

**Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan  
Final Program Environmental Impact Report**

**SCH No. 2016041018**

**North Orange County Community College District**

1830A W. Romneya Drive

Anaheim, California 92801

*Contact: Richard Williams*

*District Director, Facilities Planning and Construction*

**DECEMBER 2016**



**Findings of Fact for the Cypress College  
Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose.....	1
1.2 Organization/Format .....	2
1.3 Summary of Project Description.....	3
1.4 Project Objectives .....	3
1.5 Notice of Preparation .....	4
1.6 Environmental Impact Report.....	5
<b>2 FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Cultural Resources .....	7
<b>3 FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGATED IMPACTS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Aesthetics .....	11
3.2 Air Quality .....	12
3.3 Cultural Resources .....	16
3.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	18
3.5 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	23
3.6 Noise .....	25
3.7 Utilities and Service Systems.....	27
<b>4 FINDINGS ON LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.....</b>	<b>33</b>
4.1 Aesthetics .....	33
4.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources .....	33
4.3 Air Quality .....	35
4.4 Biological Resources .....	36
4.5 Cultural Resources .....	38
4.6 Geology and Soils .....	39
4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	42
4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	43
4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	45
4.10 Land Use and Planning .....	47
4.11 Mineral Resources .....	48
4.12 Noise .....	49
4.13 Population and Housing.....	51
4.14 Public Services.....	52

**Findings of Fact for the Cypress College  
Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
4.15 Recreation .....	55
4.16 Traffic and Circulation.....	55
4.17 Utilities and Service Systems.....	58
<b>5 FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES.....</b>	<b>61</b>
5.1 Project Alternatives.....	61
5.1.1 The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative .....	61
5.1.2 The No Project/No Development Alternative.....	62
5.1.3 The Preservation Alternative .....	62
<b>6 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS.....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>7 REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>67</b>

# Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Purpose

This statement of findings addresses the environmental effects associated with the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan (proposed project) described in the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). This statement is made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), specifically California Public Resources Code Sections 21081 and 21081.6, and the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), specifically Sections 15091 and 15093. The Cypress College Facilities Master Plan PEIR examines the full range of potential effects of construction and operation of the proposed project and identifies standard mitigation practices that could be employed to reduce, minimize, or avoid those potential effects.

California Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 require that the lead agency, in this case the North Orange County Community College District (District), prepare written findings for identified significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. Specifically, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 states, in part, that:

- (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
  - (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
  - (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
  - (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

In accordance with California Public Resource Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, whenever significant effects cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered “acceptable.”

The Final PEIR identified potentially significant effects that could result from the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan. The District finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of the approval of the proposed project will reduce most, but not all, of those effects to less-than-significant levels. Those impacts that are not reduced to less-than-significant levels are identified and overridden due to specific proposed project benefits (see Section 6, Statement of Overriding Considerations).

As required by CEQA, the District, in adopting these findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project. The District finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these findings, meets the requirements of California Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the proposed project.

In accordance with the CEQA Statutes and Guidelines, the District adopts these findings as part of its certification of the Final PEIR for the proposed project. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c)(3), the District also finds that the Final PEIR reflects the District’s independent judgment as the lead agency for the proposed project.

### **1.2 Organization/Format**

Section 1 contains a summary description of the proposed project and background information relative to the environmental review process. Section 2 identifies the significant impacts of the proposed project that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level (even though all feasible mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated into the proposed project). Section 3 identifies the potentially significant effects of the proposed project that will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. Section 4 identifies the proposed project’s potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant. Section 5 discusses the feasibility of the proposed project alternatives, Section 6 presents the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Section 7 lists the references cited and used in the preparation of the findings.

# Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

## 1.3 Summary of Project Description

The District is proposing to implement the Facilities Master Plan to more effectively meet the space needs of the projected on-campus enrollment through the next decade and beyond while constructing and renovating facilities in order to meet the District's instructional needs.

The proposed project involves construction of approximately 138,000 assignable square feet of new academic, administrative, and auxiliary uses on the Cypress College campus at 9200 Valley View Street in Cypress, California. The proposed project would include the following new buildings: Science, Engineering, and Mathematics (SEM) building; Veterans' Resource Center addition to the Student Activities Center; Library and Learning Resource Center addition; Baseball Clubhouse; and Lot 7 parking structure. In addition to new construction, the proposed project would involve the renovation of existing buildings to modernize the buildings for today's learning environment, as well as to maximize educational space and improve efficiency/utilization of existing facilities. Demolition of existing buildings would include approximately 56,561 assignable square feet and would include the following buildings: SEM, Baseball Storage/Clubhouse (Building 25), and the temporary modular restrooms (Building 38). The proposed project would also involve improvements to the pedestrian circulation network in and around campus, parking and vehicular entry improvements, and infrastructure improvements.

For a detailed description of the project and setting, please see Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft PEIR.

## 1.4 Project Objectives

The overall goal of the proposed project is to provide the optimal physical settings to support the District's academic mission. The intent of the proposed project is to develop modern teaching and learning facilities that would attract students to Cypress College while providing the physical resources necessary to support the educational process. With this overarching goal in mind, project objectives developed during the Facilities Master Plan planning process are as follows and are shown in the Draft PEIR:

- Update and modernize existing building space to meet the District's instructional needs.
- Construct new buildings to meet current and future instructional needs and the District's academic mission.
- Accommodate growth in the student body over the planning horizon.
- Expand veterans' facilities and services to train and retrain veterans as they transition into the civilian workforce.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

- Implement health and safety repairs, energy-efficient enhancements, water conservation, American with Disabilities Act (ADA) access, building security, National Fire Protection Associations Life Safety Code requirement upgrades, mass communication system, lock-down capabilities, and other needed facility renovations.

### **1.5 Notice of Preparation**

To determine the environmental topics to be addressed in the PEIR, the District circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) dated April 5, 2016, to interested public agencies, organizations, and individuals. The NOP was also sent to the State Clearinghouse at the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research. The State Clearinghouse assigned a state identification number (SCH no. 2016041018) to the PEIR. A public scoping meeting was held on the Cypress College campus on April 27, 2016, to gather additional public input. The 30-day public scoping period ended on May 4, 2016.

Comments received during the NOP public scoping period were considered during the preparation of the PEIR. Based on the scope of the proposed Master Plan, as described in the NOP, the following issues were determined to be potentially significant and are therefore addressed in the PEIR:

- Aesthetics
- Air quality
- Cultural resources
- Geology and soils
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Hazards and hazardous materials
- Hydrology and water quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public services
- Traffic and circulation
- Utilities and service systems.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

Additional CEQA-mandated environmental issue areas, such as agriculture and forestry, biological resources, mineral resources, population and housing, and recreation were found not to be significant, and therefore were not discussed in the PEIR.

### **1.6 Environmental Impact Report**

The District prepared the PEIR in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The PEIR is a full-disclosure document that informs public-agency decision makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. Measures to minimize significant effects are identified in the PEIR and reasonable alternatives to the proposed project are evaluated.

The Draft PEIR was made available to the public for review and comment for a 45-day period. The review and comment period began on September 2, 2016, and concluded on October 16, 2016. A copy of the Draft PEIR was available for public review at the Cypress Library (5331 Orange Avenue, Cypress, California 90630). The Draft PEIR was also available for review on the District website: <http://www.nocccd.edu/> and the Cypress College website: <http://www.cypresscollege.edu/>. All comment letters received in response to the Draft PEIR were reviewed and are included in the Final PEIR, along with written responses to each of the comments. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15132, the Final PEIR for the proposed project consists of: (i) the Draft PEIR and subsequent revisions; (ii) comments received on the Draft PEIR; (iii) a list of the persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft PEIR; (iv) written responses to significant environmental issues raised during the public review and comment period; (v) the MMRP; and (vi) other information contained in the PEIR, including PEIR appendices.

**Findings of Fact for the Cypress College  
Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

## 2 FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This section identifies the significant unavoidable impacts that require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued by the District, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, if the proposed project is approved. Based on the analysis contained in the PEIR, the following impacts have been determined to fall within the “significant unavoidable impacts” category: impacts to cultural resources related to the demolition of the buildings, structures, objects, features, walkways, and landscape elements that comprise the Cypress College Historic District.

### 2.1 Cultural Resources

**Historic Resources.** The proposed project anticipates the demolition of several existing core campus structures, including the SEM building, which is a contributing building and some character-defining features of existing buildings (e.g., exterior concrete stairwells) to the potential California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)-eligible Cypress College Historic District. A Historic Resources Technical Report was prepared by Dudek in September 2016 (Appendix C of the Draft PEIR) to assess the existing historic resources on the Cypress College campus. Based on this historical evaluation, it was determined that within Cypress College’s core campus is a historic district that is potentially eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3 for conveying a concentration of planned buildings, structures, and associated elements united aesthetically by their embodiment of the Brutalist modern architecture style. The buildings also represent the notable work of master architects William E. Blurock & Associates and Caudill Rowlett Scott Architects. Additionally, the Cypress College Complex building appears eligible as both a district contributor and an individual property under CRHR Criterion 3 for its high artistic value associated with the Sergio O’Cadiz sculptural wall that prominently projects from the building’s front entrance. The period of significance for the historic district is 1965 to 1976. There are 20 buildings and landscape/hardscape features located within the boundaries of the historic district. These resources, including the landscape and hardscape features, are classified as contributors to the potential district. The demolition, reconfiguration, and redesign of contributing resources, as proposed by the current project, would result in potentially significant and unmitigable impacts to historic resources.

The District finds that there are no feasible measures available to mitigate the impacts to historic resources attributable to the demolition of contributing buildings, structures, and features of the Cypress College Historic District to a level that is less than significant. However, the mitigation measures identified below would partially reduce the identified impacts.

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

**Cumulative Cultural Resource Impacts.** Cumulative impacts on cultural resources evaluate whether impacts of the proposed project and related projects, when taken as a whole, substantially diminish the number of historical or archaeological resources within the same or similar context or property type. As discussed in the Draft PEIR, the proposed project could have potentially significant impacts to unknown archaeological resources, and mitigation would be required to reduce adverse impacts to less than significant. It is anticipated that cultural resources that are potentially affected by related projects would also be subject to the same requirements of CEQA as the proposed project and mitigate for their impacts, if applicable. However, the proposed project would have potentially significant and unmitigable impacts on the identified historic district and its contributing resources. The impact to the Cypress College Historic District cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. In the event that related projects would also result in potentially significant and unmitigable impacts to historical resources, then the proposed project would contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts. These determinations would be made on a case-by-case basis, and the effects of cumulative development on cultural resources would be mitigated to the extent feasible, in accordance with CEQA and other applicable legal requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact associated with cultural resources due to the fact that demolition or removal of any historically designated building would impact the potential historic district, despite the implementation of mitigation measures (MM-) CUL-1 and MM-CUL-2.

**MM-CUL-1** Prior to the start of new construction, additions, renovations, or site improvements within or adjacent to the potential Cypress College Historic District, construction and design plans shall be reviewed for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, specifically, the Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Weeks and Grimmer 1995). Proposed Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliance work should reference both the "Accessibility Considerations" section of the Rehabilitation Guidelines and National Park Service (NPS) Preservation Brief 32, Making Historic Properties Accessible (Jester and Park 1993), to ensure that ADA-compliance work minimizes changes to historic materials and features. Prior to approval, plans for new construction and/or renovation shall be reviewed for conformance with the standards by a qualified architectural historian or historic preservation specialist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for architectural history (36 CFR Part 61).

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

The following mitigation is recommended after a thorough consideration of alternatives to activities that will result in substantial adverse change to the potential historic district on campus. While MM-CUL-2 will not reduce impacts below a level of significance, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation be undertaken.

**MM-CUL-2** Prior to replacement of the concrete stairwells on the Fine Arts; Technical Education 1, 2, and 3; Student Activities Center; Gymnasium II; and the Business Education buildings, and prior to demolition of the existing Science, Engineering, and Math (SEM) building, the North Orange County Community College District must ensure preparation of Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. Documentation shall be completed by a qualified historic preservation professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for history or architectural history. The documentation should capture the physical condition of the existing building with: (1) existing drawings (where available); (2) photographs of the buildings with large-format negatives; and (3) a written narrative that includes a detailed history and architectural description of the buildings, and highlights the historical significance.

One original copy of the final HABS documentation packet shall be offered to the following entities:

- The Library of Congress HABS Collection (to be offered as a donation)
- The South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton
- Orange County Public Library
- Orange County Archives
- Orange County Historical Society
- Los Angeles Conservancy

### **Finding**

The District finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the proposed project cultural resources impacts attributable to demolition of historic resources. Nine historically significant buildings are proposed for renovation or reuse include the Fine Arts; Humanities Lecture Hall; Gymnasium I and II; Technical Education Buildings I, II, and

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

III; Business Education; and Aquatics Center. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the identified significant impact to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the District has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the PEIR, and the identified cultural resources impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 6, Statement of Overriding Considerations).

# Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

## 3 FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGATED IMPACTS

This section identifies significant adverse impacts of the proposed project that require findings to be made under California Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. Based on substantial evidence, the District finds that adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below will reduce the identified significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

### 3.1 Aesthetics

**Visual Quality/Character Degradation.** Architectural and site design for the proposed SEM building, immersive digital classroom, viewing platform, and incineration enclosure that is not sensitive to the composition and scale of the surrounding buildings could substantially degrade the existing character and could result in potentially significant aesthetic impacts. Impacts to the existing character of the campus core are considered potentially significant but would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure MM-CUL-1.

**New Source of Light or Glare.** While it is assumed that new facilities would be constructed of similar materials as existing buildings in order to visually integrate into the existing campus environment, final building designs and materials have not yet been proposed or identified. Similarly, the specific lighting plan and intensity of new lighting sources to illuminate new buildings, facilities, and associated outdoor areas has not yet been developed. Therefore, because building materials and lighting plans have yet to be prepared for proposed buildings and facilities, light and glare generated by these project-level elements may adversely affect day- or nighttime views in the surrounding area. As such, lighting and glare are considered potentially significant impacts, and MM-AES-1, MM-AES-2, and MM-AES-3 have been provided to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**MM-AES-1** New sources of exterior lighting shall be shielded and directed downward to avoid light spillover onto adjacent properties. Lighting shall also be of the minimum required intensity to provide for safety and security purposes. Nighttime operation of new sources of lighting shall be consistent with that of existing lighting sources on campus and shall consider potential effects to nighttime views of adjacent motorists and nearby residents. Interior lighting shall be turned off when not in operation or operated in the lowest possible setting.

**MM-AES-2** The use of reflective building materials shall be minimized to the extent practicable. Building materials shall be consistent with the visual character of existing and planned campus facilities and with the overall character of the Cypress College campus.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

**MM-AES-3** The District shall prepare a photometric study for the proposed Lot 7 parking structure to ensure that off-campus residential land uses are not subjected to unnecessary light spillover and trespass. A detailed lighting plan shall be developed for the parking structure and utilized by a qualified photometric specialist to prepare the photometric study. If potential light spillover is identified, then appropriate measures, including, but not limited to, use of lower-intensity lamps shall be considered to avoid unnecessary light spillover and trespass at off-campus residential land uses.

**Cumulative Aesthetic and/or Lighting Impact.** While most planned development associated with the proposed project would be located near the campus core and would be screened from off-site viewers (either partially or fully) by existing or proposed structures and landscaping, mitigation measures MM-AES-1, MM-AES-2, and MM-AES-3 have been proposed to reduce cumulative impacts to existing visual character associated with the lighting of certain future development to a less-than-significant level.

New development is proposed on the periphery of campus and would be located in close proximity to residences to the north. In instances where lighting associated with campus development could potentially affect existing nighttime views, mitigation has been proposed that would minimize light trespass onto nearby properties. Therefore, cumulative lighting and glare impacts are considered potentially significant, but would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measures MM-AES-1, MM-AES-2, and MM-AES-3.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential aesthetic and visual quality-related impacts of the proposed project related to visual quality/character degradation, lighting and glare, and cumulative impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the District finds that, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant aesthetic and visual quality-related impacts of the proposed project identified in the Final PEIR.

## **3.2 Air Quality**

**Projected Air Quality Violation.** Construction and operation of the proposed project would result in the emissions of criteria air pollutants from mobile, area, and/or stationary sources, which may cause exceedances of federal and state ambient air quality standards or contribute to existing nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Construction-generated emissions would

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

exceed the thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for volatile organic compounds (VOC). Mitigation measure MM-AQ-1 is included to address VOCs. During construction, the project would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which sets forth general and specific requirements for all construction sites (as well as other fugitive dust sources) in the SCAQMD. The general requirement prohibits a person from causing or allowing emissions of fugitive dust from construction (or other fugitive dust sources) such that the presence of such dust remains visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emissions source. Although impacts related to anticipated PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission levels during construction are below the threshold and are therefore considered less than significant, mitigation measure MM-AQ-2 is recommended to further minimize impacts.

**MM-AQ-1** The following measures shall be adhered to during the architectural coating phases of project construction to reduce volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from activities during Phases 1 and 2:

- a. The North Orange County Community College District (District) shall procure architectural coatings from a supplier in compliance with the requirements of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings).
- b. The maximum VOC content of exterior coatings shall be limited to 100 grams per liter (g/L) for the Science, Engineering, and Mathematics (SEM) building, Expansion of the Veterans' Resource Center, Library and Learning Resource Center Expansion, and Veteran's Memorial Plaza Construction.
- c. The architectural coating phase of the Aquatic Center shall occur over a 10-day duration, or the coating application rate shall be limited to 3,410 square feet a day. The maximum VOC content of exterior coatings shall be limited to 100 g/L.
- d. The architectural coating phase of the Fine Arts building renovation shall occur over a 20-day duration, or the coating application rate shall be limited to 5,007 square feet a day.
- e. The architectural coating phase of the Humanities building renovation shall occur over a 20-day duration, or the coating application rate shall be limited to 6,906 square feet a day.
- f. The architectural coating phase of the Student Activities Center expansion shall occur over a 10-day duration, or the coating application rate shall be limited to 5,731 square feet a day.

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

- MM-AQ-2** Consistent with SCAQMD Rule 403, it is required that fugitive dust generated by grading and construction activities be kept to a minimum, with a goal of retaining dust on the site, by following the dust control measures listed as follows:
- a. During clearing, grading, earthmoving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.
  - b. During construction, water truck or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas later in the morning, after work is completed for the day, and whenever winds exceed 15 miles per hour (mph).
  - c. Soil stockpiled for more than 2 days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.
  - d. Speeds on unpaved roads shall be reduced to less than 15 mph.
  - e. All grading and excavation operations shall be halted when wind speeds exceed 25 mph.
  - f. Dirt and debris spilled onto paved surfaces at the project site and on the adjacent roadways shall be swept, vacuumed, and/or washed at the end of each workday.
  - g. Should minor import/export of soil materials be required, all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose material to and from the construction site shall be tarped and maintain a minimum 2 feet of freeboard.
  - h. At a minimum, at each vehicle egress from the project site to a paved public road, a pad shall be installed consisting of washed gravel (minimum size: 1 inch) maintained in a clean condition to a depth of at least 6 inches and extending to a width of at least 30 feet and a length of at least 50 feet (or as otherwise directed by SCAQMD) to reduce trackout and carryout onto public roads.
  - i. Review and comply with any additional requirements of SCAQMD Rule 403.

**Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.** The proposed project would involve the operation of an incineration enclosure. The incineration enclosure is a piece of equipment requested by the Department of Mortuary Science, which would meet the educational program requirements for the Baccalaureate Program. The proposed equipment would be located in the new SEM building. The Department of Mortuary Science would use the incineration enclosure for animal remains. The incineration enclosure would also be used

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

by the biology program to dispose of animal samples used in the biology laboratories (fetal pigs and cow brains).

Incineration enclosures are a stationary source that emits toxic air contaminants (TACs); therefore, an analysis is required to determine the impacts to residents in the vicinity of Cypress College. TACs associated with incineration enclosures include arsenic and compounds, beryllium and compounds, cadmium and compounds, chromium 6+, polychlorinated dibenzofurans, 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin, formaldehyde, hydrochloric acid, lead and compounds, nickel and compounds, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. Mercury and compounds can also result from the operation of incineration units, but specifically during the preparation of human remains. Mercury and compounds are generally not emitted from the incineration of animal remains (SCAQMD 2016).

According to the Tier 1 Report of the RiskTool V1.02, the incineration enclosure would fail the cancer and chronic Application Screening Index (ASI) and would pass the acute ASI. The cancer/chronic ASI and acute ASI would total 23.6 and 0.249, respectively. Since the incineration enclosure would fail the Tier 1 screening, a Tier 2 screening with a more refined approach was required to determine the cancer and chronic risk.

The Tier 2 Report was generated using the same parameters above for Tier 1, using the RiskTool V1.02. According to the Tier 2 Report, worker maximum individual cancer risk would be 0.41 in a million and would pass the screening threshold (1 in a million). Residential maximum individual cancer risk would total 3.33 in a million and would fail the screening threshold (1 in a million). 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 the 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 (SCAQMD 2015). 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.

**MM-AQ-3** As part of the permit process, the SCAQMD will evaluate compliance of the incineration enclosure with Rule 1401, New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants. The proposed incineration enclosure would be required to apply best available control technology for toxics (T-BACT) prior to operation. Under Rule 1401, permits to operate may not be issued when 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 (SCAQMD 2015), exists. T-BACT will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

### Finding

The District finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential air quality-related impacts of the proposed project related to a projected air quality violation and the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the District finds that, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant air quality-related impacts of the proposed project identified in the Final PEIR.

### 3.3 Cultural Resources

**Archaeological Resources.** According to the Cultural Resources Study (Appendix C of the Draft PEIR), no artifacts or archaeological features were identified within the proposed project area as a result of the records search or Native American coordination efforts. It has been determined that there is low potential for the inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during ground-breaking activities. The area has been highly disturbed by past modifications to the campus, and impacts to archaeological resources during each phase of the proposed project would not be significant. However, because it is always possible that intact archaeological deposits are present at subsurface levels and could be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, mitigation measure MM-CUL-3 would be implemented to ensure that any impacts associated with the unexpected discovery of archaeological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**MM-CUL-3** In the event that archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during construction activities for the proposed project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Depending upon the significance of the find under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; 14 CCR 15064.5(f); PRC Section 21082), the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work, such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery may be warranted.

**Paleontological Resource Site or Geological Feature.** According to the Los Angeles Cultural Museum Records Search (Appendix C of the Draft PEIR), there are no documented fossil localities within a 1-mile radius of the campus or within the boundaries of the campus. Fossil

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

localities are found nearby within the same Pleistocene sedimentary deposits as found at the project area. Construction of the proposed project is unlikely to impact paleontologically sensitive sediments; however, proposed improvements have the potential to impact paleontological resources. Because excavations into undisturbed Pleistocene-age deposits are possible during construction and may unearth scientifically significant fossils, such disturbance should be monitored during construction in order to mitigate adverse impacts. In the event that unexpected, intact paleontological resources are unearthed during construction, a potentially significant impact could occur. Therefore, compliance with all applicable rules, ordinances, and regulations, as well as implementation of mitigation measures MM-CUL-4 through MM-CUL-6, would reduce potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level.

**MM-CUL-4** A qualified paleontologist should attend the pre-construction meeting to consult with the grading and excavation contractors concerning excavation schedules, paleontological field techniques, and safety issues.

**MM-CUL-5** A paleontological monitor should be on site on a full-time basis during the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits of high paleontological resource potential (e.g., older Quaternary alluvium) to inspect exposures for contained fossils. Geological units with a low potential for yielding paleontological resources, including Holocene-age alluvium and previously disturbed deposits, would not require monitoring. A paleontological monitor is defined as an individual who has experience in the collection and salvage of fossil materials. The paleontological monitor should work under the direction of a qualified paleontologist.

If any subsurface fossils are found by construction personnel, activity in the immediate area should be suspended and the fossils left in place untouched until a qualified paleontologist can evaluate the significance of the find. A qualified paleontologist (or paleontological monitor) should recover them. Construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the find shall be immediately redirected away from the vicinity of the discovery to allow room for the recovery of resources as necessary. In most cases, this fossil salvage can be completed in a short period of time. However, some fossil specimens (such as a complete large mammal skeleton) may require an extended salvage period. In these instances, the paleontologist (or paleontological monitor) should be allowed to temporarily direct, divert, or halt grading to allow recovery of fossil remains in a timely manner. Because of the potential for the recovering of small fossil remains, such as isolated mammal teeth, it may be necessary to set up a screen-washing

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

operation on the site. Fossil remains collected during monitoring and salvage should be cleaned, repaired, sorted, and cataloged.

- MM-CUL-6** Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos, and maps, should be deposited (as a donation) in a scientific institution with permanent paleontological collections, such as the Dr. John. D. Cooper Center at California State University, Fullerton. Donation of the fossils should be accompanied by financial support for initial specimen storage. A final summary report should be completed that outlines the results of the discovery. This report should include discussions of the methods used, stratigraphic section(s) exposed, fossils collected, and significance of recovered fossils.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential cultural resource-related impacts of the proposed project related to archaeological and paleontological resources to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the District finds that, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant cultural and paleontological resource-related impacts of the proposed project identified in the Final PEIR.

### **3.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials and Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment.** The proposed project involves the demolition of a few buildings on campus. Due to the age of the buildings, 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 disposal. Prior to demolition, a lead-based paint and asbestos survey will be required to be conducted by a California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA)-certified asbestos assessor and California Department of Health Services-certified lead-based paint assessor (MM-HAZ-1). Impacts are potentially significant; however, upon implementation of mitigation measure MM-HAZ-1, impacts would be less than significant.

As identified in the Hazards Assessment (Appendix D of the Draft PEIR), the area was previously used for agricultural purposes. As a result, residual pesticides and metals may be present in site soils. Prior to construction activities, soils should be tested for residual pesticides and metals. Upon implementation of mitigation measure MM-HAZ-2, impacts would be less than significant.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

The Environmental Data Resources (EDR) database search indicated a release of waste oil to soil from an underground storage tank (UST) that was previously located in the automotive yard, west of Technical Education Building 1. This case was investigated and closed by the lead regulatory agency. However, release cases can be closed with residual contamination in place in soils; therefore, impacted soils could be encountered during construction activities and excavation, transport, or disposal of site soils could expose workers or the general public to hazardous materials. In order to reduce any impacts from potentially contaminated soils, a hazardous materials contingency plan should be prepared prior to the commencement of construction activities (MM-HAZ-3).

A review of the EDR report and the Cypress General Plan indicated that a 16-inch oil pipeline is located in the railroad right-of-way on the Orange County Transportation Authority's (OCTA's) property adjacent to campus. Records associated with the pipeline did not indicate that there are any leaks. However, there is the potential that leaks have occurred and gone unreported. This pipeline or potentially impacted soils could be encountered during construction in this area. Should any construction be planned near this area, response and management measures (e.g., hazardous materials contingency plan) should be prepared in the event that impacted soil is encountered during construction.

If aggregate aboveground oil/fuel storage capacity is greater than 1,320 gallons and there is a reasonable expectation of an oil discharge into or upon navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines, a spill prevention, control, and countermeasures (SPCC) plan should be prepared and implemented (or, for smaller quantities, a spill prevention and response plan) (MM-HAZ-4).

An aboveground storage tank containing vehicle fuel is located in the northeastern part of the project area. The capacity of this tank is reported as 2,000 gallons. In addition, the interview questionnaire completed by the property managers indicated that chlorine for the pool has been stored on the property in 55-gallon drums. California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95 requires the preparation of a hazardous materials business plan for any business using 55 gallons (liquid) or 500 pounds (solid) of hazardous materials. The hazardous materials business plan must be submitted electronically through the California Environmental Reporting System (MM-HAZ-5). In addition, if aggregate aboveground oil/fuel storage capacity is greater than 1,320 gallons and there is a reasonable expectation of an oil discharge into or upon navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines, an SPCC plan should be prepared and implemented (or, for smaller quantities, a spill prevention and response plan) (MM-HAZ-4). Due to the use of potentially hazardous materials on site, impacts would be potentially significant and mitigation is required.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

**MM-HAZ-1** Prior to demolition or renovation of campus buildings, a lead-based paint and asbestos survey shall be conducted by a California Occupational Safety and Health Administration-certified asbestos consultant and/or certified site surveillance technician and a California Department of Public Health-certified lead inspector/risk assessor or sampling technician. A report documenting material types, conditions, and general quantities will be provided, along with photos of positive materials and diagrams. Demolition or renovation plans and contract specifications shall incorporate any abatement procedures for the removal of material containing asbestos or lead-based paint. All abatement work shall be done in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations.

**MM-HAZ-2** Due to past uses for agriculture, prior to grading permit issuance, soil should be sampled and analyzed for metals and residual pesticides. Sampling should be conducted in accordance with California Department of Toxic Substances Control guidance documents. The soil testing will confirm the presence or absence of on-site contamination associated with past uses on the project site.

Any soils qualifying as hazardous waste will delineated, removed, and properly disposed of off site. Any soil that exceeds the California Human Health Screening Levels will be either remediated on site to levels protective of human health or removed and properly disposed of off site.

**MM-HAZ-3** Due to a prior hazardous materials spill and the location of an oil pipeline in proximity to the project area, the project area may be impacted by hazardous materials and/or wastes. A hazardous materials contingency plan should be followed during demolition, excavation, and construction activities for the project. The hazardous materials contingency plan shall include, at a minimum, the following:

- Identification of known areas with hazardous waste and hazardous materials of concern
- Procedures for temporary cessation of construction activity and evaluation of the level of environmental concern
- Procedures for restricting access to the contaminated area except for properly trained personnel
- Procedures for notification and reporting, including internal management and local agencies (e.g., local fire department, county Certified Unified Program Agency), as needed
- Health and safety measures for removal and excavation of contaminated soil

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

- Procedures for characterizing and managing excavated soils
- Procedures for certification of completion of remediation

Site workers should be familiar with the hazardous materials contingency plan and should be fully trained on how to identify suspected contaminated soil.

**MM-HAZ-4** A variety of hazardous materials would be transported to, stored on, and used on the project site during construction activities and site operations. These would include fuels for equipment and vehicles, new and used motor oils, cleaning solvents, and paints, as well as storage containers and applicators containing such materials. If aggregate aboveground oil/fuel storage capacity is greater than 1,320 gallons (or completely buried 42,000 gallons) and there is a reasonable expectation of an oil discharge into or upon navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines, a spill prevention, control, and countermeasures (SPCC) plan pursuant to 40 CFR. 112 (or, for small quantities, a spill prevention and response plan) should be prepared and implemented during construction, and if applicable, during site operations. The SPCC plan (or spill prevention and response plan) should identify best management practices for spill and release prevention and provide procedures for cleaning up and disposing of any spills or releases.

**MM-HAZ-5** A variety of hazardous materials would be transported to, stored on, used on, and disposed of on the project site during construction activities. These would include fuels for equipment and vehicles, new and used motor oils, cleaning solvents, and paints, as well as storage containers and applicators containing such materials. In addition, hazardous materials, such as chlorine, pesticides, and herbicides, are routinely stored on the site and used for building and grounds maintenance. Businesses that use 55 gallons (liquid) or 500 pounds (solid) of hazardous materials are required to submit a hazardous materials business plan (pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25500) within 30 days of beginning operations. The hazardous materials business plan should contain information on hazardous materials inventory, inspections, training, recordkeeping, and reporting. The hazardous materials business plan should be submitted electronically through the California Environmental Reporting System. Further information can be found on the County of Orange Department of Environmental Health website (<http://occupainfo.com/programs/hm>).

**Exposing Nearby Schools to Hazardous Materials.** Holder Elementary School, Wisdom Mission School, and Futureland Montessori School are all within 0.25 mile of the Cypress College campus. A variety of hazardous materials, including fuels for equipment and vehicles, new and

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

used motor oils, cleaning solvents, and paints, would be used during construction and renovation activities. Improper handling and/or use of these materials during construction would represent a potential threat to the public and the environment. Preparation of a hazardous materials contingency plan would be required to manage impacts from accidental spills or contaminated soils if discovered during construction (MM-HAZ-3).

Buildings in the project area may contain asbestos-containing materials or lead-based paint. Construction and renovation activities could expose workers and/or the general public to these hazardous materials. Prior to construction or renovation activities, a lead-based paint and asbestos survey will be completed. The associated report will include an abatement work plan that describes monitoring and abatement activities that will be carried out as part of construction activities to prevent exposure to asbestos and lead-based paint (MM-HAZ-1).

An aboveground storage tank containing vehicle fuel is located in the northeastern part of the project area. The capacity of this tank is reported as 2,000 gallons. In addition, the interview questionnaire completed by the property managers indicated that chlorine for the pool has been stored on the property in 55-gallon drums. California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95 requires the preparation of a hazardous materials business plan for any business using 55 gallons (liquid) or 500 pounds (solid) of hazardous materials. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan must be submitted electronically through the California Environmental Reporting System (MM-HAZ-5). In addition, if aggregate aboveground oil/fuel storage capacity is greater than 1,320 gallons and there is a reasonable expectation of an oil discharge into or upon navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines, an SPCC plan should be prepared and implemented (or, for smaller quantities, a spill prevention and response plan) (MM-HAZ-4). Due to the use of potentially hazardous materials on site, impacts would be potentially significant and mitigation is required.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential hazards and hazardous material-related impacts of the proposed project related to the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials; the release of hazardous materials into the environment; the exposure of schools to hazardous materials; and cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the District finds that, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant hazards and hazardous material-related impacts of the proposed project identified in the Final PEIR.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

### **3.5 Hydrology and Water Quality**

#### **Violate Water Quality Standards and Substantial Degradation of Water Quality.**

Construction activities such as grading, excavation, and trenching for construction, renovation, and demolition of facilities would result in disturbance of soils at the project site. Construction site runoff can contain soil particles and sediments from these activities. Dust from construction sites can also be transported to other nearby locations where the dust can enter runoff or water bodies. Spills or leaks from heavy equipment and machinery, staging areas, or building sites can also enter runoff. Because implementation of the proposed project would collectively require construction activities resulting in a land disturbance of more than 1 acre, Cypress College is required to obtain the Construction General Permit, which pertains to pollution from grading and project construction. Compliance with the permit requires the District to file a Notice of Intent with the State Water Resources Control Board and prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to construction. The SWPPP would incorporate best management practices (BMPs) in order to prevent, or reduce to the greatest feasible extent, adverse impacts to water quality from erosion and sedimentation. Demolition activities could result in the release of contaminated materials and hazardous substances such as lead-based paint or asbestos. Mitigation measure MM-HAZ-1 would require a lead-based paint and asbestos survey prior to demolition, which would be conducted by a Cal/OSHA-certified asbestos assessor and California Department of Health Services-certified lead-based paint assessor. In addition, there is sufficient evidence to indicate that soils on site may have residual pesticides/herbicides from past agricultural uses and that there have been hazardous materials cases involving the underground storage of fuel tanks. Excavation, transport, or disposal of soils from these areas could create a hazard to the public or the environment. Mitigation measures MM-HAZ-3 through MM-HAZ-5 would require the preparation of hazardous materials contingency plans in order to reduce potential impacts from contaminated soils, which would also reduce the potential for contaminated soils to be mobilized in stormwater runoff. Preparation and implementation of a SWPPP as a standard construction practice, as well as implementation of mitigation measures MM-HAZ-1 through MM-HAZ-5, would prevent exceedance of water quality standards, non-conformance with Waste Discharge Requirements, and degradation of water quality due to construction and demolition activities. The impact is, therefore, less than significant with mitigation.

**Alteration of existing drainage pattern of site or area.** The District distributes stormwater-specific contract language and maintains strict design standards for new construction and major remodel/additions that require contractors to subscribe to green buildings and sustainable design standards like those set forth in the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification process. All new development projects would comply with the District's Storm Water Management Plan, which requires that new development and redevelopment project

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

comply with the standards contained in the Phase II Small MS4 Permit (Section E.12). To ensure that future development and renovation activities are designed so as to reduce the volume and pollutant load of stormwater runoff from each site, mitigation measure MM-HYD-1 shall be implemented.

With implementation of MM-HYD-1, the impacts of the project on drainage patterns and long-term effects on water quality would be less than significant.

**MM-HYD-1 Project-Specific Water Quality Management Plan.** Prior to implementing a project that creates and/or replaces (including projects with no net increase in impervious footprint) more than 5,000 square feet of impervious surface, the District shall ensure such development is compliant with the standards contained in Section E.12 of the Phase II Small MS4 Permit (SWRCB Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ, as amended). The construction project shall integrate source control BMPs and low impact development (LID) designs into the project to the maximum extent feasible to reduce the potential for pollutants to enter stormwater runoff. This includes site design best management practices (as applicable), such as minimizing impervious areas, maximizing permeability, minimizing directly connected impervious areas, creating reduced or “zero discharge” areas, incorporating trees and landscaping, and conserving natural areas.

At a minimum, the district shall require facilities to be designed to evapotranspire, infiltrate, harvest/use, and/or biotreat storm water to meet at least one of the hydraulic sizing design criteria contained in the Phase II Small MS4 Permit. This means ensuring source reduction or retention/treatment of either the 85th percentile 24-hour storm runoff event, or the flow of runoff produced from a rain event equal to at least 0.2 inches per hour intensity.

Long-term operation and maintenance of LID designs and structure BMPs (e.g., infiltration basin, bioswales, buffer strips, etc.) shall be conducted in accordance with the District’s WQMP. In addition, the District shall comply with the landscape design and maintenance program contained in the Phase II Small MS4 Permit, which is intended to reduce the amount of water, pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers used.

**Exceed the Capacity of Existing or Planned Stormwater Drainage Systems.** Because the drainage sheds would maintain the same boundaries, and because changes in impervious surfaces would be relatively minor, the proposed project is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing off-site stormwater drainage system. Some on-site modifications to the drainage system

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

may be undertaken, if required, as part of new construction and renovation activities. Implementation of MM-HYD-1 would ensure that proposed projects include design features that slow and retain stormwater runoff. For these reasons, the impact of the project on the capacity of stormwater drainage systems would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Hydrological or Water Quality Impacts.** The primary pollutants of concern on a college campus are associated with private vehicle maintenance (e.g., car washing and grease/oils associated with maintenance/repairs), landscaping/grounds work (e.g., improper/excessive use of pesticides, herbicides, and/or fertilizers), and/or trash (e.g., due to improper waste disposal). Because the cumulative effects of past projects have resulted in substantial water quality problems in the region's major waterways, and because water quality problems are generally cumulative in nature, all efforts must be made to reduce pollutant concentrations within stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable, even if the impact of an individual project appears inconsequential. Mitigation measure MM-HYD-1 is designed to address this issue by reducing to the maximum extent practicable the levels of pollutants entering the storm drain system. The mitigation measure likewise ensures that the contribution of the proposed project to cumulative impacts on water quality is less than significant with mitigation.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce the potential hydrology and water quality-related impacts of the proposed project related to the alteration of existing drainage patterns, resulting in erosion or flooding; contributions to excess runoff water; an exceedance of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems; and cumulative impacts to water quality to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the District finds that, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology and water quality-related impacts of the proposed project identified in the Final PEIR.

### **3.6 Noise**

**Noise Levels in Excess of Established Standards.** Noise from construction would range from 76 to 83 A-weighted decibels (dBA) equivalent continuous sound level (Leq) at a distance of 100 feet from the center of construction activities. Noise from construction would be audible and would temporarily elevate the local ambient noise level to some degree at distances greater than 100 feet; therefore, impacts would be significant. In an effort to avoid construction noise impacts, mitigation measure MM-NOI-1 is required to control construction noise to the extent

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

practicable and feasible. With implementation of mitigation measure MM-NOI-1, construction noise would have less-than-significant impacts.

As a result of regional population and employment growth, as well as campus growth under the Facilities Master Plan, traffic on local arterial streets is expected to increase relative to current conditions. The proposed project would increase the noise level along these roads by 1 decibel (dB) or less along the study area roads in the vicinity of the campus. In community noise assessments, a 1 dB increase is not noticeable to the human ear. Therefore, due to the amount of increase in noise level (1 dB or less), noise impacts due to project-related traffic would not be significant. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant noise increases or cause an exceedance of applicable noise standards. Therefore, the impact from traffic noise associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

**MM-NOI-1** Prior to initiation of campus construction, the North Orange County Community College District shall approve a construction noise mitigation program to include the following:

- Construction equipment shall be properly outfitted and maintained with feasible noise-reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise.
- Stationary noise sources such as generators shall be located away from noise-sensitive land uses if feasible.
- Laydown and construction vehicle staging areas shall be located away from noise-sensitive land uses if feasible.
- Whenever possible, academic, administrative, and residential areas that will be subject to construction noise shall be informed 1 week before the start of each construction project.
- All construction projects pursuant to the proposed project shall be required to implement the above measures for control of construction noise.

**Temporary or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** Noise from construction activities at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers would range from approximately 74 to 89 dBA  $L_{eq}$  at a distance of 50 feet. Noise from construction would be audible and would temporarily elevate the local ambient noise level to some degree at distances greater than 100 feet from construction; therefore, impacts would be significant. In an effort to avoid construction noise impacts, mitigation measure MM-NOI-1 is required to control construction noise to the extent practicable and feasible. With the implementation of MM-NOI-1, construction noise would have less-than-significant impacts.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

### **Finding**

The District finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce the potential noise-related impacts of the proposed project related to the generation of noise levels in excess of established standards and the temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the District finds that, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant noise-related impacts of the proposed project identified in the Final PEIR.

### **3.7 Utilities and Service Systems**

**Require Construction of New Water or Wastewater Facilities.** The proposed project would generate additional wastewater discharges and potable water demand by adding academic and auxiliary space and through a general increase in the number of campus students. This additional wastewater flow and potable water use would result in an increased demand on the local infrastructure. Upon review of the final site engineering and design plans, the District will coordinate with the Golden State Water Company (GSWC) to determine whether the existing water lines have the capacity and are in good enough condition to handle the increase in water flow and the City of Cypress Public Works Department to determine whether the existing sewer lines have the capacity and are in good enough condition to handle the increase in wastewater flow. A service agreement, and if applicable, payment of impact fees would be required prior to initiating new sewer and water connections. Implementation of mitigation measures MM-UTL-1 and MM-UTL-2 would be required to ensure impacts would be less than significant.

**MM-UTL-1** Upon review of the final site engineering and design plans, the North Orange County Community College District (District) will coordinate with the Golden State Water Company to initiate a water service agreement. Coordination with the Golden State Water Company would also occur to determine if payment of impact fees would be required prior to initiating new water service connections.

**MM-UTL-2** Upon review of the final site engineering and design plans, the District will coordinate with the City of Cypress Public Works Department to determine whether the existing sewer lines have the capacity and are in good enough condition to handle the increase in wastewater flow. Prior to occupancy, the District shall pay applicable City of Cypress Public Works Department sewer infrastructure connection fees and applicable fair-share capital facilities fees, to the extent the payment of such fees is made necessary by the proposed project facilities.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

**Require the Construction of New Drainage Facilities.** Because many of the facilities in the Facilities Master Plan are in the initial planning stages (i.e., no detailed layout or designs are available), the increase or decrease in impervious surfaces that would occur campus-wide as a result cannot be quantified at this time. However, because the campus is already largely built out, is located on level topography, and is surrounded by urban land uses, the proposed project components are not anticipated to substantially modify existing topography, drainage-shed boundaries, or runoff rates/patterns. Furthermore, new facilities proposed under the Facilities Master Plan would be subject to the most current standards for drainage design as well as the regional MS4 permit, which generally requires developers to mimic pre-construction drainage patterns when designing the drainage plan for a site. Because the drainage sheds would maintain the same boundaries, and because changes in impervious surfaces would be relatively minor, the proposed project is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing off-site stormwater drainage system. Some on-site modifications to the drainage system may be undertaken, if required, as part of facility construction under the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM-HYD-1 would require preparation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), which would minimize impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Adequate Wastewater Capacity.** The proposed project would generate additional wastewater discharges by adding additional academic space and a general increase in the number of students. This additional wastewater flow would result in an increased demand on the local wastewater treatment infrastructure. Because the proposed project does not involve appreciable changes to landscaping or athletic fields, project-related increases in demand would be limited to domestic/sanitary needs of proposed buildings (e.g., restrooms, showers, laboratory facilities). Domestic/sanitary water demands at full build-out could increase by as much as 8,000 gallons per day (gpd) (or 9 acre-feet per year [afy]) to a total of 58,000 gpd (or 64 afy). Considering that the increase in potable water use would be associated with domestic/sanitary uses, the majority of water consumed would be disposed of via sewer systems. Therefore, potable water demand is assumed to be a reasonable proxy for wastewater generation, and the projected increase in wastewater generation associated with the proposed project can be approximated as 8,000 gpd, to a total of 58,000 gpd.

Upon review of the final site engineering and design plans, the District will coordinate with the City's Public Works Department to determine whether the existing sewer lines have the capacity and are in good enough condition to handle the increase in wastewater flow. A service agreement, and if applicable, payment of impact fees would be required prior to initiating new sewer connections with the City's Public Works Department. Because the proposed project is a master plan, and building- or facility-specific site plans are not available, a hydraulic analysis at the PEIR stage of analysis is premature. However, when specific building site plans are available, a hydraulic analysis will be conducted to assess impacts to Public Works sewer lines

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

prior to approval by the Division of the State Architect (DSA), as specified in MM-UTL-2. Implementation of MM-UTL-2 would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

**Landfill with Sufficient Permitted Capacity.** Construction of the proposed project would generate construction waste (e.g., concrete rubble, asphalt rubble, wood, drywall) that would result in an increased demand for solid waste collection and disposal capacity. The County of Orange Waste & Recycling will require the completion and submittal of a construction and demolition waste reduction and recycling application to the County for approval prior to Division of State Architect approval, which is, therefore, included as mitigation measure MM-UTL-3.

**MM-UTL-3** Prior to Division of State Architect approval, the District shall complete a construction and demolition waste reduction and recycling application and submit the application to the County of Orange (County) OC Waste & Recycling for approval. The construction and demolition waste reduction and recycling application will identify and estimate the materials to be recycled during construction and demolition activities and will name the County-approved facility used to recycle the waste. Compliance with the application prerequisites will be a requirement in all construction contracts. The County-approved application will be attached to all construction plans and distributed to all construction contractors. Once construction is complete, the District will be responsible for preparing a tonnage report that demonstrates that the project recycled a minimum of 50% of its construction and demolition waste. The tonnage report must be submitted to and approved by the County prior to issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy permit. Because this proposed project will be developed in phases over time, review and approval of the construction and demolition waste reduction and recycling application can be submitted by phase or by building. However, for each demolition waste reduction and recycling application submitted and approved, a corresponding tonnage report should also then be submitted for approval.

**Cumulative Utilities and Service Systems Impact.** Because of the cumulative nature of potable water impacts, the project's increase in demand on potable water, even if individually minor, could be cumulatively considerable, particularly in the context of climate change, existing drought conditions, and the trend toward increased reliance on local supplies. However, an increase in potable water demand by 9 afy represents only 0.06% of the amount of potable water supplied by GSWC'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 would be far less than the variation in demand due to climatic conditions and well within the margin of error for such estimates (GSWC 2011). Additionally, Cypress College is continuously looking for ways to decrease potable water consumption. In 2014, Cypress College reduced water consumption by reducing the time on all irrigation clocks by approximately 25%. Currently, several lawn areas are

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

being replaced with native plants. Cypress College is planning to install a centralized irrigation control system that would further reduce and manage water consumption on the campus. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to water demand would be less than significant. Implementation of MM-UTL-1 would ensure that the project would not have unanticipated impacts to the City's water infrastructure. Therefore, the impacts related to construction or expansion of water facilities and new or expanded entitlements would be less than significant with mitigation.

The proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts with regard to wastewater treatment facilities, the expansion of existing facilities, and the capacity of wastewater treatment providers. All foreseeable projects would need to evaluate their wastewater generation prior to development, and upon review of the final site engineering and design plans, would be required to coordinate with the City or the applicable sewer system jurisdiction. Implementation of MM-UTL-2 would ensure that the project would not have unanticipated impacts to the City's wastewater infrastructure and that there is sufficient capacity within the system to accommodate the proposed project. A service agreement, and if applicable, payment of impact fees would be required prior to initiating new sewer connections. Considering that the proposed project and additional projects in the vicinity would be subject to these requirements, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Because the drainage sheds would maintain the same boundaries, and because changes in impervious surfaces would be relatively minor, the proposed project is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing off-site stormwater drainage systems, requiring the construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities. Some on-site modifications to the drainage system may be undertaken, if required, as part of new construction and renovation activities. Implementation of MM-HYD-1 would ensure that the proposed project includes design features that slow and retain stormwater runoff. For these reasons, the proposed project would not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Other projects in the vicinity of the proposed project would need to be evaluated on an individual basis with regard to stormwater drainage facilities. There are existing stormwater conveyance facilities in the area, and combined with other projects, the proposed project is not expected to cause a significant impact related to stormwater runoff because all projects would be designed to meet stormwater capacity. The proposed project would not substantially change total surface runoff and would not combine with surrounding projects to contribute to significant cumulative impacts; therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Implementation of MM-UTL-3 would require that prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy permit issuance, a construction and demolition waste reduction and recycling application and tonnage report for the proposed project would be submitted to the County for review and

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

approval. The amount of solid waste generated and disposed of in nearby landfills during operation of the proposed project is expected to be within the permitted capacity of the landfills. All foreseeable projects would need to submit this information and evaluate the project's anticipated solid waste generation prior to development, and cumulative impacts would be considered in relation to landfill capacity. As such, cumulative impacts to landfill capacity would be less than significant with mitigation.

The proposed project would increase electricity demand by 28.4% and decrease natural gas demand by 6.4%. However, CalEEMod default values for electricity and natural gas consumption reflect 2011 Title 24 standards and do not reflect the more stringent energy-reduction requirements associated with the 2019 Title 24 standards or subsequent standards with which the proposed project would be required to comply. Therefore, the electricity and natural gas consumption estimates presented in Table 4.12-3 of the Draft PEIR are an overestimate of the anticipated electricity and natural gas consumption rates associated with the proposed project. Additionally, as part of the Cypress College Energy Plan, Cypress College is continuously looking for ways to improve energy conservation. Therefore, the proposed project would not combine with projects in the vicinity to result in cumulatively considerable impacts, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential utilities and service system-related impacts of the proposed project related to the construction of new water or wastewater facilities, new storm drainage facilities, insufficient landfill capacity, adequate wastewater capacity, and cumulative utilities and service systems impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the District finds that, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant utilities and service system-related impacts of the proposed project identified in the Final PEIR.

**Findings of Fact for the Cypress College  
Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

## 4 FINDINGS ON LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

### 4.1 Aesthetics

**Scenic Vistas.** The proposed project involves the construction of a variety of structures, the visual enhancement of entryways, and the improvement of pedestrian and vehicular circulation on the campus as part of the Facilities Master Plan. Construction activities, including grading and excavation, could have a temporary impact on views due to the presence and staging of equipment. However, the area surrounding the project site is characterized by residential and commercial uses. The City of Cypress General Plan does not identify any scenic areas, vistas, or corridors in the vicinity of the campus (City of Cypress 2011). No nature preserves are located within the city. There are no scenic vistas within the vicinity of the proposed project site; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Scenic Resource Damage within a State Scenic Highway.** The proposed project involves the construction of a variety of structures on the Cypress College campus, some of which could obstruct views of the surrounding area. Construction activities, including grading and excavation, could have a temporary impact on views due to the presence and staging of equipment. However, the project would not have an impact on scenic resources associated with a state scenic highway. According to the California Department of Transportation, the nearest eligible scenic roadway is the stretch of State Route (SR-) 57 from SR-90 to SR-60, which is approximately 9.5 miles from the project site at its closest point. 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. The proposed project would not damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and impacts on scenic resources would be less than significant.

#### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on aesthetics and visual resources as it relates to scenic vistas and scenic resource damage within a state scenic highway; therefore, no mitigation is required.

### 4.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources

**Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.** The proposed project would not convert Farmland to non-agricultural use. A parcel of Unique Farmland, located in Anaheim, is located approximately 2.2 miles east of the campus and appears to contain a dirt lot in the southern portion of the site and greenhouses and small rows of various crops in the northern portion of the site. A parcel of land considered to be Prime Farmland that

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

currently appears to be developed as a golf course is located approximately 1.9 mile southwest of the campus in Los Alamitos. A parcel of Farmland of State Importance is located 11.9 miles northeast from the project site, in Yorba Linda, and contains rows of crops (CDC 2016). The proposed project would not occur within these isolated Farmland locations, and would not result in the conversion of this land to non-agricultural use; therefore, no impact would occur.

**Conflict with Existing Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract.** The Williamson Act, also known as the California Land Conversion Act of 1969 (California Government Code, Section 51200 et seq.), preserves agricultural and open space lands from the conversion to urban land uses by establishing a contract between local governments and private landowners to voluntarily restrict their land holdings to agricultural or open space use. The project site is not located on any lands with Williamson Act contracts. The campus is designated as Education Facilities, according to the Land Use Policy Map of the City of Cypress General Plan (City of Cypress 2011), and is therefore not zoned for agricultural use. The campus is zoned as “Public and Semi-public Zone/Civic Center Combining Zone” and “Public and Semi-public Zone” (City of Cypress 2016). The surrounding areas are zoned as “Residential Multiple Family Zone/Civic Center Combining Zone,” “Commercial General Zone,” “Commercial General Zone/Civic Center Combining Zone,” “Residential Single Family Zone,” “Planned Community Zone,” and “Planned Commercial/Light Industrial.” The City of Buena Park borders the eastern boundary of the project site. This area bordering the project site is zoned “6,000 square feet One Family Residential,” “Medium Density Multifamily Residential,” and “Planned Development” (City of Buena Park 2015). None of these zones allow agricultural uses; therefore, there is no conflict with agricultural zoning. According to the City of Cypress General Plan, no areas within the City of Cypress are considered Agricultural land use type; therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on agriculturally zoned land.

**Conflict with Existing Forestland, Timberland, or Timberland Production Zoning.** No land within the City of Cypress is zoned as Forestland, Timberland, or Timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the proposed project site would not conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of any of any forest or timberland, as none of those land types are located within the vicinity of the project site; no impact would occur.

**Loss or Conversion of Forestland.** The proposed project is located in an urban, developed area and is not located within or in the vicinity of forest land. The closest forests are the Cleveland National Forest (to the east of Orange County) and the Angeles National Forest (north of Los Angeles) (USFS 2016). There are no state forests within Orange County. The proposed project would not contribute to the loss of forestland; therefore, there would be no impact.

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

**Changes in the Existing Environment Resulting in Conversion of Forestland or Farmland.** No Farmland or Forestland exists within the vicinity of the proposed project site. Therefore, no Farmland or Forestland would be converted for non-agricultural or non-forest use due to the proposed project. No impact on Farmland or Forestland would occur due to the proposed project; therefore, no further analysis is required.

**Cumulative Agricultural and Forestry Resource Impacts.** As analyzed above, the proposed project would experience less-than-significant impacts related to all agricultural and forestry resource issue areas. Considering the proposed project would not be located within the vicinity of farmland or forestland, the proposed project would not combine with cumulative projects resulting in a significant impact to an agricultural or forestry resource. Therefore, impacts to agricultural and forestry resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

### Finding

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on agriculture and forestry resources; therefore, no mitigation is required.

## 4.3 Air Quality

**Applicable Air Quality Plan.** The proposed project would result in population growth that is consistent with Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG's) growth projections anticipated in SCAQMD's 2012 Air Quality Management Plan. Because the planned growth of the proposed project has been factored into the underlying growth projections of the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.

**Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants.** The South Coast Air Basin is a nonattainment area for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and/or California Ambient Air Quality Standards. Implementation of the proposed project would generate short-term air pollutant emissions during construction and long-term operational emissions associated with vehicle traffic to and from the campus as well as energy use of buildings and facilities. Construction and operational emissions from the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds. Although fugitive dust and vehicle and equipment exhaust generated during project construction would contribute to the South Coast Air Basin nonattainment designation for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, this contribution would not be considered cumulatively considerable. Therefore, this impact 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. These compounds

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

would be emitted in varying amounts on campus, depending on where construction activities were occurring. Construction of the proposed project would use typical construction techniques in compliance with SCAQMD rules. 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. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

**Cumulative Air Quality Impact.** 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. With regard to operational cumulative impacts associated with nonattainment pollutants, in general, if a project is consistent with the community and general plans, it has been accounted for in the attainment demonstration contained within the state implementation plan and would, therefore, not cause a cumulatively significant impact on the ambient air quality. The proposed project would result in population growth that is consistent with the growth projections anticipated in the SCAQMD's 2012 Air Quality Management Plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on air quality as it relates to an applicable air quality plan, a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants, objectionable odors, and a cumulative air quality impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.

## **4.4 Biological Resources**

**Impact on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.** The proposed project is within an urban, developed campus. No special-status species were identified on campus during the field survey. Impacts to nesting bird and raptor species would be considered potentially significant if implementation of the proposed project would require removal or substantial trimming of healthy mature trees during the bird nesting season. Thus, the proposed project would be required to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in order to reduce impacts to nesting bird habitat.

**Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community.** The proposed project site is composed of developed, ruderal vegetation, and ornamental planting communities according to a general reconnaissance biological survey conducted on the campus. These are not considered to be native plant communities. The project site is not located on riparian habitat or a sensitive

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

natural community, and would not have an adverse effect on these habitats. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**Federally Protected Wetlands.** According to a general reconnaissance biological survey conducted on the campus, the proposed project site is composed of developed, ornamental plantings, and ruderal vegetation communities. No jurisdictional wetlands or non-wetland waters were found to occur within the proposed project site during the biological survey; therefore, no impacts would occur.

**Interfere with the Movement of any Native Resident or Migratory Fish or Wildlife Species.** The project site and the surrounding area are currently developed with urban uses and do not contain any significant areas of natural open space or areas of significant biological resource value. Developed areas within the study area include buildings, facilities, pedestrian walkways, and parking lots. Developed land is the dominant land cover type within the project area, totaling 64.25 acres. No wildlife corridors or nurseries are located on the site due to existing surrounding urban development. Therefore, no impacts related to wildlife corridors would occur.

**Conflicts with Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources.** Implementation of the proposed project could result in removal of trees protected under the Cypress Municipal Code. Section 17-17 of the City's Municipal Code provides states that no person shall cut down, destroy, or remove any landmark tree growing within the city limits without a permit from the planning director of designee. As such, the District would coordinate with the City's Planning Director prior to removing any landmark trees on campus. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other 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, the project would not impact the goals and objectives of any adopted plans. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources.** A significant adverse cumulative biological resources impact would occur where the construction or operation of the cumulative projects would encroach into areas containing sensitive biological resources, affect the movement of wildlife species, or affect the functionality of a planned conservation area. The proposed project would take place in a highly urbanized area in the city. Developed and previously disturbed areas dominate the study area and include impervious surfaces and ornamental landscaping. Overall wildlife abundance and species richness appear to be low because of the urbanized nature of the study area. No special-status plant species were identified during the biological evaluation

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

Projects surrounding the campus may have birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act but these determinations would be made on a case-by-case basis, and the effects of cumulative development on nesting birds would be mitigated to the extent feasible in accordance with CEQA and other applicable legal requirements. Therefore, cumulative adverse effects on 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be less than significant.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on biological resources as it relates to a candidate or special-status species, riparian habitat, or sensitive natural community; federally protected wetlands; the interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species; conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; a habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation, plan, or other conservation plan; and cumulative impacts to biological resources. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

### **4.5 Cultural Resources**

**Disturbance of Human Remains.** There is no evidence of human remains on the project site, and the potential for the inadvertent discovery of human remains on the project site is very low because there is no evidence of any historical camps or human settlement on the site. Additionally, existing regulations through California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, et seq. state that if human remains are discovered during project construction, no further disturbance shall occur until the Orange County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made (California Public Resource Code, Section 5097.9 et seq.). If the county coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within a reasonable time. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commissions shall identify the Most Likely Descendent. The Most Likely Descendent shall then make recommendations and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98. Given the very low potential for human remains on the project site and required compliance with existing regulations pertaining to the discovery of human remains, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to human remains.

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

### Finding

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on cultural resources as it relates to the disturbance of human remains; therefore, no mitigation is required.

### 4.6 Geology and Soils

**Expose People or Structures to Fault Rupture, Strong Seismic Ground Shaking, Liquefaction, or Landslides.** The project site is likely to experience at least one major earthquake in the foreseeable future. The intensity of such an event would depend on the causative fault and the distance to the epicenter, the moment magnitude, and the duration of shaking. The absence of on-site fault traces, the flat topography of the project site, and the character of underlying soils mean that the potential for landslides and fault rupture is minimal. However, the site is within a state seismic hazard zone for earthquake-induced liquefaction. No element of the proposed project would affect the timing, probability, or duration of an earthquake, or increase the severity of ground shaking or ground-shaking effects that would occur. Thus, the potential impact of the project would be limited to a potential for an increase in public exposure (through construction of classrooms) to high levels of ground shaking and possibly liquefaction during an earthquake.

However, this potential impact would be minimal because numerous laws, policies, and building standards are in place that impose stringent seismic safety requirements on the design and construction of new structures, especially construction undertaken by public school districts. All buildings in California are subject to the standards in the California Building Code (CBC), which require engineers to develop seismic design criteria that reflect the nature and magnitude of maximum ground motions that can be reasonably expected. These seismic design criteria allow engineers to apply appropriate building codes and design structures to withstand the effects of earthquakes. For public school districts specifically, the DSA has jurisdiction over all aspects of construction (including access compliance), to ensure that plans, specifications, and construction activities comply with the CBC (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations).

The California Geological Survey (CGS) serves as an advisor under contract with the DSA to review engineering geology and seismology reports for compliance with state geologic hazard regulations. The District will be required to send all engineering, geotechnical, and soils reports normally required to comply with the CBC to the CGS to ensure such reports also comply with applicable geologic hazard regulations (i.e., the Field Act and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act). The projects contemplated in the Facilities Master Plan would not be approved or built without adequately demonstrating to DSA and CGS their compliance with the CBC and applicable geologic hazards regulations. For this reason, the proposed project would be designed

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

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.

**Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil.** Because the proposed project site is already developed and not located in sloped areas, the potential for substantial soil erosion or significant loss of topsoil is generally low. Construction activities such as grading, excavation, and trenching for construction, renovation, and demolition of facilities discussed in the Facilities Master Plan would result in disturbance of soils at the project site. Construction site runoff can contain soil particles and sediments from these activities. Dust from construction sites can also be transported to other nearby locations where the dust can enter runoff or water bodies. Sediment from erosion of graded or excavated surface materials, leaks or spills from equipment, or inadvertent releases of construction materials could result in water quality degradation if runoff containing the sediment entered receiving waters in sufficient quantities to exceed water quality objectives. Impacts from construction-related activities would generally be short term and of limited duration.

Because implementation of the Facilities Master Plan would collectively require construction activities resulting in a land disturbance of more than 1 acre, Cypress College is required to obtain the Construction General Permit, which pertains to pollution from grading and project construction. Compliance with the permit requires the District to file a Notice of Intent with the State Water Resources Control Board and prepare a SWPPP prior to construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs in order to prevent, or reduce to the greatest feasible extent, adverse impacts to water quality from erosion and sedimentation. A copy of the applicable SWPPP would be kept at the construction site and be available for County/DSA review upon request.

BMPs would prevent construction-related contaminants from reaching impaired surface waters and contributing to urban impacts on water quality in the coastal bays and estuaries into which stormwater discharges. Required compliance with the Construction General Permit, including preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, would ensure that erosion impacts resulting from construction-related activities and ground disturbances would be less than significant.

**Located on or Would Cause Unstable Soil.** Soils within the project site could be prone to a variety of instabilities, including shrink/swell, differential settlement, or other instabilities, which could only be determined precisely through site-specific soil testing. If unstable soils are not taken into consideration in construction site preparation activities (i.e., grading) and in the design of proposed structures, unstable soils would have potentially significant impacts on the structural components of the project. Improperly designed structures could be subject, in the long term, to damage or distress as a result of adverse soil conditions, resulting in the need for frequent and potentially costly repairs; in severe cases, they could represent a public safety issue. Although

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

soil settlement and/or corrosion causes deterioration to plumbing, pipelines, and foundations in a slow, incremental manner, unexpected or sudden utility line breaks or other structural failures could occur as result of, or be more likely to occur in the event of, an earthquake.

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. Commonly employed solutions include over-excavation and replacement with engineered fills, lime treatment, moisture conditioning, proper compaction of base and sub-base soils, use of appropriate construction materials, and appropriate selection and design of foundations, among others. As discussed above, projects contemplated in the Facilities Master Plan would not be approved or built without adequately demonstrating to DSA and CGS their compliance with the CBC and applicable geologic hazard regulations. Geotechnical recommendation—likely similar to the common solutions previously described (as appropriate)—would be included as part of project designs and construction plans to protect facilities for unstable or expansive soils. For these reasons, the potential impact of the proposed project with respect to expansive or otherwise unstable soils would be less than significant.

**Located on Expansive Soil.** Projects contemplated in the Facilities Master Plan would not be approved or built without adequately demonstrating to DSA and CGS their compliance with the CBC and applicable geologic hazards regulations. Geotechnical recommendation—likely similar to the common solutions previously described (as appropriate)—would be included as part of project designs and construction plans to protect facilities for unstable or expansive soils. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Soils Incapable of Supporting Septic Tanks.** The proposed project does not include septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, no impact would occur.

**Cumulative Geological Resource or Soil Impact.** The geographic extent considered for potential cumulative impacts to people and structures related to geologic and seismic hazards is localized and site-specific. The project would experience less-than-significant impacts related to all geological and soil issue areas. Impacts related to earthquakes and adverse soil conditions would be less than significant as a result of the required compliance with applicable building codes and geologic hazard regulations. Geologic/soil issues relate to local, site-specific soil conditions, ground response to earthquakes, and the potential for adverse soil conditions to damage the project's structural components. Although impacts identified as less than significant can compound to generate a significant cumulative impact, the geology and soils impacts of the proposed project are not cumulative in nature. The only projects in the cumulative scenario that would contribute to or compound the identified impacts would be those that are overlapping or

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

adjacent to the proposed project. Because no projects in the cumulative scenario are adjacent or overlapping, there would be no cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soils, and seismicity to which the proposed project could contribute.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on geological resources or soils; therefore, no mitigation is required.

### **4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

**Generation of 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 project); motor vehicle trips to project land uses; generation of electricity associated with water supply, treatment, and distribution and wastewater treatment; and solid waste disposal.

Several statewide GHG-reduction measures would reduce GHG emissions associated with motor vehicles and electrical generation over time. Estimated annual project-generated GHG emissions would be approximately 30,608 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (MT CO<sub>2</sub>E) per year. Compared to existing conditions, the proposed project would result in a decrease of GHG emissions. The net change in GHG emissions from 2015 to 2025 would be a decrease in emissions by 1,907 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E per year. Because the proposed project would reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting, impacts are less than significant.

**Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation.** The Scoping Plan approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) on December 12, 2008, provides a framework for actions to reduce California's GHG emissions and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs. Many of the Scoping Plan measures that have been adopted will reduce GHG emissions from all development projects and their users in California. For example, adoption of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and more stringent energy conservation standards would apply to all motor vehicle users and owners of homes and commercial properties. Given that the GHG reduction goal of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (i.e., reduction of emissions to 1990 levels by 2020) would require a statewide reduction of 28.5% from "business as usual" (i.e., the emissions that would occur in the absence of any regulation of GHG emissions), a large portion of a specific project's GHG emission reductions will result from statewide measures. The proposed project would be consistent with the strategies and measures in the Scoping Plan. Furthermore, neither Cypress College, nor the

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

City of Cypress, nor the SCAQMD have adopted any GHG reduction measures that would apply to the proposed project. In light of the proposed project's consistency with the Scoping Plan, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts on GHGs.** Despite this significance conclusion, the proposed project's contribution to global GHG emissions and the resultant effect on global climate should be evaluated on a cumulative basis, as stated previously. Under CEQA, a project would have a significant cumulative impact caused by the combined impact of past, present, and probable future projects if its incremental impact represents a "cumulatively considerable" contribution to such cumulative impacts (14 CCR 15064(h)). The proposed project would generate GHG emissions that contribute to potential cumulative impacts of GHG emissions on climate change. Because levels of GHG emissions in the atmosphere are at levels considered substantial enough to create adverse impacts (i.e., climate change), the emissions of a particular project, even if not considered to produce a significant impact, may nonetheless contribute to an adverse, unavoidable impact. In light of the previous conclusions regarding the proposed project's reduction in GHG emissions relative to existing conditions and business as usual, cumulative impacts in terms of climate change are less than significant.

### Finding

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on GHG emissions; therefore, no mitigation is required.

## 4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

**Be located on a site on a hazardous materials sites listing.** 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 EDR search returned two listings at the project site in the leaking underground storage tank (LUST) database. A review of data from the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker site and the Department of Environmental Health records indicate 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.

Twenty-one of the 36 sites were listed in databases that do not indicate a release of hazardous materials; therefore, it is unlikely that these sites have impacted environmental conditions in the project area. Thirteen of the sites (not including the project site) were listed in the LUST database, indicating a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater. All 13 of these cases were investigated and closed by the lead regulatory agency. Due to their closure status, location,

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

and/or the type of media affected, it is unlikely that these sites have impacted environmental conditions at the project site. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

**Near an Airport or within an Airport Land Use Plan.** The Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County has adopted the Airport Environs Land Use Plan. 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. Proposed project activities would not pose a hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The proposed project includes the construction of multistory buildings. However, according to the Cypress General Plan Safety Element, the Cypress College campus would not be located in the building height restriction area. Therefore, the proposed project would not pose a hazard for people residing or working in the project area, and impacts would be less than significant.

**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, there would be no impact.

**Impair or Interfere with an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan.** The County of Orange Emergency Operations Plan identifies the County's emergency planning, organization, and response policies and procedures. The plan also addresses integration and coordination with other governmental levels when required. The plan addresses how the County will respond to extraordinary events or disasters, from the preparedness phase through recovery.

Construction of the proposed project could require the closure of adjacent and on-campus roadways during construction activities, which would have the potential to impact emergency evacuation procedures. A temporary construction plan may need to be prepared in order to identify alternative evacuation routes and to ensure that the construction site is designed in as safe a manner as possible. A primary goal of the plan would be to outline provisions for emergency vehicle movement at all times. The proposed project would be required to design, construct, and maintain structures, roadways, and facilities to comply with applicable local, regional, state, and/or federal requirements related to emergency access and evacuation plans. Permitting requirements mandate that the Fire Department and the DSA perform an access compliance review and a fire and life safety review, respectively, 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 would be less than significant.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

The proposed project may result in additional traffic on surrounding roadways. Additional traffic would increase the difficulty of evacuating the campus population in the event of an emergency. However, the proposed project is not anticipated to significantly impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Permitting requirements mandate that the Fire Department and the DSA perform an access compliance review and a fire and life safety review, respectively, prior to approval of individual project drawings and specification documents. Therefore, emergency response and evacuation as a result of the proposed project would be adequately evaluated in order to ensure the safest possible conditions for students, staff, and visitors at the campus. Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

**Wildland Fires.** It is unlikely that the project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. The proposed project is in an urbanized area with no adjacent wildlands. The area surrounding the project site is generally urbanized and developed. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on hazards and hazardous materials as it relates to the listing of the site on hazardous materials sites listed compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, proximity of the project to an airport or an airport land use plan, the proximity of the project to a private airstrip, the interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and wildland fires; therefore, no mitigation is required.

## **4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality**

**Deplete Groundwater Supplies.** Water service for the proposed project is and will continue to be through purchase of municipal water from GSWC. GSWC's West Orange System uses about 15 groundwater wells whose production varies from year to year, but are expected to produce in the range of 10,000 to 12,000 afy (GSWC 2011). No on-site groundwater wells are proposed and therefore impacts to groundwater supplies, aquifer volume, or lowering of the local groundwater table level would be limited to the well field from which the City derives its supplies (i.e., indirect effects).

It is estimated that the project would increase groundwater extraction from GSWC-operated groundwater wells by nearly 6 afy at full build-out. Thus, domestic/sanitary water demands at full build-out could increase by as much as 9 afy to a total of 64 afy. Given that approximately

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

62% of this increase would likely come from groundwater, it is estimated that the project would increase groundwater extraction from GSWC-operated groundwater wells by nearly 6 afy.

An increase in groundwater use of 6 afy over the next decade or so is not sufficient to significantly deplete groundwater supplies or locally lower the groundwater table. It represents only 0.06% of the amount of groundwater extracted by GSWC'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 afy), the increase in demand as a result of the proposed project would be negligible and would be far less than the variation in demand due to climatic conditions, and well within the margin of error for such estimates (OCWD 2015).

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) has been the primary agency managing the groundwater basin since 1933. The OCWD works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) and other local water districts such as GSWC to implement a comprehensive program to manage the groundwater basin to assure a safe and sustainable supply. The Groundwater Management Plan 2015 Update documents the objectives, operations, and programs aimed at accomplishing the District's mission (OCWD 2015). It is expected that this plan will be compliant with the recently enacted Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. GSWC already serves a population of 111,418 and has over 35,600 service connections, with both numbers growing only slowly since the service area is already over 90% built-out.

In this context, the estimated project-related increase in groundwater demand of 6 afy—when taken in the context of total water deliveries by GSWC and the active management of the basin by OCWD—would be minor. For these reasons, the project's incremental effect on groundwater resources would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Introduction of Housing within Flood Hazard Area.** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map, the proposed project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area (FEMA 2009). Areas immediately surrounding the campus are in a 100-year flood zone. However, the proposed project would not locate housing in one of these areas. Impacts would not occur.

**Introduction of Structures within Flood Hazard Area to Redirect Flood Flows.** According to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, the proposed project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area (FEMA 2009). Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows in a 100-year flood hazard area. Impacts would not occur.

**Loss, Injury, or Death Due to Dam or Levee Failure.** The Prado Dam is located northeast of the campus in Riverside County. The Carbon Canyon Dam, an earthfill dam that holds 12,000 acre-feet of water, is located in the northeastern portion of the City of Brea. If waters were to exceed

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

the capacity of the Carbon Canyon Dam, the portion of Cypress below Orange Avenue could be completely inundated. The Whittier Narrows Dam, also an earthfill dam, is located in Pico Rivera. The Prado Dam currently works in tandem with the Seven Oaks Dam, located approximately 40 miles upstream of the City of Cypress on the Santa Ana River, to provide increased flood protection to Orange County. Additional flood protection is provided to the Counties of Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino through the Santa Ana River Mainstem Project. The project involves improvements to the Seven Oaks Dam, Mill Creek Levee, San Timoteo Creek, Oak Street Drain, Prado Dam, Santiago Creek, and the lower Santa Ana River. The project would increase flood protection to more than 3.35 million people within the three counties. Cypress is within the dam inundation area of three dams: Prado, Carbon Canyon, and Whittier Narrows (City of Cypress 2001). According to the Cypress General Plan, Exhibit SAF-2, Dam Inundation Areas, the proposed project would be within the inundation areas for the Prado Dam and the Carbon Canyon Dam.

The proposed project would not involve the development of student housing or placement of new residences. Therefore, risks associated with dam inundation are not considered significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow.** The project site is not at risk for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No large bodies of water exist in Cypress; therefore, there are no risks of inundation by seiche. Because the project site and surrounding areas are flat, it is unlikely that inundation by mudflow would occur. The project site is approximately 7 miles east of the Pacific Ocean and would not be at risk for inundation by a tsunami. No impacts would occur.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on hydrology and water quality as it relates to the depletion of groundwater supplies; the introduction of housing within a flood hazards area; the introduction of structures within a flood hazard area to redirect flood flows; the loss, injury, or death due to a dam or levee failure; and seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

### **4.10 Land Use and Planning**

**Physically Divide an Established Community.** The campus does not currently divide or isolate an established community. The campus has been developed since the 1960s and the residential areas around the campus have been developed over time. Proposed project activities would occur on campus and would not physically divide an established community. Impacts would be less than significant.

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

**Conflict with any Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation.** The proposed project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. The proposed project is compatible with the goals and regulations established by the City of Cypress General Plan, including Zoning Regulations and the Land Use Element. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Conflict with any Applicable 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, the proposed project would not impact the goals and objectives of any adopted plans. Therefore, impacts would not occur.

**Cumulative Land Use Impacts.** As analyzed above, the proposed project would experience less-than-significant impacts related to all land use and planning issue areas. Proposed project activities would occur on campus and would not physically divide an established community. The proposed project is compatible with the goals and regulations established by the City of Cypress General Plan, including Zoning Regulations and the Land Use Element. The proposed project is not located within any adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or local or regional habitat conservation plan areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not act in conjunction with a cumulative project, resulting in a significant cumulative impact.

### Finding

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on land use and planning; therefore, no mitigation is required.

## 4.11 Mineral Resources

**Loss of Availability of a Known Mineral Resource.** According to the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, there are no gas, geothermal, or other known wells located on or in the vicinity of the project site. However, there is one oil well located approximately 0.5 mile northwest from the project site operated by Marathon Oil Company and another located 0.5 mile southwest operated by Charles T.B. Jones (CDC 2016). The proposed project would not result in a land use conflict with the existing oil extraction, nor would it preclude future oil extraction on underlying deposits. The Cypress General Plan states that there are no known mineral resource zones present in the City (City of Cypress 2011), and the project site is not mapped as or known to contain an important mineral resource. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state. No impact would occur.

**Loss of Availability of a Locally Important Mineral Resource Recovery Site.** The Cypress General Plan states that there are no known mineral resource zones present in the City (City of Cypress 2011). Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Cumulative Mineral Resource Impacts.** As analyzed above, the proposed project would experience less-than-significant impacts related to all mineral resource issue areas. Considering the proposed project would not be located within the vicinity of a known mineral resource or a locally important mineral resource recovery site, the proposed project would not combine with cumulative projects resulting in a significant impact to mineral resources. Therefore, impacts to mineral resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on mineral resources; therefore, no mitigation is required.

## **4.12 Noise**

**Excessive Groundborne Vibration or Ground-borne Noise Levels.** Construction activities that might expose persons to excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise could cause a potentially significant impact. Ground-borne vibration is typically attenuated over short distances. The closest residence to the construction areas (proposed renovation of the Humanities building) would be located approximately 150 feet or more from the construction area. At these distances and with the anticipated construction equipment, the peak particle velocity would be below 0.1 inch/second at the adjacent residences. The heavier pieces of construction equipment used could include bulldozers, graders, loaded trucks, water trucks, and pavers. Vibration is very subjective, and some people may be annoyed at continuous vibration levels near the level of perception (or approximately a peak particle velocity of 0.01 inch/second). However, construction activities are not anticipated to result in continuous vibration levels that typically annoy people, and the vibration impact would therefore be less than significant. Pile driving, blasting, or other special construction techniques are not anticipated to be used for construction of the proposed project facilities; therefore, excessive ground-borne vibration and ground-borne noise would not be generated. Additionally, ground-borne vibration would not be associated with the proposed project following construction activities. No impacts related to excessive ground-borne vibration would occur.

**Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** Long-term operational noise would result from the proposed project, which could include noise associated with the parking structure. The

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

project would also generate off-site traffic noise along adjacent roads, including Orange Avenue, Valley View Street, Holder Street, and Lincoln Avenue, as well as overall traffic noise in the vicinity of the campus. The proposed project would increase the noise levels along local roadways by 1 dB or less (rounded to whole numbers) in the vicinity of the site. This increase is not readily noticeable to the human ear in the context of a community noise environment (i.e., outside of controlled listening lab conditions). Therefore, due to the increase in noise level (1 dB or less, rounded to whole numbers), noise impacts associated with project-related traffic would be less than significant.

### **Expose People Residing or Working in Airport Land Use Plan to Excessive Noise Levels.**

The Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County has adopted the Airport Environs Land Use Plan. 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 (Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County 2005). According to the Airport Environs Land Use Plan, the project site does not lie within the 60 dBA CNEL noise contour of the airport (Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County 2015), which is below the “normally acceptable” exterior noise exposure for commercial land uses. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

### **Expose People Residing or Working within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip to Excessive Noise Levels.**

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. People residing or working in the proposed project area would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip. No impacts would occur.

**Cumulative Noise Impacts.** Construction noise impacts primarily affect the areas immediately adjacent to the construction site. The closest cumulative project site, as listed in Table 3-5 in Chapter 3 of the Draft PEIR, contains condominiums (6178 and 6182 Lincoln Avenue, Cypress, California), which are located approximately 850 feet north of the nearest proposed construction project on the Cypress College campus. Construction schedules and activities for potential future projects near Cypress College are currently unknown; therefore, potential construction noise impacts associated with two simultaneous projects are speculative. However, cumulative projects would need to comply with the City’s Noise Control Ordinance related to construction activities (Monday through Friday, 7 a.m. to 8 p.m., and Saturday, 9 a.m. to 8 p.m.; no construction activities on Sundays or during federal holidays) (City of Cypress 2016). Thus, although several construction activities may occur simultaneously at several areas on campus and in the surrounding community, given the distance between the project site and the cumulative projects within the City, and the cumulative projects’ compliance with the local jurisdictional noise

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

standards, it is unlikely that the noise increase would exceed 3 dBA (the minimum change in the sound level of individual events that an average human ear can detect). Therefore, the increased noise would not result in significant cumulative impacts.

The proposed project's traffic-related impacts would result in a 1 dBA or less increase (rounded to whole numbers) along adjacent roadways. Therefore, the increase in noise associated with cumulative traffic would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on noise as it relates to excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels, a permanent increase in ambient noise levels, exposing people residing or working within an airport land use plan to excessive noise levels, exposing people residing or working within the vicinity of a private airstrip to excessive noise levels, and cumulative noise impacts; therefore, no mitigation is required.

### **4.13 Population and Housing**

**Induce Substantial Population Growth.** The proposed project does not involve the development of campus housing; however, the proposed project would involve an increase in student enrollment. However, this projection is consistent with SCAG's growth projections for the City of Cypress. Employee growth is consistent with SCAG's overall growth projections and would not result in a substantial increase in population growth. The SEM building would include an immersive digital classroom and viewing platform, which could increase the number of visitors to the campus. However, the expected number of visitors and the increase in student population and employee growth would not exceed local population projections, and the proposed project is not considered to be growth-inducing. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing Housing.** The proposed project would not displace existing housing. Plans are to renovate and construct educational facilities, parking lots and structures, serving students and the surrounding community. No housing units currently exist on the campus. No impact would occur.

**Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing People.** The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people. There are no plans to move any facilities that would result in the displacement of people from the project area. No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts.** Cumulative impacts to population and housing would result from a combination of projects that induce population growth, displace substantial numbers of housing, or displace substantial numbers of people. The proposed

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

project would not displace people or housing because the Cypress College campus does not have any existing housing facilities on campus. While the proposed project does not involve the development of campus housing, it would involve an increase in student enrollment, employment, and facilities that could attract additional visitors to the campus, all of which would result in a slight increase in population. However, the future projections for the campus and any indirect population growth in the city as a result of the proposed project are consistent with SCAG's growth projections for each City of Cypress College's service area. In combination with the proposed project, impacts to population growth or housing availability would not be cumulatively considerable.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on population and housing; therefore, no mitigation is required.

## **4.14 Public Services**

### **Expansion of Government Facilities**

**Fire.** The proposed project would generate additional demand for fire protection services by adding additional academic and auxiliary space and a general increase in the number of students on campus. The proposed project would generate approximately 13 additional calls per year to the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) upon completion of the proposed project. Although OCFA does not attain their response-time goals, the proposed project would contribute an additional 13 calls annually in comparison to 2,868 total incidents per year, representing a projected increase in annual calls of 0.5%. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts relating to fire protection.

Additionally, the buildings constructed as part of the proposed project would be subject to the requirements of the 2016 California Fire Code. Therefore, because the proposed project would result in a limited number of additional calls for fire service, in combination with the fact that the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact in regard to fire protection.

**Police.** The proposed project would generate additional demand for police services by adding additional academic and auxiliary space and through a general increase in the number of students on campus. The proposed project would generate approximately 102 additional annual calls to the Cypress Police Department. With the addition of 102 calls annually, in comparison to 22,201 calls for service per year received by the Cypress Police Department, the proposed project would

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

result in a marginal increase (0.5%) in annual calls. In addition, the Campus Safety Authority would continue to be the primary law enforcement agency on campus, and the proposed project area is already part of the normal patrol and enforcement area of the Campus Safety Authority. The Cypress Police Department would provide additional support only if required.

Therefore, 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, the proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts to police services, and no mitigation is necessary

**Schools.** The proposed project does not involve the development of campus housing; however, the proposed project would involve an increase in student enrollment and employee growth. A net growth of six employees is expected upon buildout of the Facilities Master Plan.

There were 149 Cypress College students with children enrolled in the 2015 fall semester, and if this is assumed to be a reasonable proxy of the Cypress College population with children, then approximately 0.9% of the Cypress College student body has children. Applying this same percentage to the projected peak enrollment, the result would be 152 Cypress College students with children, or a net growth of three students with children. According to SCAG's profile of the City of Cypress, the average household size in the year 2014 for the City was approximately 3.1 (SCAG 2015). Assuming this average household size represents one child per household, then new students and employees could introduce three children to the area who would attend nearby schools (if all new Cypress College students and employees were to live in the area).

As discussed above, a net growth of six employees is expected upon buildout of the Facilities Master Plan. Applying the City's average household size (SCAG 2015) and assuming that there is an average of one child per household, new Cypress College employees could introduce six children to the area who would attend nearby schools (if all new Cypress College employees were to live in the area).

New Cypress College students and employees could potentially introduce nine children to the area who would attend nearby schools (if all new students and employees were to live in the vicinity of Cypress College). Considering the proposed project would result in a marginal increase in public school enrollment within the vicinity of Cypress College, and project implementation would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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 to serve students and the community so nearby parks would not

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

experience a significant increase in visitors and acceptable service ratios would be maintained. There are several parks in the vicinity of the project site. The closest parks are Pinewood Park, Acacia Park, and San Marino Park, located 0.2, 0.3, and 0.3 mile north of the campus, respectively. Access to these parks would not be adversely affected by project construction activities as a traffic control plan would be implemented in compliance with state and municipal construction codes in order to prevent access issues. No impacts would occur.

**Other Public Facilities.** The 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. The nearest library is the Cypress Library, which is located approximately 0.7 mile southwest of campus. No impacts would occur.

**Cumulative Public Service Impacts.** The proposed project is not anticipated to have a significant impact with regard to public services.

During a fire or medical emergency at Cypress College, the closest OCFA unit would respond at the time of the call. However, if the Fire Station 63 crew were present at their station during the time of the call they would be the first-use responder. The second-use responder would be either Station 17 or Station 13. The proposed project is not anticipated to have a significant impact with regard to fire protection services. Considering that the proposed project would contribute an additional 13 calls annually, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact associated with fire protection services.

The proposed project would result in increased calls for service to the Cypress Police Department. Based on the marginal projected increase in calls, response times would remain at similar levels at project buildout. Cumulative projects include multiple residential developments and would contribute to an additional demand for police services. However, the Campus Safety Authority would continue to be the primary law enforcement agency on campus, and the Cypress Police Department would provide additional support only if required. The proposed project would not combine with projects in the vicinity to contribute to significant impacts; therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on public services; therefore, no mitigation is required.

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

### 4.15 Recreation

**Increase the Use of an Existing Neighborhood, Regional Park, or Recreational Facility.** The proposed project would not increase the use of existing parks or recreation areas. Although the campus is projected to have an increase in student enrollment, recreational facilities are available on the campus. Off-site recreational facilities would not experience substantial physical deterioration due to an increase of use. No impacts would occur.

**Require the Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities.** The proposed project would not increase the use of existing parks or recreation areas outside of the campus. Therefore, the expansion or addition of recreational facilities or parks is not required. Recreational facilities on campus do not require expansion and would be sufficient to serve the needs of students and residents living on campus. No impacts would occur.

**Cumulative Recreational Impacts.** As analyzed above, the proposed project would experience less-than-significant impacts related to all recreational issue areas. Considering the campus has recreational facilities available on campus, the proposed project is not anticipated to increase the use of existing parks or recreation areas outside of the campus resulting in substantial physical deterioration due to an increase of use or the need for expanded or new recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

#### Finding

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on recreation; therefore, no mitigation is required.

### 4.16 Traffic and Circulation

**Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Ordinance or Policy or with an applicable Congestion Management Program.** All key study intersections will operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) under both the existing plus project and Year 2025 plus project traffic scenarios, and under both the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology. Thus, impacts associated with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or the circulation system would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Additionally, since the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to key study intersections or segments, it follows that the project would similarly not impact any intersection or segment identified in an applicable congestion management program. The 2015 Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP) (OCTA 2015) identifies Valley View Street as part of the CMP Highway System, and the intersection of Valley View Street and Katella

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

Avenue as a CMP intersection. However, as addressed above, the proposed project would not result in adverse significant impacts to these—or any other—CMP facilities. Therefore, impacts related to an applicable congestion management program or other County standards would also be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

**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 issue will not be analyzed further in the PEIR.

**Design Hazards.** Vehicular access to the Cypress College campus would continue to be provided from Lakeshore Drive via Holder Street to the east, the Cypress College South driveway via Orange Avenue to the south, and both Lakeshore Drive via Valley View Street and a smaller driveway along Valley View Street (Driveway No. 1) to the west. The proposed project would not adversely impact operations at any of the key study intersections, including these points of ingress/egress. As previously noted, Driveway No. 1 is conservatively forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS during the PM peak hour both with and without the proposed project; the continuation of this impact following implementation of the project is not considered a significant project-related impact.

The proposed project would not introduce any new project driveways or roads or reconfigure or modify any existing driveways or roads, either on site or adjacent to the campus. Additionally, similar to the existing conditions, minor operations and maintenance activities such as repaving and restriping may be required during the life of the proposed project to internal campus driveways, roads, drive aisles, and parking lots. These activities would occur under the guidance of experienced engineering professionals, ensuring that operational performance of these internal circulation facilities are maintained during any proposed operations and maintenance activities. Therefore, impacts associated with hazardous design features or incompatible uses would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

**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, either 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 no mitigation measures would be required.

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

**Conflict with Adopted Policies Regarding Public Transit, Bicycles, or Pedestrian Facilities.** The Cypress College Campus and the surrounding area is served by several alternative transportation facilities and services. The campus is currently bound by sidewalks along Holder Street, Orange Avenue, and Valley View Street. In addition, internal bicycle and pedestrian circulation is facilitated through a series of sidewalks, walkways, and paseos that bound the campus parking lots and connect the various campus buildings and facilities. Further, the bicycle trail system within the City of Cypress includes Class I, II, and III paths.

The City is currently served by five OCTA bus lines (Routes 21, 25, 42, 46, and 50). Routes 21 and 50 serve the Cypress Business Park along Valley View Street and Katella Avenue, respectively; Route 42 serves the Lincoln Avenue corridor; Route 46 provides east–west service, generally through the middle of the City; and Route 25 provides north–south service along Knott Avenue. Moreover, the existing Southern Pacific Rail Line, with a northwest–southeast alignment, crosses the northeast corner of the City, adjacent to the Cypress College campus. The right-of-way was purchased some years ago by the OCTA for potential use as a commuter rail line.

The proposed project would not adversely impact or introduce any new project driveways or roads or reconfigure or modify any existing driveways or roads, either on site or adjacent to the campus. Because the proposed project does not include any improvements within the adjacent public right-of-way or beyond the defined boundaries of the campus, it follows that the project would not impact any existing or future alternative transportation facilities in the project vicinity, such as bus stops, bike lanes, or sidewalks and crosswalks. Similarly, the proposed project would not physically preclude implementation of any regional or local policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycles, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, impacts associated with alternative transportation policies, plans, programs, and facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

**Cumulative Traffic and Circulation Impacts.** An analysis of Year 2025 cumulative traffic conditions indicates that the addition of ambient traffic growth and cumulative projects traffic will not adversely impact any of the 11 City of Buena Park study intersections. The remaining 11 City of Buena Park study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours with the addition of ambient traffic growth and cumulative projects traffic. Traffic associated with the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on the 11 City of Buena Park study intersections under the Year 2025 cumulative plus project traffic conditions, when compared to the LOS standards. The 11 City of Buena Park study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better with the addition of project traffic in the Year 2025.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

Additionally, as previously discussed, project impacts related to air traffic patterns, hazardous design features and incompatible uses, emergency access, and public transportation policies, plans, programs, and facilities would be less than significant. Thus, it follows that impacts would also be less than cumulatively considerable and would not contribute to any potential cumulative impacts in the study area. Further, it is assumed that related cumulative projects in the study area would be subject to the same federal, state, and local standards, regulations, and requirements that the proposed project must comply with, which would further reduce the opportunity for cumulative impacts in the broader project area.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on traffic and circulation as it relates to a conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or ordinance or with a congestion management plan, change in air traffic patterns; design hazards; inadequate emergency access; a conflict with adopted policies regarding public transit, bicycles, or pedestrian facilities; and cumulative traffic and circulation impacts. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

### **4.17 Utilities and Service Systems**

**Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements.** The City of Cypress Public Works Department 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 (NPDES) permit holder for 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 NPDES 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 (RWQCB). Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB and impacts would be less than significant.

**Sufficient Water Supplies.** Water service for the proposed project is and will continue to be through purchase of municipal water from GSWC. Based on metered water use for the Cypress College campus between November 2014 and October 2015, the total existing water use is approximately 165,695 gpd, or 185 afy. The proposed project would involve a net increase of approximately 81,000 ASF, or a 16% increase from the existing 500,845 ASF. Thus, domestic/sanitary water demands at full build-out could increase by as much as 8,000 gpd (or 9 afy) to a total of 58,000 gpd (or 64 afy).

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

An increase in potable water demand by 9 afy represents only 0.06% of the amount of potable water supplied by GSWC'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 would be far less than the variation in demand due to climatic conditions and well within the margin of error for such estimates (GSWC 2011).

Additionally, Cypress College is continuously looking for ways to decrease potable water consumption. In 2014, Cypress College reduced water consumption by reducing the time on all irrigation clocks by approximately 25%. Currently, several lawn areas are being replaced with native plants. Cypress College is planning to install a centralized irrigation control system that would further reduce and manage water consumption on the campus.

Therefore, sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources and impacts 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. 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 comply with AB 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.

**Excessive Use of Fuel/Energy and Power.** The proposed project would create additional electricity and natural gas demand by adding additional academic space and a general increase in the number of students. The proposed project would involve the demolition of 56,561 ASF of existing facilities on campus, which includes the existing SEM building, temporary restrooms, and baseball storage/clubhouse building. The proposed project would replace the existing SEM building with a more energy-efficient building. 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 efficiency standards apply to new construction of both residential and nonresidential buildings and regulate energy consumed for heating, cooling, ventilation, water heating, and lighting. These building efficiency standards would be enforced through the local building permit process.

The proposed project would increase electricity demand by 28.4% and decrease natural gas demand by 6.4%. However, CalEEMod default values for electricity and natural gas consumption reflect 2011 Title 24 standards and do not reflect the more stringent energy reduction requirements associated with the 2019 Title 24 standards or subsequent standards with which the proposed

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

project would be required to comply. Therefore, the electricity and natural gas consumption estimates presented in Table 4.12-3 in the Draft PEIR are an overestimate of the anticipated electricity and natural gas consumption rates associated with the proposed project.

Additionally, as part of the Cypress College Energy Plan, Cypress College is continuously looking for ways to improve energy conservation. For example, in 2014 and 2015, Cypress College completed heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system upgrades and an interior lighting retrofit. The HVAC upgrades resulted in an 800,000 kilowatt-hour and 75,000 therm reduction. The interior lighting retrofit involved the replacement of over 10,200 fluorescent lamp fixtures with LEDs, reducing the annual energy consumption by over 1,550,000 kilowatt-hours. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the excessive use of fuel or energy or the use of excessive amounts of power; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### **Finding**

The District finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on utilities and service systems as it relates to the exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements, adequate water supply, conflict with solid waste regulations, and the excessive use of fuel/energy and power; therefore, no mitigation is required.

# Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

## 5 FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

### 5.1 Project Alternatives

Chapter 6 of the Draft PEIR contains a detailed analysis of alternatives to the proposed project, including the “No Project” alternative. Based on the analysis, the District finds the feasibility of these alternatives as follows.

#### 5.1.1 The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of the “No Project” Alternative. When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the “no project” alternative will be the continuation of the plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, as required by the CEQA Guidelines, analyzes the effects of continued implementation of the District’s existing 1999 Master Plan. This means that the campus would be built out according to the growth projections established at that time, which would likely not accommodate the projected growth expected through 2025.

The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative would be considered environmentally superior in relation to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impacts (two areas) and environmentally inferior in relation to aesthetics impacts (one area). It would be environmentally neutral in relation to cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, public services, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems impacts (nine areas). The adoption of the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative would not meet the project objectives identified by the District for the modernization of learning facilities and for campus growth through 2025. The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative fails to accomplish the project objectives in the District’s vision and has environmental impacts that are the same or greater for 10 resource areas (all the neutral and inferior areas mentioned above). The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative does not accommodate future campus growth, it does not allow for the modernization of existing building space to meet instructional needs, it does not allow for the construction of new buildings to meet current and future instructional needs, it does not expand veterans’ facilities and services to train and retrain veterans as they transition into the civilian workforce, and it does not implement health and safety repairs and other needed facility renovations. The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is, therefore, not considered environmentally superior to the proposed project and it does not meet the District’s project objectives.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

### **5.1.2 The No Project/No Development Alternative**

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of the “No Project” Alternative. The No Project/No Development Alternative discusses the existing conditions of the project site at the time the NOP was published.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior in almost all resource areas. It would be environmentally neutral in five areas (aesthetics, geology and soils, land use, public services, and traffic and circulation). The adoption of the No Project/No Development Alternative would not meet the project objectives identified by the District for modernization of learning facilities and for campus growth through 2025. The No Project/No Development Alternative does not accommodate future campus growth, it does not allow for the modernization of existing building space to meet instructional needs, it does not allow for the construction of new buildings to meet current and future instructional needs, it does not expand veterans’ facilities and services to train and retrain veterans as they transition into the civilian workforce, and it does not implement health and safety repairs and other needed facility renovations. The No Project/No Development Alternative is, therefore, not considered environmentally superior to the proposed project because it does not meet the District’s project objectives.

### **5.1.3 The Preservation Alternative**

In response to the finding that there is evidence of a Historic District on campus (see the Cultural Resources Study included as Appendix C to the Draft PEIR), an alternative was developed to represent a preservation option. The Preservation Alternative suggests the preservation of character-defining features on Historic District contributor buildings in the campus core (see Table 6-1) and reuse, rather than demolition, of the SEM building. The SEM building could become classrooms and be used as swing space as needs change.

The Preservation Alternative would be considered environmentally superior in air quality, cultural resources, and GHG emissions (three areas). It would be environmentally inferior in aesthetics (one area) and environmentally neutral with regard to geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, public services, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems (eight areas). The cost to renovate and preserve the SEM building would cost \$82.4 million, while construction of the new SEM building would cost \$89.9 million. Considering renovation of the SEM building would not result in the upgrades needed to meet the educational goals for the campus, the Preservation Alternative would divert significant public funds (approximately \$82.4 million) from the construction of badly needed new instructional buildings that would meet the District’s educational goals. Additionally,

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

several millions of dollars related to operations and maintenance would be saved if construction of a new SEM building would occur, as the existing SEM building would serve as swing space during renovation of other instructional facilities (Miranda, pers. comm. 2016). The adoption of the Preservation Alternative would not meet the project objectives identified by the District for campus growth through 2025 because of the need for a new SEM building and renovated buildings to meet the educational goals for the campus. The Preservation Alternative fails to fully accomplish the project objectives in the District's vision but has fewer environmental impacts than the proposed project. Because the Preservation Alternative has fewer environmental impacts and it avoids a significant impact to the Historic District, it is environmentally superior to the proposed project.

**Findings of Fact for the Cypress College  
Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

### 6 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” (14 CCR 15093 (a)). CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final PEIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (14 CCR 15093(b)).

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the District finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final PEIR and the MMRP, when implemented, will avoid or substantially lessen virtually all of the significant effects identified in the Final PEIR for the Facilities Master Plan. However, certain significant impacts of the proposed project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts are direct impacts to significant historic resources and cumulative impacts to cultural resources (see Section 2, Findings on Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts of the Proposed Project).

The District finds that all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final PEIR that are within the purview of the District will be implemented with the proposed project, and that the remaining significant unavoidable effects are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, based upon the facts set forth above, the Final PEIR, and the record, as follows:

- a. The proposed project would allow Cypress College to update and modernize existing building space to meet the District’s instructional needs and to construct new buildings to meet current and future instructional needs and the District’s academic mission.
- b. The proposed project would accommodate growth in the student body over the planning horizon.
- c. The proposed project would allow Cypress College to expand veterans’ facilities and services to train and retrain veterans as they transition into the civilian workforce.
- d. The proposed project would allow Cypress College to implement health and safety repairs, energy-efficient enhancements, water conservation, ADA access, building security, National Fire Protection Associations Life Safety Code requirement upgrades, mass communication system, lock-down capabilities, and other needed facility renovations.

## **Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

On balance, the District finds that there are specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations associated with the proposed project that serve to override and outweigh the significant unavoidable effects of the proposed project and, thus, the adverse effects are considered acceptable.

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

### 7 REFERENCES

- 14 CCR 15000 et seq. and Appendices A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.
- Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County. 2005. “Figure 1: Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County Airport Planning Areas.” July 21, 2005. Accessed June 15, 2016. <http://www.ocair.com/commissions/aluc/docs/airportlu.pdf>.
- Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County. 2015. *Airport Environs Land Use Plan for Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos*. December 19, 2002; last amended 2015. <http://www.ocair.com/commissions/aluc/archive/2015/2015-07-16/item1.pdf>.
- California Government Code, Sections 51200–51207, California Land Conservation Act of 1969 (Williamson Act).
- California Public Resource Code, Sections 5097.9–5097.991. Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites.
- California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000–21177. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended.
- CDC (California Department of Conservation). 2016. “Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources Well Finder.” Accessed February 2016. <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr>.
- City of Buena Park. 2015. Buena Park Zoning Map. Last modified October 7, 2015. Accessed February 2016. <http://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=a40518b12a0c4019a18668d1feac301b&extent=-118.1163,33.798,-117.897,33.9074>.
- City of Cypress. 2001. *2000 General Plan Update*. Prepared by RBF Consulting for the City of Cypress. Accessed online June 15, 2016. [http://www.ci.cypress.ca.us/community\\_develpmnt/general\\_plan/general\\_plan.htm](http://www.ci.cypress.ca.us/community_develpmnt/general_plan/general_plan.htm).
- City of Cypress. 2011. *City of Cypress General Plan*. Amended April 25, 2011. Accessed April 2016. [http://www.ci.cypress.ca.us/community\\_develpmnt/general\\_plan/general\\_plan.htm](http://www.ci.cypress.ca.us/community_develpmnt/general_plan/general_plan.htm).
- City of Cypress. 2016. “City of Cypress Zoning Map – District 17.” Accessed February 2016. [http://www.ci.cypress.ca.us/community\\_develpmnt/district\\_map/zone\\_dist\\_17.html](http://www.ci.cypress.ca.us/community_develpmnt/district_map/zone_dist_17.html).

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

- FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2009. Flood Insurance Rate Map (06059C0109J). December 2009. <http://map1.msc.fema.gov/idms/IntraView.cgi?JX=952&JY=501&ROT=0&KEY=24840681&IFIT=1>.
- GSWC (Golden State Water Company) 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. Prepared by Kennedy/Jenks Consultants. August 2011.
- Miranda, A. 2016. “1999 Facilities Master Plan Previous Projects.” Personal communication (email) from A. Miranda (Director of Physical Plant & Facilities, Cypress College) to S. Rittel (Project Manager, Campus Capital Projects, Cypress College) to R. Struglia (Project Manager, Dudek) and C. Munson (Environmental Analyst, Dudek). August 10, 2016.
- OCTA (Orange County Transportation Authority). 2015. *2015 Orange County Congestion Management Program*. November 2015. <http://www.octa.net/pdf/Final%202015%20CMP.pdf>.
- OCWD (Orange County Water District). 2015. *Groundwater Management Plan 2015 Update*. June 17, 2015.
- 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*. [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/board\\_decisions/adopted\\_orders/orders/2012/12\\_035\\_WDR\\_OCSD.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/board_decisions/adopted_orders/orders/2012/12_035_WDR_OCSD.pdf).
- SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments). 2015. *Draft Profile of the City of Cypress*. May 2015. Accessed March 7, 2016. <http://www.scag.ca.gov/DataAndTools/Documents/Draft2015LP/Cypress.pdf>.
- SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 2015. Rule 1401 New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xiv/rule-1401.pdf?sfvrsn=4>
- SCAQMD. 2016. *Rule 1401 Risk Assessment Program RiskTool (VI.02) Version 8.0 and Attachment M*. March 2016. <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/permits/risk-assessment>.
- USFS (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service). 2016. “National Forest Locator Map.” Accessed February 2016. <http://www.fs.fed.us/locatormap/>.

## Findings of Fact for the Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR

---

Weeks, K. and A. Grimmer.1995. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, & Reconstructing Historic Buildings*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Heritage Preservation Services.

**Findings of Fact for the Cypress College  
Facilities Master Plan Final PEIR**

---

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK