existing facilities, and demolition of a number of existing buildings on the campus. With the proposed improvements, there would be a net increase in building floor space on the campus of approximately 256,000 gross square feet (gsf). Currently, campus buildings contain approximately 600,000 gsf of space. The construction or projects proposed under the Master Plan is expected to commence in 2003 and continue through approximately the year 2008. It is anticipated that the new and renovated facilities would accommodate and meet the educational needs of a future student population of approximately 23,000 students. In the Fall 2001 semester, there were 18,487 students enrolled at Valley College. Approximately 76 percent of the students were part-time students and 24 percent were full-time students. Funding for a portion of the projects identified in the Facilities Master Plan would be provided through the \$1,245 billion Proposition A bond measure passed in the Spring of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles County. The total bond distribution to Valley College under Proposition A is approximately \$165 million.
Lead Agenc	y Contact
Name	Cindy Sardo
Agency	Los Angeles Community College District
Phone	818-947-2433 Fax
email Address	5800 Fulton Avenue
City	Valley Glen State CA Zip 91401
Project Loc	ation
County	Los Angeles
City	
Region	One of Oliverty Coldensity Designs - Destantic Residence of Fullyan Aug
Cross Streets Parcel No.	Oxnard Street, Coldwater Canyon, Burbank Boulevard, Fulton Ave. 2341-025-903
Township	1N Range 15W Section 11 &14 Base
Proximity to	
Highways	U.S. 101, SR 170
Airports	
Railways	UPRR
Waterways Schools	Tujunga Wash Yes
Land Use	The Los Angeles Planning and Zone Code designates the project site as a PF-1XL zone for public
	facilities use in Height District 1, Extra Limited Height. Buildings and structures located in Height
	District 1, Extra Limited Height (1XL)shall not exceed two stories nor shall the highest point of the root
	of any building or structure located in such district exceed 30 feet in height.
Project Issues	Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding;
	Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks;
	Schools/Universities; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste;
	Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Growth Inducing; Landuse;
	Cumulative Effects

Document Details Report State Clearinghouse Data Base					
Reviewing Agencies	 Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of General Services; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Department of Toxic Substances Control; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Department of Housing and Community Development; Department of Health Services; Native American Heritage Commission 				
Date Received	04/29/2003	Start of Review	04/29/2003	End of Review	06/12/2003

	eles Valley College Facilities Master Plan		
Lead Agency: Los Angeles C			Ms. Cindy Sardo, Valley College
Street Address: 5800 Fulton City: Valley Glen	Avenue Zip Code:		47-2433 Augeles
		County	
Project Location:			
County: Los Angeles		Rearest Community: Valley Glen	1 70-01 4 105
	et, Coldwater Canyon, Barbank Blvd, Ful 025-903 Section	ton Ave Zip Code: 9140 m: 11 & 14 Twp: T IN	Range: R 15W Base:
Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #:	U.S. 101, SR 170 Water	ways:Tujunga Wash	
Airport	Kailw	ays: <u>MTA</u> Schools: Yes	
Document Type			
CEQA: NOP Early (Neg D Ø Draft 1	Nec Other.	EIR NEPA: DNOI EA Drafi EIS PONSI	OTHER: Joint Document Final Document Other:
Local Action Type:	Specific Plan	Rezone	Annexation
General Plan Update	Master Plan	Rezone Prezone	Redevelopment
General Plan Element	Planned Unit Developmen	t 🛛 Use Pennit	Coastal Permit
Community Plan	Site Plan	Land Division (Subdivision	on, etc) 🛛 Other:
Development Type:			
Residential: Units	Acres	U Water Pacilities:	Type MGD
□ Office: Sq. ft □ Commercial: Sq. ft	Acres Employe		Type Mineral
□ Industrial: Sq. ft.	Acres Employe	- BECEWAD	Type Watts
Educational: New Coust	ruction and Renovation of Pacilities	Waste Treatment:	Type
ar texteendigt		APR 2 Another Waster	
Funding (approx.): Fede		STATE GLEARING HOUSE	Total \$165 million
Project Issues Discusse Aesthetic / Visual	M In Document:	Schools / Universities	Water Quality
Agricultural Land	G Forest Land / Fire Hazard	Septic Systems	Water Supply/Groundwater
Air Quality	Geologic / Seismic	Sewer Capacity	Wetland / Riparian
Archeological / Historical Coastal Zone	Minerals Noise	Soil Erosion/Compaction/Ge	rading 🔲 Wildlife 🖾 Growth Inducing
Drainage / Absorption	Population / Housing Balance		Landesc
Economic / Jobs	Delic Services / Pacifities		Cumulative Effects
🗆 Fiscal	Recreation / Parks	C Vegetation	Other:
facilities use in Height District I shall the highest point of the roo Project Description: Los existing facilities, demolition of Plan would include new constru-	I, Extra Limited Height. Buildings and st of of any building or structure located in Angeles Valley College has developed a several existing buildings, and the devel cition, renovation and modernization of would be a net increase in building floor (600,000 gaf of space. The construction 2008. It is anticipated that the new and ri- st and the several sev	recurses located in Height District I, Extra usch lististet exceed 30 feet in height. Facilities Master Plan that proposes constri- opment of new surface parking, landscapin, xisting facilities, and demolition of a numb pace on the campus of a provinsitely 256./ of projects proposed under the Master Plan enovated facilities would accommodate an	designates the project site as PF-1XL zone for public Limited Height (1XL) shall not exceed two stories nor action of new facilities, renovation of and additions to g, and open space. The proposed Facilities Maater or fexisting buildings on the campus, With the 200 gross square feet (gsf). Currently, campus is expected to comment in 2003 and continued meet the educational needs of a fluture student
buildings contain approximately through approximately the year	,000 students. In the Fall 2001 semester	function of the projects identi- function of the projects identi-	ey College. Approximately 76 percent of the 18,487 ified in the Facilities Master Plan would be provided
buildings contain approximately through approximately the year population of approximately 23, students were part-time students	osition A bond measure passed in the spr nately \$165 million.		ounty. The total bond distribution to Valley College
beildings contain approximately through approximately the year population of approximately 23, students were part-time students through the \$1,245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim	ealtion: A bond measure passed in the spr nately \$165 million.	ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svcs
beildings contain approximately through approximately the year population of approximately 23, students were part-time students through the \$1,245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim	osition A bond measure passed in the spr nately \$165 million.	ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C Project Sent to the followin Resources Boating & Waterways	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svcs General Services
buildings contain approximately through approximately as- population of approximately as- tundents were part-time students through the \$1.345 hillion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact	ealtion: A bond measure passed in the spr nately \$165 million.	Project Sent to the followin	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svcs Cal EPA
building: contain approximately through approximately as population of approximately as students were part-time student through the \$1.245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began:	ealtion: A bond measure passed in the spr nately \$165 million.	Ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C Project Sent to the followin X_Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conservation	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svcs General Services Cal EPA ARB – Airport Projects ARB – Transportation Projects
buildings contain approximately through approximately as- population of approximately as- tundents were part-time students through the \$1.345 hillion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact	ealtion: A bond measure passed in the spr nately \$165 million.	Project Sent to the followin X Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conservation X Fish & Game # 2 Delta Protection Comm	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svcs General Services Cal BPA ARB - Airport Projects ARB - Transportation Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects Integrated Waste Mgmi Bd
building: contain approximately through approximately as population of approximately as students were part-time student through the \$1.245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began:	ealtion: A bond measure passed in the spr nately \$165 million.	Ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C Project Sent to the followin Resources Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conservation Fish & Game # Delta Protection Comm Forestry & Fire Prot	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svcs General Services Cal EPA ARB – Airport Projects ARB – Major Industrial Projects ARB – Major Industrial Projects Integrated Waste Mgmt Bd SWRCB: Clean Wr Prog
building: contain approximately through approximately as population of approximately as students were part-time student through the \$1.245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began:	ealtion: A bond measure passed in the spr nately \$165 million.	Project Sent to the followin X Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conservation X Fish & Game # 2 Delta Protection Comm	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svcs General Services Cal BPA ARB - Airport Projects ARB - Transportation Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects Integrated Waste Mgmi Bd
buildings contain approximately through approximately as population of approximately as students were part-line students shrough the \$1,245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began: SCH COMPLIANCE	validia A bond measure passed in the spr mately \$165 million. $\frac{4}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ $\frac{2}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$	ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C Project Sent to the followin X Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Colocado Rvr Bd Conservation X Fish & Game # S Delta Protection Comm Forestry & Fire Prot Historic Preservation X Parks & Rec Reclamation Board	state Agencies State/Consumer Svcs General Services Cal EPA ARB - Airport Projects ARB - Mayor Industrial Projects ARB - Mayor Industrial Projects ARB - SWRCB: Clean Wur Prog SWRCB: Wir Quality SWRCB: Wir Quality SWRCB: Wir Rights X, Reg. WQCB #
buildings contain approximately 33 propulation of approximately 33 students were part-line students shrough the \$1,245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began: SCH COMPLIANCE	evalua A bond measure passed in the spr analely \$165 million. (916) 445-0613 4 - 2	Ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C Project Sent to the followin X Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conervation X Fish & Game # Delta Protection Comm Forestry & Fire Prot Historic Preservation X Parks & Rec Reclamation Board Bay Cons & Dev Comm	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svcs General Services Cal BPA ARB - Airport Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects BWRCB: Clean Wir Prog SWRCB: Clean Wir Prog SWRCB: Wir Quality SWRCB: Wir Quality SWRCB: Wir Rights X Reg. WQCB # Toxic Sub Ctrl-CTC
buildings contain approximately 33, through approximately 33, students were part-line students through the \$1,245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began:	evaluation A bond measure passed in the spr matery \$165 million. 4 - 2 - 9 - 2003 5 - 7 - 2 - 2003 evaluation for the spr evaluation of the spr evaluation of the spr the spr 4 - 2 - 9 - 2003 5 - 7 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2	Project Sent to the followin X Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conservation Delta Protection Comm Forestry & Fire Prot Historic Preservation X Parks & Rec Reclamation Board Bay Cons & Dev Comm X DWR	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Sves General Services Cal EPA ARB – Airport Projects ARB – Transportation Projects ARB – Major Industrial Projects ARB – Major Industrial Projects Integrated Waste Mgmt Bd SWRCB: Utr Quality SWRCB: Wir Rights SWRCB: Wir Rights XReg. WQCB #
buildings contain approximately 33, through approximately 33, students were part-line students through the \$1,245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began:	evalua A bond measure passed in the spr analely \$165 million. (916) 445-0613 4 - 2	Ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C Project Sent to the followin X Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conservation X Fish & Game # 2 Delta Protection Comm Forestry & Fire Prot Historic Preservation X Parks & Rec Reclamation Board Bay Cons & Dev Comm DES (Emergency Svcs) Bus Transp Hous	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svcs General Services Cal BPA ARB - Airport Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects BWRCB: Clean Wir Prog SWRCB: Clean Wir Prog SWRCB: Wir Quality SWRCB: Wir Quality SWRCB: Wir Rights X Reg. WQCB # Toxic Sub Ctrl-CTC
buildings contain approximately 3, through approximately 3, through approximately 3, through the \$1,245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began:	evaluation A bond measure passed in the spr matery \$165 million. $\frac{4}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ $\frac{2}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ $\frac{2}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ evaluation of the spr sector of the spr end of the spr	Ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C Project Sent to the followin X Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conservation X Fish & Game # Delta Protection Comm Forestry & Fire Prot Historic Preservation X Parks & Rec Reclamation Board Bay Cons & Dev Comm X DWR OES (Emergency Sves) Bus Transp Hous Aeronautics	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svos Gal EPA ARB – Airport Projects ARB – Airport Projects ARB – Major Industrial Projects ARB – Major Industrial Projects Integrated Waste Mgmt Bd SWRCB: Clean Wur Prog SWRCB: Wur Quality SWRCB: Wur Quality SWRCB: Wur Rights X Reg. WQCB #
buildings contain approximately 33, students were part-line atomic and approximately 33, students were part-line atomic through the \$1,245 billion Propunder Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began:	evaluation A bond measure passed in the spr matery \$165 million. $\frac{4}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ $\frac{2}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ $\frac{2}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ evaluation of the spr sector of the spr end of the spr	Ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C Project Sent to the followin X Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conservation X Fish & Game # S Delta Protection Comm Forestry & Fire Prot Historic Preservation X Parks & Rec Reclamation Board Bay Cons & Dev Comm DWR ODS (Emergency Sves) Bus Transp Hous Aconautics X CHP	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Svcs General Services Cal BPA ARB - Airport Projects ARB - Transportation Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects SWRCB: Clean Wr Prog SWRCB: Clean Wr Prog SWRCB: Wr Quality SWRCB: Wr Rights X. Reg. WQCB # 4 Toxic Sub Ctrl-CTC Yth/Adlt Corrections Corrections Independent Comm Energy Commission X. NAHC
buildings contain approximately 3, through approximately 3, students were part-line audenti through the \$1,245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began:	evaluation A bond measure passed in the spr matery \$165 million. $\frac{4}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ $\frac{2}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ $\frac{2}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ evaluation of the spr sector of the spr end of the spr	Ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C Project Sent to the followin X Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Conservation X Fish & Game # Conservation Network & Rec Reclamation Board Bay Cons & Dev Comm X Parks & Rec Reclamation Board Bay Cons & Dev Comm X Darks & Rec Reclamation Board COBS (Emergency Sves) Bus Transp Hous Aeronautics X CHP X Caltrans # Trans Planning	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Sves General Services Cal EPA ARB - Airport Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects ARB - Major Industrial Projects SWRCB: Ur Quality SWRCB: Ur Quality SWRCB: Wr Rights X Reg. WQCB # XRCB: Wir Rights X Reg. WQCB # Corrections Independent Comm Energy Commission X NAHC Public Utilities Comm Santa Monica Mus
buildings contain approximately 3, through approximately 3, through approximately 3, through were part-line student through the \$1,245 billion Prop- under Proposition A is approxim State Clearinghouse Contact State Review Began:	evaluation A bond measure passed in the spr matery \$165 million. $\frac{4}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ $\frac{2}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ $\frac{2}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - 2003$ evaluation of the spr sector of the spr end of the spr	Ing of 2001 by the voters of Los Angeles C Project Sent to the followin X Resources Boating & Waterways Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conervation X Fish & Game # - Delta Protection Comm Forestry & Fire Prot Historic Preservation X Parks & Rec Reclamation Board Bay Cons & Dev Comm DBS (Emergency Sves) Bus Transp Hous Aeronautics X CHP C CHP C CHP	ng State Agencies State/Consumer Sves General Services Cal EPA ARB – Airport Projects ARB – Major Industrial Projects ARB – Major Industrial Projects ARB – Major Industrial Projects SWRCB: Clean Wur Prog SWRCB: Wur Rights SWRCB: Wur Rights SWRCB: Wur Rights SWRCB: Wur Rights Corrections Corrections Corrections Independent Comm Energy Commission X NAHC Public Utilities Comm

RESPONSES TO THE 5/2/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH (COMMENT LETTER A7)

Response to Comment A7-1

No response required. The letter simply acknowledges that the Draft EIR was received by the State Clearinghouse in compliance with review requirements for draft environmental documents pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.



RESPONSES TO THE 6/13/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH (COMMENT LETTER A8)

Response to Comment A8-1

No response required. The letter simply acknowledges that the Draft EIR was distributed to selected state agencies and no state agencies submitted comment letters to the State Clearinghouse by the close of the public review period.

Comment Letter B1



June 12, 2003

Ms. Cindy Sardo Director of Public Relations 5800 Fulton Ave. Valley Glen, CA 91401

Dear Ms. Sardo:

I am writing on behalf of the Los Angeles Conservancy to offer our comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Valley College Facilities Master Plan.

The Los Angeles Conservancy is the historic preservation organization for Los Angeles, and is the largest local preservation group in the country, with over 7,500 members throughout the L.A. area. In general, the Conservancy commends Valley College for taking an important step forward in its campus planning. However, we believe that the plan falls short in one important respect: the placement of the new Library/Learning Resource Center.

In 2000, the Conservancy, through the leadership of the Conservancy's Modern Committee, conducted a two-day driving tour of the San Fernando Valley, called "How Modern Was My Valley", bringing 1,000 tour-goers to architecturally significant sites of mid-20th-century Modernism in the San Fernando Valley. We were very pleased to conclude this tour at Valley College, with a docent-led stop focused on the excellent collection of Modern institutional buildings around an impressive landscape plan. Visitors proceeded from the Fulton Ave. entrance across the grand campus quadrangle to a closing reception for the tour at the college.

We were therefore greatly disappointed to see that this Master Plan so dramatically undervalues the college's beautiful existing quadrangle. The quadrangle offers a successful, harmonious Modern take on the historic campus quad, a tradition stretching back from Oxford and Cambridge to our nation's own Ivy League institutions. The placement of the new library could not possibly be more disruptive to the characterdefining features of this lovely quadrangle, or to the carefully crafted relationships among the existing buildings.

The Conservancy therefore agrees with the historic resources analysis in the DEIR, which identified this element of the project as a significant, unmitigated impact. We still believe that this significant impact can and should be avoided. While the alternatives

523 West Sixth Street, Suite 826, Los Angeles, California 90014 T: 213.623.2489 F: 213.623.3909

B1-1

B1-1

cont'd

section of the document contains some of the rationales for rejecting alternative sites, some of these explanations are unconvincing. For example, the DEIR rejects other alternative sites in part due to the height and mass of the new building. Yet, the DEIR does not apply this same rationale to placement of the building in the heart of the quadrangle -- the very site where height and mass should be most greatly minimized.

The Final EIR should contain much more specific information as to why alternative sites were rejected. The Chemistry and Physics Building site, for example, was set aside due to vague construction sequencing concerns that are not made clear to readers. Also, the discussion of "other sites" was equally vague: it is not at all clear why a site at the north end of the campus, on or near the existing Lot C, would be "in conflict with the existing plan."

We were pleased to see that the new library will be named after former Assembly Speaker Robert M. Hertzberg, an outstanding public servant and great friend of Los Angeles and San Fernando Valley history. The Conservancy only hopes that this muchneeded new facility will be sited in a manner that better respects the history and beauty of the Valley College campus.

Sincerely. Ken Bernstein

Director of Preservation Issues

RESPONSES TO THE 6/12/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM THE LOS ANGELES CONSERVANCY (COMMENT LETTER B1)

Response to Comment B1-1

In response to public concerns and based on further review of design, cost, and operational issues, the College has decided to place the new Library facility on the site of the existing Cafeteria rather than at the southern end of the Quadrangle as proposed in the Draft EIR. The decision to proceed with this alternative location for the library is in conformance with Los Angeles Community College District Design Criteria and Standards/Sustainable Design Manual requirements (DCS009 – Building Exterior Design) specifying that "...an effort to develop a design which contributes to the existing environment …" be made "… instead of stand-alone design expression," and that "...special attention should be given to the selection of form, material, color and texture … as well as to the relationship with circulation and landscaping."

The current proposed location for the new Library/Learning Resource Center would require the demolition of the Cafeteria but would leave the Quadrangle essentially as is. The Cafeteria would be relocated to a new two-story Student Services Building that would be constructed on the site of the existing Library on the west side of the Quadrangle. No significant architectural resources would be lost, however, because the campus buildings, including the Cafeteria and existing Library, are not considered individually significant in architectural terms. Architect Richard Berliner is currently developing design standards for the Valley College campus that will ensure that new development will be compatible in scale, siting, and architectural style with existing buildings.

	Comment Le	etter
May	6, 2003	
To:	Cindy Sardo Los Angeles Valley College	
Re:	Environmental Impact of Proposed Prop. A Construction	
Dear	Ms. Sardo:	
comr	I am sending you these comments because I will not be able to attend either of the two day evening EIR Community Meetings. I hope you will forward these comments to the EIR munity input process. These issues are of importance to me as well as some of my abors. I live several blocks away from Valley College just west of Fulton Ave. on Varna St.	
almo prom atmo Fulto the a parki plant done neigh that	First, I am very concerned about the beautiful trees on campus. I walk my dog there is everyday and appreciate the park-like atmosphere at the college. I have heard that the lise at the beginning of the construction planning process was that the park-like sphere would be maintained. I particularly am concerned about the old tree canopy on the in border of the campus. It is not only calming but it beautifully separates the campus from adjacent neighborhood and provides habitat for wildlife. I am concerned that the proposed ing plan would require that those beautiful mature trees be cut down and new trees be ed so that the parking areas could be made larger. I would strongly urge that this not be a stately atmosphere and the whole surrounding borhood would be robbed of the beautiful greenscape if this were done. I am cognizant a couple of non-specimen trees might have to go in order to put in the new Library, but see do not cut the beautiful pines on either side of the entrance to campus.	C1-1
the l wood their they	Also, I have noticed the radical cutting that has been done recently on the campus. The old bushes and trees are being cut to stumps and in some cases the cutting looks like timbs of the trees were ripped off without applying any sealing-tar to the remaining raw dthis may be a life-threatening way to prune a tree. Several others on my street who walk dogs or jog over there have mentioned the bad tree and shrub cutting techniques/trend observed over there as well. I hope in the near future that the trees on the campus will be tained in the professional manner in which they have been cared for over the last twenty or pars.	C1-:
8 am the e corne popu dang	Another issue that I would like to bring up is the fact that many students and employees e college speed down my street and the adjacent streets during the dayusually at 7:45- n and other times when classes or workdays must be starting. We have no stop signs on end of our street (Varna and Hillview) and there are none at the Hillview Park and Hatteras ers or the Hatteras and Nagle corners either. This is a concern also because if the plation of the college grows as expected these dangerous corners will be even more perous because the Hatteras entrance will be used even more. Apparently, when the signal whard and Fulton stops the cars, many take a short cut on Hillview, Varna, or Nagle. I have many close calls in terms of accidents on these streets.	C1-

C1-3

conťd

I hope that these safety concerns can be addressed through your EIR review process and stop signs will be a result. A couple of speed bumps on Hatteras, Hillview Park South, Hillview Park North, Varna, and Nagle would be very beneficial in terms of safety and I bet the neighbors would even kick in some of the cost because this is a dangerous situation that will only get worse.

I appreciate you taking the time to read my letter.

Sincerely,

mis How Brayta

Mrs. Thomas Brayton 5816 Varna Ave. Valley Glen, CA 91401

RESPONSES TO THE 5/6/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM THOMAS BRAYTON (COMMENT LETTER C1)

Response to Comment C1-1

As part of campus-wide site improvements, an arborist will be hired as a consultant to the College to review existing foliage. The arborist's scope of work will include surveying as well as making recommendations for preservation and/or pruning of mature foliage found around the campus. Hiring an arborist is one of many steps that the College is taking to minimize the impact of adding eight new buildings to the campus over the next 5 to 6 years. The Master Plan and Design Guidelines will also ensure that the architects of the eight new buildings are made aware of the College's sensitivity to one of Los Angeles Valley College's iconic features, namely its mature foliage. Additionally, to minimize construction impacts to foliage on the campus, the College is exploring alternative construction methodologies and the installation of temporary facilities to avoid areas with mature foliage susceptible to potential damage.

The trees and other landscaping on the campus are important visual resources that will be preserved, maintained, and improved under the proposed Master Plan. The trees along Fulton Avenue and on either side of the main entrance will remain. It is possible that a few trees on or adjacent to the sites of proposed new buildings may be removed; however, implementation of the Master Plan would result in a net increase in the number of trees and landscaping on the campus.

Response to Comment C1-2

Please see the response to Comment C1-1 above.

Response to Comment C1-3

The College recognizes and appreciates the concerns expressed by the commenter about increased traffic and motorists speeding on local residential streets. However, the analyses conducted for the Draft EIR concluded, based on significance criteria established by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation for neighborhood intrusion impacts, that the incremental additional traffic generated by the proposed project that would travel through local residential neighborhoods would not be significant.

Additionally, it should be noted that the City of Los Angeles has a neighborhood traffic management process in place that includes a number of specific steps. In the event that neighbors are concerned about neighborhood traffic intrusion, they may petition LADOT for a neighborhood traffic study. If the neighbors and LADOT agree that there is a significant problem, LADOT staff works with the neighbors to identify traffic calming/traffic management improvements that would address the traffic problem. If the neighbors agree that the suggested solutions are workable and funding is available, the improvements are installed on a temporary, trial basis. Once the improvements have been in place for a sufficient trial (usually 6 months) the neighbors are asked if they want the improvements to be installed on a permanent basis. If a sufficient number of neighbors approve and funding is available, the improvements are installed permanently. Accordingly, and in response to the concerns expressed, the College will consult

with LADOT and local elected officials regarding neighborhood impacts and possible implementation of neighborhood traffic management measures.

	1.1
Cindy Sardo	
Director of Public Relations	
Los Angeles Valley College	
5800 Fulton Ave.	
Valley Glen, CA 91401	
Dear Ms. Sardo,	
I recently attended a workshop on campus and read the Facilities Master Plan Draft	
Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). I have several concerns and suggestions. Please submit my comments as part of the public record.	
I was informed, at the workshop on May 27th, that the final location for the new	
Library/Learning Resource Center was still open for discussion. The DEIR states,	
"alternative sites were eliminated from further consideration." Which is correct? If	C2-1
additional bond or other monies allow, I believe that creating a combined library/ cafeteria complex would be preferable to irrevocably impacting the visual quality,	
character and resources of the Quadrangle landscape.	
I also encourage the preservation of the current Historical Museum's resources within the	C2-2
new Library. Nowhere in the DEIR were these resources addressed.	02-2
While I support security lighting, I also empathize with neighbors who have suffered	1 N N
from intrusive school lighting in the past. I hope that all mitigation measures related to	C2-3
artificial lighting will be implemented. The Planetarium is a significant community	ANALYSIN OF
resource as well, and night sky viewing should not be impeded in any way by lighting.	
I am most concerned with the amount of NOx and PM10 emissions that will be generated	1.1
during the construction activities. Even after mitigation, these emissions would still exceed SCAQMD thresholds. The DEIR speaks of "temporary" impacts. However, as a	1.00
resident of Valley Glen, and as a mother of a future Grant High student, I do not consider	
six years of construction to be temporary. The added pollution and noise will be present	C2-4
during my son's entire high school career!	62-4
I highly recommend the use of alternatively fueled construction equipment, turning off	
equipment when not in use (no idling), noise barriers, and increased work when school is	
not in session. I would also suggest scheduling the use of heavy machinery when students	
are not participating in outdoor athletics (to the extent possible).	
Increased traffic, street and/or lane closures, other access disruptions, increased noise and	
vibration and increased air pollution are, according to the DEIR, "not considered to be	
significant adverse impacts, because they are short-term and are commonly experienced in an urban setting such as the proposed project area." Graffiti vandalism and crime are	C2-5
commonly experienced in urban settings as well, but I still consider them significant	1.1
adverse impacts.	

Facilities Master Plan Dl	EIR comments cont.	
Buildings and the Fire/Li use permits to exceed the	alth/Sciences and Computer-Business-Technology Center ife/Safety Training Tower would require variances or conditional e current height limits in PF-1XL. I am not inherently opposed to mpus, but do suggest the use of increased landscaping and trees pact of such structures.	C2-
hazard to drivers as well "transportation demand r	and after the construction process could pose a significant safety as students walking to and from school. I am not certain what management measures" and "intersection improvements" will be I hope that traffic mitigation measures will be strictly and	C2-
the issues that may arise and all efforts to be envir tolerant landscaping, wa	ressed by the scope of the DEIR. It seems to have addressed all during the project implementation. I particularly applaud any ronmentally progressive - this includes the use of drought ter conservation measures, and otherwise promoting the Environmental Design Green Building standards.	C2-
input. I currently manage Valley Glen Voice news	me informed of future meetings and opportunities for public e several web sites (including www.valleyglen.org) and edit the sletter. I would like to publicize information about the Valley s Plan as work progresses.	C2-
Thank you.		
Soraya Dosaj		

RESPONSES TO THE COMMENT LETTER FROM SORAYA DOSAJ (COMMENT LETTER C2)

Response to Comment C2-1

In response to concerns about potential visual and historic impacts and due to site constraints and operational issues, the south end of the Quadrangle is no longer under consideration as the preferred site for the new Library/Learning Resource Center. The new proposed location is the existing Cafeteria Building. The new Library/Learning Resource Center proposed for the Cafeteria site would be a three-story, approximately 108,675-gross-square-foot building. The existing Cafeteria Building would be demolished and the Cafeteria relocated to a new Student Services Center, which would be constructed on the site of the existing Library Building. Please see Chapter 2 of this Final EIR for detailed descriptions of the revised Master Plan projects.

Response to Comment C2-2

The artifacts of the James L. Dodson Historical museum, including the archives and artifacts of William Paul Whitsett, founder of Van Nuys, will be located in the new Library/Learning Resource Center.

Response to Comment C2-3

The lighting mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR and this Final EIR will be implemented to ensure spillover lighting impacts on academic facilities and adjacent residential neighborhoods are minimized.

Response to Comment C2-4

Construction air quality impacts on sensitive populations will be minimized to the extent possible through implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in the EIR. However, it should also be recognized that the air quality analyses in the EIR were based on conservative estimates of the amount of construction that would occur on the peak day and during the peak quarter over the next 5 to 6 years. Thus, the analyses represent a hypothetical worst-case scenario. In reality, construction (and resulting pollutant emissions) would vary substantially over the course of the next 5 to 6 years and adverse impacts would occur intermittently and would be temporary. Additionally, although construction would occur at various locations on the campus, most new buildings would be located in the central campus core, at least 550 feet from Grant High School athletic fields and approximately 700 feet from Grant High School classroom facilities.

Response to Comment C2-5

The Draft EIR determined that construction noise and air quality impacts on nearby sensitive populations could be potentially significant (see Sections 3-3 and 3-11 of the Draft EIR and this Final EIR). Consequently, appropriate mitigation measures were proposed to minimize potential impacts. Also see the response to Comment C2-4 above.

Response to Comment C2-6

Comment noted. The Allied Health/Sciences Center Building site will include new landscaping.

Response to Comment C2-7

Comment noted.

Response to Comment C2-8

Comment noted.

Response to Comment C2-9

Comment noted. The commenter will be added to the College's mailing list.
Comment Letter C3 Jul. 02 2003 0 FAX ND. :12134381764 FROM : Los Angeles Valley College COMMENTS Please use this page to submit your comments on issues to be addressed in the Valley College Facilities Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) process. You may answer the questions below or discuss any aspect of Draft EIR in which you are interested. We appreciate your comments and suggestions as an important part of the process of creating a comprehensive EIR. Your input will become part of the public record and included in the Final EIR, if submitted by June 16, 2003 (the end of the public comment period). 1. What environmental issue(s) do you feel have not been considered, or adequately addressed, in the Draft EIR for the proposed Valley College Facilities Master Plan? 2. Are there existing environmental leaves or concerns in or around the Valley College area that you feel should be addressed in the Draft EIR? 3. I would like more information on the following Draft EIR issue(s): When making your comments, please be as specific as possible: 1. Please consider shrubs a other plantings in lieu of any possible wells to discourage C3-1 tagging. 2. Ef feasible, I encourage the idea of 2. Ef feasible, I encourage the idea of combining the library and coheterra buildings to maintain the central open space of the guas to maintain the central open space of the guas 3 Should construction require removal of unique 3 Should construction require removal of unique 3 Should construction require removal of Soc C3-3 tree species, contact Volley Glen Neighborhood Assoc C3-3 tree species, contact volley schaller trees. to possibly preserve saplings, schaller trees. Please complete the information below. To ensure your comments are addressed in the Draft EIR, please print clearly. Name: SORAYA DOSAJ Phone: 818-997-1356 Address: 6020 Greenbush Ave. City: Valley Glen State: CA Zip: 71401 E-mail address: fam desaja earthlink net will e-mail / mail additional comments Please return comments tonight or to the following address no later than June 16, 2003. Cindy Sardo, Director of Public Relations Los Angeles Valley College 5800 Fulton Ave. Valley Glen, CA 91401

RESPONSES TO THE 5/27/03 COMMENT SHEET FROM SORAYA DOSAJ (COMMENT LETTER C3)

Response to Comment C3-1

Comment noted. Also, please see the response to Comment C1-1.

Response to Comment C3-2

The proposed new location for the Library is the existing Cafeteria Building. The Cafeteria would be located in a new Student Services Building to be constructed on the site of the existing Library. The southern end of the Quadrangle is no longer under consideration as the preferred location for the new Library/Learning Resource Center.

Also, see the response to Comment C2-1.

Response to Comment C3-3

The Valley Glen Neighborhood Association will be contacted about any unique tree species that need to be removed to accommodate construction and will not be relocated elsewhere on campus.

	Comment Letter C4
L	A Los Angeles
I	C Valley College
Mast discu	COMMENTS se use this page to submit your comments on issues to be addressed in the Valley College Facilities er Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) process. You may answer the questions below or uss any aspect of Draft EIR in which you are interested. We appreciate your comments and suggestions in important part of the process of creating a comprehensive EIR. Your input will become part of the public of and included in the Final EIR, if submitted by June 16, 2003 (the end of the public comment period).
1.	What environmental issue(s) do you feel have not been considered, or adequately addressed, in the Draft EIR for the proposed Valley College Facilities Master Plan?
2.	Are there existing environmental issues or concerns in or around the Valley College area that you feel should be addressed in the Draft EIR?
3.	I would like more information on the following Draft EIR issue(s):
	When making your comments, please be as specific as possible:
	Need a Path (Paver) North of Music Building To
(Need a Path (Paved) North of Music Building To CA.
	Need a walkway Between The Pool & North Gym Nasium CA
	CONSIDER EXTENDING COVERED WALKWAY TO PARKING LOT CA NORTH OF MUSIC BUILding (If necessary, please use the reverse side of the paper)
Please	complete the information below. To ensure your comments are addressed in the Draft EIR, please print clearly.
	Maureen Hanrahan Phone:
Addre:	Sherman Oaks State: CA Zip: 9140
	address:
Cindy Los A 5800	e return comments tonight or to the following address no later than <u>June 16, 2003.</u> Sardo, Director of Public Relations Ingeles Valley College Fulton Ave. y Glen, CA 91401

RESPONSES TO THE 5/7/03 COMMENT SHEET FROM MAUREEN HANRAHAN (COMMENT LETTER C4)

Response to Comment C4-1

This exterior yard will be developed and improved with paths between the Quadrangle and the parking lots.

Response to Comment C4-2

Pedestrian pathways will be incorporated into the area around the new pools. Required (safety) fencing around pools may limit pedestrian routes through this area.

Response to Comment C4-3

The covered walkway system, sometimes referred to as the arcade, will be studied as part of campus-wide site improvements. It is anticipated that there may be some extension of the arcade in the future plans.

Comment Letter C5 Jul. 02 2003 FROM : FAX ND. :12134381764 os Angeles ley College COMMENTS Please use this page to submit your comments on issues to be addressed in the Valley College Facilities Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) process. You may answer the questions below or discuss any aspect of Draft EIR in which you are interested. We appreciate your comments and suggestions as an important part of the process of creating a comprehensive EIR. Your input will become part of the public record and included in the Final EIR, if submitted by June 16, 2003 (the end of the public comment period). 1. What environmental issue(s) do you feel have not been considered, or adequately addressed, in the Draft Elft for the proposed Valley College Picilities Master Plan? ð mrs 96 iT artects 2. Are there existing environmental issues or concerns in or around the Valley College area that you feel should be addressed in the Draft EIR? Debu See 3. I would like more information on the following Draft EIR issue(s): When making your comments, please be, as specific as possible: C5-1 (If necessary, please use the reverse side of the paper) nsure your comments are addressed in the Draft EIR, please print clearly. Please complete the Information Phone Name: Address State City E-mail address: Please return comments tonight or to the following address no later than June 16, 2003. Cindy Sardo, Director of Public Relations Los Angeles Valley College 5800 Fulton Ave. Valley Glen, CA 91401

RESPONSES TO THE 5/27/03 COMMENT SHEET FROM MICKEY JANNOL (COMMENT LETTER C5)

Response to Comment C5-1

Several neighbors expressed concerns at the Draft EIR public workshops about students parking in the adjacent residential neighborhoods. In response to those concerns, the College is considering installing parking meters in some spaces in campus parking lots. The metered stalls would provide a less expensive alternative to the purchase of parking passes for those students who attend classes part time. Consequently, metered parking spaces may result in increased usage of the College's parking lots and fewer students parking on local streets.

Comme	ent Letter
Subject: Draft EIR re Los Angeles Valley College New Construction June 13,2003	
You should be aware of the following Concerns regarding adverse impacts: 1. Of particular concern is the effect of the project upon the single family adjacent neighborhood at FULTON AVE., most especially the single family properties directly across from the Eastern border of the Campus on Fulton Ave itself.	
Adverse impacts being-2. Traffic : increased traffic congestion on Fulton Ave.3. Lighting: that the ambient or direct lighting from overhead parking illumination and from the windows of new buildings would increase the present light levels to be inappropriate with enjoyment of the adjacent properties along Fulton Ave.	C6-1
4. That the BUFFER AREA – at the east edges of the campus may not be maintained, particularly that the landscaping and depth of area be maintained or the effects of parking/ traffic/ entrance of vehicles/ and lighting will deteriorate and become a nuisance. That the entrance of Fulton would increase congestion at the residential neighborhood	C6-2
along Fulton, while other entrances near more intensely zoned property would be more appropriate for increase traffic.	C6-3
5. That unless a budget is provided in the future to replace mature trees and shrubs, the existing landscaping at the Eastern area of the campus serving as a buffer, cannot be relied upon to exist in the future as a mitigating factor to adverse impacts. This because trees and shrubs there are already 20 plus years or more in maturity.	C6-4
Thank You, Michael Randall 13460 Kittridge Street Valley Glen Ca. 91401	
p.s. I am Sec. of the Valley Glen Community Council and Board member of the Neighborhood Assoc. These comments reflect my own personal opinions/ concerns and include input discussed at community meetings.	

RESPONSES TO THE 6/13/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM MICHAEL RANDALL (COMMENT LETTER C6)

Response to Comment C6-1

Comments noted. Also, please see the response to Comment C2-3.

Response to Comment C6-2

The landscaped buffer along the west edge of the campus and the east side of Fulton Avenue will remain.

Response to Comment C6-3

While the campus' Fulton Avenue entrance is across from the residential neighborhood west of Fulton Avenue, it is also true that the campus' north Ethel Avenue entrance is across from the residential neighborhood north of Oxnard Street and the campus' south Ethel Avenue entrance is across from the residential neighborhood south of Burbank Boulevard. Regardless, the intersection analysis in the Draft EIR determined that the Fulton Avenue/Hatteras Street, Ethel Avenue/Oxnard Street, and Ethel Avenue/Burbank Boulevard intersections currently operate at acceptable levels of service per City of Los Angeles standards and are projected to continue to do so even with the addition of increased project traffic. Also, it should be noted that under the proposed Master Plan, more parking would be provided along the southern and eastern portions of the campus, away from the Fulton Avenue entrance and the neighborhoods to the west.

Response to Comment C6-4

The College has and will continue to maintain the existing mature trees along Fulton Avenue.

Also, see the response to Comment C1-1.

	LAVC; 18189472602; MAY-	7-03 12:56;	2,0
		RECEIVED GAL#	
×			
	April 4, 2003	APR - 7 2003 FULEE	
	To whom it may concern regarding	URS REF.	
	LA Valley College EIR Draft:	Document Control	
	As a resident of Valley Glen and specifically of Nagle A Hatteras, I feel it is necessary to point out some inadequacies which must be addressed for the Proposition A construction p comprehensive plan.	in the EIR as it now stands	
	1. No study of the traffic problems on Nagle Avenue w	vas undertaken	
	 Only part of Hillview Park Avenue was studied, tha Oxnard and Hatteras. 		C7-1
	 The report on the part of Hillview Park Avenue that the increase in the student population would minin traffic situation on that street. 		C7-2
	 4. The report states that the impact on the intersection and Fulton and Burbank (which were rated as "C" in 		C7-3
	minimal impact.		
	5. No study of Varna Avenue between Oxnard and Ha		C7-4
	No mention was made of the fact that stop signs do short cuts to the Hatteras college entrance.	not exist on the corners of	C7-5
	To residents living in the triangle informally called Hill is bordered by Oxnard on the north, Hillview Park Avenue on east, and Burbank on the south, the existing traffic situation is problematic. Hillview Park Avenue, Nagle Avenue, Varna Ave used as speedways on a daily basis, Monday through Friday, b shortcuts from crowded Oxnard Blvd. The volume of traffic of may not meet the standards for mitigation, but the speed of th these shortcuts to the Hatteras and Hillview Park Avenue adja during peak times (8am, before each class, before evening class as a critical and significant existing problem deserving of mitig The volume of traffic on these usually quiet neighborho not continually so great as to be considered "significant," but a the day a large percentage of the vehicles utilizing the shortcut clusters. This actually creates a much more dangerous traffic s volume of speeders would, especially for pedestrians, animals, street and children that ride bicycles, walk, or play ball in the u increase in this current problem (which already requires mitig considered for a mitigation strategy in any comprehensive col	the west, Fulton on the s already significant and enue, and Hatteras are sy students and staff taking in these streets apparently the vehicles that utilize acent entrances to campus sees) should be recognized gation. bod streets is apparently at numerous times during ts speed (40- 60 mph) in situation than a steady , neighbors crossing the usually quiet streets. Any gation) should definitely be	C7-6
	Additionally, there are no stop signs at the corners of H Hillview Park and Hatteras or Hillviewpark and Varna. Studen the campus do not make full stops at any of these intersections "California stop" is the rule, which increases the probability of the area. (One year ago at least one pedestrian fatality occurred and Fulton—on the part of Hillview Park that was not even con	ats and staff hurrying to s, rather the moving further traffic fatalities in d at Hillview Park Avenue	C7-7

SENT BY: LAVC; 18189472602; MAY-7-03 12:56; PAGE 3/3 The major intersections at the northwest and southwest corners of the LAVC campus should also be recognized as existing dangerous intersections. Though not rated "F" as some intersections much further away from campus are (Victory and Fulton?), the number of accidents on a weekly basis that occur at these intersections should be recognized as indicative of the severity of the already existing problem. Data C7-8 on the number and kind of accidents occurring at these intersections should be obtained and analyzed in order to develop an appropriate mitigation strategy. (Ask the Fire Department on Burbank for input, as they are the first respondrs to most of the accidents at these two intersections. Even if the EIR reports that the increase in students will minimally impact these intersections, the fact that they are already deadly should be considered. Any minimal impact will make them more deadly. C7-9 The mitigation strategy must include stop signs at the above-mentioned intersections (see attached sketch) where no signs are existant. Additionally, several speed bumps must be placed on Nagle between Hatteras and Oxnard, Hillview Park C7-10 between Fulton and Hatteras, Hillview Park between Oxnard and Hatteras, and Varna between Hatteras and Oxnard. Left turn arrows should be installed at the major C7-11 intersections on the west side of campus to ensure the safety of student drivers and the community. The fact that College Master Plan indicates that two entrances to the college parking lost will be closed on Fulton and the Hatteras/Fulton entrance will be the only college entrance on Fulton. This will certainly result in even more significant traffic (and speeding) on our Hillview Park Estates streets and is a further indication of the need for the above- suggested mitigation solutions. The majority of families living in the Hillview C7-12 Estates have indicated they strongly advocate that these strategies be implemented. Evidence in the form of neighborhood petitions is forthcoming and we would like to request another week to obtain these petitions, ie. until April 14. The neighborhood is aware that construction noise and other temporary (until 2008?) nuisances will be related to the college construction project. We are ready to persevere throughout the construction-related inconveniences because we support the C7-13 college improvements. We ask you to seriously consider this neighborhood feedback regarding the EIR Draft. Your attention to this matter is appreciated and the mitigation implementation will certainly result in increased community safety, lives saved, and already existing neighborhood support for LAVC. Respectfully submitted, Steve Reisch 5905 Nagle Ave. Valley Glen, CA 91401

RESPONSES TO THE 4/4/03 COMMENT LETTER FROM STEVE REISCH (COMMENT LETTER C7)

Response to Comment C7-1

The Draft EIR evaluated the potential for impacts due to increased traffic through residential neighborhoods on three street segments: Ethel Avenue between Victory Boulevard and Oxnard Street, Ethel Avenue between Burbank Boulevard and Chandler Boulevard, and Hillview Park Avenue between Hatteras Street and Oxnard Street. These streets were chosen for analysis since they are directly opposite primary campus access points and thus would be the streets with the highest potential for cut-through traffic. Using significance criteria established by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation for neighborhood intrusion impacts, the Draft EIR concluded that the incremental additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed project on these street segments would not be significant.

It is anticipated that lesser levels of incremental project traffic would utilize others streets in the area (such as Nagle Avenue, Varna Avenue, or the portion of Hillview Park Avenue between Hatteras Street and Fulton Avenue) that are farther from the primary campus access points that were included in the analysis. Therefore, the impacts on streets such as Nagle Avenue would not be significant based on the criteria established by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

Response to Comment C7-2

No response required. Also, see the response to Comment C7-1 above.

Response to Comment C7-3

The comment restates a conclusion of the EIR. No response is required.

Response to Comment C7-4

Please see the response to Comment C7-1.

Response to Comment C7-5

Comment noted. Also see the response to Comment C1-3 for a discussion of the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation process for implementing traffic calming or traffic management measures in local neighborhoods.

Response to Comment C7-6

Please see the response to Comment C7-1 in regards to significance of project traffic impacts on neighborhood streets. Please see the response to Comment C1-3 regarding the process for developing neighborhood traffic management plans.

Response to Comment C7-7

Please see the response to comment C1-3 regarding the process for developing neighborhood traffic management plans.

Response to Comment C7-8

The City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) has a policy to investigate accidents at particular locations when fatality accidents occur or when citizen complaints are received. LADOT was contacted regarding accident investigations at the Fulton Avenue/Oxnard Street and Fulton Avenue/Burbank Boulevard intersections (the intersections at the northwest and southwest corners of the campus referenced in the comment). According to LADOT files, between 1996 and present, no fatality accidents were recorded at the Fulton Avenue/Oxnard Street intersection while one fatality accident occurred (in November 2002) at the Fulton Avenue/Burbank Boulevard intersection. No record of citizen complaints was found in LADOT files for these locations. The investigation into the single fatality accident concluded that a motorist ran the red light and that the cause of the accident was driver error. The lack of other investigations suggests that the accident history at these locations is not out of the ordinary, and there is no particular reason to conclude that minor increases in traffic volumes and minimal impacts on operating conditions caused by the proposed project would lead to an increase in accident frequency or severity.

Additionally, it should be noted that the Master Plan proposes to close the entrance to the campus that is located on Fulton Avenue, just north of Burbank Boulevard. Closure of this entrance would reduce potential conflicts between vehicles using the entrance and motorists traveling through the Fulton Avenue/Burbank Boulevard intersection.

Response to Comment C7-9

Please see the response to Comment C1-3 regarding the process for developing neighborhood traffic management plans.

Response to Comment C7-10

Please see the response to Comment C1-3 regarding the process for developing neighborhood traffic management plans.

Response to Comment C7-11

The intersection analysis in the Draft EIR determined that the Fulton Avenue/Oxnard Street, Fulton Avenue/Hatteras Street, and Fulton Avenue/Burbank Boulevard intersections currently operate and are projected to continue to operate at acceptable levels of service per City of Los Angeles standards. The magnitude of the existing and projected turning volumes at these locations is not sufficiently high as to justify implementation of left-turn arrows.

Response to Comment C7-12

Please see the response to Comment C7-1 in regards to significance of project traffic impacts on neighborhood streets. Please see the response to Comment C1-3 regarding the process for developing neighborhood traffic management plans.

Response to Comment C7-13

The comments in this letter and other letters commenting on the Draft EIR are important to the College and will be considered by the decision making body of the lead agency, i.e., the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District, when considering approval of the proposed Facilities Master Plan. Additionally, the College administration will continue to consider the opinions and concerns of members of the community in which the College is located as implementation of the Master Plan proceeds.

_	Comment Letter 0
L	A Los Angeles
	VC Valley College
Mast discu as a	COMMENTS se use this page to submit your comments on issues to be addressed in the Valley College Facilities ter Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) process. You may answer the questions below or uss any aspect of Draft EIR in which you are interested. We appreciate your comments and suggestions n important part of the process of creating a comprehensive EIR. Your input will become part of the public rd and included in the Final EIR, if submitted by June 16, 2003 (the end of the public comment period).
1.	What environmental issue(s) do you feel have not been considered, or adequately addressed, in the Draft EIR for the proposed Valley College Facilities Master Plan?
2.	Are there existing environmental issues or concerns in or around the Valley College area that you feel should be addressed in the Draft EIR?
3.	I would like more information on the following Draft EIR issue(s):
	When making your comments, please be as specific as possible: C8-1 CONDINATE CONSTRUCTION WITH MTA RAMP BUT C8-2 RIGHT + LEFT ARNOW TURNS ON EHHEL-BURARD KILUHWENKT-SUL HILUHWENKT-SUL C8-2 RIGHT + LEFT ARNOW TURNS ON EHHEL-BURARD C8-2 RIGHT + LEFT ARNOW TURNS ON EHHEL-BURARD C8-2 RIGHT + LEFT ARNOW TURNS ON EHHEL-BURARD C8-3 EACIH MEASUREN 14 MILE WALKENG TERET 2-4 MILES TOTE C8-3 HROUND & THROUGH CAMPUS IE US US (If necessary, please use the reverse side of the paper)
	BUNTON ROSEMW Phone: 7866975
Name: Addre:	12402 = = 0.1251
City:	VAN NUYS State: (7
Pleas	address:
Cindy Los A 5800	v Sardo, Director of Public Relations Angeles Valley College Fulton Ave. y Glen, CA 91401

RESPONSES TO THE 5/7/03 COMMENT SHEET FROM BURTON AND MARSHA ROSEMAN (COMMENT LETTER C8)

Response to Comment C8-1

The College will consult with the MTA to ensure that construction of Master Plan facilities is coordinated with the Bus Rapid Transit project to the extent practicable in order to minimize disruption and disturbances to the campus and surrounding communities.

Response to Comment C8-2

The intersection analysis in the Draft EIR determined that the Ethel Avenue/Burbank Boulevard intersection currently operates and is projected to continue to operate at acceptable levels of service per City of Los Angeles standards. The magnitude of the existing and projected turning volumes at the Ethel Avenue/Burbank Boulevard intersection is not sufficiently high as to justify implementation of right-turn and left-turn arrows.

The Hillview Park Avenue/Fulton Avenue intersection is not controlled by a traffic signal but rather is controlled by a stop sign on the Hillview Park Avenue approach to Fulton Avenue. Right-turn and left-turn arrows would require signalization, which would likely not be approved by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) due to signal spacing and relatively low traffic volumes on Hillview Park Avenue. Signalization of the Hillview Park Avenue/Fulton Avenue intersection could also lead to more use of Hillview Park Avenue by cut-through traffic.

Response to Comment C8-3

Campus-wide site improvements will consider design features that walkers and runners can use to measure travel distances on specific paths or routes.

ΙΔ	Los Ano	alos	
	Los Ang		
	Valley (College	
Master Plan Draf discuss any aspe as an important r	t Environmental Impact R ect of Draft EIR in which yo part of the process of crea	eport (DEIR) process. You m ou are interested. We apprec ting a comprehensive EIR. Y	ed in the Valley College Facilities ay answer the questions below or iate your comments and suggestions our input will become part of the public end of the public comment period).
	nmental issue(s) do you fe proposed Valley College Fa		or adequately addressed, in the Draft
	isting environmental issue ddressed in the Draft EIR?		e Valley College area that you feel
3. I would like	more information on the fo	ollowing Draft EIR issue(s):	1.1
The Call This is W with Cars from Cars from Cars Cors while we ar In my ca	20 110 = / g2.	negry on 219 on ving near the Cally in Drine way, they lat their lunes classes ste. It in front of c	the paper)
			sed in the Draft EIR, please print clearly.
		Phone: 786-7	605-
	8 Hotteros ST		
City: <u>V. M.</u>		State: CH.	Zip: 91401
E-mail address:	D. Tornello @ fo	shoo.com.	
	mments tonight or to the	e following address no late	r than <u>June 16, 2003.</u>

RESPONSES TO THE 5/7/03 COMMENT SHEET FROM DANIEL TORNELLO (COMMENT LETTER C9)

Response to Comment C9-1

The 219 on-street parking spaces discussed in the Draft EIR as spaces available to the College is a count of only those spaces located immediately adjacent to the campus, on the east side of Fulton Avenue along the campus frontage, on the north side of Burbank Boulevard along the campus frontage, on Coldwater Canyon Extension (effectively within the campus), and on the south side of the portion of Hatteras Street between Coldwater Canyon Extension and Ethel Avenue (also effectively within the campus). The 219 figure does <u>not</u> include any parking spaces along the opposite side of Fulton Avenue or Burbank Boulevard adjacent to residential neighborhoods, <u>nor</u> on any residential streets.

The College appreciates the concerns expressed and recommends the commenter contact the local City Council district office and/or the Los Angeles Police Department regarding enforcement of existing permit parking restrictions.

Also, please see the response to Comment C5-1.