

CHAPTER 5 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 CCR 15128) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) briefly describe potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant, and therefore, were not discussed in detail in the EIR. The environmental issues discussed in the following sections are not considered significant, and the reasons for the conclusion of non-significance are discussed below.

This chapter includes the following other considerations that are required in an EIR:

- Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts (Section 5.1)
- Significant and Irreversible Environmental Effects (Section 5.2)
- Growth Inducement (Section 5.3)
- Effects Found Not to Be Significant (Section 5.4).

5.1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Implementation of the project-specific mitigation measures identified in the analysis in Chapter 4, Introduction to Environmental Analysis, would reduce all significant impacts to below a level of significance, with the exception of the significant impact due to the loss of historical resources. The demolition of any of the buildings, features, and landscape elements that comprise the Cypress College Historic District would result in a substantial adverse change to the historic property (the historic district) and the environment. Therefore, the measures outlined for documentation of the historic district are important to ensure that information regarding the historical development of the college campus, its association with architects William E. Blurock and Caudill Rowlett Scott Architects, and its physical manifestation of Brutalist-style educational facilities are documented, retained, and archived. The impact to the Cypress College Historic District cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

5.2 SIGNIFICANT AND IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) mandate that an EIR must address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from the Facilities Master Plan (proposed project) should it be implemented. An impact would fall into this category if (14 CCR 15126(c)):

- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources.

- The primary and secondary impacts of the project would generally commit future generations of people to similar uses.
- The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result.
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project results in wasteful use of energy).

Determining whether the proposed project may result in significant and irreversible effects requires a determination of whether key resources would be degraded or destroyed in such a way that there would be little possibility of restoring them.

Intensification of Land Use

As a result of implementation of the proposed project, some of the existing structures on the Cypress College campus would be demolished, renovated, or vacated to permit the redevelopment/construction of more intensive land uses, academic programs, and student services. Redevelopment of the campus to accommodate these more intensive land uses would result in further urbanization of the area and would represent a long-term commitment to an increasingly dense urban environment. Part of the proposed project is to improve integration of land use and functional use of space within the Cypress College campus, as well as to accommodate future growth. The conversion to more intense land uses would not constitute the commitment of a “nonrenewable resource” as described in Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines because the intensification of land uses on the campus would also lead to more opportunities for pedestrians to walk between adjacent uses on campus.

Future Similar Uses

Facilities and improvements developed under the proposed project can be expected to have a life span of approximately 50 to 70 years. Future generations would likely continue to use Cypress College for educational and community purposes. Therefore, primary and secondary impacts of the proposed project would generally commit future generations to similar uses. However, the proposed project would not preclude use of the site for other purposes in the future.

Environmental Accident

Due to the age of the buildings, any proposed demolition activities could result in the release of contaminated materials and hazardous substances such as lead-based paint or asbestos. Potential release of these hazardous materials may expose construction workers and the public to potential health hazards during demolition and construction activities. Furthermore, because the property was formerly used for agricultural purposes, residual pesticides and metals may still be present in the soil, which could also present a potentially hazardous condition. Mitigation measures such as

conducting a lead-based paint and asbestos survey prior to demolition, as well as conformance to a hazardous materials contingency plan, would be required. Compliance with all mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Additionally, while the site is located within a seismically active region and would be exposed to ground shaking in the event of a seismic event, conformance with the regulatory provisions of the Uniform Building Code and California Building Code Requirements pertaining to construction standards would minimize damage and injuries in the event of such an occurrence.

Proposed uses of the Cypress College campus would be expected to use and store chemicals and/or substances typically found in such settings. The types of hazardous materials associated with routine, day-to-day operation of the proposed project would include chemical reagents, solvents, fuels, paints, cleansers, and miscellaneous organics and inorganics that are used as part of building and grounds maintenance, as well as vehicle maintenance. Because federal, state, and local regulations govern the use of such substances, the proposed project is not expected to involve activities that would damage the environment or pose a risk to public health. Therefore, for the reasons listed previously, impacts as a result of the proposed project would not create significant and irreversible effects. (See Section 4.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this Program Environmental Impact Report (Program EIR) for analysis of the proposed project's impacts relative to hazardous waste and materials.)

Nonrenewable Energy Consumption

Construction of each of the proposed project components would result in the use of nonrenewable resources and energy sources, including fossil fuels, natural gas, and electricity. Fossil fuels would be used to power construction equipment, vehicles and equipment used for delivery of construction materials, and employee vehicles. Construction equipment would also use electricity and natural gas. Use of these energy sources would be considered a permanent commitment of resources. In addition, a variety of resource materials would be used during the construction process, including steel, wood, concrete, and fabricated materials. Once these materials and fuels are used for purposes of construction, the commitment of such materials and fuels would be considered irreversible.

Once operational, the project components would consume more energy on a daily basis than is currently generated on site. The proposed project would replace existing facilities with more energy-efficient buildings. New facilities associated with the proposed project would be subject to the State Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which are provided in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The efficiency standards apply to new construction of both residential and nonresidential buildings and regulate energy consumed for heating, cooling, ventilation, water heating, and lighting.

Natural resources in the form of construction materials would be utilized in the construction of the proposed project; however, their use is not expected to negatively impact the availability of these resources. Due to the scale of the proposed project, the use of construction materials and nonrenewable resources is not unusual or extraordinary; as a result, there would be no significant and irreversible environmental effects related to resource consumption during construction. The proposed project would not result in the excessive use of fuel or energy or the use of excessive amounts of power, and impacts would not be irreversible. (See Section 4.12, Utilities and Service Systems, of this Program EIR for analysis of the proposed project's impacts relative to energy).

5.3 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

CEQA requires a discussion of ways in which the proposed project could be growth inducing. The CEQA Guidelines identify a project as growth inducing if it fosters economic or population growth or results in the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment (14 CCR 15126.2(d)). New employees from commercial or industrial development and new population from residential development represent direct forms of growth. These direct forms of growth have a secondary effect of expanding the size of local markets and inducing additional economic activity in the area. A project could indirectly induce growth by reducing or removing barriers to growth or by creating a condition that attracts additional population or new economic activity. However, a project's potential to induce growth does not automatically result in growth. Growth can only happen through capital investment in new economic opportunities by the private or public sectors.

Direct growth-inducing impacts are commonly associated with the extension of new public services, utilities, and roads into areas that have previously been undeveloped. The extension of such infrastructure into a non-serviced area can represent the elimination of a growth-limiting factor, thereby inducing growth. Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities and ultimately resulting in an increase in the pace of development or the density of the existing surrounding development. Indirect growth-inducing impacts include an increased demand for housing, commodities, and services that new development causes or attracts by increasing the population or job growth in an area.

The construction and renovation of existing facilities on campus would have the potential to attract more students and increase the population in the area. However, the construction and renovation of these facilities is intended to accommodate the projected growth, not necessarily induce growth. However, these improved facilities would have the potential to indirectly induce growth. In comparison to the projected population increase in region, an increase in 868 students is not a substantial increase in population.

According to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the City of Cypress (City) is expected to have a population of 50,300 by 2020. The projected student enrollment at Cypress College by 2020 would be less than 868, which accounts for less than 2% of SCAG's projected population for the City. Therefore, projections are consistent with SCAG's growth projections for the City, and impacts as a result of increased student generation rates would not be substantial.

Employee growth would also be minimal. The introduction of six employees to the region would not exceed SCAG's growth projections. Therefore, employee growth is consistent with SCAG's overall growth projections and would not result in a substantial increase in population growth. Impacts as a result of increase in employees would be less than significant.

5.4 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various potentially significant impacts of a project were not discussed in detail in the EIR. This Program EIR contains an analysis of the potential significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project that is based in part on an Initial Study (IS) prepared by the North Orange County Community College District and is attached as Appendix A.

5.4.1 Aesthetics

Scenic Vista Effects

The *City of Cypress General Plan* (Cypress General Plan) does not identify any scenic areas, vistas, or corridors in the vicinity of the campus (City of Cypress 2011). Analysis performed during the IS phase of the proposed project determined that impacts to a scenic vista would be less than significant, and further analysis in the Program EIR was not required. Additional information is provided in Appendix A.

Scenic Resource Damage

There are no designated scenic roadways within the project vicinity. There are no other scenic resources near or within the proposed project site that are visible from a scenic roadway. Analysis performed during the IS phase of the proposed project determined that impacts to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would be less than significant, and further analysis in the EIR was not required. Additional information is provided in Appendix A.

5.4.2 Agricultural Resources

The IS determined that all impacts associated with agricultural resources would be less than significant, and no additional analysis in the Program EIR would be required. For a detailed discussion on less-than-significant impacts regarding agricultural resources, see Appendix A.

5.4.3 Air Quality

Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plan

The proposed project would involve renovation and modernization of existing educational facilities on the Cypress College campus, as well as the construction of new educational facilities and demolition of existing facilities. The proposed project would not include the construction or development of housing facilities. However, the proposed project would involve an increase in student enrollment, which could result in an increase of students and employees living in the vicinity of the campus. However, this projection is consistent with SCAG's growth projections for each city of Cypress College's service area. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in population growth that is consistent with SCAG's growth projections anticipated in the SCAQMD's 2012 AQMP. Because the planned growth of the proposed project has been factored into the underlying growth projections of the 2012 AQMP, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Additionally, the proposed project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations. Analysis within this Program EIR determined that impacts would be less than significant.

Violation of an Air Quality Standard

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in the emission of criteria air pollutants from mobile, area, and/or stationary sources, which would cause exceedances of federal and state ambient air quality standards or contribute to existing nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Analysis within this Program EIR determined that impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulatively Considerable Increase of a Criteria Pollutant

Cumulative localized impacts could occur if the construction of the proposed project component were to occur concurrently with another off-campus project. Construction schedules for potential future projects near the Cypress College campus are currently unknown; therefore, potential construction impacts associated with two simultaneous projects are speculative. The CEQA Guidelines state that if a particular impact is too speculative for evaluation, the agency should note its conclusion and terminate discussion of the impact (14 CCR 15145). However, air

pollutant emissions associated with construction activity of future projects would be reduced through implementation of control measures required by the SCAQMD. Cumulative PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions would be reduced because all future projects would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which sets forth general and specific requirements for all construction sites in the SCAQMD. Impacts with regards to cumulative construction emissions would be less than significant.

Considering the proposed project would result in population growth that is consistent with the growth projections anticipated in the SCAQMD's 2012 AQMP, operation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the nonattainment pollutants in the basin, and this impact would be less than significant, as discussed in this Program EIR.

Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in temporary sources of fugitive dust and construction vehicle emissions. However, according to the Localized Significant Thresholds (LSTs) analysis in Section 4.2.4, Impact Analysis, of this Program EIR, construction activities would not generate emissions in excess of site-specific LSTs during the respective construction phases, and impacts to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site would be less than significant.

Long-term operation of the proposed project would result in daily vehicular trips that would generate local emissions that could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. However, according to the Carbon Monoxide (CO) Hotspot analysis, in Section 4.2.4 of this Program EIR, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in CO concentrations surrounding key intersections within the vicinity of the campus that would exceed state CO standards. Accordingly, impacts were determined to be less than significant, as discussed in this Program EIR.

The proposed project would involve the operation of an incineration enclosure. Incineration enclosures are a stationary source that emits toxic air contaminants; therefore, a Tier 2 screening analysis was prepared to determine the impacts to residents within the vicinity of Cypress College. According to the Tier 2 Report, worker MICR would be 0.41 in a million and would pass the screening threshold (1 in a million). Residential MICR would total 3.33 in a million and would fail the screening threshold (1 in a million) (see Appendix B). Under Rule 1401, permits to operate may not be issued when emissions of TACs result in a maximum incremental cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million without application of best available control technology for toxics (T-BACT), or a maximum incremental cancer risk greater than 10 in 1 million with application of T-BACT, or a health hazard index (chronic

and acute) greater than 1.0. Therefore, Mitigation Measure (MM-) AQ-3 would require the application of T-BACT, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Upon implementation of MM-AQ-3, impacts would be less than significant.

Objectionable Odors

Construction of proposed project components would result in the emission of diesel fumes and other odors typically associated with construction activities. However, typical construction techniques in compliance with SCAQMD rules would be used. Odors are highest near the source and would quickly dissipate off site. Any odors associated with construction activities would be temporary and would cease upon completion of construction.

Land uses and industrial operations that typically are associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food-processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Accordingly, it is not anticipated that any operational sources under the proposed project would result in objectionable odors. Analysis within this Program EIR determined that impacts would be less than significant.

5.4.4 Biological Resources

The IS determined that all impacts associated with biological resources would be less than significant, and no additional analysis in the Program EIR would be required. For a detailed discussion on less-than-significant impacts regarding biological resources, see Appendix A.

5.4.5 Cultural Resources

Disturbance of Human Remains

There is very low potential for human remains on the project site, and compliance with existing regulations pertaining to the discovery of human remains would be required. As a result, it was determined that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to human remains. Analysis is provided Section 4.3, Cultural Resources, of this Program EIR.

5.4.6 Geology and Soils

Exposure to Faulting, Seismic Ground Shaking, Liquefaction, or Landslides

The projects considered in the proposed project would not be approved or built without adequately demonstrating their compliance with the California Building Code and applicable geologic hazards regulations to the Division of the State Architect and California Geological Survey. For this reason, the proposed project would be designed and built in a manner that would reduce public exposure to geologic risks to acceptable levels, and the potential impacts of the

proposed project would be less than significant. A more detailed analysis is provided in Section 4.4, Geology and Soils, of this Program EIR.

Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil

Because the proposed project site is already developed and is not located in sloped areas, the potential for substantial soil erosion or significant loss of topsoil is generally low. Analysis found within this Program EIR (Section 4.4 and Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality) determined that impacts related to soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

Unstable Geologic Unit or Expansive Soils

Shrinking/swelling of soil, differential settlement potential, and high corrosion risks are common geotechnical issues in California, particularly within clay-rich residual soils, hydric soils, and wetland/estuarine peat/mud deposits. Standard engineering practices have been developed to effectively address such concerns. Projects considered in the Facilities Master Plan would not be approved or built without adequately demonstrating their compliance with the California Building Code and applicable geologic hazards regulations to the Division of the State Architect and California Geological Survey. For these reasons, the potential impact of the proposed project with respect to expansive or otherwise unstable soils would be less than significant. Additional detail is provided in Section 4.4.

Septic Tanks or Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems

The proposed project does not include septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, no impact would occur. The IS determined that this issue would not be analyzed further in the Program EIR.

5.4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction of the proposed project would result in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that would primarily be associated with use of off-road construction equipment, on-road hauling and vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. Operation of the proposed project would result in GHG emissions through energy use (natural gas and generation of electricity consumed by the proposed project); motor vehicle trips to proposed project land uses; generation of electricity associated with water supply, treatment, and distribution and wastewater treatment; and solid waste disposal. Compared to existing conditions, the proposed project would result in an addition of GHG emissions. Several statewide GHG-reduction measures would reduce GHG emissions associated with motor vehicles and electrical generation over time. The proposed project would

result in a net decrease in GHG emissions; therefore, the proposed project would result in an impact for GHG emissions that is less than significant.

Conflict with Applicable Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan

Cypress College, local jurisdictions, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) have not adopted any GHG reduction measures that would apply to the GHG emissions associated with the proposed project. At this time, no mandatory GHG regulations or finalized agency guidelines would apply to implementation of this proposed project, and no conflict would occur. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant, as discussed in this Program EIR.

5.4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Located on a Site Included on a Hazardous Materials List

The project site itself is listed in 13 regulatory databases. Most of these listings are related to the permitted handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials. The Environmental Data Resources search returned two listings at the project site in the leaking underground storage tank database. A review of data from the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker site and the Orange County Department of Environmental Health records indicates that these two listings are for the same release case. Records for this case indicate a release of waste oil to soil; the case was closed in October 1992 (EDR 2016). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, as discussed in Section 4.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Near an Airport or within an Airport Land Use Plan Area

The Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County has adopted the *Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP) for Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB), Los Alamitos*. The project site is located approximately 2 miles northeast of the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base and 3.4 miles southwest of Fullerton Municipal Airport. The project site is located within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan area for the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base (ALUC 2005). The proposed project includes the construction of multistory structures. The maximum height that is proposed as part of the proposed project would be for the new Science, Engineering, and Mathematics (SEM) building. According to Exhibit SAF-9 of the Cypress General Plan Safety Element, the Cypress College campus would not be located in the building height restriction area (City of Cypress 2011). Therefore, the proposed project activities would not pose a hazard for people residing or working in the project area, and impacts would be less than significant as discussed in this Program EIR.

Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No private airstrips exist within 2 miles of the proposed project site; therefore, the IS determined that there was no impact.

Impaired Emergency Response

Permitting requirements mandate that the fire department and the Division of the State Architect perform an access compliance review and a fire and life safety review prior to approval of individual project drawings and specification documents. Therefore, emergency access would be ensured, and the proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Impacts were determined to be less than significant in this Program EIR.

Wildland Fire Risks

The proposed project is in an urbanized area with no adjacent wildlands. The area surrounding the project site is generally urbanized and developed. Therefore, impacts were determined in the IS to be less than significant, and no further analysis was included in this Program EIR.

5.4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

Depleted Groundwater Supplies

The water needs of the proposed project would be met by the Golden State Water Company. No on-site groundwater wells are proposed; therefore, impacts to groundwater supplies, depletion of aquifer volume, or lowering of the local groundwater table level would be limited to the well field from which the water district derives its supplies. It is estimated that the proposed project would increase groundwater extraction from Golden State Water Company–operated groundwater wells by nearly 9 acre-feet per year. It represents only 0.09% of the amount of groundwater extracted by Golden State Water Company’s West Orange System in 2010 (i.e., about 10,260 acre-feet). Compared to the annual groundwater production within the Orange County Basin as a whole (i.e., roughly 330,000 acre-feet per year), the increase in demand as a result of the proposed project would be negligible and far less than the variation in demand due to climatic conditions and would be well within the margin of error for such estimates (OCWD 2015). Analysis in this Program EIR determined that impacts would be less than significant.

Introduction of Housing within a Flood Hazard Area

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map, the proposed project site is not located within the 100-year flood hazard area (FEMA 2009). Additionally, the proposed project does not include a housing component. Therefore, the proposed project would not locate housing in a 100-year flood hazard area.

Introduction of Structures That Would Impede or Redirect Flood Flows

As stated previously, the proposed project is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows in a 100-year flood hazard area.

Loss, Injury, or Death Due to Dam Inundation

Due to the distance of dams from the campus and improvements that have been made to the Lower Santa Ana River channel, flooding due to levee or dam failure is unlikely. Impacts were determined to be less than significant in the IS.

Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

According to the City of Cypress General Plan EIR, the project site is not at risk for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (City of Cypress 2001). This was determined to be “no impact” in the IS.

5.4.10 Land Use and Planning

Physically Divide an Established Community

The campus has been developed since the 1960s, and residential areas around the campus have developed over time. The campus does not divide or isolate an established community. The proposed construction and renovation would occur on campus and would not divide the surrounding community. Impacts were determined to be less than significant in the IS.

Conflict with Any Applicable Land Use Plans, Policies, or Regulations

The Facilities Master Plan would be consistent with all applicable land use plans and policies, including the Cypress General Plan and zoning code. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts related to land use and planning, as analyzed in this Program EIR.

Conflict with Any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan

The proposed project is not located within any adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or local or regional habitat conservation plan areas. Since the proposed project is not located within any approved plan areas, it would not impact the goals and objectives of any adopted plans. Therefore, impacts would not occur.

5.4.11 Mineral Resources

The IS determined that no impacts associated with mineral resources would occur, and no additional analysis in the Program EIR would be required. For a detailed discussion regarding mineral resources, see Appendix A.

5.4.12 Noise

Excessive Groundborne Vibration

Pile driving, blasting, or other special construction techniques are not anticipated to be used for construction of the facilities identified in the Facilities Master Plan; therefore, excessive groundborne vibration and groundborne noise would not be generated. Additionally, groundborne vibration would not be associated with the proposed project following construction activities. Analysis within this Program EIR determined that no impacts related to excessive groundborne vibration would occur.

Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise

Due to the amount of increase in noise level (less than 1 decibel, rounded to whole numbers), noise impacts due to project-related traffic are not anticipated to be significant. Analysis within this Program EIR (Section 4.9, Noise) determined that impacts would be less than significant.

Exposing People to Excessive Noise Near a Public Airport

The Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County has adopted the *Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP) for Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB), Los Alamitos*. The project site is located approximately 2 miles northeast of the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base and 3.4 miles southwest of Fullerton Municipal Airport. The project site is located within the Airport Land Use Plan airport planning area for the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base. According to the Airport Environs Land Use Plan, the project site does not lie within the 60 A-weighted decibel Community Noise Equivalent Level noise contour of the airport (ALUC 2015), which is below the “normally acceptable” exterior noise exposure for commercial land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to significant noise levels associated with public airports.

Exposing People to Excessive Noise Near a Private Airstrip

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No private airstrips exist within 2 miles of the proposed project site; therefore, there is no impact.

5.4.13 Population and Housing

The IS determined that all impacts associated with population and housing would be less than significant, and no additional analysis in the Program EIR would be required. For a detailed discussion on less-than-significant impacts regarding population and housing, see Appendix A.

5.4.14 Public Services

Fire Protection

The proposed project would result in a limited number of additional calls for fire service and would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities (the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts).

Police Protection

In light of the proposed project's forecasted effect on existing response times, in combination with the fact that project implementation would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, analysis within this Program EIR determined that the proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts to police services; therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

Schools

The proposed project would not generate additional demand for elementary and secondary schools in the surrounding community; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Parks

The proposed project would have no impact on local parks. The proposed project area would experience an increase in population; however, the campus offers athletic fields and recreational opportunities, so nearby parks would not have a significant increase in visitors, and acceptable service ratios would be maintained.

Other Public Facilities

The proposed project would have no impact on libraries and other public facilities. Cypress College has a library on campus to serve the students; therefore, any increase in student enrollment would not adversely affect local libraries, and acceptable service ratios would be maintained.

5.4.15 Recreation

The IS determined that all impacts associated with recreation would be less than significant, and no additional analysis in the Program EIR would be required. For a detailed discussion on less-than-significant impacts regarding recreation, see Appendix A.

5.4.16 Traffic and Circulation

Conflict with Any Applicable Plans

An analysis of existing plus project traffic and year 2025 cumulative plus project traffic indicates that there are no significant impacts as a result of the proposed project at any of the 18 analyzed intersections, and no mitigation is required.

Conflict with Applicable Congestion Management Plan

An analysis of future (year 2025) cumulative traffic conditions indicates that the addition of ambient traffic growth and cumulative projects' traffic would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program. The analysis within this Program EIR determined that no adverse impacts would result.

Change in Air Traffic Patterns

The nearest airport is Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base, located 2 miles southwest of the project site. No private airstrips exist within 2 miles of the project site. Air traffic patterns would not be affected by the proposed project. No impact would occur, and this was addressed in the IS.

Design Feature Hazard

Proposed circulation modifications would increase wayfinding to the campus by making campus entries more visible. The proposed project would neither have adverse impacts on safety based on design features nor increase hazards due to an incompatible use. The analysis within this Program EIR determined that no adverse impacts would result.

Inadequate Emergency Access

Vehicular access to the Cypress College campus would continue to be provided from several existing entry points along Holder Street, Orange Avenue, and Valley View Street. The proposed project would not adversely impact operations at any of the key study intersections, including these points of ingress/egress. Further, the proposed project would not introduce any new project driveways or roads or reconfigure or modify any existing driveways or roads on site or adjacent to the campus. Consistent with state and local fire codes, adequate turning radius and vertical

clearance would be maintained on internal campus driveways, roads, drive aisles, and parking lots. Therefore, impacts associated with emergency access would be less than significant, and the analysis within this Program EIR determined that no adverse impacts would result.

Conflict with Alternative Transportation

The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycles, or pedestrians. The campus is currently designed with pedestrian walkways and access points that separate pedestrians from on-campus vehicular routes. Furthermore, the campus has bike racks to accommodate bicyclists, and these facilities would not be impacted by the proposed project. No change in public transit routes would occur as a result of the proposed project. The analysis within this Program EIR determined that no adverse impacts would result.

5.4.17 Utilities and Service Systems

Exceedance of Wastewater Treatment Requirements

The proposed project would generate additional wastewater discharges by adding additional students. Cypress Public Works provides sewer collection for the City, including the Cypress College campus. Wastewater collected by the City is treated by the Orange County Sanitation District (City of Cypress 2016). The Orange County Sanitation District is the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit holder for the Fountain Valley Reclamation Plant No. 1 and Huntington Beach Treatment Plant No. 2, and it is responsible for compliance with the wastewater treatment requirements in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit, Order No. R8-2012-0035/CA0110604 (Santa Ana RWQCB 2012). Upon connection to City wastewater facilities, the proposed project would be in compliance with the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and impacts would be less than significant.

Adequate Wastewater Treatment Capacity

The Orange County Sanitation District treatment plants have the capacity to process 372 million gallons per day and are currently processing approximately 187 million gallons per day. Any increase in demand by the proposed project would be relatively minor in the context of the overall treatment capacity of the Orange County Sanitation District. A service agreement, and if required, payment of impact fees would be required prior to initiating new sewer connections with the Orange County Sanitation District. Therefore, the analysis in this Program EIR determined that impacts with regard to wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

Adequate Water Supply

An increase in potable water demand by 9 acre-feet per year represents only 0.06% of the amount of potable water supplied by Golden State Water Company's West Orange System in 2010 (i.e., about 15,287 acre-feet). Therefore, the increase in demand as a result of the proposed project would be negligible and far less than the variation in demand due to climatic conditions and would be well within the margin of error for such estimates (GSWC 2011). Therefore, the analysis in this Program EIR determined that impacts with regard to water supply would be less than significant.

Conflict with Solid Waste Regulations

Approximately 57% of all waste recovered from Cypress College was recycled, with an additional 20% diverted on campus in 2015 (Rittel, pers. comm. 2016). Solid waste generated from construction and operation of the proposed project would be consistent with the campus's ongoing recycling programs, which historically have been successful at diverting at 77% of on-campus-generated solid waste from a landfill to an appropriate recycling facility. Maintaining the existing diversion rate would ensure comply with Assembly Bill 341, which requires all large state facilities to divert at least 75% of solid waste from landfills by 2020. Given these considerations, impacts associated with solid waste statutes and regulations would be less than significant. Therefore, the analysis in this Program EIR determined that impacts with regard to solid waste would be less than significant.

Excessive Use of Fuel/Energy and/or Excessive Use of Power

The proposed project would create additional electricity and natural gas demand by adding additional students. The proposed project would involve the demolition of 56,561 assignable square feet of existing facilities on campus. The proposed project would replace these existing facilities with more energy-efficient buildings. New facilities associated with the proposed project would be subject to the State Building Energy Efficiency Standards, embodied in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The proposed project would not result in the excessive use of fuel or energy or in excessive amounts of power; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

5.5 REFERENCES

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

ALUC (Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County). 2005. "Figure 1: Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County Airport Planning Areas" [map]. July 21, 2005. Accessed July 2016. <http://www.ocair.com/commissions/aluc/docs/airportlu.pdf>.

- ALUC. 2015. *Airport Environs Land Use Plan for Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos*. Adopted December 19, 2002. Last amended 2015. Accessed July 2016. <http://www.ocair.com/commissions/aluc/archive/2015/2015-07-16/item1.pdf>.
- City of Cypress. 2001. *City of Cypress General Plan Environmental Impact Report*. September 2001. Accessed February 2016. http://www.ci.cypress.ca.us/community_develpmnt/eir/eir.htm.
- City of Cypress. 2011. *City of Cypress General Plan*. Amended April 25, 2011. Accessed February 2016. http://www.ci.cypress.ca.us/community_develpmnt/general_plan/general_plan.htm.
- City of Cypress. 2016. “City of Cypress Public Works Department.” Accessed July 2016. http://www.ci.cypress.ca.us/public_works/public_works.htm.
- EDR (Environmental Data Resources). 2016. *The EDR Radius Report with Geocheck, 9200 Valley View Street, Cypress, CA 90630*. April 20, 2016.
- FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2009. “Flood Insurance Rate Map (06059C0109J)” [City of Cypress]. December 2009. Accessed July 2016. <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=Cypress%20College#searchresultsanchor>.
- GSWC (Golden State Water Company). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan – West Orange*. Final. Prepared by Kennedy/Jenks Consultants. August 2011.
- OCWD (Orange County Water District). 2015. *Groundwater Management Plan 2015 Update*. June 17, 2015.
- Rittel, S. 2016. “Cypress College Solid Waste Usage.” Email from S. Rittel (Project Manager, Campus Capital Projects, Cypress College) to R. Struglia (Project Manager, Dudek) and C. Munson (Environmental Analyst, Dudek). June 23, 2016.
- Santa Ana RWQCB (Regional Water Quality Control Board). 2012. *Order No. R8-2012-0035 and NPDES No. CA0110604; Waste Discharge Requirements and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit for Orange County Sanitation District Reclamation Plant No.1 and Treatment Plant No. 2*. Adopted June 15, 2012. Accessed July 2016. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/board_decisions/adopted_orders/orders/2012/12_035_WDR_OCSD.pdf.