

SECTION 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (*California Public Resources Code*, Sections 21000 et seq.) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is a public document designed to provide the lead responsible and interested agencies, special districts, local and State governmental agency decision makers, and the public with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision making.

This Draft EIR has been prepared to identify, analyze, and mitigate, to the extent feasible, the potential environmental effects associated with construction and implementation of the uses allowed by the proposed the Mt. San Antonio College (Mt. SAC or college) 2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (proposed 2018 EFMP). This Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA (*California Public Resources Code*, Sections 21000 et seq.), and the Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines) (Title 14, *California Code of Regulations*, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 et seq.). Mt. SAC is the Lead Agency under CEQA and is responsible for preparing the Draft EIR. The determination that Mt. SAC is the "lead agency" is made in accordance with Sections 15051 and 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which define the lead agency as the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. Further, preparation of this Draft EIR is subject to Section 21080.09(d) of the California Public Resources Code, which requires that public higher education institutions consider the environmental impacts of academic and enrollment plans. The Mt. SAC Board of Trustees (Board) is empowered by the California State Constitution to be the policy-making body of the college, and the Board will ultimately determine whether to approve the proposed 2018 EFMP and certify the Final EIR.

A summary description of the proposed 2018 EFMP, the development that would be allowed by the proposed 2018 EFMP, and implementing actions needed are provided in Section 1.3, Project Description, below. A complete description of the proposed Project is provided in Section 3.0, Project Description.

This Draft EIR serves as the primary environmental document for all entitlements associated with the proposed 2018 EFMP, including all discretionary approvals requested or required to implement the Project, as further discussed in Section 3.6, Intended Uses of this Draft EIR. Proposed Phase 1A and 1B components of the proposed 2018 EFMP, as described in Section 3.0, Project Description, which are anticipated to be constructed over the next few years, are being evaluated in this EIR at a "project level" and include development of the Student Center and Central Campus Infrastructure, Parking Structure R and Tennis Courts, Parking Structure S and West Temple Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, and the Sand Volleyball Courts and Parking Lot W Reconstruction (Phase 1A); and Bookstore (Phase 1B). The proposed Project buildout of Phases 1A, 1B, and 2 of the proposed 2018 EFMP is being evaluated at a "program level". Additional information about the purposes of the Draft EIR is provided in Section 2, Introduction, of this Draft EIR. Mt. SAC has reviewed and revised all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports as needed for consistency with Mt. SAC regulations and policies, and this Draft EIR reflects its own independent judgment. Preparation of this Draft EIR included reliance on appropriate Mt. SAC technical personnel and review of all technical subconsultant reports.

This Executive Summary has been prepared in accordance with Section 15123(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, which states that an EIR should contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences and should identify (1) each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures and alternatives that would reduce or avoid that effect; (2) areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency; and (3) issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and how to mitigate significant effects.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The Mt. San Antonio College (Mt. SAC or college) campus is located in the southeastern part of Los Angeles County in the City of Walnut (refer to Exhibit 3-1, Regional and Local Vicinity Map, in Section 3.0, Project Description of this Draft EIR). The campus encompasses 418.44 acres (comprised of 3 parcels) and is located north and south of Temple Avenue east of Grand Avenue, with the "West Parcel" located west of Grand Avenue and south of Amar Road/Temple Avenue. Mountaineer Road and Edinger Way form the northern boundary of the campus and the eastern boundary is consistent with the City of Walnut's eastern boundary. The California State Polytechnic University (Cal Poly) Pomona is located immediately east of the campus. The Mt. SAC campus is approximately 1.8 miles west of State Route (SR)-57, 1.0 mile south of Interstate (I)-10, and 0.9 mile north of SR-60. Exhibit 3-1 depicts the regional and local vicinity of the campus.

A general description of the current environmental setting for the campus is provided in Section 3.2, Environmental Setting, of this Draft EIR, with more detailed information for each topical issue provided in Sections 4.1 through 4.16). The *Mt. San Antonio College 2012 Facilities Master Plan Campus Final Program EIR* (SCH 2002041161) was certified by the Board of Trustees in December 2013. Subsequently, the Board of Trustees approved the 2015 Facilities Master Plan Update (FMPU) in October 2016. In summary, the campus is currently developed with various educational (e.g., classrooms, class laboratories, athletics facilities) and support uses (offices, library, assembly and meeting rooms, child care, audiovisual, radio and television facilities), as allowed by the 2015 Facilities Master Plan Update (FMPU). Primary educational buildings and uses are located north of Temple Avenue and east of Grand Avenue on approximately 160 acres of gently sloping terrain. Agriculture buildings, facilities, and uses ("The Farm") are located on gently sloping and hilly areas covering approximately 70 acres, at the northeastern section of campus. The 10-acre wildlife sanctuary and an additional 16 acres of open space are located south of Temple Avenue near Grand Avenue, with a surface parking lot and athletic facilities located on a relatively flat 91-acre portion of campus area south of Temple Avenue and east of Grand Avenue. In addition, the southeastern section of campus (approximately 26 acres of hilly terrain) is preserved as a Land Use Management and Grazing Area. The campus areas west of Grand Avenue are undeveloped and include an area preserved as habitat for sensitive plant and animal species.

The City of Walnut filed lawsuits related to the environmental documentation and approval of the Mt. SAC Physical Education Project (PEP) and West Parcel Solar Project. In April 2018, Mt. SAC and the City of Walnut entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that established mutual understanding of the scope of work for the West Parcel, the Stadium (PEP) Project, parking structures, and future projects at Mt. SAC. The MOA is included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR.

As further discussed in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, and Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR, the area occupied by Mt. SAC east of Grand Avenue is zoned as Residential Planned Development (RPD)-61,700-0.6 DU with a Civic Center Overlay and the area west of Grand Avenue and south of Temple Avenue is zoned RPD-28,500-1.3 DU. Per Section 53094 of the California Government Code, Mt. SAC does not have to comply with the zoning regulations of the

City of Walnut since the City's current Planning and Zoning Ordinance does not make specific provisions for the location of public schools. The City is undertaking a zoning consistency process to create an Schools and Public Institutional (SPI) zone that would apply to the Mt. SAC campus and other schools and public institutional uses in the City, consistent with its SPI land use designation in the recently adopted 2018 *City of Walnut General Plan* (WGP), including development standards; permitted, conditionally permitted, and prohibited uses, and other regulations for the SPI zone. Relevant to the proposed 2018 EFMP, the campus area east of Grand Avenue is proposed to be rezoned to SPI. The proposed Zoning Code Amendment (ZCA) and Zone Change (ZC) were recommended by the Walnut Planning Commission to the City Council for approval on September 5, 2018. On January 9, 2019, The ZCA and ZC were presented to the Walnut City Council for review and the Council moved to continue the item until the settlement agreement between Mt. SAC and the City of Walnut is approved and enforceable. At this time the settlement agreement has not been finalized or approved by the governing bodies of Mt. SAC and the City. With adoption of the ZCA and ZC, which involves zoning the portion of the Mt. SAC campus east of Grand Avenue as Schools and Public Institutional zone, Mt. SAC would be required to comply with established zoning regulations. For educational facilities, the Mt. SAC Board of Trustees may exempt Mt. SAC from the City's zoning requirements, pursuant to the provisions of CGC Section 53094(b).

Additionally, as further discussed in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, of this Draft EIR, developed and/or disturbed areas dominate the campus; however, portions of the campus contain naturally vegetated areas. These areas include the Mt. SAC Wildlife Sanctuary, the hills that support running and athletic trails, and the hills leading to the adjacent water storage tanks. The proposed 2018 EFMP would occur in predominantly developed areas that contain sparse, ornamental vegetation subject to heavily landscaped activities. The portions of the proposed Project that will occur in naturally vegetated areas, totaling approximately 105.26 acres, is limited to those areas identified for future development and/or improvements associated with buildout of Phases 1A, 1B and 2 of the proposed 2018 EFMP. One special status plant species was observed during the general survey: southern California black walnut. No special status wildlife species were observed during the general survey.

No jurisdictional waters are anticipated to be impacted. Measures to avoid indirect impacts to any adjacent drainages are discussed in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR.

The campus is expected to support local wildlife movement exclusively, with no potential for regional wildlife movement. Implementation of the proposed 2018 EFMP is not expected to further limit local wildlife movement on site due to the lack of any new substantial obstructions resulting from proposed Project implementation. Indirect effects on movement such as increased night lighting, increased noise, or other increases associated with increased human activity would be considered negligible and unlikely to further degrade the quality of the open spaces on site and other local travel routes used by wildlife in the campus.

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed 2018 EFMP involves facilities and site and infrastructure improvements anticipated to occur with implementation of the proposed 2018 EFMP 10-year horizon period (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2). The proposed Project components include Buildings/Facilities, Vehicular Circulation and Parking, Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation, Open Space, Public Art, Wayfinding/Signage, Lighting, Natural Habitat and Urban Forest, Sustainable Practices/Energy, Utility Infrastructure and Construction Activities.

The proposed 2018 EFMP identifies the framework for the uses and development of land on campus necessary to accommodate an identified level of enrollment and physical development. However, enrollment decisions and the actual implementation of specific capital projects are influenced by multiple factors, including funding decisions, demographics, and other factors external to the proposed 2018 EFMP process. Thus, while the proposed 2018 EFMP identifies the physical resources necessary to meet Mt. SAC's mission and its long-range development plans, it makes no commitments regarding the timing for achieving identified enrollment projections or implementing physical development. The current and proposed Mt. SAC Land Use Plans are shown on Exhibit 3-3 of this Draft EIR. As shown, the proposed Mt. SAC Land Use Plan anticipates future development in six zones on campus: Primary Educational Zone, Athletics and Support Zone, Agricultural Zone, Wildlife Sanctuary/Open Space Zone, Land Management and Athletics Zone, and Agricultural/Sustainable Development Zone. These zones are further described in Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR.

Assumptions regarding the rate of growth and potential phasing of the proposed physical development are presented in Section 3.5.2, Growth Projections, of this Draft EIR for planning and analysis purposes. In summary, the proposed 2018 EFMP generally has a planning horizon of approximately 10 years (through 2027) and anticipates an increase in the unduplicated student headcount from 37,864 students in fall 2017 to between 40,802 and 42,745 students in fall 2027 (based on estimated medium and high growth rates). For analysis purposes, the phases and timeframes are assumed as Phase 1A – 2019 to 2021, Phase 1B – 2022 to 2025, and Phase 2 – 2025 to 2027.

As identified on Table 3-1, 2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan Statistical Summary (Phases 1A, 1B and 2) of this Draft EIR, with implementation of the proposed 2018 EFMP: 33 aged and/or temporary facilities (approximately 207,805 gsf of building space) would be removed/demolished; 13 new buildings (approximately 752,000 gsf), including 10 major buildings would be constructed; up to four parking structures would be constructed; and 9 buildings (405,023 gsf) would be renovated. Therefore, should the proposed 2018 EFMP be fully implemented, there would be approximately 2,474,053 gsf of building space on campus (including the previously approved Physical Education Project [PEP]). This represents a net increase of approximately 766,925 gsf compared to existing conditions when taking into consideration the PEP, and a net increase of approximately 544,195 gsf when considering the proposed development under Phases 1A, 1B and 2 of the proposed 2018 EFMP. The proposed 2018 Facilities Master Plan is presented in Exhibit 3-4 of this Draft EIR.

The proposed 2018 EFMP identifies vehicular circulation, parking, and non-vehicular circulation improvements for the campus. The recommended approach for additional parking includes improving existing surface parking lots to increase capacity and circulation flow and building up to four new parking structures. The recommended approach to on-campus vehicular circulation keeps vehicles on the outer portions of campus, thus helping to separate pedestrian and vehicular circulation and reserve the academic core of campus for pedestrians. Improvements to campus vehicular circulation, emergency/service access, campus parking (surface and parking structures), bicycle circulation, and pedestrian circulation (including pedestrian bridges) are described in Sections 3.5.4 and 3.5.5 of this Draft EIR.

In addition to the demolition and renovation of existing buildings, construction of new buildings, and parking and circulation components, implementation of the proposed 2018 EFMP would include athletic facilities, enhanced open space areas and public art, implementation of an Urban Forest Initiative, infrastructure improvements, and utility infrastructure and roadway improvements at the Farm Precinct.

Further, as described in Section 3.5.8, Sustainability Practices/Energy of this Draft EIR, the Mt. SAC Board of Trustees adopted the 2018 Climate Action Plan (2018 CAP) to guide the campus towards becoming a more sustainable institution, and to prepare students to engage in finding solutions to the college's environmental challenges. The 2018 CAP articulates the vision, goals, and strategies which will move Mt. SAC to become a sustainable campus with net-zero carbon emissions and has been developed in coordination with campus stakeholders to ensure that it meets the various needs of the campus. In addition to compliance with applicable goals set forth in the 2018 CAP, Mt. SAC has committed to the sustainable strategies/practices during the 10-year planning period for the proposed 2018 EFMP.

As discussed previously, certain projects in Phases 1A and 1B are being evaluated at a "project-specific level" as described in Section 3.0, Project Description of this Draft EIR, and include development of the Student Center and Central Campus Infrastructure, Parking Structure R and Tennis Courts, Parking Structure S and West Temple Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, and Sand Volleyball Courts and Parking Lot W Reconstruction (Phase 1A); and Bookstore (Phase 1B). Impacts resulting from construction and operation of the proposed 2018 EFMP as a long-range planning and development plan at a "program level" (Phases 1A, 1B and 2), including components that were included in previous Facilities Master Plans but not yet implemented.

As further discussed in Section 2, Introduction of this Draft EIR, it is not anticipated that Phase 3 components of the proposed 2018 EFMP would be built during the 10-year horizon period; therefore, they are not being evaluated in this Draft EIR. Implementation of Phase 3 components of the proposed 2018 EFMP would be subject to separate environmental review pursuant to CEQA; however, they are considered in the cumulative impacts analysis in this Draft EIR and are described in Section 4.0, Introduction to the Environmental Analyses, of this Draft EIR.

1.4 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires an evaluation of the comparative effects of a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Project that would feasibly attain most of the proposed 2018 EFMP's basic objectives and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed Project (Title 14, *California Code of Regulations* [CCR] Section 15126.6). A feasible alternative is one that can be accomplished successfully in a reasonable period of time, taking economic, legal, social, and technological factors into consideration (14 CCR 15126.6). The range of alternatives is governed by the "rule of reason" that requires the Draft EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasonable choice.

Section 5.0, Alternatives, of this Draft EIR, addresses alternatives to reduce the proposed 2018 EFMP's potential impacts that have been identified as significant and unavoidable. Specifically, these include impacts related to Cultural Resources and Transportation/Traffic. Section 5.0 provides descriptions of each alternative, a comparative analysis of the potential environmental effects of each alternative to those associated with the proposed 2018 EFMP, and a discussion of each alternative's ability to meet the proposed Project objectives. The following is a summary description of the alternatives evaluated in this Draft EIR.

- **No Project/No Development.** This alternative assumes that no additional development would occur at the Mt. SAC campus. This No Project alternative is evaluated in accordance with Section 15126.6(e)(3).
- **Medium Growth Rate Alternative.** The purpose of this alternative is primarily to reduce the amount of traffic generated by the proposed 2018 EFMP. As discussed in Section 3.0, Project Description, Mt. SAC projects that its annual growth rate will range between 0.18 and 1.22 percent, with a mid-point of 0.75 percent. For purposes of analysis, this Draft

EIR analyzes the high growth rate of 1.22 percent, therefore this alternative involves implementation of the proposed 2018 EFMP based on a medium growth rate of 0.75 percent. As noted in Table 3-2 of the Project Description, the full-time equivalent students (FTES) is projected to increase from 13,185 during the fall semester of 2017 to 14,237 FTES under the medium growth rate, compared to 15,055 students under a high growth rate in the fall semester of 2027. The unduplicated headcount is projected to increase from 37,864 students (during the fall semester of 2017) to 40,802 students under a medium growth rate, compared to 42,745 students under a high growth rate in the fall semester of 2027. Under this alternative, the increase in daily traffic resulting from the proposed Project for the 2027 horizon year would be reduced from 5,613 daily trips with the proposed 2018 EFMP, to approximately 3,379 daily trips.

The Medium Growth Rate Alternative would continue to construct new and renovate existing buildings and structures, thus resulting in a similar impact footprint. The primary difference in anticipated projects would be the need for less parking which could result in smaller structures or elimination of one or more parking structures.

As required by CEQA, Section 5.0 also identifies alternatives considered but eliminated from the detailed analysis and the environmentally superior alternative. Alternatives that were considered and eliminated from detailed analysis include: Alternative Site, Mt. SAC Historic District Retention, and 2015 Facilities Master Plan Update.

1.5 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that a Draft EIR contain issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With respect to the proposed 2018 EFMP, the major issues to be resolved by Mt. SAC, as the Lead Agency, include the following:

- Whether this environmental document adequately describes the environmental impacts of the proposed 2018 EFMP.
- Whether the recommended mitigation measures and proposed Project design features should be modified and/or adopted.
- Whether the benefits of the proposed Project override its significant adverse impacts, including impacts that cannot be mitigated to a level below significance after adoption of feasible mitigation measures.
- Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the proposed 2018 EFMP besides those identified in the Draft EIR.
- Whether there are any alternatives to the proposed Project that would substantially lessen any of its significant impacts while achieving most of the basic project objectives.

1.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Section 15123(b)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a Draft EIR summary should identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. This Draft EIR has taken into consideration the comments received from the public and various agencies in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of this Draft EIR and through the scoping process. Written comments received during the NOP and scoping period are contained in Appendix A. Environmental issues that have been raised during opportunities for public input regarding the scope of the Draft EIR are summarized in Section 2.5, Public Review

Process, of this Draft EIR and are addressed in each relevant environmental issue area analyzed in Sections 4.1 through 4.16 of this Draft EIR.

It should also be noted that during the NOP public review period, Mt. SAC received a consultation request pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation.

The primary areas of controversy currently known to Mt. SAC that have been raised to date related to the implementation of the proposed 2018 EFMP are related to excavation and construction activities, traffic (construction and operation), and parking and circulation (including pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular). The recommended facilities and site and infrastructure improvements anticipated to occur with implementation of the proposed 2018 EFMP including construction activities, are described in Section 3.0, Project Description. Construction activities as they pertain to specific environmental topics are discussed for each topical issue in Sections 4.1 through 4.16. Potential traffic and parking impacts (including pedestrian and vehicular circulation) are addressed in Section 4.14, noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.11, and lighting impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Aesthetics.

1.7 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FROM THE PROJECT

Pursuant to Sections 15126.2 and 15126.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Draft EIR is required to identify any potentially significant adverse impacts and recommend mitigation that would eliminate or reduce these impacts to levels of less than significant. At the onset of the CEQA process, Mt. SAC determined that an EIR is required for the proposed 2018 EFMP and, as allowed by CEQA, did not prepare an Initial Study (refer to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15060 and 15081). It was determined that, with the exception of agricultural resources (Farmland), forestry resources, and mineral resources, which do not exist on campus, implementation of the proposed 2018 EFMP could have potentially significant impacts for each of the remaining topical environmental issues identified in the environmental checklist included in Appendix G to the State CEQA Guidelines. This Draft EIR focuses on those remaining environmental impact resource areas that are identified in the environmental checklist included in Appendix G to the State CEQA Guidelines. The scope of the Draft EIR was further determined based upon comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), and comments received at the public scoping meeting held by Mt. SAC. Based on the determination by Mt. SAC and input received during the scoping process, the environmental issue areas identified for study in this Draft EIR are:

- Aesthetics,
- Air Quality,
- Biological Resources,
- Cultural Resources,
- Energy
- Geology and Soils,
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions,
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials and Wildfire
- Hydrology and Water Quality,
- Land Use and Planning,
- Noise,
- Population and Housing,
- Public Services and Recreation,
- Transportation/Traffic,
- Tribal Cultural Resources, and
- Utilities and Service Systems.

Sections 4.1 through 4.16 of this Draft EIR provide the required environmental analysis for these topical issues. Table 1-1 presents a summary of the thresholds analyzed; environmental impacts of the proposed 2018 EFMP; project-specific Mitigation Measures (MMs) that reduce any potentially significant impacts; and the level of significance of each impact after mitigation. Significant irreversible environmental changes and growth-inducing impacts, are addressed in Section 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations.

If Mt. SAC, as Lead Agency, determines that unavoidable significant adverse impacts will result from the proposed 2018 EFMP, Mt. SAC must prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations before it can approve the proposed Project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations states that the decision-making body has balanced the benefits of the proposed 2018 EFMP against its unavoidable significant environmental effects and has determined that the benefits of the proposed Project outweigh the adverse effects and, therefore, the adverse effects are considered to be acceptable. Based on the analysis presented in the Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed 2018 EFMP (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2) would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to cultural resources and transportation/traffic. A Statement of Overriding Considerations would be required for the proposed 2018 EFMP.

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION**

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Section 4.1 – Aesthetics				
Threshold 1.1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2) Less than significant Project Specific Less than significant.
Threshold 1.2: Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	No impact	No impact	No mitigation is required.	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2) No impact Project Specific No impact
Threshold 1.3: Would the project in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2) Less than significant Project Specific Less than significant.
Threshold 1.4: Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	MM AES-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the City that the contractor specifications require any temporary nighttime lighting installed during construction for security or any other purpose be downward-facing and hooded or shielded to prevent light from spilling outside the staging area and from directly broadcasting security light into the sky or onto adjacent residential properties. Compliance with this measure shall be verified by the City's Building and Safety Department during inspections of the construction site.	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2) Less than significant Project Specific Less than significant.
Section 4.2 – Air Quality				
Threshold 2.1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	MM AQ-1 All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) shall meet Tier 4 final off-road emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices certified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Any emissions-control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Threshold 2.2: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<u>Construction Emissions</u> Potentially significant <u>Operational Emissions</u> Less than significant	<u>Construction Emissions</u> Potentially significant <u>Operational Emissions</u> Less than significant	Please refer to MM AQ-1 above.	Less than significant
Threshold 2.3: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Section 4.3 – Biological Resources				
Threshold 3.1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	MM BIO-1 Focused special status plant surveys will be conducted in habitat suitable for special status plant species in the survey area within two years prior to any ground disturbance at that location. Focused surveys shall be conducted by qualified Biologists and shall be conducted per the most current CNPS protocol and during the appropriate blooming period for each potentially occurring special status plant species. If special status plant species are not found within the proposed Project impact area, no further mitigation would be required. If special status plant species are detected within impact areas, an Avoidance and Mitigation Plan will be developed and implemented by Mt. SAC prior to project implementation. The Avoidance and Mitigation Plan would include on-site translocation of any bulbs of special status plant species within the impact area. MM BIO-2 During grading and construction activities, should any southern California black walnut tree be impacted, including trimming greater than one-quarter of a tree's canopy, significant digging or trenching within the tree's dripline, or tree removal, the impacts shall be mitigated according to the Mt. SAC California Black Walnut Management Plan (Helix 2012). At a minimum, the loss of any southern California black walnut trees resulting from the project shall be replaced in the designated on-site conservation area at a ratio of 1:1 for each tree with a trunk greater than 6 inches in diameter at breast height and at a higher replacement ratio for smaller trees. MM BIO-3 No project-related activities shall result in the failure of a nest protected under the conditions set forth in the <i>California Fish and Game Code</i> . The nature of the project may require that work would be initiated during the breeding season for nesting birds (March 15–September 15) and nesting raptors (February 1–June 30). To avoid direct impacts on active nests, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist for nesting birds and/or raptors within three days prior to clearing of any vegetation or any work near existing structures (i.e., within 50 feet for nesting birds and within 500 feet for nesting raptors). If the Biologist does not find any active nests within or immediately adjacent to the impact area, the vegetation clearing/construction work shall be allowed to proceed.	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
			If the Biologist finds an active nest within or immediately adjacent to the construction area and determines that the nest may be impacted or breeding activities substantially disrupted, the Biologist shall delineate an appropriate buffer zone (at a minimum of 25 feet) around the nest depending on the sensitivity of the species and the nature of the construction activity. Any nest found during survey efforts shall be mapped on the construction plans. The active nest shall be protected until nesting activity has ended. To protect any nest site, the following restrictions to construction activities shall be required until nests are no longer active, as determined by a qualified Biologist: (1) clearing limits shall be established within a buffer around any occupied nest (the buffer shall be 25–100 feet for nesting birds and 300–500 feet for nesting raptors), unless otherwise determined by a qualified Biologist; and (2) access and surveying shall be restricted within the buffer of any occupied nest, unless otherwise determined by a qualified Biologist. Encroachment into the buffer area around a known nest shall only be allowed if the Biologist determines that the proposed activity would not disturb the nest occupants. Construction can proceed when the qualified Biologist has determined that fledglings have left the nest or the nest has failed.	
Threshold 3.2: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Please refer to MMs BIO-1 through BIO-3 above.	Less than significant.
Threshold 3.3: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 3.4: Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 3.5: Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Please refer to MM BIO-2 above.	Less than significant
Threshold 3.6: Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Section 4.4 – Cultural Resources				
Threshold 4.1: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	MM CULT-1 Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation shall be implemented to reduce the significant impact on contributing resources to the Mt. SAC Historic District. An augment to the prior HABS documentation package shall be prepared to include all contributing resources within the Historic District not previously recorded. Specifically HABS documentation shall be prepared for Buildings 4, 7, 10, 11, 19A, 26A, 26B, 26C, 26D, 47, 48, F1, F2A, F2B, F3A, F4A, F5A, F7, G2, and the Wildlife Sanctuary: HABS Level II Narrative Historical Report. As HABS documentation has been prepared for the historic district, this report would serve as an addendum to the extant documentation prepared consistent with <i>Historic American Buildings Survey Guidelines for Historical Reports</i> (National Park Service 2007). Prior to the demolition or renovation of resources contributing to the Mt. SAC Historic District, the college shall enlist the services of a qualified architectural historian to prepare an Addendum HABS Narrative Historical Report as well as California Department of Parks and Recreation (CA DPR) 523 forms that documents all contributing resources that were not previously documented. Documentation through HABS is an important measure because it allows documentation of the resource before alterations begin. Given the relative historic significance of the resources, Level II HABS is the recommended documentation standard, to be prepared in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation and HABS specific guidelines. A narrative historical report following the <i>Historic American Buildings Survey Guidelines for Historical Reports</i> (National Park Service 2007) should be prepared for the adversely impacted resources. All historic documents shall be made available to the public in the collection of the College's Library/Learning Technology Center. Facilities Planning & Management shall ensure compliance. HABS Level II Large-format Photographs. A qualified HABS photographer shall provide photo-documentation that documents all contributing resources that were not previously documented. The photo-documentation shall be made available to the public in the collection of the College's Library/Learning Technology Center. The documentation shall be done in accordance with the Guidelines provided in the <i>Photographic Specifications: Historic American Building Survey, Historic American Engineering Record, Division of National Register Programs, National Park Service, Western Region</i>. Mt. SAC Facilities Planning & Management shall ensure compliance.	<u>2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)</u> Significant and unavoidable <u>Project Specific</u> Significant and unavoidable for Student Center and Central Campus Infrastructure and Bookstore Less than significant for Parking Structure R and Tennis Courts and Sand Volleyball Courts and Parking Lot W Reconstruction

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
			HABS Level II Reproduction of select existing drawings (if available) The college shall prepare archivally stable reproduction of original as-built drawings for all contributors that were not previously included in the HABS documentation. Reproductions of drawings shall be done in accordance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation</i>. Select existing drawings, where available, may be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar or Vellum in accordance with the U.S. Copyright Act, as amended. Mt. SAC's Facilities Planning & Management shall ensure compliance. MM CULT-2 Prior to demolition of any additional buildings that are contributors to the Mt. SAC Historic District, to recognize the history of Mt. SAC, interpretive sign(s) shall be established in one or adjacent to one of the major buildings in the historical heart of the campus, such as the new Library/Learning Resources or Student Center. The interpretative panels could utilize information from the HABS Level II Narrative Historical Report and large-format photographic documentation, as well as historical views of the campus. Mt. SAC Facilities Planning & Management shall ensure compliance.	
Threshold 4.2: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	MM CULT-3 Prior to initiation of grading activities, the following requirements shall be incorporated on the cover sheet of the Grading Plan under the general heading "Conditions of Approval": - A qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Professional Qualifications in Archaeology (Archaeologist) shall be present at the pre-grade meeting to consult with the Contractor and other consultants prior to the start of earth-moving activities. - During construction grading and site preparation activities, the Contractor shall monitor all construction activities. In the event that cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and/or isolated artifacts) are discovered, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery and the Contractor shall inform the Mt. SAC Project Manager. The Archaeologist shall analyze the significance of the discovery and recommend further appropriate measures to reduce further impacts on archaeological resources. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. Facilities Planning & Management shall monitor compliance.	Less than significant.
Threshold 4.3: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Section 4.5 – Energy				
Threshold 5.1: Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 5.2: Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Section 4.6 – Geology and Soils				
Threshold 6.1(i): Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	No impact	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
Threshold 6.1(ii): Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	MM GEO-1 Prior to the approval of project plans by the Division of the State Architect (DSA), a site-specific geotechnical study shall be prepared for each proposed structure. The Geotechnical Report shall be prepared by a registered Civil Engineer or certified Engineering Geologist and shall contain site-specific evaluations of the seismic and geologic hazards affecting the project and shall identify recommendations for earthwork and construction. All recommendations from forthcoming site-specific geotechnical studies shall be included in the site preparation and building design specifications. Compliance with this requirement shall be verified by the DSA as part of the project certification process, which includes review and approval of the site-specific geotechnical studies by the California Geological Survey (CGS). MM GEO-2 Prior to the approval of project plans by the Division of the State Architect (DSA), recommendations from the Geotechnical Study Report Proposed Parking Structure at Parking Lot S Mt. San Antonio College Walnut, California (October 23, 2017), Geotechnical Study Report Proposed Student Center Building Mt. San Antonio College 1100 North Grand Avenue Walnut, California 91789 (October 5, 2017), and Geotechnical Study Report Proposed Lot R Tennis and Parking Structure Mt. San Antonio College 1100 North Grand Avenue Walnut, California (December 1, 2017) prepared by Converse Consultants shall be included in the site preparation and building design specifications. Compliance with this requirement shall be verified by the DSA as part of the project certification process.	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Threshold 6.1(iii): Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Potentially significant	<u>Bookstore, Parking Structure R and Tennis Courts, Parking Structure S and West Temple Avenue Bridge</u> Potentially significant <u>Student Center and Central Campus Infrastructure</u> Less than significant	Please refer to MMs GEO-1 and GEO-2 above.	Less than significant
Threshold 6.1(iv): Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Please refer to MMs GEO-1 and GEO-2 above. MM GEO-3 In accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Mt. San Antonio Community College District and the City of Walnut, grading and drainage plans for all future Mt. SAC exempt education facilities shall be subject to administrative review and approval by the City of Walnut's Building Official.	Less than significant
Threshold 6.2: Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	Please refer to MM GEO-3 above. MM HYD-2 Prior to the issuance of a grading permits for the Bookstore, Sand Volleyball Courts and Parking Lot W Reconstruction, Parking Structure R and Tennis Courts, Parking Structure S and West Temple Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, and Student Center and Central Campus Infrastructure projects, recommendations from the <i>Preliminary Low Impact Development Report (LID) For Mt SAC Parking Structure [S]</i> (September 14, 2018) prepared by BkF, <i>Preliminary Low Impact Development Report (LID) For Mt. SAC Student Center</i> (September 27, 2018) prepared by BkF, and <i>Storm Water Low Impact Development (LID) Report Athletic Complex East Storm Water Improvements</i> (August 30, 2018) prepared by Psomas shall be included in the site preparation and building design specifications.	Less than significant
Threshold 6.3: Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	Potentially significant	<u>Bookstore and restroom building associated with Sand Volleyball Courts and Parking Lot W Reconstruction</u> Potentially significant <u>Student Center and Central Campus Infrastructure, Parking Structure R and Tennis Courts, and Parking Structure S and West Temple Avenue Pedestrian Bridge</u> Less than significant	Please refer to MMs GEO-1 through GEO-3 above.	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures (MMs)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Threshold 6.4: Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the <i>Uniform Building Code</i> (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	Potentially significant	<u>Structure R and Tennis Courts, Parking Structure S and West Temple Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, and Bookstore</u> Potentially significant <u>Student Center and Central Campus Infrastructure, Sand Volleyball Courts and Parking Lot W Reconstruction</u> Less than significant	Please refer to MMs GEO-1 and GEO-2 above.	Less than significant
Threshold 6.5: Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	No impact	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
Threshold 6.6: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	Potentially significant	<u>Student Center, Bookstore, and Parking Structure S and Pedestrian Bridge</u> Potentially significant <u>Parking Structure R and Tennis Courts and Sand Volleyball Courts and Parking Lot W Reconstruction</u> Less than significant	MM GEO-4 Prior to initiation of grading activities, the following requirements shall be incorporated on the cover sheet of the Grading Plan under the general heading "Conditions of Approval": a. A qualified Paleontologist and Paleontological Monitor shall be present at the pre-grade meeting to consult with the grading contractor and other consultants prior to the start of earth-moving activities. At the meeting, the Paleontologist shall establish procedures for paleontological resources surveillance based on the location and depths of paleontologically sensitive sediments, and shall establish, in cooperation the Mt. SAC Project Manager, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of the fossils as appropriate. b. A qualified Paleontological Monitor shall be present at the site when grading and excavation in paleontologically sensitive sediments (Puente Formation and Quaternary older alluvial fan deposits). Paleontological monitoring is not required in areas where excavation occurs within fill soils. c. The Monitor shall have the authority to temporarily direct, divert, or halt grading to allow recovery of paleontological resources. In areas rich in micro-vertebrates, collection of large bulk samples of matrix for later water screening to recover small bones and teeth shall be part of the paleontological salvage program. d. Fossils recovered from this project shall be cleaned, stabilized, identified, and documented. A report on the paleontological resources recovered from the parcels shall be prepared by the Paleontologist and submitted to Mt. SAC Facilities Planning & Management.	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
			e. Fossils with their contextual data must be deposited at a recognized museum or institution.	
Section 4.7 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
Threshold 7.1: Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	MM GHG-1 All major capital projects (10,000 square feet and above) shall be designed to outperform Title 24, Part 6, Energy Efficiency Standards, by a minimum of 15%.	Less than significant
Threshold 7.2: Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gas emissions?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Section 4.8 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials and Wildfire				
Threshold 8.1: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 8.2: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
Threshold 8.3: Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 8.4: Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 8.5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	No impact	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
Threshold 8.6: Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Threshold 8.7: Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires? Threshold 8.8: Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Threshold 8.9: Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? Threshold 8.10: Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? Threshold 8.11: Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslide, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	No impact	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
Section 4.9 – Hydrology and Water Quality				
Threshold 9.1: Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	MM HYD-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, Mt. SAC shall ensure preparation of a site-specific hydrologic evaluation for each proposed development project based on the project-specific grading plan and site design of each individual project. This evaluation shall include, but not be limited to: (1) an assessment of runoff quality, volume, and flow rate from the proposed Project site; (2) identification of project-specific BMPs (structural and non-structural) to reduce the runoff rate and volume to appropriate levels; and (3) identification of the need for new or upgraded storm drain infrastructure (on and off campus) to serve the project. Project design shall include measures to upgrade and expand campus storm drain capacity where necessary, as identified through the project-specific hydrologic evaluation. Design of future projects shall include measures to reduce runoff, including, but not limited to, the provision of permeable landscaped areas adjacent to structures to absorb runoff and the use of pervious or semi-pervious paving materials. All recommendations from forthcoming site-specific hydrologic evaluations shall be included in the site preparation and building design specifications. MM HYD-2 Prior to the issuance of a grading permits for the Bookstore, Sand Volleyball Courts and Parking Lot W Reconstruction, Parking Structure R and Tennis Courts, Parking Structure S and West Temple Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, and Student Center and Central Campus Infrastructure projects, recommendations from the <i>Preliminary Low Impact Development Report (LID) For Mt SAC Parking Structure [S]</i> (September 14, 2018) prepared by BkF, <i>Preliminary Low Impact Development Report (LID) For Mt. SAC Student Center</i> (September 27, 2018) prepared by BkF, and <i>Storm Water Low Impact Development (LID) Report Athletic Complex East Storm Water Improvements</i> (August 30, 2018) prepared by Psomas shall be included in the site preparation and building design specifications.	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Threshold 9.2: Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 9.3(i): Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site? Threshold 9.3(ii): Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site? Threshold 9.3(iii): Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? Threshold 9.3(iv): Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 9.4: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 9.5: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Section 4.10 – Land Use and Planning				
Threshold 10.1: Would the proposed project physically divide an established community?	No impact	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
Threshold 10.2: Would the proposed project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Section 4.11 – Noise				
Threshold 11.1: Would the project generate substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	Potentially significant	Less than significant	MM NOI-1 Prior to the first grading permit, the Project Applicant shall prepare a Construction Noise Management Plan to ensure that noise levels from project-related construction activities do not exceed 65 dBA L_{eq} at off-campus uses. The Construction Noise Management Plan shall identify which construction areas could be developed concurrently such that noise from these project areas do not exceed the established noise limit. The Construction Noise Management Plan shall identify measures to reduce construction related noise to off-campus uses, including, but not limited to: 1. Use of erected sound barriers or existing structures to minimize noise transmission. 2. Phasing of construction activities at project areas such that noisier construction phases shall not occur concurrently. 3. Phasing of concurrent project areas such that multiple construction areas shall not be located in close proximity to the same offsite use.	Less than significant
Threshold 11.2: Would the generate substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 11.3: Would the project generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 11.4: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No impact	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
Section 4.12 – Population and Housing				
Threshold 12.1: Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through the extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 12.2: Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No impact	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
Section 4.13 – Public Services and Recreation				
Threshold 13.1: Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Threshold 13.2: Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 13.3: Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 13.4: Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for other public facilities?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 13.5: Would the proposed project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 13.6: Would the proposed project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Section 4.14 – Transportation/Traffic				
Threshold 14.1: Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities paths?	<u>Existing Plus Project</u> Potentially significant <u>Interim Year 2021 Cumulative Plus Project</u> Potentially significant <u>Buildout Year 2027 Cumulative Plus Project</u> Potentially significant <u>Construction-Related Traffic</u> Potentially significant	<u>Existing Plus Project</u> Potentially significant <u>Interim Year 2021 Cumulative Plus Project</u> Potentially significant <u>Buildout Year 2027 Cumulative Plus Project</u> Potentially significant <u>Construction-Related Traffic</u> Potentially significant	MM TRA-1 Prior to the completion of new construction under the proposed 2018 EFMP, Mt. SAC shall be responsible for fair share contributions towards the installation of the following improvements: 4. Temple Avenue and Grand Avenue - Convert the eastbound right turn lane to a shared thru-right turn lane. This will not require any physical reconstruction but will require additional striping to provide a third eastbound thru lane on the east leg of the intersection. - Convert the westbound right turn lane to a shared thru-right turn lane. This will not require any physical reconstruction but will require additional striping to provide a third westbound thru lane on the west leg of the intersection. 9. Temple Avenue and University Drive - Convert the westbound right turn lane to a shared thru-right turn lane. This will not require any physical reconstruction but will require additional striping to	<u>Existing Plus Project</u> Significant and unavoidable <u>Interim Year 2021 Cumulative Plus Project</u> Significant and unavoidable <u>Buildout Year 2027 Cumulative Plus Project</u> Significant and unavoidable <u>Construction-Related Traffic</u> Less than significant

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
			provide a third westbound thru lane on the west leg of the intersection. 10. Temple Avenue and Campus Drive - Convert the westbound right turn lane to a shared thru-right turn lane. This will not require any physical reconstruction but will require additional striping to provide a third westbound thru lane on the west leg of the intersection. 11. Kellogg Drive and Campus Drive - Convert the shared eastbound thru-right turn lane to an exclusive right turn lane. This will only require restriping on the eastbound approach. 12. Temple Avenue and Valley Boulevard - Add a second northbound left turn lane. This will require restriping of both the north and south legs of the intersection (no physical reconstruction) and may result in the loss of some parking spaces along Valley Boulevard, south of Temple Avenue. 13. Temple Avenue and Pomona Boulevard - Convert the southbound lanes to provide two exclusive left turn lanes and a shared thru-right turn lane. This will require restriping on the southbound approach and the removal of the existing "right lane must turn right" and "right turn only" signs. 18. Holt Avenue and Grand Avenue - Convert the southbound right turn lane to a shared thru-right turn lane. This will require additional striping on the south leg to either extend the right turn lane at Virginia Avenue north to Holt Avenue to act as a trap right turn lane (where drivers in that lane will be forced to turn right at Virginia Avenue), or to convert the lane to a shared thru-right turn lane at Virginia Avenue. Some physical improvements, including the removal of the existing raised median island and relocation of the signal pole, will also be needed for the northwest corner of the Holt Avenue/Grand Avenue intersection. 21. Cameron Avenue and Grand Avenue - Add a second eastbound right turn lane. This will only require restriping and will not require any physical improvements. 22. Mountaineer Road and Grand Avenue - This intersection already includes dual southbound and westbound left turn lanes, dual westbound right turn lanes, and a northbound (de-facto) right turn	

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
			lane. To mitigate the impacts, a northbound through lane would need to be added on Grand Avenue, which is not feasible due to right-of-way constraints. 23. San Jose Hills Road and Grand Avenue - Convert the westbound thru lane to a shared thru-left turn lane. This will only require striping, no physical reconstruction. - Convert the northbound right turn lane to a shared thru-right turn lane. This will not require any physical reconstruction but will require additional striping to provide a third northbound thru lane on the north leg of the intersection. 24. La Puente Road and Grand Avenue - Modify the signal phasing to include an eastbound right turn overlap. MM TRA-2 Prior to the completion of new construction under the proposed 2018 EFMP, Mt. SAC shall be responsible for fair share contributions towards the installation of the following improvements: 1. Amar Road and Nogales Street - Convert the eastbound right turn lane to a shared thru-right turn lane. This will not require any physical reconstruction but will require additional striping to provide a third eastbound thru lane on the east leg of the intersection. 5. Temple Avenue and Mt. SAC Way - Convert the westbound right turn lane to a shared thru-right turn lane. This will not require any physical reconstruction but will require additional striping to provide a third westbound thru lane on the west leg of the intersection. MM TRA-3: Construction contractors shall submit an application for a truck hauling plan to the City of Walnut for review and approval prior to the start of any grading, demolition, or construction activities, in compliance with Title 2, Chapter 2.40, Hauling of Earth Materials, of the Walnut Municipal Code. The contractor shall comply with the conditions of the permit, including designated haul routes, time limits for hauling operations, debris on City roadways, temporary signage requirements, and other restrictions. MM TRA-4: Construction contractors shall submit traffic control plans and other construction documents that show compliance with the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook (WATCH) to Mt. SAC Facilities Planning and Management. The Traffic Control Plan shall be implemented by the contractor throughout the construction phase of each project. This shall include the use of signs and flag persons during truck hauling activities and heavy equipment movement outside	

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
			the construction site and notification of the City of Walnut, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department of planned changes in vehicle circulation patterns, street closures, detours, parking, and other traffic and access issues. MM TRA-5: For any construction work on public rights-of-way, the contractor shall obtain an encroachment permit from the City of Walnut and shall comply with the conditions of the permit, including restoration of roadways and public improvements, time limits for construction, debris on City roadways, and other restrictions. MM TRA-6: For any temporary street, sidewalk, walkway, and/or bike lane closure, the construction contractor shall submit plans to Mt. SAC Facilities Planning and Management to maintain pedestrian access on adjacent sidewalks and ensure vehicle, pedestrian, and bicyclist safety along the construction site perimeter and along construction equipment and haul routes on campus. MM TRA-7: Construction staging areas and construction worker parking areas shall be designated at specific locations on campus and not on public rights-of-way or internal roads, sidewalks, walkways and bike paths/bike lanes, as approved by Mt. SAC Facilities Planning and Management. MM TRA-8: Construction sites shall be surrounded by temporary fencing to secure construction equipment, prevent vehicle and pedestrian access and trespassing, and reduce hazards during grading, demolition, or construction activities.	
Threshold 14.2: Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 13.3: Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 13.4: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	Please refer to MMs TRA-3 through TRA-8 above.	Less than significant
4.15 Tribal Cultural Resources				
Threshold 15.1: Would the project Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	No impact	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact

TABLE 1-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION,
AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Thresholds of Significance	Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures [MMs]	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Phases 1A, 1B, and 2)	Project-Specific		
Threshold 15.2: Would the project Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	MM TCR-1 Tribal Cultural Resources Monitoring. Prior to the commencement of any grading activities in which native soil is disturbed, Mt. SAC shall ensure that a Native American monitor has been retained to observe grading activities in native sediment and to salvage and catalogue tribal cultural resources as necessary. The Native American monitor shall be present at the pre-grading conference, shall establish procedures for tribal cultural resource surveillance, and shall establish, in cooperation with Mt. SAC, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of the tribal cultural resource as appropriate. If the tribal cultural resources are found to be significant, the Native American observer shall determine appropriate actions, in cooperation with Mt. SAC for exploration and/or recovery.	
Section 4.16 – Utilities and Service Systems				
Threshold 16.1: Would the proposed project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment facilities or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 16.2: Would the project have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 16.3: Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 16.4: Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goal?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant
Threshold 16.5: Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation is required	Less than significant

This page intentionally left blank