APPENDIX A
NOP/Initial Study and Comment Letters
November 4, 2016

To: Distribution List

From: North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801-1819

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

The North Orange County Community College District (District) will be the lead agency and will prepare a program environmental impact report (PEIR) for the proposed project identified below. The District is requesting your view regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the PEIR. Responsible agencies are requested to indicate their statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project.

The description, location, and the potential environmental effects resulting from the proposed project are contained in the initial study, which is available through the District’s website (http://www.nocccd.edu/) and at the Administrative Offices, North Orange County Community College District, Anaheim, campus located at the address above. The initial environmental review indicates that the proposed project may have potentially significant effects on the environment in the following categories: aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation and traffic, utilities and service systems, and mandatory findings of significance. The PEIR will include an analysis of these impact areas, as well as feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid or reduce potential impacts.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but no later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. A public scoping meeting will be held on Thursday, November 17, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. in the Fullerton College Student Center, Rooms 224, 226, and 228 at Fullerton College.

Please send your response to Mr. Richard Williams at the address shown above. Please provide the name of a contact person in your agency.
**Notice of Preparation**

**Project Title:** Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

**Project Location:** Fullerton College, generally bounded by North Berkeley Avenue to the north and east, North Lemon Street to the west, and East Chapman Avenue to the south.

**Proposed Project:** The District plans to construct a new Welcome Center, new instructional buildings, a Horticulture and Vocational Services Center, a new child development center, and an 840-space parking structure; realign campus access to the parking structure; construct a new Maintenance and Operations Facility and Thermal Energy Storage; construct new storage, offices, and a shower/locker room north of the existing pool; implement improvements to Sherbeck Field; create new parking lots north of Berkeley Avenue adjacent to the 3100 building and south of the Lemon Street parking structure; and construct a Performing Arts Complex. The District also plans to design new entry signage at key entry points, improve pedestrian circulation, and improve circulation and connections between the campus north of Berkeley Avenue and south of East Chapman Avenue, as well as within the main campus. Renovations would include the Math Building, Physical Education, Wilshire Theater, Business Building, Humanities Building, Campus Services, Administration Building, Fine Arts Gallery, and Academic Computing. It is anticipated that these improvements will be phased over a 10-year period.
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Richard Williams
District Director, Facilities Planning and Construction
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1 INTRODUCTION

The North Orange County Community College District (District) is updating its Facilities Master Plan for its Orange County campuses: Cypress College, Fullerton College, and its School of Continuing Education in Anaheim. The 2011 Facilities Master Plan provides an analysis of the evolving student body and makes planning recommendations based on educational needs. The District is undertaking a comprehensive improvement and building program to make the upgrades and repairs of existing buildings, to construct new facilities to improve the safety and educational experience of those attending the colleges, and to meet projected enrollment based on growth in population and jobs and the state Chancellor’s Office enrollment projections in accordance with the Measure J Facilities Bond Program.

Measure J was passed in November 2014 and will issue $574 million in bonds to fund upgrades to technical job training facilities, aging classrooms, and veterans’ amenities. Key Measure J priorities include the following: (1) upgrading antiquated science labs, lecture halls, technology, and instructional equipment to better prepare students for growing fields of study and high-skill careers; (2) enhancing classroom space and training centers as well as technically trained workers; (3) expanding veterans facilities and services as well as job placement centers to train and retrain veterans as they transition into the civilian workforce; and (4) making health and safety repairs, energy-efficient enhancements, and other needed facility renovations on each of the District’s three campuses.

At Fullerton College, the District plans to construct the following projects as part of the Facilities Master Plan (proposed project):

- A new Welcome Center at the corner of East Chapman Avenue and North Lemon Street
- Two new instructional buildings, one south of the 1400 building and one south of the proposed parking lot on East Chapman Avenue
- New Horticulture and Vocational Sciences Center
- New Child Development Center
- A new 840-space parking structure located west of Sherbeck Field and a pedestrian bridge from the parking structure to the Classroom Office 1400
- New parking lots north of Berkeley Avenue adjacent to the 3100 building and south of the Lemon Street parking structure
- Realignment of the campus access to the Centennial Parking Structure
A new Maintenance and Operations facility located north of the chiller plant, a thermal storage addition to the south of the chiller plant, and an addition on the east side of the chiller plant

- New storage, offices, and a small shower/locker room building to the north of the existing pool
- The addition of field lighting and 4,500 stadium seats to Sherbeck Field
- A new Performing Arts complex, sculpture garden, arts plaza, and campus quad, in the south campus quad at the southeast corner of East Chapman Avenue and North Lemon Street with renovation of the existing Wilshire Theater
- Renovation of Physical Education 1200 facilities to include a third sand volleyball court and renovations to Health Services, faculty offices, and the Wellness Center
- Renovation of Math 600, Business 300, Humanities 500, Campus Services 840, Administration 100, and the Fine Arts Gallery 1000
- Renovation of Academic Computing 3100
- New signage at key entry and exit points of the campus such as the intersection of North Berkeley Avenue and North Lemon Street, along Berkeley Avenue at Lot 5, along Berkeley Avenue south of Sherbeck Field, along Berkeley Avenue at Lot B-2 East, along East Chapman Avenue at North Lawrence Avenue, at the intersection of East Chapman Avenue and North Lemon Street (north and south of the intersection), and along North Lemon Street at Lot C West

It is anticipated that these improvements will be phased over a 10-year period.

1.1 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) serves as the main framework of environmental law and policy in California. CEQA emphasizes the need for public disclosure and identifying and preventing environmental damage associated with proposed projects. Unless the project or program is deemed categorically or statutorily exempt, CEQA is applicable to any project or program that must be approved by a public agency in order to be processed and established. The proposed project considered herein does not fall under any of the statutory or categorical exemptions listed in the 2016 CEQA Statute and Guidelines (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.; 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) 15000 et seq.) and, therefore, must meet CEQA requirements.

Considering the proposed project has the possibility of creating a significant impact, the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) is required by CEQA. The EIR will be
analyzed at a program level because the proposed project fits under the scope of a program EIR (PEIR). The following summarizes Section 15168(a) of the CEQA Guidelines:

A PEIR is an EIR that may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either:

1. Geographically
2. As logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions
3. In connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program
4. As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways.

1.2 Purpose of the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study

The intent of this document is to provide an overview and analysis of the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project (the implementation of the Facilities Master Plan) for Fullerton College by the District. This document is accessible to the public, in accordance with CEQA, in order to receive feedback and input on topics to be discussed in the PEIR.

1.3 Availability of the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study

The initial study/notice of preparation (IS/NOP) for Fullerton College is being distributed directly to numerous agencies, organizations, and interested groups and persons during the scoping period (see Appendix A for the IS/NOP distribution list). The IS/NOP is also available for review at the following locations:

- North Orange County Community College District Headquarters, 1830 A W. Romneya Drive, Anaheim, California 92801
- Fullerton Public Library, 353 W Commonwealth Ave, Fullerton, California 92832

In addition, the IS/NOP is available online through the District website (http://www.noccccd.edu/).
2 PROJECT LOCATION

Fullerton College occupies an approximately 70-acre site in the City of Fullerton in northern Orange County. The City of Fullerton is surrounded by La Habra and Brea to the north, Placentia to the east, Anaheim to the south, and Buena Park to the west. Figure 1 shows the campus’s regional location. Specifically, Fullerton College is bounded by residential development to the north, south, and east and Fullerton Union High School to the west (see Figure 2). Fullerton College is located at 321 E. Chapman Avenue in the City of Fullerton. Fullerton College recently purchased two properties, located at 416 and 429 E. Chapman Avenue, which are also considered part of the proposed project site.
3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Fullerton College was formed in 1913 and is the District’s oldest campus. As one of the first community colleges operating in California, it afforded students the opportunity to complete the first 2 years of college within their community. Fullerton Junior College was reorganized in 1922 as an independent junior college district, called the Fullerton Junior College District, although it shared a Board of Trustees with the High School District. The first Master Plan for the college dates to 1935. Fullerton College experienced major growth after World War II with the Servicemen Readjustment Act (the G.I. Bill of Rights) when many service men and women went back to school upon their return from war. Housing was ultimately the biggest problem on the campus. The City of Fullerton had already experienced a drought in the housing market in the 1920s and 1930s, and the problem only worsened after the war when veterans returned home to settle down and start families, only to find that there was no housing available. To help remedy the problem, the college established a Veterans Home in 1946, the only school-sponsored housing for G.I. students in Southern California. The transition from Fullerton Junior College District to the North Orange County Community College District began in 1964 when the residents of three school districts (Anaheim Union High School District, Brea-Olinda Unified School District, and Placentia Unified School District) elected to form an interim junior college district to be merged with the existing Fullerton Junior College District. This merger increased the District boundaries to 157 square miles and brought the first election of a District Board of Trustees (District 2011).

The campus is Spanish in style with a number of modernist buildings in the mix. The campus is very compact and is designed with multistory buildings with few interior roadways. A portion of the Fullerton Union High School campus remains on the Fullerton College campus (athletic fields and farm in the northwest corner). As shown in Table 1, Fullerton College had an enrollment of 24,512 students in 2015 and is projected to experience a peak enrollment of 27,701 students during the 10-year planning period (CCCCCO 2016 and District 2016a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Student Headcount Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>24,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2025</td>
<td>27,701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office 2016; District 2016a

Fullerton College offers credit academic, career technical, and basic skills courses. The lower division credit courses lead to transfer and/or to one of one hundred associate degrees in academic and career technical majors. Many of the existing campus facilities have a long history of service, and there is a need to address aging infrastructure, deferred maintenance, and
advances in educational technology (District 2011). To accommodate course and program demands and overall campus growth, Fullerton College proposes construction of a new Welcome Center at the corner of East Chapman Avenue and North Lemon Street; two new instructional buildings, one south of the 1400 building and one south of the proposed parking on lot on East Chapman Avenue; new additions to the Horticulture Lab Complex; a new 840-space parking structure located west of Sherbeck Field; new parking lots north of Berkeley Avenue adjacent to the 3100 building and south of the Lemon Street parking structure; realignment of the campus access to the Centennial Parking Structure; a new Maintenance and Operations building located north of the chiller plant and a thermal storage addition to the south of the chiller plant; new storage and a small shower/locker room building to the north of the existing pool; the addition of field lighting and 4,500 stadium seats to Sherbeck Field; a new Performing Arts complex in the south campus quad at the southeast corner of East Chapman Avenue and North Lemon Street with renovation of the existing Wilshire Theater; renovation of the Math 600 building; renovation of Physical Education 1200 facilities to include a third sand volleyball court and renovations to Health Services; faculty offices and the Wellness Center; renovation of Business 300 and Humanities 500 buildings; renovation of Campus Services 840, Administration 100, and the Fine Arts Gallery 1000; and new signage at key entry and exit points of the campus.

3.1 Project Objectives

- Update and modernize existing building and facility space to meet the District’s instructional needs.
- Construct new buildings and facilities to meet current and future instructional needs and the District’s academic mission.
- Increase academic square foot efficiency, through renovation and construction of new buildings and facilities to maximize functional space.
- Accommodate growth in the student body and within academic divisions over the planning horizon.
- Expand veterans’ facilities and services to train and retrain veterans as they transition into the civilian workforce.
- Construct new parking facilities to improve the parking deficit.
- Implement health and safety repairs, energy-efficient enhancements, water conservation, Americans 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.
3.2 Environmental Setting

Fullerton College has a long history beginning in 1913 and currently houses 47 buildings. The campus is surrounded by development with few opportunities for outward expansion. The campus is served by two freeways, State Route (SR-) 91 and SR-57, and the campus is proximate to other educational facilities, including Fullerton High School and California State University, Fullerton. The campus is on a gentle slope that is higher in the north of campus and lower in the south of campus. The campus is designed for pedestrians, and no bicycle riding is allowed on campus. Students walk their bicycles in to park them on campus.

3.3 Proposed Facility Master Plan Elements

This section provides a description of the various components of the proposed project evaluated in this IS. Specific components include buildings and facilities proposed for construction, renovation, and demolition, as well as site improvements.

3.3.1 Proposed Construction

Based on the information contained in the Facilities Master Plan (District 2015), some Master Plan elements (identified below) would be assessed at the program level because specific project details are not known at this time. Other Master Plan elements (also identified below) have detailed information available and would receive project-level assessment. See Figure 3 for existing campus land uses and Figure 4 for proposed campus land uses.

Project elements include the following:

- **Welcome Center.** The proposed Welcome Center would be located northeast of the East Chapman Avenue and North Lemon Street intersection, to make it accessible and visible to students, visitors, and the community.
- **New Instruction Building.** This building would be located between the Classroom Office 1400 and Physical Education 1200.
- **Chapman Newell Instructional Building.** This new instructional building will provide a buffer between the neighborhood and proposed parking along East Chapman Avenue.
- **Horticulture and Vocational Services Center.** New greenhouses would be constructed along with an instructional facility that will include lecture space as well as lab space for the biotech program and kitchen facilities for the food/nutrition program.
- **New Centennial Parking Structure.** This would be an 840-space parking structure located west of Sherbeck Field. A pedestrian bridge from the parking structure to the Classroom Office 1400 building is proposed.
• **Realignment of Campus Access to the Centennial Parking Structure.** Realign the primary one-way access from Berkeley Avenue (north) to the proposed structure and then from the structure to Berkeley Avenue (east).

• **New Parking Lots.** New parking lots are proposed for the site north of Berkeley Avenue (location of the Berkeley 3000 building, which is proposed for demolition), south of the Lemon Street Structure, south of the Safety 1500 building, south of East Chapman Avenue, and east of North Newell Place.

• **Berkeley Center.** This building would be demolished to accommodate 300 additional student parking spaces.

• **New Maintenance and Operations Facility and Thermal Energy Storage.** The new Maintenance and Operations facility would be located west of the Centennial Parking Structure and north of the chiller plant. The Thermal Energy Storage building would be located south of the chiller plant.

• **Aquatics Center.** The Aquatics Center would have a storage and small shower/locker room and office building added to the north of the existing pool.

• **Sherbeck Field Improvements.** Field lighting and 4,500 stadium seats would be added to the existing Sherbeck Field. The addition of lighting would allow instructional classes and athletic events to take place until 10:00 p.m. The field would be used by the football team for fall football practice, five home games and the possibility of post season contests, spring football practice, and summer football practice; the soccer team for games; the men’s and women’s cross-country teams for practice and conditioning; the baseball and softball teams during inclement weather (occurs once or twice a year); and by the Physical Education Department for classes taught throughout the year. Outside groups such as the Rosary High School girls’ soccer team and Hope University’s men’s and women’s soccer teams may also use the field.

• **New Performing Arts Complex.** The Performing Arts Complex is a replacement building complex that would define the South Campus Quad, and includes renovation of the historic Wilshire Theater.

### 3.3.2 Proposed Building Renovations/Modernization

Due to the age and condition of the existing buildings, the Facilities Master Plan emphasizes renovation and modernization of existing facilities. The goals of the proposed renovations are to maximize functional space, eliminate nonfunctional space, and improve efficiency/utilization of existing facilities. Building renovations could include new energy-efficient lighting; ceilings; paint; flooring; casework; elevators; ADA access; ADA-compliant restrooms; stairwells; and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems. In some cases, interior walls could be removed.
or modified. Figure 4 shows the buildings proposed for renovation. The following renovations are proposed and would be addressed at the project level:

- Math 600
- Physical Education 1200 – Wellness Center, faculty offices, and Health Center
- Wilshire Theater 2100
- Business 300
- Humanities 500
- Campus Services 840
- Administration 100
- Fine Arts Gallery 1000
- Academic Computing 3100

3.3.3 Proposed Demolition

The following facilities would be removed as part of implementation of the Facilities Master Plan and would be assessed at the project level. Figure 5 shows the proposed demolition and removals.

- Berkeley Center 3000
- Horticulture 1600 buildings
- Theater Arts 1300
- Music 1100
- A 1957 addition to Administration 100
- Student Services 2000
- 2300–Media Services/Academic Computing/Maintenance and Operation Shops
- Classrooms 1955–60
- Classrooms 1901–04
- Office 2200

3.3.4 Site Improvement Elements

Various site improvement elements are included in the Facilities Master Plan and would be assessed at the project level.
Vehicular Circulation

Primary vehicular circulation is on public streets that surround the campus (Berkeley Avenue, East Chapman Avenue, and North Lemon Street). There is a need to improve circulation and connections on campus between the campus north of Berkeley Avenue and south of East Chapman Avenue, as well as within the main campus. Vehicular drop-off points need to be clearly identified. The campus is not open to bicycles or skateboards.

Pedestrian Circulation

Fullerton College is primarily a pedestrian-oriented campus, but there is a need for more pathways for pedestrians, particularly for students parking in the north who then walk across parking lots to access instructional buildings in the south of campus.

Other Improvements

Entryways to the campus need to be more clearly defined with signage.

3.4 Project Phasing

The Facilities Master Plan would be implemented in two phases with unscheduled projects beyond Year 6. The proposed construction phasing is outlined below.

Phase 1 (2017–2018)

- New Instruction Building South of East Chapman Avenue
- Sherbeck Field Improvements
- Centennial Parking Structure
- Building 500 Renovation
- New Maintenance and Operations Building, Thermal Energy Storage, and Chilled Water Plant Expansion

Phase 2 (2019–2022)

- Building 300 Renovation
- New Horticulture/Lab School/Vocational Science Center
- New Performing Arts Complex – Phase 1
- New Welcome Center
- New Instructional Building
Unscheduled

- New Performing Arts Complex – Phase 2
- Performing Arts/Wilshire Theater Renovation
- Renovate Building 2100
- Renovate Building 600
- Renovate Building 100
- Renovate Building 840 Campus Services
- Renovate Health Center
- Renovate Building 1000 Fine Arts Gallery
- Renovate Faculty Lounge and Offices
- Renovate Building 3100
- Parking Lot Improvements at Building 3000
4 PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

Required Permits and Approvals

The lead agency, the District, is responsible for CEQA clearance and site plan review. A public agency, other than the lead agency, that has discretionary approval over the project is known as a “responsible agency,” as defined by the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). The responsible agencies and their corresponding approvals for this project include the following:

State of California

- Division of the State Architect (approval of construction drawings)
- Department of Toxic Substances Control (any activity that may involve the hazardous waste handling and disposal)

Regional Agencies

- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit)
- Orange County Fire Authority (emergency access)
5 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The District finds that the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment based on the results of the IS checklist, as described in Section 6. Potentially significant effects have been identified, and the District has decided to prepare a PEIR to address these impacts, as described below:

1. **Aesthetics:** The proposed project could have a substantial effect by degrading the existing visual quality of a site or creating a new source of substantial light or glare. See Section 6.3.1, Aesthetics, for additional information.

2. **Agriculture and Forestry Resources:** The proposed project would not have an impact on agricultural resources. See Section 6.3.2, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, for additional information.

3. **Air Quality:** Short-term, construction-related impacts are anticipated to occur due to fugitive dust and emissions from vehicles. The operational phase of the proposed project could also result in a substantial increase in emissions. To accurately determine the proposed project’s potential impacts on air quality, further analysis will be required. Impacts are considered potentially significant. See Section 6.3.3, Air Quality, for additional information.

4. **Biological Resources:** The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to special-status wildlife and plant species, and habitat on the project site or interfere with the movement of a migratory wildlife species. Impacts are considered less than significant. See Section 6.3.4, Biological Resources, for additional information.

5. **Cultural Resources:** The proposed project could have the potential to expose cultural, archaeological, or paleontological resources during ground-disturbing activities, or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Impacts are considered potentially significant. See Section 6.3.5, Cultural Resources, for additional information.

6. **Geology and Soils:** The proposed project could expose people or structures to adverse risks associated with hazardous geologic or soil conditions. Impacts are considered potentially significant. See Section 6.3.6, Geology and Soils, for more information.

7. **Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** The proposed project would result in temporary construction-related emissions. During the operational phase, emissions would also increase due to higher energy usage. To accurately determine the proposed project’s potential impacts on greenhouse gas emissions, further analysis will be required. Impacts are considered potentially significant. See Section 6.3.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, for additional information.
8. **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** The proposed project could introduce hazardous materials to people or the environment. To determine the proposed project’s potential hazardous materials impacts, further analysis will be required. Impacts are considered potentially significant. See Section 6.3.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for additional information.

9. **Hydrology and Water Quality:** Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed project could have the potential to result in temporary construction-related impacts on water quality from erosion and sedimentation. Proposed project operation could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, deplete groundwater supplies, and degrade water quality. Impacts to hydrology and water quality will be analyzed further in the PEIR. See Section 6.3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, for additional information.

10. **Land Use and Planning:** The proposed project could conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project. Impacts to land use and planning will be analyzed further in the PEIR. See Section 6.3.10, Land Use and Planning, for more information.

11. **Mineral Resources:** The proposed project would not have an impact on mineral resources. See Section 6.3.11, Mineral Resources, for additional information.

12. **Noise:** The proposed project could expose persons to noise levels that exceed standards or to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, and result in a substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels during construction or operation. Noise impacts will be analyzed further in the PEIR. Refer to Section 6.3.12, Noise, for more information.

13. **Population and Housing:** The proposed project would not divide an established community or displace people or housing. However, the proposed project could induce substantial population growth. Population and housing impacts will be analyzed further in the PEIR. See Section 6.3.13, Population and Housing, for more information.

14. **Public Services:** The proposed project could result in impacts to fire protection and police protection due to access issues and possible disturbances from project construction and operation. See Section 6.3.14, Public Services, for additional information.

15. **Recreation:** The proposed project would not have an impact on recreational facilities. See Section 6.3.15, Recreation, for additional information.

16. **Transportation and Traffic:** During construction and operation of the proposed project, increases in traffic due to construction worker commutes, equipment and materials deliveries, and increases in student enrollment and campus visitors may occur. The proposed project could also introduce hazards to roadways, walkways, and bike paths.
This impact will be analyzed further in the PEIR. See Section 6.3.16, Transportation and Traffic, for additional information.

17. Utilities and Service Systems: The proposed project could have a significant impact on utilities and service systems since it may require construction of new stormwater drainage facilities and water and wastewater treatment facilities and could require new or expanded water entitlements or resources. The proposed project would be required to comply with solid waste statutes and would be required not to adversely impact landfill capacity. See Section 6.3.17, Utilities and Service Systems, for additional information.

18. Mandatory Findings of Significance: The proposed project could result in significant impacts. See Section 6.3.18, Mandatory Findings of Significance, for more information.
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6  INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title:

Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

2. Lead agency name and address:

North Orange County Community College District
1830 W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801

3. Contact person and phone number:

Richard Williams, District Director, Facilities Planning and Construction, 714.808.4893

4. Project location:

Fullerton College
321 E. Chapman Avenue
Fullerton, California 92832

5. Project sponsor’s name and address:

North Orange County Community College District
1830A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801

6. General plan designation:

School

7. Zoning:

P-L Public Land (except for Chapman-Newell property which is zoned Office-Professional)

8. Description of project. (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary):

The District plans to prepare a PEIR to provide the public and responsible agencies with information about the potential environmental effects of the proposed Facilities Master
Plan improvements for Fullerton College, located in Fullerton, California. The Facilities Master Plan provides an analysis of the evolving student body and makes planning recommendations based on educational needs. The District is undertaking a comprehensive improvement and building program to make the upgrades and repairs to existing buildings and to construct new facilities to improve the safety and educational experience of those attending the colleges in accordance with Measure J.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project’s surroundings):**

Fullerton College occupies an approximately 70-acre site in the City of Fullerton in northern Orange County. The City of Fullerton is surrounded by La Habra and Brea to the north, Placentia to the east, Anaheim to the south, and Buena Park to the west. Figure 1 shows the campus’s regional location. Specifically, Fullerton College is bounded by residential development to the north, south, and east and Fullerton Union High School to the west (see Figure 2).

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

- Division of the State Architect for approval of construction drawings
- Department of Toxic Substances Control for any activity that may involve the hazardous waste handling and disposal
- Occupational Health and Safety Administration to be notified of the proposed construction, renovation, and demolition plans
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board for the issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit
- Orange County Fire Authority for review of project design regarding emergency access
6.1 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☑ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☑ Cultural Resources ☑ Geology and Soils
☑ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☑ Hazards and Hazardous Materials ☑ Hydrology and Water Quality
☑ Land Use and Planning ☐ Mineral Resources ☑ Noise
☑ Population and Housing ☑ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☑ Transportation and Traffic ☑ Utilities and Service Systems ☑ Mandatory Findings of Significance
6.2 Determination

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 11/4/2016
6.3 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-Than-Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

6.3.1 Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The proposed project involves construction of a variety of structures, renovation of several existing structures, pedestrian and access road improvements, entryway improvements, and parking structure/lots on the Fullerton College campus as part of the Facilities Master Plan. Some of the structures would be large, multistory buildings, 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 area surrounding the project site is characterized by public, residential, religious institution, and
commercial uses. The City of Fullerton General Plan does not identify any scenic areas or vistas in the vicinity of the campus. There is a designated scenic corridor at the intersection of Brea Boulevard and Harbor Boulevard approximately 0.4 mile northwest of the project site (City of Fullerton 2012a); however, Fullerton College is located is an area where the presence of existing development limits the availability of views to this scenic corridor.

No nature preserves are located within the City, but several parks are located throughout the City. The closest parks are Hillcrest Park and Byerrum Park located approximately 0.1 and 0.3 mile away, respectively; however, Fullerton College is located is an area where the presence of existing development limits the availability of views to nearby parks. As discussed, there are no scenic vistas visible to or from the project site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. This topic will not be analyzed further in the PEIR.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project involves construction of a variety of structures on the Fullerton 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. According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans 2016), the nearest eligible scenic roadway is the stretch of SR-57 from SR-90 to SR-60, which is approximately 1.9 miles from the project site at its closest point. This highway is not an officially designated scenic roadway, but it is considered eligible. There are no designated scenic roadways within the project vicinity. Additionally, there are no County of Orange designated scenic highways within the vicinity of the campus (County of Orange 2005). The proposed project would not damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and no further analysis is required. This topic will not be analyzed further in the PEIR.

c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project entails implementation of the Facilities Master Plan for the Fullerton College campus. Because it introduces a wide variety of projects to the campus, implementation of the proposed project could substantially impact the visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings. New construction and renovation would occur in the campus periphery, which would be most visible to surrounding viewers. The District’s intent is to update and modernize existing
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building space and construct new buildings to meet current and future instructional needs and the District’s academic mission. The visual character and quality of the project site would be enhanced through the construction of facilities with consistent architectural themes. The proposed project could possibly degrade the view for residents near the campus. Impacts are potentially significant and will be examined further in the PEIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. New sources of light and glare could be introduced as a result of the proposed project. Additional exterior and interior lighting would likely be added upon construction of the new facilities on campus. Windows and other reflective features associated with newly renovated and constructed facilities could also introduce glare to the project site and the surrounding areas. Although light and glare considerations would be factored into the design of individual buildings, further analysis is necessary to understand if light and glare would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or have a cumulative impact since multiple new buildings are proposed under the Facilities Master Plan. Impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

6.3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not convert farmland to nonagricultural use. The entire project site and project vicinity are designated as urban and built-up land, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Natural Resources Agency (DOC 2016). A parcel of Prime Farmland, located in Placentia, is located approximately 4.7 miles east of the campus and appears to contain a dirt lot on the entirety of the site. Additionally, a parcel of land designated as a mixture of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland is located approximately 4.8 mile northwest of the campus in Yorba Linda (DOC 2016). The site appears to contain several rows of crops. The proposed project would not occur within these isolated Farmland locations, and would not result in the conversion of this land to nonagricultural use. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no further analysis is required in the PEIR.
b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. 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 Fullerton College campus is designated as public land (P-L) in the City of Fullerton General Plan Land Use map (City of Fullerton 2016a). The area west of the project site consist of public land (P-L), two-family residential preservation (R-2P), limited density multi-family residential (R-3), limited density multi-residential preservation (R-3P), and central business district (C-3). The area to the north of the project site consists of single family residential (R-1), single family residential preservation (R-1P), and limited density multi-family residential (R-3) (City of Fullerton 2016a). East of the project site consists entirely of single-family residential (R-1), and south of the project site consists of office professional land (O-P) and public land (P-L) (City of Fullerton 2007). None of these zones allows agricultural uses. Additionally, according to the City of Fullerton General Plan EIR, less than 1% (approximately 5.3 acres) of the City is devoted to agricultural uses (City of Fullerton 2012b). Due to the developed nature of the site and surrounding land, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Therefore, there would be no conflict with agriculturally zoned land, and no further analysis is required in the PEIR.

c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. As discussed previously, the project site is designated as public land, except for the Chapman-Newell parcel which is zoned Office-Professional. The surrounding land consists of commercial and residential uses (City of Fullerton 2007, 2016a). All construction would take place on the Fullerton College campus, and the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of any forest or timberland since none of those land types are located within the vicinity of the project site. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required in the PEIR.
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**d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

*No Impact.* 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 located in the Chino Hills State Park and Cleveland National Forest, approximately 5.5 miles northeast and 13.8 miles southeast, respectively, of the project site (USFS 2016). The proposed project would not contribute to the loss of forest land, and no impact would occur. No further analysis is required in the PEIR.

**e) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

*No Impact.* No farmland or forest land exists within the vicinity of the project site, as described in Sections 6.3.2(a)–(d). Therefore, no farmland or forests would be converted for nonagricultural or non-forest use due to the proposed project. No impact on farmland or forest land would occur due to the proposed project; therefore, no further analysis is required in the PEIR.

### 6.3.3 Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Conflicts with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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a) **Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The City of Fullerton is within the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Air Quality Management Plan, prepared by SCAQMD, incorporates planning projections to devise a plan to meet federal and state air quality requirements. The proposed project would increase air pollutants in the short term due to construction activities, and long-term increases would likely result from an increase in student enrollment. An increase in commuting students and visitors would likely result in an increase in vehicular pollutants and pollutants associated with campus operations, compared to the current campus emissions levels. Campus energy demands would likely increase due to expanded enrollment and the increased number of buildings on campus, potentially contributing to an increase of criteria air pollutant emissions. These scenarios would introduce more air pollutants into the proposed project area and could potentially obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan. These issues will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

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

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project could violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an air quality violation. Construction of the proposed project would result in a temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed caused by soil disturbance, dust emissions, and combustion pollutants from on-site construction equipment, as well as from construction worker vehicles, vendor/delivery trucks, and off-site haul trucks. Oxides of nitrogen (NO\textsubscript{x}), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter equal to or less than 10 microns (PM\textsubscript{10}), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter equal to or less than 2.5 microns (PM\textsubscript{2.5}), and sulfur dioxide (SO\textsubscript{2}) emissions would primarily result from the use of construction equipment and motor vehicles. Volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions would result from architectural coating. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation, and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions.

Long-term air pollution could result from vehicular emissions and campus operations. An increase in student enrollment could contribute to additional criteria air pollutant emissions. Campus energy demands would likely increase due to the development of the new buildings, contributing to an increase of criteria air pollutant emissions. To determine the proposed project’s potential for violating any air quality standards, further analysis is required in the PEIR.
c) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants under nonattainment according to a federal or state standard. Criteria pollutants under nonattainment in the South Coast Air Basin include ozone and particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$) (SCAQMD 2013). Ozone emitted from construction vehicles and commuter vehicles could contribute to long-term air quality impacts. Particulate matter emitted from construction activities could contribute to temporary impacts. Further investigation is required to determine the proposed project’s potential to result in a considerable net increase of these criteria pollutants. These issues will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors include population groups that are susceptible to the effects of air pollutants. Sensitive receptors include the elderly, children, those with serious medical conditions, and any other group considered sensitive to the harmful effects of air pollutants. Sensitive receptors located within the vicinity of the campus include nearby residences, Raymond Elementary School, and Fullerton Union High School. Substantial pollutant concentrations could result from project construction activities and campus operations. Further analysis is required regarding the amount of criteria air pollutant emissions that would result from the proposed project and whether this would be considered substantial. This issue will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** It is possible that odors could be released during construction activities and while the new facilities are in operation. Pre-construction and construction activities include grading and painting, which could result in the temporary release of objectionable odors. While in operation, odors associated with waste and chemicals used for cleaning and facility maintenance could be released from the project site. This issue will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

### 6.3.4 Biological Resources

Information in this section is based on a general reconnaissance biological survey conducted by Dudek biologist Ryan Gilmore on October 11, 2016. Based on the results of the survey, a Biological Constraints Analysis has been prepared and is provided as Appendix B of this IS.
### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☒️</td>
<td>☒️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☒️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☒️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** On October 11, 2016, Dudek Arborist/Biologist Ryan Gilmore performed a general biological investigation of the project site, plus a 200-foot buffer totaling approximately 123.67 acres (study area). The purpose of the general survey was to identify vegetation communities and land covers, and identify potential habitat for any

---

2 The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), effective September 2012, changed its name to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).
threatened, endangered, or otherwise special-status species that may occur within the study area. No focused, protocol-level surveys for plants or wildlife were conducted.

Raptors that breed in wooded areas which may occur within the study area include American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), barn owl (*Tyto alba*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), and great horned owl (*Bubo virginianus*). Other species that may over-winter or visit the study area include ferruginous hawk (*Buteo regalis*), northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), and sharp-shinned hawk (*Accipiter striatus*).

A limited number of wildlife species was observed or detected during the general field survey of the study area, including a total of 6 bird species. Bird species included American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), Anna’s hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), rock dove (*Columba livia*), European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), house finch (*Carpodacus mexicanus*), and house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*). No raptors or active nests were observed during the site visit.

If trees were to be removed during proposed project activities, this could have a substantial adverse effect on these special-status avian species because these trees could potentially provide nesting opportunities for bird and raptor species protected under the California Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918.

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.

Vegetation clearing should be undertaken outside the nesting season (February through August) in order to avoid impacting nesting birds. If construction activities must occur during the nesting season, then all suitable habitat should be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist before commencement of any vegetation clearing. Typically, if an active nest is detected, then an appropriate avoidance buffer around the nest, as determined by a qualified biologist, is flagged and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete.

Upon compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species would be less than significant. This topic will not be analyzed further in the PEIR.
b) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**No Impact.** The project site consists of developed land, ornamental plantings, ruderal vegetation communities/land covers, and transportation uses (see Figure 3 of Appendix B), according to a general reconnaissance biological survey conducted on the Fullerton College campus. These are not natural vegetation communities considered sensitive by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The project site is not located in riparian habitat or a sensitive natural community, and the project would not have an adverse effect on these habitats. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no further analysis is required. This topic will not be analyzed further in the PEIR.

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

**No Impact.** The project site does not support any aquatic resources regulated by the ACOE, or the CDFW as jurisdictional wetlands, “waters of the U.S.,” or “waters of the State.” No drainages were observed within the study area. The closest aquatic resource is Brea Creek (concrete box channel or wash) located 0.12 miles to the west at its closest approach. Therefore, the proposed project would have no adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.

d) **Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** Wildlife corridors are linear features that connect large patches of natural open space and provide avenues for the migration of animals. Habitat linkages are small patches that join larger blocks of habitat and help reduce the adverse effects of habitat fragmentation; they may be continuous habitat or discrete habitat islands that function as stepping stones for wildlife dispersal.

No wildlife corridors or habitat linkages were identified near the study area. Given the extent of existing development north, east, south, and west of the project site and the campus’ location between several busy vehicular thoroughfares, the study area is expected to support limited wildlife movement, and lacks intact connectivity to other
major habitat reserve areas. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on the migratory movement of any wildlife species.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

_No Impact._ The City of Fullerton Municipal Code Chapter 9.06 Community Forestry states that no person shall injure, prune, or remove any public tree growing within the city public right-of-way (parkways, parks, and areas around public buildings) without a permit from the Director of Maintenance Services. Furthermore, no person shall injure, prune, or remove a landmark tree. Landmark trees are defined as any tree found to be of high value because of its species, size, age, or historic associations and have been designated by the City Council. Landmark trees are designated by the City and identified on maps filed in the Planning Department.

Dudek contacted the City on October 10, 2016 to determine the potential locations of landmark trees within the study area. The City stated that there are currently no official landmark trees as designated by the past or present City Council decree. Therefore, there are no landmark trees within the study area or project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and there would be no impact.

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

_No Impact._ Exhibit 25 of the City of Fullerton General Plan does not identify Habitat Conservation areas within the vicinity of the project site (City of Fullerton 2012c). The project site is not identified on a regional or state conservation plan. Consequently, the project would not conflict with provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. This issue will not be analyzed further in the PEIR.

### 6.3.5 Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

Potentially Significant Impact. Renovations are planned for several existing facilities on campus, which were constructed more than 50 years ago. A historical resources survey will be performed to determine whether these, or any other buildings or structures, are considered historically significant as defined in the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Further analysis is required, and this topic will be addressed in the PEIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Excavation would occur to create the foundations for new facilities. Archaeological resources could be adversely altered or damaged as a result of these activities. Therefore, impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Potentially Significant Impact. Excavation and ground-disturbing activities associated with the construction of the proposed project could adversely alter geological features and paleontological resources, causing potentially significant impacts. A paleontological study will be required and will be included in the PEIR.

d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Potentially Significant Impact. Excavation would occur to create foundations for new facilities. Although it is unlikely due to previous ground disturbance, human remains...
could be located within the project site and could be disturbed by these activities. This topic will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

### 6.3.6 Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

**i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could expose people or structures to the adverse effects of fault rupture. The proposed project site is located in the La Habra Quadrangle. No active fault lies directly underneath the
project site; however, the Whittier Fault Zone is located 4.5 miles northeast of the proposed project site (DOC 2015). The nearest fault line includes the El Modeno and Peralta Hills faults, located in the City of Anaheim, approximately 3.0 miles southeast of Fullerton College. The Los Alamitos Fault, at its closest point, is 10.75 miles southwest of the project site in the City of Los Alamitos. Farther away are the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone and Chino Fault (Caltech 2016). Due to the proximity to fault zones, the campus could be vulnerable to the effects of fault rupture. Impacts associated with fault rupture are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

_Potentially Significant Impact._ Given the campus’s proximity to the El Modeno and Peralta Hills faults and Whittier Fault Zone, 3.0 miles and 4.5 miles, respectively, the site would be vulnerable to the adverse effects of strong seismic ground shaking. These adverse effects would be minimized since building design and renovations would comply with the Division of the State Architect requirements, the Fullerton Municipal Code, and the State of California Uniform Building Code, as controlled by the permitting process. These codes impose design standards and requirements that seek to minimize the damage associated with seismic events. Further analysis is required to determine the potential impacts associated with a seismic event on the project site. Therefore, impacts are potentially significant and will be addressed in the PEIR.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

_Potentially Significant Impact._ The proposed project could potentially expose people and structures to seismic ground failure, including liquefaction. Liquefaction occurs when partially saturated soil loses its effective stress and enters a liquid state, which can result in the soil’s inability to support structures above. Liquefaction can be induced by ground-shaking events and is dependent on soil saturation conditions. According to the California Geological Survey, the project site is located within the Anaheim 7.5-minute quadrangle and the La Habra 7.5-minute quadrangle, both of which are recognized as zones vulnerable to the effects of liquefaction (CDC 1998a, 1998b). However, according to Exhibit 27 of the City of Fullerton General Plan Natural Environment Element, the project site is not within a liquefaction area or other seismic hazard area. Project design and construction would conform to the Division of the State Architect requirements, the Fullerton Municipal Code, and the Uniform Building Code. These codes would abate the effects of seismic-related ground failure and
liquefaction. However, due to the site being within zones vulnerable for liquefaction, the impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure are potentially significant, and further examination will be included in the PEIR.

iv) Landslides?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Landslides often occur during or after strong earthquakes. According to Exhibit 27 of the City of Fullerton General Plan Natural Environment Element, the project site is not identified as susceptible to landslides (City of Fullerton 2012c). Additionally, the project site is relatively flat. Due to these site conditions, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse risks associated with landslides. No further analysis is required in the PEIR.

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would potentially induce soil erosion and loss of topsoil, since unearthed soil exposed through excavation and grading activities could be transported away through wind or water flow. The proposed project would comply with standards and requirements in order to obtain a Stormwater Construction Activities permit and a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. This requires that a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) be prepared and implemented to mitigate and minimize the effects of soil erosion and loss of topsoil. Impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could be vulnerable to or result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. The proposed project site would be located on Mocho loam, San Emigdio loam, and Xerorthents loamy cut and fill areas (USDA 2016). Project design and construction, however, would conform to Fullerton Municipal Code Section 14.03 and the Uniform Building Code. These regulatory requirements include measures that would prevent and abate effects of lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. However, impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.
d) *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?*

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project could be vulnerable to the effects associated with expansive soil since the project site is located on Mocho loam, San Emigdio loam, and Xerorthents loamy cut and fill areas, which have expansive properties (USDA 2016). However, the proposed project would comply with the Uniform Building Code, which would minimize risks to life and property in relation to expanding soils. Nonetheless, impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

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

*No Impact.* The proposed project does not include septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, no impact would occur. This issue will not be analyzed further in the PEIR.

6.3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

*Potentially Significant Impact.* Global climate change is a cumulative impact; a project has a potential impact through its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs). Thus, GHG impacts are recognized as exclusively cumulative impacts: there are no noncumulative GHG emission impacts from a climate change perspective (CAPCOA 2008). This approach is consistent with that recommended by the California Natural Resources Agency, which noted in its public notice for the proposed CEQA amendments that the evidence indicates that in
most cases, the impact of GHG emissions should be considered in the context of a cumulative impact, rather than a project-level impact (CNRA 2009a). Similarly, the Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action for amendments to the CEQA Guidelines confirms that an EIR or other environmental document must analyze the incremental contribution of a project to GHG levels and determine whether those emissions are cumulatively considerable (CNRA 2009b).

The proposed project would result in the emission of GHGs. Temporary GHG impacts would result from the operation of construction vehicles and equipment. The operation of new, on-campus facilities would also increase campus energy demand and would therefore result in the ongoing emission of GHGs. Further analysis is required to determine the estimated project-generated GHG emissions and their impact on global climate. Impacts are potentially significant and will be addressed in the PEIR.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Potentially Significant Impact. There are several federal and state regulatory measures aimed at identifying and reducing GHG emissions, most of which focus on area source emissions (e.g., energy use) and changes to the vehicle fleet (hybrid, electric, and more fuel-efficient vehicles). The Global Warming Solutions Act (Assembly Bill (AB) 32) prepared a scoping plan and the first update in 2014, which established regulations to reduce California GHG emission levels to 431 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CARB 2014). The proposed project would comply with regulations established by AB 32. However, further investigation is required to determine estimated project-generated GHG emissions and their relationship to AB 32 and other applicable plans and policies. Impacts are potentially significant and will be addressed in the PEIR.

### 6.3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The District Environmental Health and Safety Department manages issues regarding health and safety and is responsible for coordinating safety trainings for employees, participating in campus safety meetings, conducting site inspections, developing procedures to minimize toxic chemical exposure, and working with government agencies such as the Occupational Safety and Health Authority (District 2016b). The Environmental Health and Safety Department is responsible for ensuring that the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials is conducted safely throughout all District campuses. Hazardous materials would be used during maintenance and construction processes, potentially including fuels, lubricating fluids, solvents, and cleaning products. If these materials were released, they could prove to be hazardous; therefore, the Environmental Health and
Safety Department would be responsible for implementing programs to prevent any risks involved with handling hazardous materials.

The proposed project involves construction, renovation, and demolition of several buildings. Older buildings proposed for renovation may contain lead and asbestos, since their construction predated regulation of these materials. Although it is unknown whether the existing buildings contain any of these materials, precautions must be taken during renovation processes. Additionally, other pollutants or materials may be released during renovation processes. SCAQMD and the local California Occupational Safety and Health Administration office would be notified of the proposed construction, renovation, and demolition plans before their execution. The types, amounts, and concentrations of these materials are unknown at this stage; therefore, the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section 6.3.8(a), the proposed project would potentially create a significant hazard to the public through the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. The proposed project site is within 0.25 mile of Fullerton Union High School and Raymond Elementary School. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant and this issue will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

d) Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site could be included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5. The Department of Toxic Substances Control is responsible for this list, which includes hazardous waste facilities known to have an unauthorized release of hazardous materials,
hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action, and sites known to have been used for authorized or unauthorized solid waste disposal. A hazardous materials site search will be conducted, and this issue will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

*No Impact.* The Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County has adopted the Airport Environments Land Use Plan. The project site is located approximately 3.1 miles east of Fullerton Municipal Airport. The project site is not located within the planning area for Fullerton Municipal Airport or any other airport land use plan (ALUC 2005). Additionally, proposed project activities would not pose a hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Although the proposed project includes the construction of several multistory buildings, the campus is not located within the height restriction zone for Fullerton Municipal Airport or any other airport. Impacts would not occur, and this topic will not be analyzed in the PEIR.

f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

*No Impact.* The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No private airstrips exist within 2 miles of the project site; therefore, there is no impact and this issue will not be analyzed further in the PEIR.

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

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The City of Fullerton Fire Department and the Division of the State Architect would review all proposed project designs. An access compliance review and fire and life safety review would be performed to prevent implementation impairment of or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. However, it is not known whether the proposed project would interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and further analysis is required. Impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.
h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** 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 a completely urbanized area that contains no adjacent wildlands (City of Fullerton 2012b). Additionally, the area surrounding the project site is generally urbanized and developed. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant and no further analysis is required. This topic will not be analyzed in the PEIR.

### 6.3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*Potentially Significant Impact.* Water quality could be adversely affected by stormwater runoff from the project site. Pollutants existing on campus come from campus operations and vehicle use, maintenance, construction, and landscaping activities. These pollutants include fuel, oil, fertilizers, paints, solvents, cleaners, loose soil, and trash. Storm events could carry pollutants to these drainage features, which could further carry pollutants into the Pacific Ocean. The proposed project would comply with necessary standards and requirements in order to obtain a Stormwater Construction Activities permit and a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. This requires that a SWPPP be prepared and implemented to mitigate and minimize the effects of soil erosion and loss of topsoil. The SWPPP would also contain measures that would require the proper handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials, preventing their release into the surrounding environment. The SWPPP would be implemented during construction of the proposed project; however, impacts associated with campus operations would need to be examined further. Analysis is required to determine whether water quality standards or waste discharge requirements could be violated by operation of the proposed project. Impacts are considered potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

**b) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The Orange County Water District manages the Orange County Groundwater Basin, which provides groundwater to the City of Fullerton. Water would be required for construction and renovation activities, including dust abatement during grading, cement mixing, and cleaning. Water is also necessary for campus
operations such as landscape maintenance, cleaning, and for students and employees. Although water demands are not anticipated to substantially deplete groundwater supplies, further investigation is required to determine estimated campus water demands. This topic will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

c) **Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could substantially alter the drainage pattern of the campus and may result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site. A SWPPP would be prepared that would include measures to prevent substantial erosion or siltation during construction activities. However, further analysis is required to determine the impacts associated with campus operations. The proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river because neither of these exists within the vicinity of the campus, and the project site is already fully developed. Impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

d) **Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the area and could increase the rate or amount of surface runoff. Campus construction would introduce new impervious surface area to the project site, but the site is previously developed and contains both impervious surfaces and permeable surfaces. Further analysis is required to determine the risk of on- or off-site flooding associated with the proposed project. Impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

e) **Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section 6.3.9(d), new impervious surfaces would be introduced by the proposed project; however, further analysis is required to determine if there would be a contribution to runoff exceeding the capacity of the existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.
f) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

_Potentially Significant Impact._ Due to the introduction of pollutants from construction vehicles, maintenance, and construction activities, the water quality of stormwater runoff would be degraded. As described in Section 6.3.9(a), a SWPPP would be developed and implemented to mitigate the effects of construction activities on stormwater runoff water quality. Further analysis is required to determine the impact of campus operations on water quality. Impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed in the PEIR.

g) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

_No Impact._ According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map, the project site is not located within the 100-year flood hazard area. Portions of the campus are located in areas of 0.2% annual chance flood, but these are not considered a 100-year flood hazard area (FEMA 2009). Additionally, the proposed project does not include a housing component. Therefore, the proposed project would not locate housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. Impacts would not occur, and no further analysis is required. This topic will not be analyzed in the PEIR.

h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

_No Impact._ According to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, the project site is not located within the 100-year flood hazard area. Portions of the campus are located in areas of 0.2% annual chance flood, but these are not considered 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, and this topic will not be analyzed in the PEIR.

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

_Potentially Significant Impact._ The proposed project is within the vicinity of two dams, the Brea Dam and the Fullerton Dam, 1.0 mile and 2.5 miles away, respectively. Due to the proximity to these dams, the project site could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam. Although the proposed project would not involve development of student housing or placement of new residences, risks are considered potentially significant. Therefore, this topic will be analyzed further in the PEIR.


j) **Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

*No Impact.* The proposed project site is approximately 14 miles from the Pacific Ocean, and the City of Fullerton is approximately 150 feet above mean sea level; therefore, the project site would not be exposed to impacts from a tsunami (City of Fullerton 2016b). The proposed project site is not in the vicinity of any surface waters or potential mudflow sources. Additionally, according to the City of Fullerton’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, earthquake-induced seiches are not considered a risk in the City of Fullerton (City of Fullerton 2010). Therefore, the proposed project would not be exposed to impacts from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, and no further analysis is required in the PEIR.

**6.3.10 Land Use and Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X. <strong>LAND USE AND PLANNING</strong> – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Would the project physically divide an established community?**

*Less-Than-Significant Impact.* The project site was developed in 1913, and the residential areas around the campus have been developed over time (District 2016a). The project site currently has a zoning designation of public land (P-L) and Office-Professional, and no change in zoning is proposed. Additionally, the campus does not divide or isolate an established community. The proposed construction and renovation would occur entirely on campus and would not divide the surrounding community. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required in the PEIR.
b) *Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project would involve renovation and modernization of existing facilities on the Fullerton College campus, and construction of new facilities and demolition of existing facilities. Although it is unlikely that the proposed project would result in a conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations, further analysis is required. Impacts would be potentially significant, and this topic will be discussed within the PEIR.

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

*No Impact.* The proposed project is not located within any adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or local or regional habitat conservation plan areas. The City of Fullerton General Plan does not identify any biological resource protection policies applicable to the project site. Since the proposed project is not located within any approved plan areas, it would not impact the goals and objectives of any adopted plans. Therefore, impacts would not occur, and no further analysis is required.

### 6.3.11 Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*No Impact.* 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 0.3 mile north from the project site operated by Dolke-Thomas Oil Syndicate (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. According to Chapter 19 of the City of Fullerton’s General Plan, Fullerton does not contain any areas designated as Mineral Resource Zones. The project site does not contain mineral resources; therefore, the proposed project would not result in a loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. As discussed in Section 6.3.11(a), there are no mineral resources on the project site or within the City of Fullerton. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource, and no further analysis is required.

6.3.12 Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) **Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project could expose persons to a noise level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Excessive noise could result from construction activities and the operation of construction vehicles. Additionally, the proposed project could result in the exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of established standards due to noise generated within the campus (e.g., by machinery, sporting events, and music events) and traffic noise. The City has established interior and exterior noise standards, which vary depending on time of day. These standards are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA) at Property Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM – 10:00 PM</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM – 7:00 AM</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Residential Noise Zones and sensitive uses, the following allowed noise level standards shall not be exceeded:

- For a cumulative period of more than 30 minutes in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus 5 dB(A) for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes, but less than 30 minutes in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus 10 dB(A) for a cumulative period of more than 5 minutes, but less than 15 minutes in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus 15 dB(A) for a cumulative period of more than 1 minute, but less than 5 minutes in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus 20 dB(A) for a cumulative period of less than 1 minute in an hour.

*Source: City of Fullerton 2016c*

It is possible that construction and operational activities could exceed the noise levels summarized in Table 2; therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant. This issue will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

b) **Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

*Potentially Significant Impact.* Construction activities could generate or expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels that exceed the groundborne vibration and noise thresholds established by the City of Fullerton (see Table 3).
Table 3
City of Fullerton Groundborne Vibration and Noise Impact Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Groundborne Vibration Impact Levels (VdB re 1 microinch/sec)</th>
<th>Groundborne Noise Impact Levels (dB re 20 micro Pascals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent Events ¹</td>
<td>Infrequent Events ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operations.</td>
<td>65 VdB ³</td>
<td>65 VdB ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep.</td>
<td>72 VdB</td>
<td>80 VdB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime use.</td>
<td>75 VdB</td>
<td>83 VdB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Fullerton 2016c*

¹ Frequent Events is defined as more than 70 vibration events per day.
² Infrequent Events is defined as fewer than 70 vibration events per day.
³ This criterion limit is based on levels that are acceptable for most moderately sensitive equipment such as optical microscopes. Vibration sensitive manufacturing or research will require detailed evaluation to define the acceptable vibration levels.
⁴ Vibration-sensitive equipment is not sensitive to groundborne noise.

Additionally, construction activities could expose Raymond Elementary School, Fullerton Union High School, and nearby residences to excessive groundborne vibrations and noise. Impacts are potentially significant, and this issue will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

c) *Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is already developed as the Fullerton College campus. However, the proposed project could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels due to noise generated within the campus (e.g., machinery, sporting events, music events) and traffic noise. Impacts are potentially significant, and this topic will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

d) *Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels due to construction activities, grading, demolition, and traffic associated with construction vehicles. Impacts are potentially significant, and this issue will be analyzed further in the PEIR.
e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project site is not located within the planning area for Fullerton Municipal Airport or any other airport land use plan (ALUC 2005), and Fullerton Municipal Airport is approximately 3.1 miles west of the project site. Therefore, there is little potential to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Impacts are considered less than significant, and this issue will not be analyzed further in the PEIR.

f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No private airstrips exist within 2 miles of the 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, and no further analysis is required. This topic will not be analyzed in the PEIR.

### 6.3.13 Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would involve renovation and modernization of existing educational facilities on the Fullerton College campus, and
construction of new educational facilities and demolition of existing facilities. The proposed project would not include the construction or development of housing facilities. However, the proposed project would involve an increase in student enrollment, which could result in an increase of students and employees living in the vicinity of the campus. Additionally, the proposed project would include the construction of a new Performing Arts Center and renovation of the Wilshire Theater and addition of stadium seats to Sherbeck Field, which could attract visitors to the campus. This issue will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

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

*No Impact.* The proposed project would not displace existing housing. Plans are to renovate and construct educational facilities and parking lots serving students and the surrounding community. No housing units currently exist on the campus. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. This topic will not be analyzed in the PEIR.

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

*No Impact.* 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, and no further analysis is required. This topic will not be analyzed in the PEIR.

### 6.3.14 Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

**Fire protection?**

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project could have an adverse impact on fire protection providers. Because the proposed project includes an increase in student enrollment, additional calls for service could result, which could affect the service ratio, response time, or other performance objectives of fire protection services. Impacts are potentially significant; therefore, further analysis is required and this issue will be addressed in the PEIR.

**Police protection?**

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project may have an adverse impact on police protection providers. Because the proposed project includes an increase in student enrollment, additional calls for service could result, which could affect the service ratio, response time, or other performance objectives of police protection services. Impacts are potentially significant; therefore, further analysis is required and this issue will be addressed in the PEIR.

**Schools?**

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project would result in increased student enrollment and employee growth. Because the proposed project includes an increase in student enrollment, additional school children could attend schools in the area if the increased student enrollment results in new school children attending local schools. Impacts are potentially significant; therefore, further analysis is required and this issue will be addressed in the PEIR.

**Parks?**

*No Impact.* The proposed project would have no impact on local parks. The proposed project area would experience an increase in students and employees; however, the campus offers athletic fields and recreational opportunities, so nearby parks would not see 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 Hillcrest Park, Byerrum Park, Amerige Park, and Ford Park, located 0.1, 0.3, 0.6, and 0.7 mile from the
campus, respectively. Access to these parks would not be adversely affected by project construction activities since a traffic control plan would be implemented in compliance with state and municipal construction codes to prevent access issues. No impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required. This topic will not be analyzed in the PEIR.

**Other public facilities?**

*No Impact.* The proposed project would have no impact on libraries and other public facilities. Fullerton 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 Fullerton Public Library, which is located approximately 0.6 mile southwest of campus. No impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required. This topic will not be analyzed in the PEIR.

### 6.3.15 Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV. RECREATION</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*No Impact.* The closest parks are Hillcrest Park, Byerrum Park, Amerige Park, and Ford Park, located 0.1, 0.3, 0.6, and 0.7 mile from the campus, respectively. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing parks or recreation areas. Although the campus is projected to experience an increase in student enrollment of more than 3,000 students over the 10-year planning period, recreational facilities are available on the campus; therefore, off-site recreational facilities would not experience substantial physical deterioration due to an increase of use. One of the project components is to add stadium seats and lighting to Sherbeck Field so that athletic activities and games could remain on campus. No impacts to recreational facilities would occur, and no further analysis is required in the PEIR.
b) **Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

**No Impact.** As discussed in Section 6.3.15(a), the proposed project would not increase the use of existing parks or recreation areas outside of the campus. Therefore, the expansion or addition of off-site recreational facilities or parks is not required. One of the project components is to add stadium seats and lighting to Sherbeck Field so that athletic activities and games could remain on campus. No impacts to recreational facilities would occur, and no further analysis is required in the PEIR.

### 6.3.16 Transportation and Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

_Potentially Significant Impact._ The proposed project could conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Applicable plans include the Fullerton Built Environment Element of the City of Fullerton General Plan. The proposed project has the potential to affect the streets immediately surrounding the campus, which include North Lemon Street, East Chapman Avenue, Nutwood Place, and North Berkeley Avenue. The Facilities Master Plan projects an increase in student enrollment of more than 3,000 students over the 10-year planning period, thus resulting in an increase in traffic.

If an increase in traffic would result in level of service (LOS) scores lower than “E,” or the baseline LOS if worse than LOS E, for signalized and unsignalized intersections (City of Fullerton 2012a), impacts would be significant. A traffic impact analysis will be conducted and the results included in the PEIR.

b) Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

_Potentially Significant Impact._ The proposed project could conflict with the Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP) (OCTA 2015). As described in Section 6.3.16(a), conflicts could occur due to an increase in student enrollment and campus visitors. The CMP requires that intersections do not fall below a LOS score of “E.” It is unknown whether the proposed project would conflict with LOS standards or any other standards set by the CMP. A traffic impact analysis will be conducted and the results included in the PEIR.

c) Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

_No Impact._ According to Exhibit 16 of the City of Fullerton General Plan, the project site is outside of the Fullerton Municipal Airport Runway Protection Zone. Consequently, the proposed project would not change air traffic patterns or result in substantial safety risks regarding air traffic (City of Fullerton 2012a). No further analysis is required in the PEIR.
d) **Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project could increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The proposed project would involve construction of a new 840-space parking structure, a new surface parking lot, and realignment of the campus access to the Centennial Parking Structure. To ensure that these project elements would not introduce hazardous circulation or design features, further analysis is needed to determine if there is any risk associated with the proposed project design. A traffic impact analysis will be conducted and the results included in the PEIR.

e) **Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project could result in inadequate emergency access. The proposed project would introduce a new 840-space parking structure, a new surface parking lot, and realignment of the campus access to the Centennial Parking Structure. The new parking structure, parking lot, and other improvements would have to be designed so as not to inhibit emergency access to the campus or any surrounding areas. The parking improvements, as well as all other project renovations and construction, would comply with the Uniform Building Code. Additionally, the City of Fullerton Fire Department and the Division of the State Architect would review all project designs. However, a traffic impact analysis is required to determine whether the project design would affect emergency access. Impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

f) **Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?**

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities in the Mobility Section of the City of Fullerton General Plan or the Orange County CMP (City of Fullerton 2012a; OCTA 2015). A traffic impact analysis is required to determine whether the proposed project would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the PEIR.
### 6.3.17 Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would involve the construction of new buildings and renovation of existing buildings. In addition, the campus would experience student growth of approximately 3,000 students. These new buildings and an increase in students would result in an increase in wastewater discharge from the project site. Further investigation is required to determine whether wastewater treatment would exceed requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This topic will be analyzed further in the PEIR.
b) *Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could involve construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities since the campus would experience student growth and the proposed project would involve the construction of new buildings. Further analysis will be conducted to determine the projected water demand and whether this demand would require the construction of additional water and wastewater facilities. Impacts are considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the PEIR.

c) *Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could require construction of new stormwater drains and infrastructure to support the newly constructed and renovated buildings and structures. Drains and infrastructure would be designed to carry stormwater flow to existing stormwater drainage facilities. Although there would not be a significant increase in impervious surfaces as a result of the proposed project, further analysis is needed to determine whether additional stormwater flow would result from the proposed project. This topic will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project includes development of new facilities on campus. In addition, the campus is expected to experience student growth of approximately 3,000 students, which would result in an increase in water demand. Further analysis is required to determine the expected water demands and whether current water supplies are sufficient, or whether new or expanded entitlements would be needed. Impacts are potentially significant, and this topic will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

e) *Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?*

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As described in Section 6.3.17(a), it is anticipated that the campus would experience an increase in student enrollment. It is possible that the proposed
project could create a demand that would exceed the wastewater treatment capacity of the area. Further analysis is required, and this issue will be addressed in the PEIR.

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

_Potentially Significant Impact._ The Olinda Alpha landfill, which permits a maximum of 8,000 tons of waste per day, serves the City of Fullerton (City of Fullerton 2012b; County of Orange 2016). The proposed project includes construction of new facilities and anticipates student growth. Further analysis is required to determine the increase in solid waste generated by Fullerton College, and whether this would exceed the capacity at the Olinda Alpha landfill. Impacts are potentially significant, and this topic will be addressed in the PEIR.

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

_Potentially Significant Impact._ AB 341 requires that at least 75% of solid waste generated by a state jurisdiction be diverted from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, or composting by 2020. Cities, counties, and regional agencies are required to develop a waste management plan that would achieve a 75% diversion from landfills (CalRecycle 2015). Further investigation is required to confirm that the proposed project would comply with AB 341. Impacts are potentially significant, and this topic will be analyzed in the PEIR.

**6.3.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a)** Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

*Potentially Significant Impact.* As discussed in Section 6.3.5, proposed construction activities could impact examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory if archaeological, paleontological, or historical resources were impacted. These issues will be analyzed further in the PEIR.

**b)** Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project could have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. The PEIR will analyze past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity of the proposed project.

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

*Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project could have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. This topic will be analyzed further in the PEIR.
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APPENDIX A

NOP Distribution List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Credentials</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Gebelein</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>Fullerton Public Library</td>
<td>353 W. Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>Clerk-Recorder</td>
<td>Clerk-Recorder</td>
<td>County of Orange</td>
<td>41 Civic Center Plaza, Room 108</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>City of Fullerton</td>
<td>505 W. Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Felz</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>City of Fullerton</td>
<td>505 W. Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Public Information Director</td>
<td>Public Information Director</td>
<td>City of Buena Park</td>
<td>5550 Beach Boulevard, First Floor</td>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>City of Anaheim</td>
<td>200 South Anaheim Boulevard</td>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralston</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
<td>City of La Habra</td>
<td>13700 La Habra Boulevard</td>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Clerk-Recorder</td>
<td>Clerk-Recorder</td>
<td>County of Orange</td>
<td>41 Civic Center Plaza, Room 108</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Bonsand</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>City of Fullerton</td>
<td>505 W. Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Sortwell</td>
<td>Director of Development Services</td>
<td>Director of Development Services</td>
<td>City of Placentia</td>
<td>444 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>Belmer</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Public Works</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Public Works</td>
<td>City of Brea</td>
<td>401 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Sumida</td>
<td>Deputy Executive Officer</td>
<td>Deputy Executive Officer</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>21305 Copley Dr.</td>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Fullerton Joint Unified High School District</td>
<td>351 West Valencia Drive</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Olmos</td>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
<td>City of Brea</td>
<td>401 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td>Director of Development Services</td>
<td>Director of Development Services</td>
<td>City of Placentia</td>
<td>444 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Sklar</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
<td>13700 La Habra Boulevard</td>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Scheitelberg</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>SoCalGas</td>
<td>P.O. Box 3150</td>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Discher</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
<td>13700 La Habra Boulevard</td>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Schenkelberg</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
<td>13700 La Habra Boulevard</td>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Mikes</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse</td>
<td>1205 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Billete</td>
<td>District Director</td>
<td>District Director</td>
<td>Orange County Community College District</td>
<td>505 W. Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>Vice President, Administration</td>
<td>Vice President, Administration</td>
<td>Fullerton College</td>
<td>505 W. Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Chrisman</td>
<td>Director of Physical Plant/Facilities</td>
<td>Director of Physical Plant/Facilities</td>
<td>Fullerton College</td>
<td>505 W. Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
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<th>State</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
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<th>Organization</th>
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<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Ramsland</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>City of La Habra</td>
<td>201 East La Habra Boulevard</td>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elias</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Public Works</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Public Works</td>
<td>City of Brea</td>
<td>401 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Belmer</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Public Works</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Public Works</td>
<td>City of Brea</td>
<td>401 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Sumida</td>
<td>Deputy Executive Officer</td>
<td>Deputy Executive Officer</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>21305 Copley Dr.</td>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Fullerton Joint Unified High School District</td>
<td>351 West Valencia Drive</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Sklar</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
<td>13700 La Habra Boulevard</td>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>CA</td>
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APPENDIX B

Biological Constraints Analysis
Mr. Richard Williams  
District Director, Facilities Planning and Construction  
North Orange County Community College District  
1830 W. Romneya Drive  
Anaheim, California 92801

Subject: Biological Constraints Analysis for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan Project

Dear Mr. Williams:

This letter presents the findings of a biological constraints analysis conducted by Dudek on the approximately 83-acre Fullerton College property located in the City of Fullerton, Orange County, California (project site; Figure 1). The project site is generally located south and west of North Berkeley Avenue, east of North Lemon Street, and north of East Wilshire Avenue (Figure 2).

The North Orange County Community College District (District) is updating its Facilities Master Plan for its Orange County campuses: Cypress College, Fullerton College, and its School of Continuing Education in Anaheim. The 2011 Facilities Master Plan provides an analysis of the evolving student body and makes planning recommendations based on educational needs. The District is undertaking a comprehensive improvement and building program to make the upgrades and repairs of existing buildings, to construct new facilities to improve the safety and educational experience of those attending the colleges, and to meet projected enrollment based on growth in population and jobs and the state Chancellor’s Office enrollment projections in accordance with the Measure J Facilities Bond Program. Measure J was passed in November 2014 and issued $574 million in bonds to fund upgrades to technical job training facilities, aging classrooms, and veterans’ amenities.

At Fullerton College, the District plans to construct the following projects as part of the Facilities Master Plan (proposed project):

- A new Welcome Center at the corner of East Chapman Avenue and North Lemon Street
- Two new instructional buildings, one south of the 1400 building and one south of the proposed parking on lot on East Chapman Avenue
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- New Horticulture and Vocational Sciences Center
- New Child Development Center
- A new 840-space parking structure located west of Sherbeck Field and a pedestrian bridge from the parking structure to the Classroom Office 1400
- New parking lots north of Berkeley Avenue adjacent to the 3100 building and south of the Lemon Street parking structure
- Realignment of the campus access to the Centennial Parking Structure
- A new Maintenance and Operations facility located north of the chiller plant, a thermal storage addition to the south of the chiller plant, and an addition on the east side of the chiller plant
- New storage, offices, and a small shower/locker room building to the north of the existing pool
- The addition of field lighting and 4,500 stadium seats to Sherbeck Field
- A new Performing Arts complex, sculpture garden, arts plaza, and campus quad, in the south campus quad at the southeast corner of East Chapman Avenue and North Lemon Street with renovation of the existing Wilshire Theater
- Renovation of Physical Education 1200 facilities to include a third sand volleyball court and renovations to Health Services, faculty offices, and the Wellness Center
- Renovation of Math 600, Business 300, Humanities 500, Campus Services 840, Administration 100, and the Fine Arts Gallery 1000
- Renovation of Academic Computing 3100
- New signage at key entry and exit points of the campus such as the intersection of North Berkeley Avenue and North Lemon Street, along Berkeley Avenue at Lot 5, along Berkeley Avenue south of Sherbeck Field, along Berkeley Avenue at Lot B-2 East, along East Chapman Avenue at North Lawrence Avenue, at the intersection of East Chapman Avenue and North Lemon Street (north and south of the intersection), and along North Lemon Street at Lot C West

It is anticipated that these improvements will be phased over a 10-year period.

This letter report is intended to: (1) describe the existing conditions of biological resources within the project site in terms of vegetation, flora, wildlife, and wildlife habitats; (2) discuss potential constraints to development of the project site; and (3) provide recommendations for
avoidance of biological resources and additional actions that may be required for environmental permitting of the project with respect to biological resources.

PROJECT SITE DESCRIPTION

The project site is an existing college campus with paved access roads, parking lots, buildings, and landscaped areas. Fullerton College is surrounded by urban residential and commercial uses in all directions. Fullerton High School is directly adjacent northwest of the campus along North Lemon Street.

Topography of the project site is generally flat with elevations ranging from approximately 175 feet above mean sea level at the center of campus to approximately 223 feet in the northern portion of campus. The project site can be found within Section 27, T. 3 S., R. 10 W. of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute La Habra, California quadrangle map (Figure 2).

METHODS

The biological constraints analysis began with a review of available literature and data to evaluate the environmental setting and identify potential special-status biological resources that may be found on the project site. The review included the California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS) Environmental Conservation Online System, and California Native Plant Society’s (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants data. A 5-mile buffer around the project site was queried in the USFWS data using geographic information systems (GIS) software, and a “nine-quad” query was conducted of the CNDDB and CNPS Inventory. The nine-quad query included the USGS 7.5-minute La Habra quadrangle and the surrounding eight USGS quadrangles (Anaheim, Baldwin Park, El Monte, Long Beach, Los Alamitos, Orange, San Dimas, Whittier, and Yorba Linda). These databases provided information regarding special-status plants, wildlife, and habitats recorded for the project site and vicinity. Dudek also reviewed soil survey maps, USGS National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) of aquatic resources, USFWS’ National
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Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps\(^5\), and other in-house documentation, GIS layers, and sources for locations of special-status species and water resources.

On October 11, 2016, Dudek Arborist/Biologist Ryan Gilmore performed a general biological investigation of the project site, plus a 200-foot buffer totaling approximately 123.67 acres (study area). The purpose of the general survey was to identify vegetation communities and land covers, and identify potential habitat for any threatened, endangered, or otherwise special-status species that may occur within the study area. No focused, protocol-level surveys for plants or wildlife were conducted.

Vegetation community and land cover mapping was conducted according to the CDFW’s Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities\(^6\) and List of Vegetation Alliances and Associations\(^7\), also referred to as the Natural Communities List. Vegetation communities and land covers were mapped in the field directly onto 1:2,400-scale (1 inch = 200 feet) aerial photographic maps. Non-natural vegetation communities or land covers not listed in the Natural Communities List followed generic habitat types used in the Orange County Habitat Classification System (OCHCS)\(^8,\,^9\), and were identified as mapping units (e.g., Ornamental Mapping Unit). Following completion of the fieldwork, all vegetation polygons were digitized using ArcGIS and a GIS coverage was created.

During the field survey, a general inventory of plant and wildlife species detected by sight, calls, tracks, scat, or other signs was compiled; and the potential for special-status species to occur within the study area was determined. Observable special-status resources including perennial plants and conspicuous wildlife (e.g., birds and some reptiles) commonly accepted as regionally sensitive by the USFWS, CDFW, and/or CNPS were recorded and later digitized into a project-specific GIS coverage.

In addition, a preliminary investigation of the extent and distribution of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) jurisdictional “waters of the U.S.,” Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdictional “waters of the State,” and CDFW jurisdictional streambed and associated riparian habitat was conducted.

RESULTS

This section describes the soils, vegetation communities and floral diversity, wildlife diversity, and special-status biological resources. The study area does not occur within any established conservation plan boundaries such as a Natural Community Conservation Plan area or Habitat Conservation Plan area.

Soil Survey Review

The Soil Survey of Orange County and Western Part of Riverside County was analyzed for indicators of streams and the historic mapping of wetlands, seeps, springs, or hydric soils. Three soil series were identified as occurring within the boundaries of the study area: Mocho loam, 0 to 2% slopes (166); San Emigdio fine sandy loam, 0 to 2% slopes (194), and Xerorthents loamy, cut and fill areas, 9 to 15% slopes (219). One drainage feature was identified on the map that occurs approximately 0.12 miles west of the study area (Brea Creek).

National Hydrography Dataset and National Wetlands Inventory Review

The study area occurs within the southeast portion of the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Hydrologic Unit (805.00), and more specifically within the Anaheim Hydrologic Area Split (845.60) and Anaheim Hydrologic Subarea Split (845.61). The Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Hydrologic Unit includes covers most of Los Angeles County and is mostly fully developed and/or entitled. The Anaheim Hydrologic Subarea Split watershed is primarily drained by the Carbon Creek flood control channel and Moody Creek flood control channel, both of which connect with Coyote Creek and eventually merge with the San Gabriel River before eventually draining into the Pacific Ocean. No tributaries to Brea Creek channel occur within the study area. Brea Creek channel is identified as a “flowline” within the NHD and “blue-line” drainage on the USGS 7.5-minute La Habra and Anaheim quadrangle maps.

A review of the NWI dataset revealed no aquatic resources within the project site or surrounding study area.
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Vegetation Communities and Floral Diversity

Four non-natural land covers were mapped within the study area based on general physiognomy and species composition, including: developed, ornamental, ruderal, and transportation. These land cover types are described below and depicted within Figure 3. Table 1 summarizes the extent of each land cover within the study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetation Community or Land Cover</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Project Site</th>
<th>Off Site (200-foot Buffer)</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Natural Land Covers / Unvegetated Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Mapping Unit</td>
<td>50.46</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>81.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Mapping Unit</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruderal Mapping Unit</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Mapping Unit</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59</strong></td>
<td><strong>123.67</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Natural Land Covers/ Unvegetated Communities

Developed Mapping Unit

The developed mapping unit includes areas occupied by college campus structures, residential and commercial structures, paving, and other impermeable surfaces that typically do not support vegetation or habitat for species; however, non-native ornamental landscaping may occur within the mapping unit.

Ornamental Mapping Unit

This land cover type consists of introduced plantings of exotic, and sometimes native, species as landscaping. Species associated with this mapping unit that occur within the study area include jacaranda (*Jacaranda mimosifolia*), fern pine (*Podocarpus gracilior*), camphor (*Cinnamomum camphora*), Canary Island pine (*Pinus canariensis*), sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), Queen palm (*Syagrus romanzoffiana*), rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis*), Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*), Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*), and various non-native ornamental grass species.
Ruderal Mapping Unit

This land cover type consists of early successional grasslands dominated by non-native, pioneering herbaceous plants and associated with disturbed areas. The type of non-native species that dominate ruderal areas are generally forbs as opposed to grasses. Species associated with this mapping unit that occur within the study area include black mustard (Brassica nigra) and Russian thistle (Salsola tragus).

Transportation Mapping Unit

This barren cover type consists of major paved vehicular access roads that lack vegetation. Roadways within the study area include East Chapman Avenue, North Lemon Street, North Berkeley Avenue, and East Wilshire Avenue.

Wildlife Diversity

A limited number of wildlife species was observed or detected during the general field survey of the study area, including a total of 6 bird species. Bird species included American crow (Corvus brachyrhynchos), Anna’s hummingbird (Calypte anna), rock dove (Columba livia), European starling (Sturnus vulgaris), house finch (Carpodacus mexicanus), and house sparrow (Passer domesticus). No raptors or active nests were observed during the site visit.

Special-Status Biological Resources

The presence of protected or regulated vegetation communities, plant species, and wildlife species occurring or potentially occurring within the study area was based on a literature review and evaluation of the habitat found within the study area. Special-status biological resources are classified by either State or Federal resource management agencies, or both. Special-status vegetation communities include habitats considered “sensitive” by the CNDDB that are unique, of relatively limited distribution, or of particular value to wildlife. Special-status plant and wildlife species include those listed as threatened or endangered under provisions of the State and federal Endangered Species Acts, or as California Species of Concern (SSC) by the CDFW. The species discussed below have been afforded special recognition by local, State, or federal resource conservation agencies and organizations, principally due to the species’ declining or limited population sizes usually resulting from habitat loss.
Sensitive Vegetation Communities

No natural vegetation communities considered sensitive by the CNDDB were identified within the study area.

Special-Status Plants

Special-status plants include those listed, or candidates for listing, as threatened or endangered by the USFWS and CDFW, and species identified as rare by the CNPS (particularly California Rare Plant Rank [CRPR] 1A – Presumed extinct in California; CRPR 1B – Rare, threatened, or endangered throughout its range; and CRPR 2 – Rare or Endangered in California, more common elsewhere). A total of 39 special-status plant species were reported in the CNDDB, USFWS, and CNPS databases as occurring in the vicinity of the study area. However, no special-status plant species were observed within the study area during the site visit. Based on the species ranges, and land covers (e.g., developed, ornamental, ruderal, and transportation) and soils present on the project site, there is no potential for special-status plants to occur.

Special-Status Wildlife

Special-status wildlife include those listed, or candidates for listing, as threatened or endangered by the USFWS and CDFW, and designated as SSC by CDFW. A total of 50 special-status wildlife species were reported in the CNDDB and USFWS databases as occurring in the vicinity of the study area. However, no special-status wildlife species were observed within the study area during the site visit. Based on the species ranges, and land covers (e.g., developed, ornamental, ruderal, and transportation) and urban pressures present on the project site, there is no potential for special-status wildlife to occur.

Raptor Nesting and Foraging

Since the study area is comprised of ornamental landscaping that support mature trees, there are limited nesting habitats for raptors. Foraging opportunities may occur outside the project site within the ruderal grassland areas. No raptor species were observed within the study area during the site visit.

Raptors that breed in wooded areas which may occur within the study area include American kestrel (Falco sparverius), barn owl (Tyto alba), Cooper's hawk (Accipiter cooperii), red-shouldered hawk (Buteo lineatus), red-tailed hawk (Buteo jamaicensis), and great horned owl (Bubo virginianus). Other species that may over-winter or visit the study area include ferruginous hawk (Buteo regalis), northern harrier (Circus cyaneus), and sharp-shinned hawk (Accipiter striatus).
Jurisdictional Aquatic Resources

The project site does not support any aquatic resources regulated by the ACOE, or the CDFW as jurisdictional wetlands, “waters of the U.S.,” or “waters of the State.” No drainages were observed within the study area. The closest aquatic resource is Brea Creek (concrete box channel or wash) located 0.12 miles to the west at its closest approach.

Public and Landmark Trees

The City of Fullerton Municipal Code Chapter 9.06 Community Forestry states that no person shall injure, prune, or remove any public tree growing within the city public right-of-way (parkways, parks, and areas around public buildings) without a permit from the Director of Maintenance Services. Furthermore, no person shall injure, prune, or remove a landmark tree. Landmark trees are defined as any tree found to be of high value because of its species, size, age, or historic associations and have been designated by the City Council. Landmark trees are designated by the City and identified on maps filed in the Planning Department.

Dudek contacted the City on October 10, 2016 to determine the potential locations of landmark trees within the study area. The City stated that there are currently no official landmark trees as designated by the past or present City Council decree. Therefore, there are no landmark trees within the study area or project site.

The biologist observed a number of potentially regulated public trees growing within the parkways and medians on the following streets: East Chapman Avenue, North Lemon Street, East Wilshire Avenue, North Balcom Avenue, North Newell Place, and East Brookdale Place. Regulated public trees are depicted within Figure 4.

Designated Critical Habitat

No federally designated critical habitat for any plant or wildlife species occurs within the study area.

Wildlife Corridors and Habitat Linkages

Wildlife corridors are linear features that connect large patches of natural open space and provide avenues for the migration of animals. Habitat linkages are small patches that join larger blocks of habitat and help reduce the adverse effects of habitat fragmentation; they may be continuous habitat or discrete habitat islands that function as stepping stones for wildlife dispersal.
No wildlife corridors or habitat linkages were identified near the study area. Given the extent of existing development north, east, south, and west of the project site and position between several busy vehicular thoroughfares, the study area is expected to support limited wildlife movement, and lacks intact connectivity to other major habitat reserve areas.

SUMMARY OF BIOLOGICAL CONSTRAINTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The project site is an existing college campus characterized by non-natural land covers and unvegetated communities (e.g., developed and ornamental mapping units). Dudek understands that the proposed project involves renovation of existing structures and construction of new buildings and landscape features within the existing college campus footprint. For the purposes of this preliminary assessment, Dudek has assumed that standard best management practices during construction activities would be implemented and all future temporary and permanent impacts would occur within the existing development footprint.

Based on the results of the literature review and recent field observations conducted by Dudek, two potential biological resource constraints were identified for the proposed project:

- **Breeding and nesting bird habitat.** The project site and study area contain vegetation and trees that could potentially support breeding and nesting bird species, including raptors. Disturbing or destroying occupied nests, live young, and eggs is a violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703) and California Fish and Game Code (Section 3503). Dudek recommends initiation of vegetation clearing outside the nesting season (February through August) in order to avoid impacting nesting birds. If construction activities must occur during the nesting season, then all suitable habitat should be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist before commencement of any vegetation clearing. Typically, if an active nest is detected then an appropriate avoidance buffer around the nest, as determined by a qualified biologist, is flagged and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete.

- **Public Trees.** There are a large number of public trees located within the study area and regulated by the City of Fullerton. The City of Fullerton Municipal Code Chapter 9.06 Community Forestry requires a permit for activities that may alter, injure, or require the removal of a public tree.
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If you have any question regarding the information provided within this letter report, please do not hesitate to contact me at 949.373.8321.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Ryan Henry
Senior Biologist/Project Manager

Att.: Figures 1–4

cc: Rachel Struglia, Dudek
FIGURE 1
Regional Map
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December 5, 2016

Mr. Richard Williams
North Orange County Community College District
1830 A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA. 92801

Dear Mr. Williams:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (NOP). The District plans to prepare a PEIR to provide the public and responsible agencies with information about the potential environmental effects of the proposed Facilities Master Plan improvements for Fullerton College, located in Fullerton, California. The Facilities Master Plan provides an analysis of the evolving student body and makes planning recommendations based on educational needs. The District is undertaking a comprehensive improvement and building program to make the upgrades and repairs to existing buildings and to construct new facilities to improve the safety and educational experience of those attending the colleges in accordance with Measure J.

The campus is served by two freeways, State Routes (SR-91) and (SR-57), and the campus is proximate to other educational facilities, including Fullerton High School and California State University, Fullerton. The campus is on a gentle slope that is higher in the north of campus and lower in the south of campus. The campus is designed for pedestrians, and no bicycle riding is allowed on campus. Students walk their bicycles in to park them on campus.

The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability. The Local Development-Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Program reviews land use projects and plans through the lenses of our mission and state planning priorities of infill, conservation, and travel-efficient development. To ensure a safe and efficient transportation system, we encourage early consultation and coordination with local jurisdictions and project proponents on all development projects that utilize the multimodal transportation network. We provide these comments consistent with the State’s smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl.

(Caltrans) is a commenting agency on this project and has the following comments for your consideration.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
1) In conjunction with Deputy Directive 64-R2 (Complete Streets)
   http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/docs/dd_64_r2.pdf and the California Strategic
   Management Plan goal of tripling bicycle mode share and doubling walking and transit
   mode share by 2020, Caltrans supports uses that encourage sustainable modes of travel.
   As such, we encourage the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan to incorporate
   walking, biking, and pedestrian accessibility as much as possible.

2) Please provide bicycle parking at the proposed land uses outlined in Section 3.31 of the
   NOP, to encourage multimodal access as described in Comment #1.

3) The City of Fullerton is currently conducting a Priority Bike Connection Plan which
   encompasses all areas of the City, including the area surrounding Fullerton
   College. Please coordinate with the City in the development of this plan, as it has the
   potential to reduce vehicular traffic demand in the surrounding area.

Please continue to keep us informed of this project and any future developments that
could potentially impact State transportation facilities. If you have any questions or need
to contact us, please do not hesitate to call Aileen Kennedy at (657) 328-6276.

Sincerely,

MAUREEN EL HARAKE
Branch Chief, Regional-Community-Transit Planning
District 12

c: Lee Haber, Traffic Operations Northeast
   Yatman Kwan, System Planning
   OPR, State Clearinghouse

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system
to enhance California’s economy and livability."
November 17, 2016

Mr. Richard Williams
District Director
Facilities Planning and Construction
North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801

NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) FOR FULLERTON COLLEGE FACILITIES
MASTERPLAN PROJECT (SCH# 2016111016)

Dear Mr. Williams:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has reviewed the subject NOP. The following project description is stated in the NOP: "The District to construct a new Welcome Center, new instructional buildings, a Horticulture and Vocational Services Center, a new child development center, and an 840-space parking structure; realign campus access to the parking structure; construct a new Maintenance and Operations Facility and Thermal Energy Storage; construct new storage, offices, and a shower/locker room north of the existing pool; implement improvements to Sherbeck Field; create new parking lots south of the Lemon Street parking structure; and construct a Performing Arts Complex. Renovations would include the Math Building, Physical Education, Wilshire Theater, Business Building, Humanities Building, Campus Services, Administration Building, Fine Arts Gallery, and Academic Computing. It is anticipated that these improvements will be phased over a 10-year period."

Based on the review of the submitted document DTSC has the following comments:

1. The EIR should identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the project site may have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment is necessary to identify any recognized environmental conditions.

2. If there are any recognized environmental conditions in the project area, then proper investigation, sampling and remedial actions overseen by the appropriate regulatory agencies should be conducted prior to the new development or any construction.
3. If the project plans include discharging wastewater to a storm drain, you may be required to obtain an NPDES permit from the overseeing Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

4. If during construction/demolition of the project, soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soil and/or groundwater exist, the EIR should identify how any required investigation and/or remediation will be conducted, and the appropriate government agency to provide regulatory oversight.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (714) 484-5476 or email at Johnson.Abraham@dtsc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Johnson P. Abraham
Project Manager
Brownfields Restoration and School Evaluation Branch
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program - Cypress

kl/sh/ja

cc: See next page.
cc: Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (via e-mail)
    State Clearinghouse
    P.O. Box 3044
    Sacramento, California 95812-3044
    State.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

    Mr. Guenther W. Moskat, Chief (via e-mail)
    Planning and Environmental Analysis Section
    CEQA Tracking Center
    Department of Toxic Substances Control
    Guenther.Moskat@dtsc.ca.gov

    Mr. Dave Kereazis (via e-mail)
    Office of Planning & Environmental Analysis
    Department of Toxic Substances Control
    Dave.Kereazis@dtsc.ca.gov

    Mr. Shahir Haddad, Chief (via e-mail)
    Schools Evaluation and Brownfields Cleanup
    Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program - Cypress
    Shahir.Haddad@dtsc.ca.gov

    CEQA# 2016111016
November 15, 2016

Richard Williams
North Orange County Community College District
1830A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801

RE: SCH# 2016111016; Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan Project, Notice of Preparation for Draft Environmental Impact Report, Orange County, California

Dear Mr. Williams:

The Native American Heritage Commission has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code section 21064.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21064.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (b))). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064 subd.(a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064 (a)(1)). In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources with the area of project effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, "tribal cultural resources" (Pub. Resources Code § 21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.2). Please reference California Natural Resources Agency (2016) “Final Text for tribal cultural resources update to Appendix G: Environmental Checklist Form,” http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/docs/ab52/Clean-final-AB-52-App-G-text-Submitted.pdf. Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.3 (a)). AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015. If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements. If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. § 800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends lead agencies consult with all California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC’s recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments. Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.

AB 52

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

1. Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project: Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:
   a. A brief description of the project.
   b. The lead agency contact information.
   c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (d)).
d. A "California Native American tribe" is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code § 21073).

2. **Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe’s Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report**: A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1, subsds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1(b)).
   a. For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code § 65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (b))."

3. **Mandatory Topics of Consultation if Requested by a Tribe**: The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:
   a. Alternatives to the project.
   b. Recommended mitigation measures.
   c. Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)).

4. **Discretionary Topics of Consultation**: The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:
   a. Type of environmental review necessary.
   b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
   c. Significance of the project’s impacts on tribal cultural resources.
   d. If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)).

5. **Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process**: With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code sections 6254 (r) and 6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (c)(1)).

6. **Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document**: If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency’s environmental document shall discuss both of the following:
   a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
   b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (b)).

7. **Conclusion of Consultation**: Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
   a. The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
   b. A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (b)).

8. **Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document**: Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (a)).

9. **Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation**: If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (e)).

10. **Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:**
a. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
   i. Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
   ii. Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.

b. Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
   i. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
   ii. Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
   iii. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

c. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.

d. Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code § 21084.3 (b)).

e. Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a nonfederally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code § 815.3 (c)).

f. Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code § 5097.991).

11. Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource: An environmental impact report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
   a. The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.
   b. The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
   c. The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (d)).

This process should be documented in the Cultural Resources section of your environmental document.

The NAHC's PowerPoint presentation titled, "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices" may be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CaliEPAPDF.pdf

SB 18

SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code § 65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.cpr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf

Some of SB 18's provisions include:

1. Tribal Consultation: If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe. (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (a)(2)).

2. No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation. There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.

3. Confidentiality: Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code section 65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 that are within the city's or county's jurisdiction. (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (b)).

4. Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation: Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
   a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
   b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason,
we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and “Sacred Lands File” searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/

NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
   a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
   b. If any known cultural resources have been already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
   c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
   a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
   b. The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.

3. Contact the NAHC for:
   a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project’s APE.
   b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.

4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.
   a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
   b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
   c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code section 7050.5, Public Resources Code section 5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Please contact me if you need any additional information at gayle.totton@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gaye Totton, M.A., PhD.
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse
rwilliams@nocccd.edu
Richard Williams, District Director
North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneya Dr.,
Anaheim, CA 92801

Notice of Preparation of a CEQA Document for the
Fullerton College Master Plan

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The SCAQMD staff’s comments are recommendations regarding the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the proposed project that should be included in the Draft EIR. Please send the SCAQMD a copy of the Draft EIR upon its completion. Note that copies of the Draft EIR that are submitted to the State Clearinghouse are not forwarded to the SCAQMD. Please forward a copy of the Draft EIR directly to SCAQMD at the address in our letterhead. In addition, please send with the Draft EIR all appendices or technical documents related to the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all air quality modeling and health risk assessment files. These include original emission calculation spreadsheets and modeling files (not Adobe PDF files). Without all files and supporting air quality documentation, the SCAQMD will be unable to complete its review of the air quality analysis in a timely manner. Any delays in providing all supporting air quality documentation will require additional time for review beyond the end of the comment period.

Air Quality Analysis
The SCAQMD adopted its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook in 1993 to assist other public agencies with the preparation of air quality analyses. The SCAQMD recommends that the Lead Agency use this Handbook as guidance when preparing its air quality analysis. Copies of the Handbook are available from the SCAQMD’s Subscription Services Department by calling (909) 396-3720. More recent guidance developed since this Handbook was published is also available on SCAQMD’s website: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-handbook-(1993). SCAQMD staff also recommends that the Lead Agency use the CalEEMod land use emissions software. This software has recently been updated to incorporate up-to-date state and locally approved emission factors and methodologies for estimating pollutant emissions from typical land use development. CalEEMod is the only software model maintained by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and replaces the now outdated URBEMIS. This model is available free of charge at: www.caleemod.com.

The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources related to the project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of heavy-duty equipment from grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, that is, sources that generate or attract vehicular trips should be included in the analysis.

The SCAQMD has also developed both regional and localized significance thresholds. The SCAQMD staff requests that the lead agency quantify criteria pollutant emissions and compare the results to the recommended regional significance thresholds found here: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf. In addition to analyzing regional air quality impacts, the SCAQMD staff recommends calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to localized significance thresholds (LSTs). LSTs can be used in addition to the recommended regional significance thresholds as a second indication of air quality impacts when preparing a Draft EIR document. Therefore, when preparing the air quality analysis for the proposed project, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a localized analysis by either using the LSTs developed by the SCAQMD or performing dispersion modeling as necessary. Guidance for performing a localized air quality analysis can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/localized-significance-thresholds.
In the event that the proposed project generates or attracts vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment. Guidance for performing a mobile source health risk assessment (“Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis”) can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/mobile-source-toxics-analysis. An analysis of all toxic air contaminant impacts due to the use of equipment potentially generating such air pollutants should also be included.

In addition, guidance on siting incompatible land uses (such as placing homes near freeways) can be found in the California Air Resources Board’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective, which can be found at the following internet address: http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf. CARB’s Land Use Handbook is a general reference guide for evaluating and reducing air pollution impacts associated with new projects that go through the land use decision-making process.

Finally, should the proposed project include equipment that generates or controls air contaminants, a permit may be required and the SCAQMD should be listed as a responsible agency and consulted. The assumptions in the submitted Draft EIR would also be the basis for permit conditions and limits. Permit questions can be directed to the SCAQMD Permit Services staff at (909) 396-3385, who can provide further assistance.

Mitigation Measures
In the event that the project generates significant adverse air quality impacts, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures that go beyond what is required by law be utilized during project construction and operation to minimize or eliminate these impacts. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15126.4 (a)(1)(D), any impacts resulting from mitigation measures must also be discussed. Mitigation Measure resources are available on the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook website: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook

Data Sources
SCAQMD rules and relevant air quality reports and data are available by calling the SCAQMD’s Public Information Center at (909) 396-2039. Much of the information available through the Public Information Center is also available via the SCAQMD’s webpage (http://www.aqmd.gov).

The SCAQMD staff is available to work with the lead agency to ensure that project emissions are accurately evaluated and mitigated where feasible. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Jack Cheng, Air Quality Specialist by e-mail at jcheng@aqmd.gov or by phone at (909) 396-2448.

Sincerely,

Jillian Wong
Jillian Wong, Ph.D.
Planning and Rules Manager
Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources

JC:JW
ORC161201-03
Control Number
November 30, 2016

North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819

Subject: Response to Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

Dear Mr. Williams,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan Initial Study. The City of Fullerton supports the college in its efforts to better serve its growing student population, and we look forward to working with you throughout this process.

The City offers the following comments in response to the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report, Initial Study and Facilities Master Plan.

Project Description and Notice of Scoping Meeting

In our review of the Initial Study (IS) and Notice of Preparation (NOP), we note that the project description is not consistent between the Initial Study and the NOP, nor is the project description within the Initial Study consistent with Figures 4 and 5 within the Initial Study itself. While some of these inconsistencies are more minor in nature, others are more substantive and should be addressed. Where the project description is consistent it has been indicated with a “✓”, and where it is inconsistent, a fuller explanation is provided. Items that don’t apply are labeled “NA.” The following Table 1 – Comparison of Consistency Between Project Descriptions, describes these inconsistencies:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>IS Section 1 - Introduction</th>
<th>IS Section 3 - Project Description</th>
<th>IS Section 3.3 - Proposed Facilities Master Plan Elements</th>
<th>Notice of Preparation Project Description</th>
<th>IS Figure 4 - Proposed Campus Land Uses</th>
<th>IS Figure 5 - Proposed Demolition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Center</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Shows existing buildings to be demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horticulture and Vocational Sciences Center</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Shows existing buildings to be demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Child Development Center</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Shows existing buildings to be demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New 840-Space Parking Structure West of Sherbeck Field and pedestrian bridge to Classroom 1400</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Pedestrian bridge to Classroom 1400 not depicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Component</td>
<td>IS Section 1 - Introduction</td>
<td>IS Section 3 - Project Description</td>
<td>IS Section 3.3 - Proposed Facilities Master Plan Elements</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation Project Description</td>
<td>IS Figure 4 – Proposed Campus Land Uses</td>
<td>IS Figure 5 – Proposed Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Parking Lots North of Berkeley Adjacent to 3100 Building and South of Lemon Street Parking Structure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Shows existing buildings to be demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realignment of Campus Access to Centennial Parking Structure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Maintenance and Operations North of Chiller Plant and New Additions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Storage, Offices and Shower/Locker Room North of Existing Pool</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of Field Lighting and 4,500 Stadium Seats to Sherbeck Field</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Implement Improvements to Sherbeck Field.</td>
<td>Not depicted</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Component</td>
<td>IS Section 1 - Introduction</td>
<td>IS Section 3 - Project Description</td>
<td>IS Section 3.3 - Proposed Facilities Master Plan Elements</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation Project Description</td>
<td>IS Figure 4 - Proposed Campus Land Uses</td>
<td>IS Figure 5 - Proposed Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Performing Art Complex (PAC), Sculpture Garden, Arts Plaza, Campus Quad and Renovations to Existing Wilshire Theater</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Shows buildings to be demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Physical Education 1200, Health Services, Faculty offices and Wellness Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation to Math 600, Business 300, Humanities 500, Campus Services 840, Administration 100 and Fine Arts Gallery 1000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Shows portion of Admin 100 building to be demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Academic Computing 3100</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Not described</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Signage</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Future Parking Structure on Lot C West</td>
<td>Not described</td>
<td>Not described</td>
<td>Not described</td>
<td>Not described</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Demolitions</td>
<td>Not described</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Not described</td>
<td>Not described</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to the extensive nature of the inconsistencies between the various project descriptions, particularly as they relate to the Sherbeck Field Stadium, the proposed future parking structure, and the Newell Chapman historic building demolitions, within the Initial Study and their supporting Figures, the City requests that the Notice of Preparation, Initial Study, including Figures 4 and 5, be revised to correct the inconsistencies and to provide full and accurate disclosure of the entirety of the project. When these revisions have been completed, the City requests that the Initial Study be recirculated for public review for a new 30-day period, that the Notice of Preparation be distributed again, and that a new Scoping Meeting be held during the public review period. In order to ensure that the public is given the greatest opportunity to participate in this process, the City of Fullerton requests that notification is coordinated with the City to enable the City to assist in publicizing the re-release of the documents and new scoping meeting.

Initial Study Checklist – List of Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required
Please revise the Initial Study Checklist Item 10 to reflect that the City of Fullerton is a public agency from whom permits must be obtained for any improvements within the City’s public right-of-way or connection to utilities, and for compatibility with any of the City’s emergency responder requirements.

6.3.1 Aesthetics

Please revise Section 6.3.1 c) to more specifically include the addition of a 4,500-seat stadium on Sherbeck Field and include a full analysis of this potentially significant impact.

Please revise Section 6.3.1 d) to more specifically describe the proposed addition of stadium lighting to Sherbeck Field as a significant new lighting source, and include a full analysis of this potentially significant impact.

6.3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.

6.3.3 Air Quality

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.

6.3.4 Biological Resources

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.
6.3.5 Cultural Resources

Please revise Section 6.3.5 a) to more specifically address the following areas of potential impact to historical resources:

- Hetebrink House – 515 E. Chapman Avenue – Identify the Hetebrink House as being listed as a National, State and Local Historic Landmark. Due to the fact that the Hetebrink House is surrounded on three sides by the Fullerton College Campus, please include a full analysis of any potential impacts to this property as a result of the proposed project.

- 428, 434 and 438 E. Chapman (east of Newell) – Figure 4 (Proposed Campus Land Uses) identifies the construction of a new instructional building and parking lot at this location, however the demolition of the existing structures is not depicted on Figure 5 (Proposed Demolition), nor is it described in Section 3.3.3 – Proposed Demolition. Research demonstrates that the properties are cultural resources worthy of preservation; documentation provided by Fullerton Heritage shows that the properties are historically significant due to their association with individuals important to the City of Fullerton’s development and their embodiment of the craftsman style of architecture. (Exhibit 1 – DPR Forms for 428, 434 and 438 E. Chapman Avenue) Please revise the Initial Study and any associated figures to clearly describe and depict the proposed demolition of these historic structures, include a full analysis of any potential impacts.

- 420 E. Chapman Avenue – This property is identified within the project boundary (Figures 2, 4 and 5), but no future use is identified. Please revise the Initial Study and any associated figures to clearly describe and depict the proposed demolition of this historic structure, and include a full analysis of any potential impacts.

- Townsite East/College Park Residential Preservation Zone – The residential properties to the immediate south of the 400 block of E. Chapman are located in the Townsite East/College Park preservation zone, established in 1996. This preservation zone is characterized by houses constructed primarily in the early 1900s. The proposed intensification of development and uses at Fullerton College have the potential to adversely impact these historic resources. Please revise the Initial Study to include a full analysis of any potential impacts. (Exhibit 2 – Fullerton Residential Preservation Zones)

- Fullerton Potential Landmark Districts 1, 4, 11 and 12 – The Fullerton Plan identifies four potential historic landmark districts that are immediately adjacent to, or in close proximity to, the Fullerton College campus. Each of these districts is characterized by houses constructed primarily in the early 1900s. The proposed intensification of development and uses at Fullerton College have the potential to adversely impact these historic resources. Please revise the Initial Study to include a full analysis of any potential impacts. (Exhibit 3 – The Fullerton Plan Historic Tables and Exhibits)
6.3.6 Geology and Soils

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.

6.3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.

6.3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.

6.3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.

6.3.10 Land Use and Planning

The properties located south of Chapman Avenue between N. Newell Place and N. Balcom Avenue are depicted on Figure 4 as the location of a new instructional building and a new parking lot (lot 11). These properties are zoned O-P (Office Professional). The proposed instructional building is not a permitted use in the O-P zone. Please revise Section 6.3.10 b) to include a discussion and full analysis of this zoning conflict.

6.3.11 Mineral Resources

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.

6.3.12 Noise

This is an area of significant concern to the City, however the Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.

6.3.13 Population and Housing

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.

6.3.14 Public Services

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.

6.3.15 Recreation

The Initial Study adequately describes areas to be analyzed. No further revisions are requested.
6.3.16 Transportation and Traffic

The City of Fullerton appreciates that LLG, project traffic engineers, have reached out to the City’s traffic engineer for input. We request continued coordination with the City on several circulation aspects of the Master Plan and please revise the Initial Study to more fully describe and study the following:

- With respect to the reconfiguration of Parking Lots E, 10 and W (between Chapman and Wilshire) – potential reworking of the pedestrian crossing at Lawrence and Chapman, maintenance of connection to the east-west alley located westerly of Newell Pl., consolidation of access points onto Wilshire, coordination with city improvements related to the Wilshire Avenue Bike Boulevard, bus loading zone for performing arts groups, and participation in improvements to the Wilshire/Lemon intersection to better address vehicular and pedestrian movements.
- With respect to Parking Lots 8 and A on the north side of Chapman – further consideration of driveway locations onto Chapman.
- With respect to Parking Lot 7 at the northwest corner of Chapman and Berkeley – study the elimination of the driveway from Chapman to reduce traffic conflicts at the Chapman/Berkeley intersection.
- With respect to the proposed parking lot at the northeast corner of Berkeley and Lemon – study the alignment of the access drive with Centennial Way to improve vehicular and pedestrian safety.
- With respect to Parking Lot 6 and the egress of vehicles from the proposed Centennial Structure – thorough analysis and mitigation is needed to address the impact on vehicular and pedestrian circulation at Berkeley and Brookdale.
- Emergency vehicle access to all parts of the campus, including full access around the proposed Centennial parking structure.
- Any new traffic signals or modifications in or affecting public right of way must be coordinated with and approved by the City Traffic Engineer.
- Ensure that baseline traffic counts are taken during peak traffic periods over multiple days and multiple weeks.

6.3.17 Utilities and Service Systems

- Please revise the Initial Study to identify current and proposed campus connections to water, sewer and storm drains and demonstrate that the lateral connections are sufficient to accommodate new facilities.
- Please revise the Initial Study to verify that the campus water system provides adequate pressure for fire suppression.
- In order to maintain and improve water service to the campus as improvements and additions are made, the College will be responsible for the following:
  - Upgrade all meter assemblies, backflows, fire-line assemblies and hydrants which do not conform to City Water Utility Specifications and Standards
- Relocate the existing 6 inch meter assembly on Chapman Avenue out of the public right of way and on to college property
- Preparation of a Water Improvement Plan by a California Registered Civil Engineer showing the location of all existing and proposed meters, hydrants and fire-lines to be upgraded.

- Please be aware that any work in public street right of way will require approval of the Director of Public Works, and that permits will need to be obtained from the City’s Public Works Department.

Alternatives Analysis

The City encourages a robust analysis of project alternatives in the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) in order to mitigate, or eliminate, impacts through design. At a minimum, please include the following alternatives:

Elimination of Addition of 4,500 Stadium Seats and Lighting to Sherbeck Field – This proposed component of the master plan has the potential for significant impacts that cannot be mitigated, nor is the addition of significant new sports facilities specifically stated within Section 3.1 – Project Objectives. Elimination of the stadium, therefore, would not impact the project’s ability to achieve the project objectives. Please include an analysis that eliminates the construction of the stadium improvements.

Reduction in Size of Improvements to Sherbeck Field – Please include an analysis of a reduced-scope of stadium improvements.

Alternative Location of Stadium – Please include an analysis of opportunities for joint use of comparable stadium facilities within the area, such as those found at California State University, Fullerton, as well as identifying all other potential existing locations and analyzing the feasibility of such use. In addition, include an analysis of the ability to construct a new stadium at the Cypress College campus.

Preservation of 428, 434 and 438 E. Chapman Avenue – Please include an analysis of an alternative that would preserve these existing historic resources and remodel/re-use for office or residential purposes in order to maintain compatibility with residences in the adjacent preservation zone and to avoid impacts.

Relocation of Parking Lot 11 – In the scenario of the demolition of the existing structures at 420-438 E. Chapman Avenue and the construction of a new instructional building, please include an analysis of an alternative that relocates the proposed Parking Lot 11 to the rear of the property taking access instead off of N. Newell Place, and moves the proposed instructional building to the front of the property in order to remove an additional driveway entrance on E.
Chapman Avenue, and improve and retain the historic streetscape. As a sub-alternative, please analyze the complete removal of Parking Lot 11.

Alternative Parking Resource Identification – Exhibit 4 has a notation that Lot C West is being considered as the site for a “potential future parking structure 175 stalls per level.” The number of levels is not stated. This would seem to indicate that the College intends to construct an additional parking structure at this location, as well. This letter has addressed the need for further analysis of this component of the Master Plan in another section. As an alternative to the continued construction of costly new parking structures, please consider the identification of partnerships for the use of other nearby parking facilities, including potential partnerships with the City of Fullerton, to provide new parking resources. These alternatives could also include the identification, and promotion, of alternative modes of transportation in order to reduce the need for student parking.

We appreciate your consideration of the matters raised in this letter. Edgardo Caldera is the City’s primary contact for this project. He can be reached at (714) 773-5773 or EdgardoC@ci.fullerton.ca.us. Of course, I am always available to discuss any of the items in this letter, as well as anything else related to the City’s participation in this project, and can be reached at (714) 738-3347 or via e-mail at karenh@ci.fullerton.ca.us. We look forward to our continued participation in the process as we each seek creative ways to resolve issues of mutual concern.

Best Regards,

Karen Haluza, AICP
Director of Community Development

Attachments:
Exhibit 1 – DPR Forms for 428, 434 and 438 E. Chapman Avenue
Exhibit 2 – Fullerton Residential Preservation Zones
Exhibit 3 – The Fullerton Plan Historic Tables and Exhibits
The single-family residence at 434 E. Chapman, constructed in 1922 in the Craftsman bungalow style, is largely intact and retains most of its original architectural features. The residence was converted to an office use in 1989, with alterations and additional features constructed on the structure's east side to accommodate ADA requirements for accessibility and openings on the west side were filled and plastered over to comply with building code requirements.

Built with a concrete foundation, the rectangular-shaped structure features a defined front porch, a low-pitched gable roof with wide, exposed roof eaves, and horizontal wood siding—all typical features of Craftsman bungalow architecture. At each end of the porch, three wooden columns atop a stuccoed pilaster support the roof structure at the front. The raised porch is accessed by concrete steps. The front (north) elevation features two, tripartite windows consisting of multi-light fixed sash and multi-light wood casement. The main entrance is a solid wood door with three small glass lights. Existing doors and windows on all sides of the
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structure retain the original wood frames. The east elevation, although altered with ADA-compliant ramp and entrances in 1989, still retains the original windows, brick stairs and porch, and a modest compound gable roof. The back (south) side is fully intact and unaltered. The structure is boarded up and the inside is not accessible. It appears that the interior contains fine wood detailing and built-in cabinet work that the contractor (Oliver Compton) is known to have included in his construction.

As a contributing feature, a detached garage structure is situated behind (south) of the residence; built at the same time as the residence, it is unaltered, retaining its horizontal wood siding and a front-gable roof with exposed roof beams, similar in design to the residence. The remaining back portion of the property is paved for use as a parking area.

Although neglected for some time, the house and garage appear to be in solid condition. Important, the alterations made to the house in 1989 are reversible, and a full restoration of the original design is quite possible.
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Sullivan by notable local builder Oliver S. Compton. Born March 19, 1862 in Waterford, Indiana, during the Civil War, Compton was employed as a clerk in the Goshen, Indiana local hardware store operated by James A. Riley in 1885, and later worked as an implement dealer. In 1905, he and his wife, Ida A. Berkley (1867-1974), moved to Pasadena (701 S. Grand), joining a large influx of Indiana natives who had moved to the area. He quickly established a successful contractor business in Pasadena before moving to Fullerton in 1912. At the time, Fullerton had a pressing need for housing but no certified architects (Frank Benchley would be the city’s only formally trained architect in the 1920s), and the town relied on a small handful of general contractors for new housing stock. As one of the town’s first developers, Compton quickly established a solid reputation for the construction of sturdy and comfortable bungalows for the working class. Unlike developers such as Richard Gregory and Harry Crocke, who would purchase small tracts of land to develop, Compton built individual residences initially in the central core of the town laid out by town founders Edward and George Amerige in 1887. By the 1920s, local developers began to concentrate on ways to differentiate themselves from each other. Harry Maxwell specialized in Spanish Colonial Revivals; Ernest S. Gregory built English cottage homes; and Oliver S. Compton constructed Craftsman bungalows. His bungalows (e.g., 202 West Whiting, 315 North Malden) were both compact and well-built and popular with new arrivals working in the oil and citrus industries. His clientele was primary from the working and middle class.

Oliver Compton’s son, Fauntleroy Langstroth (“Bud”) Compton (1889-1980), was the chief colorist and assistant to famed tile article Ernest A. Batchelder, and Bud’s home at 745 East Rio Grande Street (1916), a Pasadena Landmark, is noted for its proliferation of beautifully designed and colored tiles. The home would also be featured in the June 1919 issue of The Ladies’ Home Journal. Oliver Compton would use Batchelder tiles in some of his Fullerton projects, most notably his own two-story residence at 202 West Whiting, which was featured in the city’s 1978-79 survey, City of Fullerton Historical Building Survey, Heritage Revisited. The survey noted the home’s “numerous details”, including small stained glass panels on the north side and a glazed Batchelder tile set in the chimney. Bud Compton, a graduate of Throop Polytechnic Institute (now the California Institute of Technology), continued to work for the Batchelder-Wilson Tile Company until its closing in 1932, but also worked with his father on projects both in Fullerton and Pasadena.

Oliver and Ida Compton were ardent members of the International Order of Odd Fellows (IOOF) and opened their Pasadena and Fullerton homes to any member of the fraternal organization passing through town. When the couple moved to Fullerton, they became charter members of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows Lodge Number 103 (Ida was a Rebekah). When the Lodge needed a formal building for its meetings, Compton volunteered to both design and construct the new Fullerton Odd Fellows Temple (112 East Commonwealth Avenue). Situated in a prominent location in the historic central business district, the Odd Fellows Temple, constructed in 1927-28, had an unusual arrangement of functions for the time. Lodge members reserved the second floor for their secret and


**Image Log:**

Image 1: Building Permit, issued in 1922; On file, City of Fullerton, Community Development Department. Internet.

Image 2: Photo of Ida and Oliver Compton

Image 2: 434 E. Chapman Avenue, exterior. 1978 Fullerton Historic Survey. On file, Fullerton Public Library, Local History Room

**Photo Log:**

Photo 1: North (Chapman Ave.) elevation, looking southwest

Photo 2: North (Chapman Ave.) elevation, looking south

Photo 3: East elevation, looking southwest

Photo 4: Partial east elevation, showing porch area

Photo 5: South elevation

Photo 6: West elevation, looking northeast, showing solid stuccoed wall with no openings

Photo 7: Interior (taken from outside), showing wood detailing and in-place cabinet work

Photo 8: Detached garage, north elevation

---

**State of California - The Resources Agency**

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**CONTINUATION SHEET**

Property Name: [Redacted]
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**Image 1:** Building Permit, issued in 1922; On file, City of Fullerton, Community Development Department.
Photo 1: North (Chapman Avenue) elevation, looking southwest

Photo 2: North (Chapman Ave.) elevation, looking south
Photo 5: South elevation

Photo 6: West elevation, looking northeast
**P2. Location:**
- [ ] Not for Publication  
- [ ] Unrestricted

  *a. County: Orange*
  
  *b. USGS 7.5' Quad and (P2c, P2e, and P2h or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)*

  *c. Address: 438 E. Chapman Avenue City Fullerton Zip 92832*

  *d. UTM: (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone __, __ mE/ __ mN*

  *e. Other Location Date: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, decimal degrees, etc., as appropriate)*

**P3a. Description:** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

Constructed in 1921, the single-family residence at 438 E. Chapman Avenue features Craftsman style architecture that is still well preserved. The initial construction, issued with an address of 436 E. Chapman Avenue, consisted of the house with a rectilinear footprint and a detached garage, both placed over 120 ft. back from the street on its 173-foot-deep lot. In 1949, a 308-sq.-ft. addition to the front of the structure was undertaken. The added construction replicated the initial architectural style of the house, and there is a seamless connection between the addition and the original construction of the residence. Composed of horizontal wood siding, a modified hip roof that has wide eaves with exposed rafters, double hung wood windows, and a stuccoed chimney, the residence still retains classic Craftsman features.

The main entrance, located on the west side of the house, is part of the addition completed in 1949. It consists of a wood paneled door with multi-light wood sidelights and wood screens. Its wood surround is made up of fluted wood pilasters and entablature.

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)

---

**P4. Resources Present:**
- Building  
- Structure  
- Object  
- Site  
- District  
- Element of District  
- Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5b. Description of Photo:** (view, date, accession #, North elevation; Oct. 2015)

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:**
- Historic  
- Prehistoric  
- Both

1921, city of Fullerton building permit

**P7. Owner and Address:**
North Orange County Community College District
1830 W. Romneys Drive
Anthem, CA 92801

**P8. Recorded by:** (Name, affiliation, and address)
Fullerton Heritage
P.O. Box 3356
Fullerton, CA 92834

**P9. Date Recorded:** 11/3/2015

**P10. Survey Type:** (Describe)
- Intensive

**P11. Report Citation:** (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.")

---

*Attachments:*
- NONE
- Location Map
- Continuation Sheet
- Building, Structure, and Object Record
- Archaeological Record
- District Record
- Linear Feature Record
- Milling Station Record
- Rock Art Record
- Artifact Record
- Photograph Record
- Other (List):
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Other doors include a wood paneled door and wood paneled screen on the south elevation, two multi-light French doors on the east elevation, and a wooden door, now boarded up, facing north on the west side of the house. All wood windows on the east and west elevations retain their original wood frames.

The front (north) elevation, part of the 1949 addition, features a wooden bay window, multi-paned on all three sides. A small octagonal window, framed in wood, is also featured on the front façade. A 2-foot high red brick base extends the entire breadth of the front façade, wrapping around the west side to the main entrance. These features, along with the design of the west-facing main entrance, are characteristic of post-WWII architecture, yet is fully complimentary to the Craftsman style of the 1920s.

A non-original ADA-compliant ramp with metal railing is situated on the east elevation. Other alterations to the original structure include the replacement of several windows with metal one-over-one and sliding sash, the replacement of the doors on the east elevation, and the removal of wood siding and the use of stucco on the back portion of the west elevation. Most of these alterations were completed when the house was converted to an office use in 1985, with building code requirements dictating these changes. It is important to note that all of these alterations are reversible, so a substantial restoration of the house's original design is quite feasible.

A detached garage, built with the house in 1921, is no longer on the property.

Continuation of B10

Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival and other period styles.

Building History

The Craftsman bungalow at 438 (formerly 436) East Chapman Avenue was designed and built by architect Frank Benchley for Harold J. Kelley (1879-1964) in 1921. In 1913, Kelley was employed by the Benchley Fruit Company, where he most likely became familiar with Frank Benchley. Kelley, 40, married Emma T. Schreiner, 32, a member of the Fullerton pioneer Salveson family, in February 1921, and the residence was mostly likely a gift to his bride. The Kelleys lived next door at 440 East Chapman Avenue before moving into their new home. The couple would remain in the home until the early 1960s.

In 1919, Kelley was employed as a foreman, then manager, of the Charles C. Chapman Ranch, a 140-acre citrus ranch. A leader in the incorporation of both Orange County and Fullerton, and Fullerton's first mayor, Charles C. Chapman (1853-1944) earned the moniker "Father of the Citrus Industry" by developing and marketing Valencia oranges from his Fullerton ranch. Kelley would manage the Chapman Ranch until 1933, when he accepted a position as manager of the Randolph Marketing Company (210 W. Truslow), a prosperous citrus packing house established in 1923. He would remain with the company until his retirement in 1957. Kelley's son, Harold Johnstone Kelley (1923-1959), a lifelong resident of Fullerton, would also become well-known in the citrus-packing industry and be employed by the Chapman Ranch Company as a financial counselor.

Architectural Context

Frank Keith Benchley (1884-1962) was Fullerton's only architect and one of the most prominent and impressive architects in Orange County in the 1920s. Benchley was born in Ventura County on January 25, 1884, spending his early years in Los Angeles, before his family moved to Fullerton in 1893, where he received his education in the
Historic Places in 1994, and the following year, his brother asked him to prepare plans for a modern packing house for the Anaheim Valencia Growers' Association (805 E. Center). He was often asked to design brick stores and offices for local businessmen, including the James P. Glenn Furniture Store (124-126 W. Wilshire) in Fullerton; the Sam Scelig Grocery Store (139 W. Center) in Anaheim; and a medical office for Walter J. Bigham (449 W. Center) in Anaheim.

In 1922, the Orange County Board of Supervisors hired Benchley to design a new Hall of Records, a two-story, yellow-brick building which provided a new home for the county records, the tax collector, the superintendent of schools, the road department, the county surveyor, the probation office, the law library, health department, and headquarters for the county free public library. When completed, the impressive complex, located in downtown Santa Ana, would give Benchley's career a major boost, and he began receiving commissions around Orange County. Pleased with the Hall of Records, the Supervisors hired Benchley to design a new $200,000 jail across from the Courthouse on the east side of Sycamore Street. Before constructing the facility, Benchley made a trip to Cincinnati with members of the Board of Supervisors to inspect the latest locking systems in modern jails. The new jail opened in 1924, with rooms for 260 prisoners as well as offices for the Sheriff and his staff. In 1923, he would again be hired by Orange County to develop plans and specifications for the addition of a Psychopathic Ward to the Orange County Hospital, with a bridge connecting the ward with the main building.

Benchley's important and distinctive architectural projects gained him much notice, and as a member of a prominent family, he was able to obtain residential commissions from wealthier and more influential clientele. From 1920 to 1926, Benchley moved into designing more opulent and significantly larger homes, including his own in the Hollywood Hills, and also began to incorporate different architectural styles and elements. (His last Craftsman-styled project would be the Pomona Bungalow Court in 1922.) In 1920, he designed and built a Mission Revival dwelling for Fullerton mayor Richard S. Gregory (130 Hillcrest Drive, destroyed by fire); a similarly styled home the following year for Otto and Anita Shepardson (144 Hillcrest Drive), designated a Fullerton Local Landmark in 2015; and in 1924, designed the residence considered his masterpiece in Fullerton: the Walter and Adella Muckenthaler home in the Golden Hills area. Commissioned for $35,000 in 1924, the 18-room villa reflects Walter Muckenthaler's interest in Mission-style architecture and Italian villas. Situated on a hill overlooking the ranch, the house exceeded "the design of a normal ranch house with its spectacular architectural details, including the solarium and the front of the house." In 1965, the Muckenthalers donated the home and grounds to the City of Fullerton with the condition that it be developed into a cultural center. The Muckenthaler Cultural Center was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1980.

In addition to the homes he designed in Fullerton during this later period, Benchley also completed homes in Santa Ana and Anaheim, most notably a lavish Pueblo Revival home (500 N. Clementine) for Charles Boege, Anaheim City Treasurer and vice president of the First National Bank. At the time of construction, the Boege residence, which cost $8,000, was one of Anaheim's costliest home.

In 1926, Benchley began construction of an expansive Mediterranean Revival home for himself and his family in the Hollywood Hills (6315 Longview). Aside from a brief period in Alhambra(1203 Fourth Street), he would remain in Los Angeles for the remainder of his life. On January 18, 1927, he was elected to membership on the Los Angeles Stock Exchange (LASE), establishing a brokerage firm, Wagy & Benchley, with his brother-in-law, Wallace P. Wagy (1897-1970), who had previously worked for his uncle's corrupt firm, Wagy & Company. In 1928, the company, located in the Stock Exchange Building, was renamed Frank Benchley & Company. Benchley also began investing in oil fields in Los Angeles and Orange County.
18Meyer, Vicki. Email Regarding Frank Benchley's Architectural License, December 12, 2014. On file, Local History Room, Fullerton Public Library. Benchley's license number was B-1209.


12"Citizens Subscribe to Community Hotel." Los Angeles Times September 29, 1921, p. 18; "Big Hotel to Rise at Fullerton." Los Angeles Times October 16, 1921, p. V7. At the time of construction, Fullerton had no hotels, and the Spanish Colonial Revival building was constructed by subscriptions from local residents for $130,000.

13a"Lodges and Club." Southwest Builder and Contractor, June 11, 1920, p. 17.


15a"Contract for Plant Awarded: Fullerton Contractor to Build new Packing House for Growers Association." Los Angeles Times January 21, 1923, p. V2; "Construction News." Journal of Electricity and Western Industry vol. 50. No. 3 (February 1, 1923), p. 120.


19b"Preliminary Jail Plans Accepted; Plans of Architect Benchley Approved by Board." Fullerton News Tribune August 17, 1923, p. 1; "Benchley Will Design Jail for County; County Supervisors Authorize Well Known Fullerton Architect to Prepare Plans." Fullerton News Tribune July 18, 1923, p. 1.


Image 1: Building Permit, issued in 1921; on file, City of Fullerton, Community Development Department.

Image 2: Benchley Building, 310 N. Spadra (Harbor) Blvd. (now razed)
Photo 4: Partial east elevation (central porch area)

Photo 5: Partial south (back) elevation, looking northwest
Photo 6: Partial west elevation (front portion of structure)

Photo 7: Partial west elevation (back portion of structure)
Historic Preservation
Tables and Exhibits

Historical Resources

The City of Fullerton maintains a local register of historical resources pursuant to Public Resources Code §5020.1 as part of the General Plan. Adopted by ordinance in conjunction with the adoption of The Fullerton Plan, the local register of historic resources is a list of properties officially designated or recognized as historically significant by the City of Fullerton. The list is based upon the 2001 historic building survey entitled Fullerton Through the Years. While Fullerton Through the Years identifies historical resources as of its completion in 2001, the local register of historic resources contained in The Fullerton Plan is a dynamic document, amended by General Plan Amendments, and will therefore contain more current information than Fullerton Through the Years.

Properties on the register can have one of seven designations based on the level of significance and property owner interest and whether or not the designation relates to a property, an object, or a district. These are:

- **Property** (from highest to lowest designation)
  - National Register
  - Local Landmark
  - Significant Property (Potential Local Landmark)
  - Possible Significant Properties

- **Object**
  - Feature of Cultural Importance

- **District**
  - Landmark District
  - Potential Landmark District

The register also includes, for reference, those Significant Properties which have been demolished or altered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Historic Name</th>
<th>Present Name</th>
<th>Landmark Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1731 North Bradford Avenue</td>
<td>Pierotti House and Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>201 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Plummer Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-10 (HL-80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>515 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>John Hetebrink House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>112 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton Odd Fellows Temple</td>
<td>The Williams Building</td>
<td>HL-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>202 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Commonwealth Post Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>237 West Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton City Hall</td>
<td>Fullerton Police Station</td>
<td>HL-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>122 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Farmers &amp; Merchants Bank</td>
<td>Landmark Plaza</td>
<td>HL-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>500 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Firestone Tire Service Building</td>
<td>Fox Plaza</td>
<td>Not Designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>501 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Masonic Temple</td>
<td>Spring Field Conference Center</td>
<td>HL-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>510 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Fox Fullerton Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1300 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Hillcrest Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1201 West Malvern Avenue</td>
<td>Muckenthaler Estate</td>
<td>Muckenthaler Cultural Center</td>
<td>HL-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>117 North Pomona Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton First Methodist Episcopal Church</td>
<td>First Church of Religious Science</td>
<td>HL-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>110 East Santa Fe Avenue (relocated from 105 West Truslow Ave.)</td>
<td>Union Pacific Depot</td>
<td>Old Spaghetti Factory Restaurant</td>
<td>HL-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>120 East Santa Fe Avenue</td>
<td>Santa Fe Depot</td>
<td>Fullerton Station</td>
<td>HL-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>201 West Truslow Avenue</td>
<td>Elephant Packing House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>110 East Wilshire Avenue</td>
<td>Chapman Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>234-236 East Wilshire Avenue</td>
<td>Dewella Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>CSUF Campus</td>
<td>Dr. George Clark House</td>
<td>Heritage House</td>
<td>Not Designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>142 East Amerige Avenue</td>
<td>Methodist Parsonage</td>
<td>Les Beaux Cheveux</td>
<td>HL-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Properties Recognized as a "Local Landmark"**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Historic Name</th>
<th>Present Name</th>
<th>Landmark Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>315 East Amerige Avenue</td>
<td>Cusick House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>434 West Amerige Avenue</td>
<td>Klose House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>520 West Amerige Avenue</td>
<td>Ruddock House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>147 West Ash Avenue</td>
<td>Song Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>126 North Balcom Avenue</td>
<td>Otto House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>720 Barris Drive (relocated from 117 South Pomona Ave.)</td>
<td>Dauser House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>400 West Brookdale Place</td>
<td>Hirigoyen House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>444 West Brookdale Place</td>
<td>Edgar Johnson House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>201 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton High School:</td>
<td>Fullerton High School:</td>
<td>HL-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>201 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Science Building No. 1</td>
<td>Fullerton High School:</td>
<td>HL-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>201 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Science Building No. 2</td>
<td>Fullerton High School:</td>
<td>HL-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>502 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Stuelke House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2025 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Hale House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Chapman Park</td>
<td>Chapman Ranch and House</td>
<td>Chapman Park</td>
<td>HL-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>213 Claire Avenue</td>
<td>Noutary House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>130 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Pacific Electric Depot</td>
<td>Il Gliotto Restaurant</td>
<td>HL-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>329 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Loumagne's Market</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>S29-531 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Grieves Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1510 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Annin House</td>
<td>Fullerton Guest Home</td>
<td>HL-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>300 West Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Amerige Brothers' Realty Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>763 North Euclid Street</td>
<td>Clinton Smith House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>511 West Fern Drive</td>
<td>Mills House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>519 West Fern Drive</td>
<td>Cleaver House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Historic Name</td>
<td>Present Name</td>
<td>Landmark Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>539 West Fern Drive</td>
<td>Kelley House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>800 North Grandview Avenue</td>
<td>Carrie Earl McFadden Ford House</td>
<td>Harriet Spree Residence</td>
<td>HL-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>111-113 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Dean Block</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>201 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Masonic Temple</td>
<td>Parker Building</td>
<td>HL-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>212-216 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Schumacher Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>305 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>California Hotel</td>
<td>Villa Del Sol</td>
<td>HL-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>604 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Edward K. Benchley House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>107 South Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Fender Radio Shop</td>
<td>Ellingson Building</td>
<td>HL-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>412 South Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Allen Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>417-427 South Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Dreyfus Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>150 Hillcrest Drive</td>
<td>Fuller House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>532 West Jacaranda Place</td>
<td>Mennes House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>410-412 South Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>First Lutheran Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1021 North Lemon Street</td>
<td>Tracey Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>150 Marion Boulevard (relocated from 145 East Commonwealth)</td>
<td>Davies House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>771 West Orangethorpe Avenue</td>
<td>Porter House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1155 West Orangethorpe Avenue</td>
<td>Gardiner House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1230 West Orangethorpe Avenue</td>
<td>Royer House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>211 North Pomona Avenue</td>
<td>Rutabagorz Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>301 North Pomona Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton Library</td>
<td>Fullerton Museum Center</td>
<td>HL-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>705 North Richman Avenue</td>
<td>Abbott House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>343 East Santa Fe Avenue</td>
<td>Miller Manufacturing Building</td>
<td>Lakeman Chassis</td>
<td>HL-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>119 West Santa Fe Avenue</td>
<td>Ellingson Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Historic Name</td>
<td>Present Name</td>
<td>Landmark Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>125 West Santa Fe Avenue</td>
<td>John Reeder Gardiner Building</td>
<td>Heroes Restaurant</td>
<td>HL-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>227 West Santa Fe Avenue</td>
<td>Sanitary Laundry Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>229 West Santa Fe Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton Dye Works Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>324 West Truslow Avenue</td>
<td>Annin House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>225 West Union Avenue</td>
<td>El Dorado Ranch</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>610 West Valley View Drive</td>
<td>Gobar House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>112 East Walnut Avenue</td>
<td>Crystal Ice House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1101 East Whiting Avenue</td>
<td>Conley House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>126 West Whiting Avenue</td>
<td>Westwood Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>130 West Whiting Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>315 East Wilshire Avenue</td>
<td>Wilshire Junior High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>124 West Wilshire Avenue</td>
<td>Auditorium &amp; Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>834 North Woods Avenue</td>
<td>Starbuck House</td>
<td></td>
<td>HL-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Properties Recognized as a "Significant Property" (Potential Local Landmark)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Present Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>320 North Adams Avenue</td>
<td>Storts Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>201 East Amerige Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton General Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>516 West Amerige Avenue</td>
<td>Russell House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>142 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Self-Realization Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>321 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Fullerton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>600 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Rawlins House</td>
<td>Gamma Phi Beta Sorority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>901 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Henry Kroeger House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2208 East Chapman Avenue</td>
<td>Cooper House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>109-123 East Commonwealth</td>
<td>Amerige Block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Historic Name</td>
<td>Present Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>118 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Mariola Apartments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>520 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Foster House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>524 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Thompson House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1530 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Lyon House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>2223 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Gallemore House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>213-215 West Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Val Veta - Hunt Wesson Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>419 West Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Jacob Yaeger House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1747 West Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Russ House or Hunter House</td>
<td>Congregational Church of Fullerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>200 East Elm Avenue</td>
<td>Rialto Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>845 North Euclid Street</td>
<td>Adams Barbershop Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>219 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Amerige House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>509 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Wintter House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>616 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Clarence Spencer House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>713-723 South Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Mary Spencer House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>419 East Las Palmas Drive</td>
<td>Pomona Bungalow Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>327 West Orangetherpe Avenue</td>
<td>Nenno House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1400 West Orangetherpe Avenue</td>
<td>Henry Kroeger House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1520 West Orangetherpe Avenue</td>
<td>Gamble House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>314 North Pomona Avenue</td>
<td>Cherami House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>321 North Pomona Avenue</td>
<td>Cherami House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>609 North Raymond Avenue</td>
<td>Henry Kroeger House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1313 North Raymond Avenue</td>
<td>Gamble House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>701 North Richman Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Historic Name</td>
<td>Present Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>302 West Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Stone Pillars in Amerige Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>109 North Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Stedman Jewelers' Street Clock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>1155 West Orangethorpe Avenue</td>
<td>Pump House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>353 West Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Hitching Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Fullerton Main Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>Bells along El Camino Real</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>NW Corner of Commonwealth and</td>
<td>Flagstone Bench</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highland Avenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Features of Cultural Importance**

"Significant Properties" That Have Been Demolished or Altered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Historic Name</th>
<th>Present Name</th>
<th>Landmark Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>233 East Amerige Avenue</td>
<td>Stanton House</td>
<td>Demolished in 1992</td>
<td>HL-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>341 East Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>Grumwald's Tin Shop (Edison Market)</td>
<td>Demolished in 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>315 North Ford Avenue</td>
<td>Ford Elementary School</td>
<td>Demolished in 1983</td>
<td>HL-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>700 South Harbor Boulevard</td>
<td>La Vida Bottling Company Building</td>
<td>Demolished in 1983</td>
<td>HL-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>327 West Orangethorpe Avenue</td>
<td>Winter House</td>
<td>Altered in 1996-98</td>
<td>HL-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>2000 East Wilshire Avenue</td>
<td>Des Grange House</td>
<td>Demolished in 1986</td>
<td>HL-27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roadway Functional Classifications

The City of Fullerton circulation system consists of a network of local streets providing access to the arterial highway system, which in turn provides access to the regional freeway system. This network serves two distinct and equally important functions: It provides access to adjacent land uses, and it facilitates the movement of persons and goods to and from, within and through the City. The design and operation of each street is determined by the importance placed on each of these functions for each classification. Streets which have a mobility and/or regional access function will have more lanes, higher speed limits, and fewer access points. Where direct access to individual properties is required, streets will have fewer lanes, slower speeds, and more frequent side streets and driveways to serve abutting properties.

To define the intended uses of roadways, the City uses a functional classification system. The system provides a logical framework for the design and operation of the roadway system. Since some major thoroughfares in the City of Fullerton are part of the county-wide arterial network, they also have to be coordinated through the Orange County Master Plan of Arterial Highways.

Table 7: Roadway Functional Classifications summarizes the characteristics of the various functional classifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Number of Travel Lanes (Minimum)</th>
<th>Right-of-Way Width</th>
<th>Typical Daily Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Arterial Highway</td>
<td>6 Divided</td>
<td>100 to 120 feet</td>
<td>30,000 to 49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Arterial Highway</td>
<td>4 Divided</td>
<td>80 to 84 feet</td>
<td>20,000 to 33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Arterial Highway</td>
<td>4 Undivided</td>
<td>80 to 84 feet</td>
<td>16,000 to 22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Collector Street</td>
<td>2 Undivided</td>
<td>60 to 84 feet</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Street</td>
<td>2 Undivided</td>
<td>varies, typically 50 to 60 feet</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 30, 2016

Mr. Richard Williams
North Orange County Community College District
1830A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819

Re: Draft Program EIR for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

Dear Sir:

The proposed campus land uses as shown with Figure 4 and described by the Initial Study of the draft Program EIR for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan may well impact a number of historic buildings on or near the Fullerton College campus. Specifically, the following aspects of the proposed Master Plan involving historic structures may incur significant impacts, and the Draft Program EIR needs to fully describe the proposed action with its possible impacts and provide alternatives to the stated action which mitigate any impacts:

- The “renovation” of Wilshire Theatre (Auditorium) at 311 N. Lemon St., a structure designated as a Local Landmark by the city of Fullerton
- The “renovation” of the historic 300 Building (Business), 500 Building (Humanities), and 840 Building (Campus Services); all of these buildings qualify for listing on the National Register of Historic Places
- The improvements for the areas directly north and west of the John Hetebrink House at 515 E. Chapman Avenue, a structure that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places; any improvements or buildings proposed in proximity to a structure placed on the National Register needs to be designed and sited so as not to compromise the historic integrity of that structure’s setting.
- The removal of four residential structures on the south side of Chapman Avenue, east of Newell Place, and in their place, the construction of surface parking and an Instructional Building

Additionally, Fullerton Heritage is requesting that the Facilities Master Plan include the two vacant lots presently owned by Fullerton College (NOCCCD) between Wilshire Avenue and Amerige Avenue, east of Lawrence Avenue. The future use or disposition of this vacant property by Fullerton College needs to be identified and its associated impacts described, given that this property borders an historic neighborhood of the city.

A wealth of information exists for all of the aforementioned historic structures located on the Fullerton College campus. Both the Fullerton College Library Archives and the Local History Room of the Fullerton Public Library have original blueprints, photographs, maps and/or articles on the these buildings. Those who are preparing the draft Program EIR should take advantage of this information in order to provide an Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER) for each of these buildings as part of the draft Program EIR.
Thank you for providing an opportunity to state our interest and concerns for inclusion in the draft Program EIR. We look forward to meeting with you or other appropriate staff to discuss possible revisions to the Master Plan so as to avoid impacts to historic structures and neighborhoods.

In addition to me, please feel free to contact Kate Dalton and Deb Richey, both board members of Fullerton Heritage, to discuss the above comments.

Sincerely,

Ernie Kelsey, President
Fullerton Heritage

Ernie Kelsey: Email: con805@yahoo.com; Tele: (310) 480-8085
Kate Dalton: Email: kandtdalton@earthlink.net; Tele: (714) 525-6668
Debora Richey: Email: drichey@fullerton.edu; Tele: (714) 525-6411
Today's date: 12-02-16

Mr. Williams,

These are some of my concerns in regards to the possibility of building a new Sherbeck Stadium:

1-SAFETY. In November several cars on Union Ave were broken into. Valuables from my Union Ave property were stolen. I timely filed a police report that same day. This is what my neighbor told me as I asked her whether she had seen anyone suspicious: "I saw guys at different times on your driveway, but that's always the case when the college students park next to our curb". This kind of parking and pedestrian traffic in our residential neighborhood will sharply worsen under a new Sherbeck Stadium.

2-TRAFFIC. Eventually, currently a nuisance with the renting out of Sherbeck Field for soccer games. A new large stadium will make matters infinitely worse. Moreover, drawing an axis from the high school in Placentia near the 57fwy Chapman exit-this is borderline with FullertontoHarbor with Berkley, we find around its immediacies stadiums with a total aggregate capacity for over 54,000 spectators. Conceptualizing Fullerton in its entirety there is not need for another large stadium. We can not overcome the concerns on adding a large stadium under the above description.

3-RESIDENTIAL NO-NO. Building a large stadium next Fullerton High School stadium defies all practical logic on a residential area. This kind of planning is more suitable for a big Sports Center Complex far from a residential neighborhood.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Barrera
davbar32@gmail.com
714-833-8588
813 E UNION AVE
FULLERTON CA 92831
November 4, 2016

To: Distribution List

From: North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801-1819

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

The North Orange County Community College District (District) will be the lead agency and will prepare a program environmental impact report (PEIR) for the proposed project identified below. The District is requesting your view regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the PEIR. Responsible agencies are requested to indicate their statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project.

The description, location, and the potential environmental effects resulting from the proposed project are contained in the initial study, which is available through the District’s website (http://www.nocccd.edu/) and at the Administrative Offices, North Orange County Community College District, Anaheim, campus located at the address above. The initial environmental review indicates that the proposed project may have potentially significant effects on the environment in the following categories: aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation and traffic, utilities and service systems, and mandatory findings of significance. The PEIR will include an analysis of these impact areas, as well as feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid or reduce potential impacts.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but no later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. A public scoping meeting will be held on Thursday, November 17, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. in the Fullerton College Student Center, Rooms 224, 226, and 228 at Fullerton College.

Please send your response to Mr. Richard Williams at the address shown above. Please provide the name of a contact person in your agency.
Notice of Preparation

Project Title: Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

Project Location: Fullerton College, generally bounded by North Berkeley Avenue to the north and east, North Lemon Street to the west, and East Chapman Avenue to the south.

Proposed Project: The District plans to construct a new Welcome Center, new instructional buildings, a Horticulture and Vocational Services Center, a new child development center, and an 840-space parking structure; realign campus access to the parking structure; construct a new Maintenance and Operations Facility and Thermal Energy Storage; construct new storage, offices, and a shower/locker room north of the existing pool; implement improvements to Sherbeck Field; create new parking lots north of Berkeley Avenue adjacent to the 3100 building and south of the Lemon Street parking structure; and construct a Performing Arts Complex. The District also plans to design new entry signage at key entry points, improve pedestrian circulation, and improve circulation and connections between the campus north of Berkeley Avenue and south of East Chapman Avenue, as well as within the main campus. Renovations would include the Math Building, Physical Education, Wilshire Theater, Business Building, Humanities Building, Campus Services, Administration Building, Fine Arts Gallery, and Academic Computing. It is anticipated that these improvements will be phased over a 10-year period.

Richard Williams
District Director, Facilities Planning and Construction
November 4, 2016

To: Distribution List

From: North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801-1819

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

The North Orange County Community College District (District) will be the lead agency and will prepare a program environmental impact report (PEIR) for the proposed project identified below. The District is requesting your view regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the PEIR. Responsible agencies are requested to indicate their statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project.

The description, location, and the potential environmental effects resulting from the proposed project are contained in the initial study, which is available through the District’s website (http://www.nocccd.edu/) and at the Administrative Offices, North Orange County Community College District, Anaheim, campus located at the address above. The initial environmental review indicates that the proposed project may have potentially significant effects on the environment in the following categories: aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation and traffic, utilities and service systems, and mandatory findings of significance. The PEIR will include an analysis of these impact areas, as well as feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid or reduce potential impacts.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but no later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. A public scoping meeting will be held on Thursday, November 17, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. in the Fullerton College Student Center, Rooms 224, 226, and 228 at Fullerton College.

Please send your response to Mr. Richard Williams at the address shown above. Please provide the name of a contact person in your agency.
Notice of Preparation

Project Title: Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

Project Location: Fullerton College, generally bounded by North Berkeley Avenue to the north and east, North Lemon Street to the west, and East Chapman Avenue to the south.

Proposed Project: The District plans to construct a new Welcome Center, new instructional buildings, a Horticulture and Vocational Services Center, a new child development center, and an 840-space parking structure; realign campus access to the parking structure; construct a new Maintenance and Operations Facility and Thermal Energy Storage; construct new storage, offices, and a shower/locker room north of the existing pool; implement improvements to Sherbeck Field; create new parking lots north of Berkeley Avenue adjacent to the 3100 building and south of the Lemon Street parking structure; and construct a Performing Arts Complex. The District also plans to design new entry signage at key entry points, improve pedestrian circulation, and improve circulation and connections between the campus north of Berkeley Avenue and south of East Chapman Avenue, as well as within the main campus. Renovations would include the Math Building, Physical Education, Wilshire Theater, Business Building, Humanities Building, Campus Services, Administration Building, Fine Arts Gallery, and Academic Computing. It is anticipated that these improvements will be phased over a 10-year period.

Richard Williams
District Director, Facilities Planning and Construction

A couple of Points:
1. Make sure all new parking structures are adequate for many years to come and use solar panels to the maximum.
2. When students are enrolling, add parking passes to their initial package. This way, it is not so much confusing directions for new students trying to figure out where to park.

Best of luck,
Gloria Bonalité, 5135 Stanford Ave.
December 2, 2016

NOCCD
1830A West Romneya
Anaheim CA 92801-1819

ATTN: Richard Williams

Comments on Fullerton College Master Plan

First, the plan gives no attention to bicycle commuting. The campus has good nearby bicycle routes on Berkeley, Hornet/Dorothy and a planned Bicycle Boulevard on Wilshire but the campus is not set up to take advantage of these routes by providing safe connections within the campus.

Second, in particular it would be useful to have a direct connection onto the campus from Hornet at Berkeley both for bicycles and pedestrians (since many cars park on streets to the north of campus).

Third, I think that the college should consider eliminating football since it benefits so few in-district students at a very high cost. CSUF, the second largest university in the state has done very well without a football team for some years now. It was a hard decision at the time but the program was a severe financial drain. It certainly has not hurt enrollment at the university.

Fourth, with other nearby stadiums available and often not used (e.g. Fullerton College, and CSUF) it seems to be an unnecessary use of funds to build yet another stadium.

Fifth, noise from amplified music and voices are already a problem. I live on Cannon, not as close as others, and yet I often hear loud and inappropriate music and voices from that area.

Sixth, light from the stadium and parking structure may also be a problem. Lights from the Lemon structure are clearly visible from rooms in my house now and should be better shielded.

Seventh, the college should act to keep traffic from its parking lots from flooding Wilshire, especially once the bicycle boulevard is built. Eastbound traffic should be prohibited.

Eighth, any facility built north of Berkeley should be compatible with, and not make any negative impact on, the adjoining neighborhood on Dorothy Drive.

The college has not been a good neighbor in the past. Now there is an opportunity to reverse that.

In short bicycle routes/commuting should be accommodated; the stadium is unneeded and if built will no doubt cause noise and light problems for those living nearby.

Thank you

Vince Buck
406 Cannon Lane
714 870 5258
November 27, 2016

To: Richard Williams
   District Director, Facilities Planning and Construction
   And North Orange County Community College District

From: Martin and Maria Chavez
       625 Princeton Circle West
       Fullerton, CA 92831

Subject: Response to the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

As a long time resident, neighbor and supporter to Fullerton Community College, I cannot support the planned upgrades and new construction on the campus. I have tried to be as open minded on the projects that have been done and planned. I went to the public scope meeting on Thursday, November 17, 2016 on the Fullerton College campus. I heard many individuals speak from neighbors and college administrators and yourself Mr. Williams. Many in the community spoke very passionately about how they would be impacted. Many of these neighbors were from the surrounding area, not from just one section of the community.

Those projects that I will not support are the planned construction of the parking structure and upgrades (improvements) to Sherbeck Field. I know you call it improvements, but in reality they are new construction upgrades on the initial Fullerton College Field which used Measure X funds. And funds that have been saved, as Greg Shultz stated for this project. Funds which I would consider to be taxpayer money. Which I would think should go towards professor wages and student services; which would benefit varied students as possible, not just one group.

I cannot support the Sherbeck Field Stadium and Parking Structure because it will impact my “Quality of Life” and my neighbors. These are my reasons.

- Increase in traffic. Living here I have seen the increase in traffic and the safety of those attending FC and the surrounding community. There have been accidents due to distractive driving, speed, and lack of experience from young drivers. Many students and neighbors have difficulty walking through these streets. When I mean traffic, it is not just around Berkeley, Lemon, and Chapman, but surrounding neighborhood streets that are used as bypass streets.
- With the increase of traffic is the increase of greenhouse emission levels. These increased levels will harm my health and family. As the Sherbeck Stadium would have a capacity of 4500 and the new parking structure also bringing more vehicles in this compact area. Since the FC campus is at a lower elevation and surrounded by a hillside
on the Northside. Pollutants are more apt to stay in concentration within this area and not dissipate as easily.

- Increase in emissions has been documented to increase health issues such as cardiovascular disease, cancer, and respiratory disease.

- Increase in stadium noise due to the planned 4500 capacity stadium. The noise produced by the PA system and those attending events will carry over to my house and neighbors. The current blueprint of the stadium amplifies the sound even further, since the noise produced has no other way to filter out but to the homes near the stadium. You must consider the topography of the campus and were the field is situated. On the North end section you have a low hillside with homes which act as buffer from any sound to dissipate. The stadium would further condense and amplify these sounds produced from those an attendance and PA systems.

- Lighting that is planned on Sherbeck Field will also spill over to homes in this neighborhood. It will have an ill affect for those like me who go to work early in the morning to get a well nights rest. Light spillage cannot be mediated due to the fact you either have light or no light. There is no such thing as controlled lighting.

- The planned usage of Sherbeck Field would increase with more events. Currently I have noticed an increase in events. These events although small just made up of maybe a few hundred people can get loud. I still remember this past year, UnderArmor Football Tournament was held on your field, it was loud; PA system, players and spectators being loud and it was not more than a few hundred people. Also the FC graduation held on portable bleachers was also loud. That was also not over 800 attendees. I could only imagine 4500 attendees.

- The new planned Parking Structure also would just make way for another structure to be used as a race track or illegal firework setting area. I can hear this happen at night from my home with the current parking structure off Lemon St and I live at east end of the campus. There is a lack of enforcement or administrators just do not care or do not know how to resolve this issue. It happens throughout the year.

- The structures such as Sherbeck field and Parking Structure will change the landscape and aesthetics. As a taxpayer I cannot support these two projects especially Sherbeck Stadium because it will only benefit a small group of students.

- FC has no limits on use. It has no policies in place on who can use FC fields. Saturday and Sunday can vary with use, but they start early and end late just as it gets to darker. I could only imagine events happening at night.

- The noise from the construction process would have a substantial impact on my Quality of Life.

- The FC Stadium will cause my family and those in the surrounding community to not get a complete night’s rest. Many of us have to go to sleep early, since we get up early to go to work. That means no light and noise to get sleep and be rested. A new study that was reported on CBS News on December 1st regarding “lack of sleep”. That it shows that “it increases cardiovascular disease, diabetes, depression and accidents, when individuals get less than 7 hours of sleep”, reported by Dr. Jon LaPook.

- The FC stadium and the campus itself are situated in an area that is to close to homes. The campus was never meant to have a stadium. A stadium will make life unbearable due to the noise, traffic, trash, loitering before, during and after a game. That is currently happening, but on a smaller scale.
Alternatives to the Sherbeck Field Stadium and Parking Structure

- Share Fullerton High School District Stadium, this stadium will be renovated soon. FC can also see if the can use CSUF Stadium down the road. Both of these stadiums could accommodate FC football games. It makes sense, saving money for the taxpayer and stretching those funds for the college to be used on other projects that would benefit all students and other departments.
- Best use of current parking structure and campus parking. Maybe give students incentives to park on the campus and/or use public transportation.

Regarding the Traffic Survey for the EIR:

I am concerned on how the traffic survey is being conducted and measured. I noticed that trip meters were set-up on Thursday November 17th and removed Monday November 21st in the early morning. I believe these measurements will not be an accurate analysis of the vehicle traffic that passes through this area; which includes traffic, noise and pollution levels.

First of all, weekends is when Berkeley is least used. Secondly, the dates these trip meters were set-up. Thursday November 17th through Sunday, November 20th and maybe part of Monday, November 21st was conducted the week when many schools and government agencies were going to be closed or operating on a holiday mode due to the upcoming Thanksgiving Holiday.

These two traffic survey meters were set-up at two locations on Berkeley Ave. First one was on Berkeley Ave. closest to Chapman Ave right by the entrance to the first driveway that is between the soccer field and tennis court. The second was on the northern section of the campus on Berkeley Ave, entrance between the Horticulture Studies and the FHS Farm. I did not notice any traffic survey trip meters on Lemon St or on Chapman Ave. I would think these streets should also be part of your study analysis, since these projects are impacting the whole community on all sides of the Fullerton Community College Campus.

I believe the traffic survey should be done after the holidays, maybe the first or second week of the Spring semester. Traffic survey should include Monday through Friday and not the weekend. This would give you a more accurate data on vehicle traffic, noise, and pollution levels that impacts the surrounding community that surrounds Fullerton College campus.

Sincerely,

Martin Chavez and Maria Chavez
Richard Williams
NOCCCD
1830A W. Romneya Dr.
Anaheim, CA 92801
Re: Fullerton College Athletic Stadium Impact Study
Nov. 30, 2016

Dear Mr. Williams,

As twenty year residents of Fullerton we are writing to voice our concerns about the proposed new Fullerton College Stadium that might be built just blocks from our home in the historic Hillcrest neighborhood.

Our concerns with building a new college stadium are the increased traffic in the area, increased noise pollution from the stadium, increased light pollution from the new LED lights, increased crime in the neighborhood, increased parking congestion in the residential areas near the college, increased vehicle accidents, and more wear and tear on the streets that already need repairs.

Perhaps our greatest concern is fiscal responsibility. Why on earth do we need to spend funding dollars on another stadium when Fullerton High School (FHS) has a stadium right across the street and Cal State University, Fullerton also has one only 2.1 miles away that could be shared? Wouldn’t it be more fiscally and environmentally responsible to upgrade and share the FHS stadium that already exists right across the street? With the FHS stadium having a seating capacity of 6700 (larger than the proposed stadium) and the average attendance at FC games being 1140 (based on last season statistics) an upgraded FHS stadium could easily be shared with FC students and families.

At a time when funding and environmental impacts are a concern throughout our state North Orange County Community College District should show restraint and leadership by compromising with the citizens most negatively impacted by this project. We thank you in advance for reading our email and seriously considering a shared stadium with Fullerton High School.

Sincerely,

Cathy & Patrick Crawford
Fullerton College
Facilities Master Plan
Program EIR

Please leave comment card in one of the drop-off boxes or mail this card by the end of the scoping period (December 3, 2016).

Name: Anna Dalir
Agency/Affiliation: Resident Librarian
Address: 629 Princeton Circle East
           Fullerton, CA 92831
Email Address: annalynne@hotmail.com
Comment: I am opposed to any modifications to Shenbeck Field. I do not want my family's quality of life affected negatively by light pollution, noisy traffic and safety issues that the proposed stadium could cause. Thank you, Anna Dalir

North Orange County Community College District
ATTN: Richard Williams
1830A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801
Fullerton College
Facilities Master Plan
Program EIR

Please leave comment card in one of the drop-off boxes or mail this card by the end of the scoping period (December 3, 2016).

Name: Wayne Dalin
Agency/Affiliation: Homeowner
Address: 629 Princeton Circle East
Email Address: Waynedalin@hotmail.com
Comment: I strongly oppose the creation of a stadium at Sherman Field. My reasons are as follows:

North Orange County Community College District
ATTN: Richard Williams
1830A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801

92801-182373
Comment continued: 1) Noise pollution from the crowds and sound system 2) Air pollution caused by concentrated spray caused by car emissions 3) Light pollution caused by the stadium lighting (admit despite the claims of school are not mitigated by the masking lights) 4) Trash Problems caused by students parking in the neighborhood 5) Parking problems as people will park in our neighborhood because the parking is free 6) Safety problems because people searching for parking I witness this when parking used to be unrestricted in our neighborhood drive fast and don't look for children.
Dear Richard Williams,

I have been a Fullerton resident since 1996. I have lived at 813 E Union Ave for the last 10 years. I am currently having some mild life disruptions because Fullerton College visitors and students sometimes park their autos in front of my house and I hear as well the megaphone and yelling sounds from FHS stadium. I have no doubts in my mind that the building of a new Sherbeck Stadium would aggravate these problems exponentially. What are right now mild issues I am able to deal with, would turn into nightmare. I am saying this, even though, my elderly mom who has chronic migraines, already gets the worst of her headaches when noise from the stadium becomes too loud. Besides all this, building a new stadium a few yards from Fullerton High School is simply nonsense. Please, do not hesitate contacting me if you have any questions about my serious concerns.

Sincerely,

Susan Egger
813 E Union Ave
Fullerton CA 92831
Phone#: (657) 378-9360
sueggr@yahoo.com
December 3rd

Dear Mr. Williams,

I am writing to you in opposition to the proposed stadium that is being planned at Fullerton College.

A stadium is a money losing vanity project & an insult to taxpayers currently on the hook for NOCCD related bond debt.

The College should focus on keeping promises, such as with the Veteran’s Center & spend less time trying to expand correspondence toragment's interests.

Pay down the debt & teach our students economics, civics & math instead of building yet another vanity project.

Thank you for your time.

[Signature]

Joshua Tepper, Fullerton Resident
90 NEX 100-200
Fullerton, CA 92834
(626) 594-5240
November 30, 2016

Mr. Richard William
North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneysa Drive
Anaheim, California 92801-1819

Subject: Response to Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Report for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

Dear Mr. Richard:

We request that the scope of the PEIR resolve serious flaws contained, promoted, and concluded in the Dudek November 2016 Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan Initial Study (hereafter “FCMPIS”). These flaws include unspecified assumptions, inadequate scope, and inaccurate findings.

For the sake of brevity in our response, we will adopt as needed the Acronyms and Abbreviations used in FCMPIS.

**PEIR should Include Biological Resources, contrary to FCMPIS Findings:**

FCMPIS incorrectly concludes impacts on biological resources are not significant in the PEIR study area. This conclusion relies on a single day biological survey on October 11, 2016 (FCMPIS, 6.3.4) in which is stated that “no raptor species were observed within the study area during the site visit” (FCMPIS, Appendix, p. 8).

We have on occasion seen hawks hunting attempts in the area. The strip of land east of 3100 Berkeley where the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan (“FMP”) proposes to build a new parking lot (hereafter “PLOT”) is rich in raptor food such as rabbits, groundhogs, squirrels, rodents, and other “critters.” We live directly north of and adjacent to the Berkeley center, and have regularly observed hawks that “hang out” on the two large pine trees growing near the 3100 building on Berkeley Avenue. They also like to sit atop the telephone poles that overlook PLOT.

A nearby neighbor who lives at the Berkeley curve just below Hornet identified these hawks, writing to us this week that she sees “chicken/red tail hawks very often.” Furthermore she tells us that “they are there in the spring...stay all summer and are here into the fall. I haven’t seen one recently” This may explain why FCMPIS failed to see one the one day of the year they happened to stop by.

Contrary to FCMPIS woefully insufficient observations, raptors are present within the boundaries of the FMP, and especially in the PLOT area. The PEIR should include Biological Resources, especially as it pertains to PLOT.

**PEIR should Include Long Term Ongoing Impacts on Air Quality (not merely Construction Related Impacts identified by FCMPIS):**

In its summary findings concerning Air Quality, FCMPIS emphasizes “Short-term, construction-related impacts [that] are anticipated to occur due to fugitive dust and emissions from vehicles” (p. 21). However, ongoing emissions should also be studied, especially for PLOT.
The unique topography of PLOT (a hill), location (unbounded adjacency to single-family residences), the concentration of vehicles (FMP does not specify parking lot density or special accommodations of PLOT) require an emissions concentration study limited to the PLOT boundaries. The modelling and study should not merely average Air Quality across the entire FMP area. It should anticipate “worst case scenarios” of emissions and pollutant concentrations at PLOT. PEIR should model localized time-lapsed point concentration measurement and prediction of pollutants on adjacent housing next to PLOT (not just averages).

**PEIR should include Long Term Ongoing Impacts on Greenhouse Gas Emissions (not merely Construction Related Impacts identified by FCMPIS):**

In its summary findings concerning Greenhouse Gas Emissions, FCMPIS states that “the proposed project would result in temporary emissions” (p. 31). However ongoing emissions should be examined, especially for PLOT.

Currently, all Fullerton College parking lots are continually lighted from dusk to dawn; hence, it would be reasonable to expect this would be the case for PLOT. Furthermore, the regular concentration of vehicles coming, going, running while parked, etc. will contribute to accumulated greenhouse emissions. The PEIR should separate calculate and publish the incremental contribution of greenhouse gases for PLOT.

**Contrary to FCMPIS findings, PEIR should address potential Land Use and Planning intrusions caused by proposed East of Berkeley Center Parking area that would be adjacent to Single Family Residence properties on Dorothy Drive**

To date, there is a clear boundary between the neighborhoods North and East of Berkeley Drive and the Fullerton College Campus. The current Berkeley center (3100) has been, to date, an exception we can live with. It seems to be used mostly for FC staff and maintenance personnel and appears to draw only infrequent student and public use and traffic. It is not a place that is often frequented by “strangers.” So far, we have made very few calls to police out of safety and security concerns. Except for the almost daily 5:30 AM noise of the dumpsters being emptied and the random starting and stopping of compressors or other machinery, we consider the Berkeley center a “quiet neighbor.”

PLOT, however, would entirely change this delicate balance. PLOT would be a significant intrusion into the neighborhood. PLOT would disturb the neighborhood with safety and security concerns, lights, noise, and impede the “quiet enjoyment” of our back yards.

Since the scope of PLOT has not been specified, we are left to assume worst case scenarios, i.e., that this will be a totally public area that is heavily used, open to any and all autos, pedestrians, and anyone else who may want to walk, sit, stand, or sleep there. (For example, the current FC parking garage, based on the noises we often hear, seems to be a practice area for budding and accomplished skateboarders, drag racers, musicians, and anyone else that wants to hang out there...). PLOT will increase the risk that neighborhood inhabitants, including small children and infants, will suffer harm from illegal and/or criminal elements and activities. These activities may include drug and alcohol use and/or commerce, car thefts, house break-ins, etc. As part of the campus setting, PLOT may attract sex predators, and facilitate additional places for overnight sleeping and/or parking.
The PEIR should consider and develop plans to mitigate the superimposed effects of simultaneous peak usage of the Fullerton High School stadium and proposed FC Sherbeck Field “improvements,” a relevant issue which FCMPIS fails to identify.

The FMP refers to “improvements to Sherbeck Field.” The PEIR should disclose planned rated peak capacity of these “improvements” and provide relevant statistics and environmental impacts a these peak events. These statistics should include, but not be limited to (1) geographically overlaid noise (decibel) contours, (2) peak air quality concentration contours, pollutant dissipation rates leading up to, during, and after the event, (3) cumulative annual greenhouse gases impacts and statistics based on the number of such peak events, and (4) traffic patterns. It should also include the impact on emergency services response times (medical, fire, and police) to surrounding neighborhoods during these peak events. The study should disclose how many such peak events are expected annually.

Furthermore, the PEIR should also include similar statistics when Sherbeck field events occur simultaneously with Fullerton High School Stadium events. The PEIR should disclose how many such simultaneous events could be expected to occur annually. For example, a 4700 Sherbeck field event and a 6300 Fullerton High School Stadium (“FHSS”) would imply noise, pollution, traffic, etc. from 10,000 people. The PEIR should overlay the combined effects of the simultaneous usage and provide the superimposed effect of the peak usage of 2 facilities. Since these two event facilities are perhaps 500 meters apart, they should be treated in a combined way for the purposes of evaluating environmental and community impacts.

The PEIR should also identify and provide mitigation plans for other issues, including:

1) **The Deleterious impact on Neighborhood Safety and Security**
2) “Light Pollution” impacts on neighborhoods, especially those from PLOT on adjacent homes
3) Impact on community and neighborhood emergency evacuation procedures and timelines (e.g. due to mudslides, earthquake, or other natural disasters)

Respectfully submitted:

![Signature]

James D Fite
Patrice L Fite
400 Dorothy Drive
Fullerton, CA 92831
November 26, 2016

Mr. Richard Williams, District Director,
Facilities Planning & Construction
North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819

Dear Mr. Williams,

I am writing to address impacts from the proposed projects located on Fullerton College Campus, particularly the Centennial Parking Structure and the build out of a lit, 4500 seat stadium with sound system to be located at Sherbeck Field. The term field is disingenuous. I believe that there are several impacts that have not been adequately addressed in the Initial Study.

The IS is correct in saying the following, but there are other impacts in addition to what is listed.

**Aesthetics**: The proposed project could have a substantial effect by degrading the existing visual quality of a site or creating a new source of substantial light or glare.

*My comments:*

*Neighborhood homes to the East are within 100 feet of the proposed playing field, while neighbors to the North are located on a hill, directly facing into the light. The four to six one hundred-foot high lighting standards will carry 12-24 lights each, creating glow, spill and ambient light for several blocks as well as visual pollution in a city with building height restricted to 9 stories. Also the lighting from the proposed Centennial Parking Structure will negatively impact neighbors who already see lights, including blue lights all night long at the Lemon parking structure. Substantial impacts that should be considered are listed below:*

**Negative Effects of Bright Light include but are not limited to:**

Negatively affects neighbor’s normal daily pattern of life. (Several teachers and others who go to sleep early expressed concern of how the lights would affect their sleeping patterns.)

**Damage to retinas, both human and animal.** (http://www.brightfocus.org/macular/article/are-bright-lights-damaging-eye) Bright Focus Foundation

**Lights with significant blue light have been proven to cause eye damage.** (T-24) (Gunnar Optics http://www.gunnars.com/artificial-lighting-and-the-blue-light-hazard/)

**Disruption of Circadian Rhythm.** (DarkSky.org, issue #80, 2010 Find at: http://darksky.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/NS80.pdf)

Numerous scholarly articles have concluded that human exposure to artificial lighting such as lights used at CSUF’s Intermural Field (Musco #228 LED at 5700 Kelvin with 65 cri) is detrimental to human health in numerous ways especially causing retinal degeneration:

“The photoreceptors in the retina . . . are susceptible to damage by light, particularly blue light. The damage can lead to cell death and diseases.” Shaban H, Richter C. A2E and blue light in the retina: the paradigm of age-related macular degeneration. Biol Chem 2002 Mar-Apr;383(3-4):537-45.

“It is not too harsh to state that virtually all persons with vision problems should be removed from a light environment where the predominant light waves are a temperature above 3500K or a wavelength less than approximately 500 nm.” Elaine Kitchel, M.ED.VI. The effects of fluorescent light on the ocular health of persons with pre-existing eye pathologies. American Printing House for the Blind, 2000.

“Exposure to the eye to intense light, particularly blue light, can cause irreversible, oxygen-dependent damage to the retina. We have found that illumination of human retinal pigment epithelium cells induces significant uptake of oxygen that is both wavelength and age dependent...and contribute to the development of age-related maculopathy.” Rozanowska M, et al. Blue light induced reactivity of retinal age pigment. Journal of Biological Chemistry 1995; 270(32):18825-18830.

“... high levels of exposure to blue or visible light may cause ocular damage, especially later in life, and may be related to the development of age-related macular degeneration.” Taylor HR, West S, Munoz B, Rosenthal FS, Bressler SB, and Bressler NM. The Long Term Effects of Visible Light on the Eye. Archives of Ophthalmology 1992; 110:99-104.

“The effectiveness of light in inducing photodamage to the retina increases with decreasing wavelength from 500 to 400 nm.” Andley UP, L.T. Chylack Jr LT. Recent Studies on Photodamage to the Eye with Special Reference to Clinical and


"Because sunlight and many high-intensity artificial light sources contain relatively high proportions of blue, and the retina as well as pigment epithelium contain several types of blue-absorbing molecules, the short-wavelength band of the visible spectrum may contribute to the pathogenesis of age-related macular degeneration and amplify some forms of inherited retinal degeneration." Remé CE, Wenzel A, Grimm G, Iseli HP. Mechanisms of Blue Light-Induced Retinal Degeneration and the Potential Relevance for Age-Related Macular Degeneration and Inherited Retinal Diseases SLTBR Annual Meetings Abstracts 2003.

"... the photon catch capacity of the retina is significantly augmented during blue-light illumination, which may explain the greater susceptibility of the retina to blue light than to green light. However, blue light can also affect function of several blue-light-absorbing enzymes that may lead to the induction of retinal damage." Grimm C, et al. Rhodopsin-Mediated Blue-Light Damage to the rat Retina: Effect of Photoreversal of Bleaching. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2001 Feb;42(2):497-505.

All quotes above are referenced in the following article are from: Living Well With Low Vision, entitled, "Artificial Lighting and the Blue Light Hazard." http://lowvision.preventblindness.org/daily-living-2/artificial-lighting-and-the-blue-light-hazard/#blue

The IS is correct in saying the following, but there are other impacts in addition to what is listed.

**Agriculture and Forestry Resources:** The proposed project would not have an impact on agricultural resources.

**Biological Resources:** The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to special-status wildlife and plant species, and habitat on the project site or interfere with the movement of a migratory wildlife species. Impacts are considered less than significant.

*My comment:*

**Impacts on plants, animals and birds in the area are underestimated.**

There are wild animals and birds who live in the area that would be affected as well as plants and farm animals located at the FHS farm and
plants located at the FC horticulture building that would be effected by nighttime lighting and noise.

The IS is correct in saying the following, but there are other impacts in addition to what is listed.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** The proposed project would result in temporary construction-related emissions. During the operational phase, emissions would also increase due to higher energy usage. To accurately determine the proposed project's potential impacts on greenhouse gas emissions, further analysis will be required. Impacts are considered potentially significant.

*My comments:*

*Greenhouse gas emissions would continue to affect the air quality of the area surrounding FC because of the extra automobile travel along Berkeley and automobile traffic into and out of the proposed Centennial Structure.*

*The sports lighting would add to ozone levels in Fullerton.* An article from the American Chemical Society reports that, a brightly lit sports stadium provides, “enough light to drive certain chemical reactions in the atmosphere that would boost daytime levels of ozone, one of the most prevalent and difficult-to-control air pollutants in urban areas.” (From: “Monitoring the Skies” Chemical and Engineering News, American Chemical Society Magazine, Feb. 11, 2009 Press Pac)

The IS is correct in saying the following, but there are other impacts in addition to what is listed.

**Noise:** The proposed project could expose persons to noise levels that exceed standards or to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, and result in a substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels during construction or operation.

*My comments:*

*Noise impacts WILL be substantial during construction and after with use of the stadium and the Centennial Parking Structure.*

The lay of the land is unique to our neighborhood as homes to the East are within 100 feet of the proposed playing field, while homes to the North are located on a hill, creating a natural amphitheater. Noise from Fullerton High School already carries east to Raymond Avenue. Noise from sports fields are already heard as far north as the peak of Luanne Ave.
Construction Noise WILL Exceed Fullerton's Allowable Interior and Exterior Noise Levels. (Fullerton Noise Standards: 7AM - 5PM - 55dBA)
During the construction of the parking structure on Lemon, noise of installing pylons was excessively loud and disruptive to the surrounding area.
Post Construction Presents Noise Problems As Well:
Prolonged exposure to moderate levels of noise involving irrelevant speech can effect performance, unlike the moderate intensity white noise of 55dBA noted as Fullerton's limit.
[A 2003 study reported in Noise and Health Journal entitled, “The effects of background noise on cognitive performance during a 70 hour simulation of conditions aboard the International Space Station.”
There are three major factors that determine the effect of noise on cognitive performance: Intensity (loudness), type of noise, and duration. Moderate levels of noise can affect performance, depending on it's type and duration. For example, moderate intensity white noise (55 dB), has little or no effect on performance while moderate intensity irrelevant speech can seriously disrupt performance (LeCompte, 1994; Smith, 1999). The effect of duration has received little attention to date, however, Smith and Miles (1985) have demonstrated that the longer the exposure the greater the decrement in performance. From: Noise and Health. A Bi-Monthly Interdisciplinary Journal. http://www.noiseandhealth.org/article.asp?issn=1463-1741:year=2003:volume=6:issue=21:spage=3:epage=16:aulast=Smith]

The IS is correct in saying the following, but there are other impacts in addition to what is listed.

Transportation and Traffic: During construction and operation of the proposed project, increases in traffic due to construction worker commutes, equipment and materials deliveries, and increases in student enrollment and campus visitors may occur. The proposed project could also introduce hazards to roadways, walkways, and bike paths.

My comments:
Traffic Impact:
• Purpose of Berkeley was to be an alternate route for Fullerton residents going up Harbor to avoid traffic. The stadium and parking structure will necessitate
the installation of 2 new traffic signals making a total of 4 traffic signals over miles between Chapman and Lemon and 5 between Chapman and Harbor.
• This will also negatively impact the new bicycle street of Wilshire and overburden the corner of Chapman and Berkeley.

**Safety Hazard:**
• Crossing Berkeley is already dangerous for pedestrians, extra traffic from a new parking structure will exacerbate this problem.

The IS is correct in saying that there may be some other environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.

**Mandatory Findings of Significance Section C:**
My comments:

**Stadium Creates a Public Nuisance:**
• No limit on use creates 7 days/week traffic, light & sound problems.
• Impact would be unlike anywhere else in the area. Area is right next to an often heavily populated downtown and an established, historic residential neighborhood.
• Numerous similar situations across the US testify to the negative impacts on neighbors.
• Decrease in property value and increase in neighboring houses being turned into rentals.

**A Better Location Exists for Football Games and for a Parking Structure:**
• Cypress Campus (NOCCCDD’s other college) is a much more conducive space for a football stadium.
• Other nearby stadiums exist for rental including:
  • Fullerton High School - across the street
  • Lion’s Field - .7 miles away
  • Titan Stadium - 2.1 miles away
  • Spaulding Stadium at Buena Park High School - 5.3 miles away
  • La Habra High School - 6.2 miles away
  • Shapell Stadium, Yorba Linda High School (currently used) - 9.1 miles away
• Other locations exist for a parking structure, specifically lot located at Lemon and Chapman.

**Proposed Stadium Is Unnecessary:**
• Proposed stadium is located right next to a soon to be renovated stadium FC has used for years.
• Stadium is of benefit primarily to football players
  • Football players are .0059% of total college population. (Ratio of Football Players to General Student Population is 118/20,000 according to the Fullerton College Workforce Center.)
  • Football players are .0189% of the population within 1 mile square that would be affected by stadium. (Neighborhood population is approximately 6216, Fullerton population is 138,981 and is 22.36 square miles.)
  • 83% are from out of district. (98/118) 49% are from out of state (58/118) Fullerton residents would be forced to pay thousands of dollars for a stadium used by .0059% of the college population, half of whom are not even from CA. The purpose of the CA Community College System based on the bylaws of the California Community College Athletic Association, and the California Master Plan for public education is to support local students. This is the reason that the cost is so low.
  • The number of student contact hours a football player is awarded for competitive play is 2 hours. The actual coursework of PE 207F is described as, “This course needs to be taken in order for a student athlete to participate in intercollegiate football.” Participation in intercollegiate football does not require a stadium.
  • FC receives $180.00/student credit hour. At 2 credit hours per football player enrolled in PE 207F, that would be $42,480.00 in FTES/year. If the build out of a stadium on Sherbeck Field cost around $4M, as reported by FC, then it would take over 94 years to pay it off using FTES. If costs to rent CSUF’s stadium is $20,000/game, then at 6 games/year the $4M would pay for 33.3 years of rented play at CSUF’s field.

I have many concerns about the construction of a stadium with lights, sound and seating for 4500 on Sherbeck Field at Fullerton College. I also want to note that the construction of the proposed Centennial Parking Structure is also a concern. It is my conclusion that after taking into consideration the above significant impacts on the neighbors, Fullerton College should abide by the precedent under which it has operated for 95 years and use other facilities for it’s football games, not install a stadium on Sherbeck Field.

Thank you for receiving our concerns.

Sincerely,

Mary Frances Gable
Resident 637 Princeton Circle, West, Fullerton, CA 92831
December 2, 2016

Dr. Cheryl Marshall, Chancellor
1830 West Romneya
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819

Dear Dr. Marshall,

Thank you for inviting the neighbors to comment at the Pre EIR meeting at Fullerton College on November 17th; we do appreciate the forum and the opportunity to express our opinions on Fullerton College’s Master Plan. As you may have heard, there were no positive comments about the idea of a stadium on Fullerton College campus and comments about the planned Centennial Parking Structure were negative as well. The neighbors of Fullerton College recognize that you have only recently been installed as Chancellor and therefore do not have an understanding of the historic discontent between the two regarding parking issues and a stadium at Sherbeck Field.

Unfortunately, I was not able to speak with you personally at the meeting President Schulz hosted at the college last July. I would very much like to get together with you to discuss the buildout of two projects on the campus, Sherbeck Stadium and the Centennial Parking Structure. As a neighbor, an adjunct faculty member of NOCCCD, SCE for 26 years, a contributor to the Fullerton College Centennial Celebration, (I co-wrote with Dr. Robert Jensen and contributed 30 actors to the program.) a 27 year Fullerton resident active in a local political organization, a wife, mother and grandmother, I am invested in the college and fully believe we can achieve an amicable solution to the problems these two projects present.

This letter bears my response to the Initial Study. Along with my response, I would like to request a meeting with you in order to discuss alternate solutions to a stadium on Sherbeck Field and the Centennial Parking Structure. Please let me know when you are available.

Thank you very much,

Mary Frances Gable
E: mfrangable@gmail.com
C: 714-222-6794
Address: 637 Princeton Circle West, Fullerton, CA 92831-2731
Mr. Richard Williams, District Director, Facilities Planning & Construction  
North Orange County Community College District  
1830A West Romneyna Drive  
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819  

11/26/2016

Dear Mr. Williams,

I am writing to address impacts from the proposed projects located on Fullerton College Campus, particularly the Centennial Parking Structure and the build out of a lit, 4500 seat stadium with sound system to be located at Sherbeck Field. The term field is disingenuous. I believe that there are several impacts that have not been adequately addressed in the Initial Study.

The IS is correct in saying the following, but there are other impacts in addition to what is listed. **Aesthetics:** The proposed project could have a substantial effect by degrading the existing visual quality of a site or creating a new source of substantial light or glare.

*My comments:*

> Neighborhood homes to the East are within 100 feet of the proposed playing field, while neighbors to the North are located on a hill, directly facing into the light. The four to six hundred-foot high lighting standards will carry 12-24 lights each, creating glow, spill and ambient light for several blocks as well as visual pollution in a city with building height restricted to 9 stories. Also the lighting from the proposed Centennial Parking Structure will negatively impact neighbors who already see lights, including blue lights all night long at the Lemon parking structure. Substantial impacts that should be considered are listed below:

**Negative Effects of Bright Light include but are not limited to:**

**Nighttime light suppresses melatonin secretion in humans.** (“In 1980, researchers at the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) demonstrated that exposure to 2500 lux of bright white light at night strongly suppressed production of melatonin.” from: Lewy AJ, Wehr TA, Goodwin FK, Newsome DA, Markey SP. Light suppresses melatonin secretion in humans. Science. 1980 Dec 12;210(4475):1267-9.)

**Negatively affects neighbor’s normal daily pattern of life.** (Several teachers and others who go to sleep early expressed concern of how the lights would affect their sleeping patterns.)

**Damage to retinas, both human and animal.** ([http://www.brightfocus.org/macular/article/are-bright-lights-damaging-eye](http://www.brightfocus.org/macular/article/are-bright-lights-damaging-eye))Bright Focus Foundation

**Lights with significant blue light have been proven to cause eye damage.** (T-24) ([Gunnar Optics](http://www.gunnars.com/artificial-lighting-and-the-blue-light-hazard/))

Numerous scholarly articles have concluded that human exposure to artificial lighting such as lights used at CSUF’s Intermodal Field (Musco #228 LED at 5700 Kelvin with 65 cri) is detrimental to human health in numerous ways especially causing retinal degeneration:

“The photoreceptors in the retina... are susceptible to damage by light, particularly blue light. The damage can lead to cell death and diseases.” Shaban H, Richter C. A2E and blue light in the retina: the paradigm of age-related macular degeneration. Biol Chem 2002 Mar-Apr;383(3-4):537-45.

“It is not too harsh to state that virtually all persons with vision problems should be removed from a light environment where the predominant light waves are a temperature above 3500K or a wavelength less than approximately 500 nm.” Elaine Kitchel, M.ED.VI. The effects of fluorescent light on the ocular health of persons with pre-existing eye pathologies. American Printing House for the Blind, 2000.

“Exposure to the eye to intense light, particularly blue light, can cause irreversible, oxygen-dependent damage to the retina. We have found that illumination of human retinal pigment epithelium cells induces significant uptake of oxygen that is both wavelength and age dependent... and contribute to the development of age-related maculopathy.” Rozanowska M, et al. Blue light induced reactivity of retinal age pigment. Journal of Biological Chemistry 1995; 270(32):18825-18830.

“... high levels of exposure to blue or visible light may cause ocular damage, especially later in life, and may be related to the development of age-related macular degeneration.” Taylor HR, West S, Munoz B, Rosenthal FS, Bressler SB, and Bressler NM. The Long Term Effects of Visible Light on the Eye. Archives of Ophthalmology 1992; 110:99-104.


“Because sunlight and many high-intensity artificial light sources contain relatively high proportions of blue, and the retina as well as pigment epithelium contain several types of blue-absorbing molecules, the short-wavelength band of the visible spectrum may contribute to the pathogenesis of age-related macular degeneration and amplify some forms of inherited retinal degeneration.” Remé CE, Wenzel A, Grimm G, Iseli HP. Mechanisms of Blue Light-Induced Retinal Degeneration and the Potential Relevance for Age-Related Macular Degeneration and Inherited Retinal Diseases SLTBR Annual Meetings Abstracts 2003.
“... the photon catch capacity of the retina is significantly augmented during blue-light illumination, which may explain the greater susceptibility of the retina to blue light than to green light. However, blue light can also affect function of several blue-light-absorbing enzymes that may lead to the induction of retinal damage.” Grimm C, et al. Rhodopsin-Mediated Blue-Light Damage to the rat Retina: Effect of Photoreversal of Bleaching. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2001 Feb;42(2):497-505.

All quotes above are referenced in the following article are from: Living Well With Low Vision, entitled, “Artificial Lightig and the Blue Light Hazard.” http://lowvision.preventblindness.org/daily-living-2/artificial-lighting-and-the-blue-light-hazard/#blue

The IS is correct in saying the following, but there are other impacts in addition to what is listed. **Agriculture and Forestry Resources:** The proposed project would not have an impact on agricultural resources. **Biological Resources:** The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to special-status wildlife and plant species, and habitat on the project site or interfere with the movement of a migratory wildlife species. Impacts are considered less than significant.

*My comment:*

*Impacts on plants, animals and birds in the area are underestimated.* There are wild animals and birds who live in the area that would be affected as well as plants and farm animals located at the FHS farm and plants located at the FC horticulture building that would be effected by nighttime lighting and noise.

The IS is correct in saying the following, but there are other impacts in addition to what is listed. **Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** The proposed project would result in temporary construction-related emissions. During the operational phase, emissions would also increase due to higher energy usage. To accurately determine the proposed project’s potential impacts on greenhouse gas emissions, further analysis will be required. Impacts are considered potentially significant.

*My comments:*

*Greenhouse gas emissions would continue to affect the air quality of the area* surrounding FC because of the extra automobile travel along Berkeley and automobile traffic into and out of the proposed Centennial Structure.  
*The sports lighting would add to ozone levels in Fullerton.* An article from the American Chemical Society reports that, a brightly lit sports stadium provides, “enough light to drive certain chemical reactions in the atmosphere that would boost daytime levels of ozone, one of the most prevalent and difficult-to-control air pollutants in urban areas.” (From: “Monitoring the Skies” Chemical and Engineering News, *American Chemical Society Magazine*, Feb. 11, 2009 Press Pac)
The IS is correct in saying the following, but there are other impacts in addition to what is listed.

**Noise:** The proposed project could expose persons to noise levels that exceed standards or to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, and result in a substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels during construction or operation.

*My comments:*

*Noise impacts WILL be substantial during construction and after with use of the stadium and the Centennial Parking Structure.*

The lay of the land is unique to our neighborhood as homes to the East are within 100 feet of the proposed playing field, while homes to the North are located on a hill, creating a natural amphitheater. Noise from Fullerton High School already carries east to Raymond Avenue. Noise from sports fields are already heard as far north as the peak of Luanne Ave.

**Construction Noise WILL Exceed Fullerton’s Allowable Interior and Exterior Noise Levels.** (Fullerton Noise Standards: 7AM - 5PM - 55dBA)

During the construction of the parking structure on Lemon, noise of installing pylons was excessively loud and disruptive to the surrounding area.

**Post Construction Presents Noise Problems As Well:**

Prolonged exposure to moderate levels of noise involving irrelevant speech can effect performance, unlike the moderate intensity white noise of 55dBA noted as Fullerton’s limit. [A 2003 study reported in Noise and Health Journal entitled, “The effects of background noise on cognitive performance during a 70 hour simulation of conditions aboard the International Space Station.”]

There are three major factors that determine the effect of noise on cognitive performance: Intensity (loudness), type of noise, and duration. **Moderate levels of noise can affect performance, depending on it’s type and duration.** For example, moderate intensity white noise (55 dB), has little or no effect on performance while **moderate intensity irrelevant speech can seriously disrupt performance** (LeCompte, 1994; Smith, 1999). The effect of duration has received little attention to date, however, Smith and Miles (1985) have demonstrated that **the longer the exposure the greater the decrement in performance.**


The IS is correct in saying the following, but there are other impacts in addition to what is listed.

**Transportation and Traffic:** During construction and operation of the proposed project, increases in traffic due to construction worker commutes, equipment and materials deliveries, and increases in student enrollment and campus visitors may occur. The proposed project could also introduce hazards to roadways, walkways, and bike paths.
My comments:

**Traffic Impact:**
- Purpose of Berkeley was to be an alternate route for Fullerton residents going up Harbor to avoid traffic. The stadium and parking structure will necessitate the installation of 2 new traffic signals making a total of 4 traffic signals over miles between Chapman and Lemon and 5 between Chapman and Harbor.
- This will also negatively impact the new bicycle street of Wilshire and overburden the corner of Chapman and Berkeley.

**Safety Hazard:**
- Crossing Berkeley is already dangerous for pedestrians, extra traffic from a new parking structure will exacerbate this problem.

The IS is correct in saying that there may be some other environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.

**Mandatory Findings of Significance Section C:**
My comments:

**Stadium Creates a Public Nuisance:**
- No limit on use creates 7 days/week traffic, light & sound problems.
- Impact would be unlike anywhere else in the area. Area is right next to an often heavily populated downtown and an established, historic residential neighborhood.
- Numerous similar situations across the US testify to the negative impacts on neighbors.
- Decrease in property value and increase in neighboring houses being turned into rentals.

**A Better Location Exists for Football Games and for a Parking Structure:**
- Cypress Campus (NOCCCD's other college) is a much more conducive space for a football stadium.
- Other nearby stadiums exist for rental including:
  - Fullerton High School - across the street
  - Lion's Field - .7 miles away
  - Titan Stadium - 2.1 miles away
  - SPAULDING STADIUM AT BUENA PARK HIGH SCHOOL - 5.3 miles away
  - LA HABRA HIGH SCHOOL - 6.2 miles away
  - Shapell Stadium, Yorba Linda High School (currently used) - 9.1 miles away
- Other locations exist for a parking structure, specifically lot located at Lemon and Chapman.

**Proposed Stadium Is Unnecessary:**
- Proposed stadium is located right next to a soon to be renovated stadium FC has used for years.
- Stadium is of benefit primarily to football players
  - Football players are .0059% of total college population. (Ratio of Football Players to General Student Population is 118/20,000 according to the Fullerton College Workforce Center.)
- Football players are .0189% of the population within 1 mile square that would be affected by
stadium. (Neighborhood population is approximately 6216, Fullerton population is 138,981
and is 22.36 square miles.)
- 83% are from out of district. (98/118) 49% are from out of state (58/118) Fullerton residents
would be forced to pay thousands of dollars for a stadium used by .0059% of the college
population, half of whom are not even from CA. The purpose of the CA Community College
System based on the bylaws of the California Community College Athletic Association, and
the California Master Plan for public education is to support local students. This is the reason
that the cost is so low.
- The number of student contact hours a football player is awarded for competitive play is 2
hours. The actual coursework of PE 207F is described as, “This course needs to be taken in
order for a student athlete to participate in intercollegiate football.” Participation in
intercollegiate football does not require a stadium.
- FC receives $180.00/student credit hour. At 2 credit hours per football player enrolled in PE
207F, that would be $42,480.00 in FTES/year. If the build out of a stadium on Sherbeck Field
cost around $4M, as reported by FC, then it would take over 94 years to pay it off using
FTES. If costs to rent CSUF’s stadium is $20,000/game, then at 6 games/year the $4M would
pay for 33.3 years of rented play at CSUF’s field.

I have many concerns about the construction of a stadium with lights, sound and seating for 4500
on Sherbeck Field at Fullerton College. I also want to note that the construction of the proposed
Centennial Parking Structure is also a concern. It is my conclusion that after taking into
consideration the above significant impacts on the neighbors, Fullerton College should abide by the
precedent under which it has operated for 95 years and use other facilities for it’s football games,
not install a stadium on Sherbeck Field.

Thank you for receiving our concerns.

Sincerely,

Mary Frances Gable
Resident, 637 Princeton Circle West
Fullerton, CA 92831-2731
Name: Laura Gallagher
Agency/Affiliation: Neighborhood
Address: 175 Hillcrest Ln.
Email Address: mlg@earthlink.net
Comment: I am concerned that the improvements will create additional traffic and parking.

North Orange County Community College District
ATTN: Richard Williams
1830A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801
Comment continued: Our neighborhood is already highly impacted with that. You will need plans to mitigate (or work with the city) that. I can barely get out on to Lemon in the morning and it is dangerous with the lack of visibility. I am also concerned about enlarging the stadium, bringing more traffic and parking issues, and without a clear need for the use. It seems unnecessary. Aren't there other uses of the money for something really needed? You say you encourage people to park on your campus like for graduations and they don't. They have to use our streets no matter what. You need to do better there.
Tuesday, November 29, 2016

RE: Fullerton Stadium

FVNAC Council,

I am writing this letter in concern for my neighborhood. I am 100% against the city building a Fullerton Stadium! It is an unnecessary expenditure with another far less costly option. After reviewing the Fullerton Plan 2030 Program from the EIR, I can see that this will have an increasingly negative affect on my local neighborhood. We already have to contend with College parking and student trash, during school days, I can only imagine the kind of negative impact it will have for us during game time. Not to mention loud noise and stadium lights.

I have examined closer the EIR report on page 27- 35 it appears as though the stadium will “substantially damage scenic resources, degrade existing visual character and quality, substantial light glare, violate air quality, and so much more!”

My main concerns are the pollution from events, trash, parking issues (as they plan to add two new lights to accommodate stadium parking.) Light Pollution - This will totally destroy any sense of a nighttime experience! The fact that the Fullerton Joint Unified High School District is willing to share their stadium with the community college will save taxpayers tons of money and sparing the neighborhood.

Please heed our concerns and re-examine the Joint Use Agreement, this would be the most favorable outcome!

Thank you,

Jennifer and Oliver Gelles
606 E Fern Dr
Fullerton 92831
Fullerton College
Facilities Master Plan
Program EIR

Please leave comment card in one of the drop-off boxes or mail this card by the end of the scoping period (December 3, 2016).

Name: JESSIE GUZMAN
Agency/Affiliation: RESIDENT
Address: 117 HILLCREST DR
Email Address: GUZMANJESSIE@HOTMAIL.COM
Comment: YOUR CONSIDERATION REGARDING OUR CONCERNS IS GREATLY APPRECIATED
1) DURING CONSTRUCTION & Post Parking Impact On Our Block.

North Orange County Community College District
ATTN: Richard Williams
1830A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801

92801-182373
Comment continued:

2) **Final Traffic Circulation on Berkeley, Lemon, Hornet & Harbor Blvd. Please put some thought on this. The existing egress for the parking structure fronting Lemon Street is poor. Please minimize impact on Lemon.**
To: Mr. Richard Williams, District Director, Facilities Planning & Construction, NOCCCD

From: Bob & Sue Harmston
1000 No. Yale Ave.
Fullerton, CA 92831

Phone: 714-879-4716

Dear Council member,

We, along with many of our neighbors, are very concerned about the proposed project to build a stadium at Fullerton College. As a family of educators we think we understand the desire of the college to have its own stadium and its monetary potential. But it is at the expense of our neighborhood and peace of life.

My family has lived in this home for over 40 years with peace of mind and relative safety with our two children. We live on a corner of Yale and Glenwood, which is dangerous as it is with cars making blind turns without signaling or observing cross traffic from the cul-de-sac of Yale. The loudspeakers from the softball field are tolerable and college student parking and traffic is understandable and a fact of life near a college; we accept that.

However, we cannot see a positive impact to our traffic/parking/crime/safety situation if another stadium is built so near to two others that already exist; one at FUHS and another at CSUF. It is our understanding that the Fullerton College complains of scheduling at one and prohibitive cost at the other. Well, would the cost of building another one be equal or off-setting? Is the destruction of an entire neighborhood worth the pecuniary interests of the college, or the deterioration of property values, or even the potential traffic congestion/parking (requiring additional police coverage to handle the alcohol, trash and crime from
inebriated attendees? Yes, we've witnessed such behavior around here through the years. But can you just imagine the exponential increase if a stadium is added to that?

We were once the youngest couple around, with no one their age for my two kids to play with. Now they have their families and live elsewhere. Almost all my neighbors are now young and most with little children. We really fear for their safety now with what is a nice area of Fullerton to live in. We cannot envision that as a future situation if another stadium is built this close to two other stadiums. Let the college use the stadium at Harbor and La Palma, or FUHS, or CSUF.

Please help us keep our home value and safety as it currently is. Please eliminate plans to build a stadium at FC!

Respectfully,

Bob & Sue Harmston
Fullerton College
Facilities Master Plan
Program EIR

Please leave comment card in one of
the drop-off boxes or mail this card by the end
of the scoping period (December 3, 2016)

Name: [Handwritten name]
Agency/Affiliation: [Handwritten affiliation]
Address: [Handwritten address]
Email Address: [Handwritten email]
Comment: [Handwritten comment]

North Orange County Community
College District
ATTN: Richard Williams
1830A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801

92801$1623 C023
Comment continued:

The size of CSWR field is tremendously larger than the buildings could use.

And thus directly south of the proposed student center, my real estate, quality of life, due to lights and noise, and value of my property would be adversely affected.

Also, building another parking structure will not help students from parking on all of our streets, making fires and dropping off children not done. Assessment zone created to ensure students to use these
November 4, 2016

To: Distribution List

From: North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneiya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801-1819

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental-Impact Report for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

The North Orange County Community College District (District) will be the lead agency and will prepare a program environmental impact report (PEIR) for the proposed project identified below. The District is requesting your view regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the PEIR. Responsible agencies are requested to indicate their statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project.

The description, location, and the potential environmental effects resulting from the proposed project are contained in the initial study, which is available through the District's website (http://www.nocccd.edu/) and at the Administrative Offices, North Orange County Community College District, Anaheim, campus located at the address above. The initial environmental review indicates that the proposed project may have potentially significant effects on the environment in the following categories: aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation and traffic, utilities and service systems, and mandatory findings of significance. The PEIR will include an analysis of these impact areas, as well as feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid or reduce potential impacts.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but no later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. A public scoping meeting will be held on Thursday, November 17, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. in the Fullerton College Student Center, Rooms 224, 226, and 228 at Fullerton College.

Please send your response to Mr. Richard Williams at the address shown above. Please provide the name of a contact person in your agency.
December 3, 2016

Dear Mr. Richard Williams,

I am the resident at 408 Dorothy Drive, Fullerton California 92831. I am writing to you regarding the notice I received from Fullerton College. The subject of the letter stated it was a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan. As a resident that will be directly impacted by the changes proposed, I am deeply concerned about the environmental effects as well as the overall safety of my children.

Below is the list of my concerns regarding all proposed changes but especially the parking lot to be built directly behind my property.

Environmental Concerns

- Impact on the food supply of hawks/other birds in the area. The field behind the house is used for the main food supply.

- Increased air pollution
  a. I have two young children that play outside and do not need increased smog to breath.
  b. I have a five-year-old son with asthma

- Impact on organic vegetable garden and citrus trees in my back yard. Air pollution will directly affect their production and sustainability.

- Parking lots at Fullerton College are lit all night. Light pollution directly behind our house will cause the following issues:
  a. light directly shining into our house
  b. sleep disruption
  c. our current ability to enjoy and view planets, stars, city view
  d. increased noise pollution (already extremely noisy from current parking structures in place)

Safety Concerns

- Increased risk of illegal and/or criminal activity
  a. car thefts
  b. sexual predators
  c. drugs

- Fullerton College students currently hop the fence and trespass on our property. This activity will increase drastically and put my children at risk.
It is with great urgency that I ask you to consider these environmental and safety factors before moving forward with any changes. I purchased this house specifically for the view and the feeling of being removed from the traffic of downtown Fullerton. This parking lot will drastically reduce the value of my home and impact the safety of my children.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kristyn Law
Kirk Ryan Law
Peggy Smith

408 Dorothy Drive
Fullerton, California 92831

714.955.3985
knlaw15@gmail.com
November 4, 2016

To: Distribution List

From: North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneys Drive
Anaheim, California 92801-1819

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

The North Orange County Community College District (District) will be the lead agency and will prepare a program environmental impact report (PEIR) for the proposed project identified below. The District is requesting your view regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the PEIR. Responsible agencies are requested to indicate their statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project.

The description, location, and the potential environmental effects resulting from the proposed project are contained in the initial study, which is available through the District’s website (http://www.nocccd.edu/) and at the Administrative Offices, North Orange County Community College District, Anaheim, campus located at the address above. The initial environmental review indicates that the proposed project may have potentially significant effects on the environment in the following categories: aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation and traffic, utilities and service systems, and mandatory findings of significance. The PEIR will include an analysis of these impact areas, as well as feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid or reduce potential impacts.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but no later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. A public scoping meeting will be held on Thursday, November 17, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. in the Fullerton College Student Center, Rooms 224, 226, and 228 at Fullerton College.

Please send your response to Mr. Richard Williams at the address shown above. Please provide the name of a contact person in your agency.
Notice of Preparation

Project Title: Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

Project Location: Fullerton College, generally bounded by North Berkeley Avenue to the north and east, North Lemon Street to the west, and East Chapman Avenue to the south.

Proposed Project: The District plans to construct a new Welcome Center, new instructional buildings, a Horticulture and Vocational Services Center, a new child development center, and an 840-space parking structure; realign campus access to the parking structure; construct a new Maintenance and Operations Facility and Thermal Energy Storage; construct new storage, offices, and a shower/locker room north of the existing pool; implement improvements to Sherbeck Field; create new parking lots north of Berkeley Avenue adjacent to the 3100 building and south of the Lemon Street parking structure; and construct a Performing Arts Complex. The District also plans to design new entry signage at key entry points, improve pedestrian circulation, and improve circulation and connections between the campus north of Berkeley Avenue and south of East Chapman Avenue, as well as within the main campus. Renovations would include the Math Building, Physical Education, Wilshire Theater, Business Building, Humanities Building, Campus Services, Administration Building, Fine Arts Gallery, and Academic Computing. It is anticipated that these improvements will be phased over a 10-year period.

[Signature]

Richard Williams
District Director, Facilities Planning and Construction
November 4, 2016

To: Distribution List

From: North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801-1819

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

The North Orange County Community College District (District) will be the lead agency and will prepare a program environmental impact report (PEIR) for the proposed project identified below. The District is requesting your view regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the PEIR. Responsible agencies are requested to indicate their statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project.

The description, location, and the potential environmental effects resulting from the proposed project are contained in the initial study, which is available through the District’s website (http://www.nocccd.edu/) and at the Administrative Offices, North Orange County Community College District, Anaheim, campus located at the address above. The initial environmental review indicates that the proposed project may have potentially significant effects on the environment in the following categories: aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation and traffic, utilities and service systems, and mandatory findings of significance. The PEIR will include an analysis of these impact areas, as well as feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid or reduce potential impacts.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but no later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. A public scoping meeting will be held on Thursday, November 17, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. in the Fullerton College Student Center, Rooms 224, 226, and 228 at Fullerton College.

Please send your response to Mr. Richard Williams at the address shown above. Please provide the name of a contact person in your agency.

Because of the effect the project will have on the environment of my neighborhood I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSED PROJECT!

Peggy R. Mason
632 Princeton C. East
92831
Notice of Preparation

Project Title: Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

Project Location: Fullerton College, generally bounded by North Berkeley Avenue to the north and east, North Lemon Street to the west, and East Chapman Avenue to the south.

Proposed Project: The District plans to construct a new Welcome Center, new instructional buildings, a Horticulture and Vocational Services Center, a new child development center, and an 840-space parking structure; realign campus access to the parking structure; construct a new Maintenance and Operations Facility and Thermal Energy Storage; construct new storage, offices, and a shower/locker room north of the existing pool; implement improvements to Sherbeck Field; create new parking lots north of Berkeley Avenue adjacent to the 3100 building and south of the Lemon Street parking structure; and construct a Performing Arts Complex. The District also plans to design new entry signage at key entry points, improve pedestrian circulation, and improve circulation and connections between the campus north of Berkeley Avenue and south of East Chapman Avenue, as well as within the main campus. Renovations would include the Math Building, Physical Education, Wilshire Theater, Business Building, Humanities Building, Campus Services, Administration Building, Fine Arts Gallery, and Academic Computing. It is anticipated that these improvements will be phased over a 10-year period.

[Signature]
Richard Williams
District Director, Facilities Planning and Construction
Fullerton College
Facilities Master Plan
Program EIR

Please leave comment card in one of
the drop-off boxes or mail this card by the end
of the scoping period (December 3, 2016).

Name: Suzanne Muhaidly
Agency/Affiliation: Homeowner
Address: 601 N. Yale Ave, Fullerton
Email Address: SMuhaidly@sbcglobal.net
Comment: I would like to
voice my opposition to the
proposed enhancements of
Sherbeck Field. Simply put

North Orange County Community
College District
ATTN: Richard Williams
1830A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801
Comment continued: it is just simply too close to residential properties. The proposed lighting and sound systems would make it difficult to enjoy quiet in one's own home and yard.

Also, regarding the proposed parking structure, I would like to see the school investigate an alternative plan such as a shuttle service. What I've heard of the plan that entails putting multiple lights on lemon seems unimaginative and problematic for traffic flow. I hope that a compromise, on both of these issues can be reached.
Mr. Richard Williams,

My name is Suzanne Muhaidyly and I live at 601 N. Yale Ave., Fullerton, CA. I am writing to voice my opposition to the development of Sherbeck Stadium. I feel very strongly that the proposed development is too close to residential homes and that its impact would negatively affect the homeowners who live nearby as well as the general area as a whole.

Firstly, the amount of noise that will be generated is of great concern. The proposed stadium would sit on land adjacent to many neighborhoods. The only barrier between the stadium and the homes is a two-lane road. The homes are so close to Sherbeck field in fact that people have found footballs in their backyards. To put in a sound system for this football stadium would in essence mean putting in a sound system for the neighborhood. Having evening gatherings, family barbecues, birthdays... would be intruded on by game noise. This is not to mention bands, car radios, traffic noise and all the extras that go with Community College Football games. It would be an assault of noise.

Also, light pollution is going to impact this whole area. Light pollution has been proven to increase daytime pollution and cause sleep disturbance. I do not want high voltage lighting lightening up the night sky in my neighborhood.

I would like to see a proposal for the use of either of the two stadiums that are already built and sit within 2 miles of Sherbeck Field. I would like the college to think about all aspects of this development which include; citizens, wildlife, traffic, city aesthetics, health and quality of life. I would like to see Fullerton Community College show leadership for responsible development.

I urge you to not build the stadium on Sherbeck Field because it is just too close to residential property.

Suzanne Muhaidyly
December 5, 2016

Mr. Richard Williams
NOCCCD District Director, Facilities Planning & Construction
1830A West Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819

Mr. Williams,

For nearly 20 years, I have lived on Princeton Circle West adjacent to the college. It is a friendly, safe, quiet and most significantly- a peaceful neighborhood. Your plans for building a stadium at Sherbeck Field will destroy all that this neighborhood enjoys. I along with the vast majority of the homeowners and residents ardently oppose the building of an unnecessary and unwanted stadium at Fullerton College’s Sherbeck Field. A new stadium would - based on the Environmental impact statement – literally poison our neighborhood with unwanted noise, traffic and light pollution.

Greg Schulz and the DUDEK consultant were very vague in how they answered very specific questions regarding Sherbeck Stadium field use policy, Musco lighting illumination summaries and the lack of any renderings of the proposed stadium. Why the stadium plans were not made available for the public to view? As homeowners (i.e., taxpayers) do we not have a right to view the plans, diagrams, sketches?

Why build a stadium when there are two, better alternatives available right now in Fullerton: CSUF Titan Stadium which holds 10,000, and FUHS stadium which holds 6,700. Either of these venues is a more responsible choice for the very quiet or compact neighborhood that surrounds Fullerton College. There is no discernable need for another football stadium at FJC when there is a larger, equally equipped stadium at FUHS which is just over a block away from the Fullerton College practice field (which itself is quite beautiful and functional and should remain as-is; a practice field).
The environmental impact and quality of life cannot be mitigated:

- Light pollution
- Increased traffic
- Air pollution
- Noise pollution

The loud stomping, voices and cheers from 4500 screaming fans is troubling, given the proximity to the neighborhood. Would you want this project in your backyard, I do not imagine that you would. *The document EIR by DUDEK consultants states the project will cause significant and permanent increases in light pollution, noise and traffic, should a stadium be built.* If you lived in this neighborhood and our roles reversed, you might feel this threat to your neighborhood and all the property values at risk within it.

In 1973, the city of Fullerton had the foresight to know that FJC is ‘a poor place to put a stadium because the area is primarily residential, parking is historically a problem, and access is poor’. This is from an article written in the Fullerton Tribune 11/27/73; 43-years ago! If parking and access were poor then, how do you think it will be any better today in 2016?

Can you understand why 466 residents from 400 nearby homes who signed a petition opposing this stadium have extremely grave concerns with the things we are being told (and not told) about the stadium and its use?

Please reconsider going forward with this project.

Sincerely,

Anne S. Murphy
Rachel Struglia

From: Greg Schulz <GSchulz@fullcoll.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2016 3:52 PM
To: rwilliams@nocccd.edu
Cc: Rachel Struglia; Rodrigo Garcia; Larry Lara
Subject: Fwd: Support a stadium-shared use agreement with NOCCCD!

1 of 4

Begin forwarded message:

From: Cheryl Marshall <cmarshall@nocccd.edu>
Date: December 6, 2016 at 10:05:31 AM PST
To: Greg Schulz <GSchulz@fullcoll.edu>
Subject: FW: Support a stadium-shared use agreement with NOCCCD!

From: Irene & Mark Myers [mailto:immyers@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2016 2:10 PM
To: Jeffrey Brown <jbrown@nocccd.edu>
Cc: Barbara Dunsheath <bdunsheath@nocccd.edu>; TRUSTEE LLAHTINEN <llahtinen@nocccd.edu>; Steve Blount <stblount@ca.rr.com>; TRUSTEE MMCCLANAHAN <mmcclanahan@nocccd.edu>; TRUSTEE JRODARTE <jrodarte@nocccd.edu>
Subject: Support a stadium-shared use agreement with NOCCCD!

My husband and I live on Dorothy Lane, right behind the Fullerton College, and we are encouraging the FJUHSD Board Members to support a "stadium shared use agreement" with NOCCCD.

Thank you,
Mr. and Mrs. Mark & Irene Myers
Dear Mr. Williams:

The foregoing is my opposition to the proposed football stadium in Fullerton College in what is currently known as Sherbeck Field, as well as the specific environmental concerns I have.

As an initial matter, I object to the current deadline to the scoping session because one of the most significant concerns regarding this project is the potential light pollution and the full scope of that pollution cannot be determined based on current information. Your proposal is for a 4,500 seat stadium in an area that appears to be slightly smaller than that of Fullerton High School’s stadium, which means the seating will have to be built up fairly high to accommodate the space limitations. The nearby residents claim the lighting would be 100 feet high which does sound about right.

The EIR will need to identify the height of the proposed LED lighting for the stadium and how far that light will be visible into the surrounding neighborhoods. This is also the issue with the football stadium at the high school, of course, but the difference is that the only residential neighborhood bordering the high school stadium is on a steep hill, so the effect of the light pollution is substantially less. The EIR will need to evaluate mitigation measure as well, such as less harsh lighting, creating fencing around the stadium to minimize light pollution, locating the lighting in such a way as to place the lighting away from the residential neighborhoods, lowering the height of the LED polls and potentially reducing the number of seats in the stadium if necessary.
Finally, I would be remiss if I did not also point out that this entire stadium is only possible due to fraudulent misrepresentation by the NOCCCD Board of Trustees. This stadium is being built with bond money that was made possible by Measure J, which passed in 2014. Measure J was a $574 million bond measure that the NOCCCD said was needed to fund improvements to a veteran’s center, not a football stadium. Had the NOCCCD been upfront and admitted this was what they wanted to do with the $574 million bond money the measure never would have passed in the first place. I keep being told that the stadium is not being built with Measure J money, but that is frankly not true. The Fullerton College initial study specifically includes the stadium in the list of improvements considered “in accordance with the Measure J Facilities Bond Program.” Also, the article that was published about the stadium last year (“Still No Timetable for Measure J Renovations”, by Jason Burch, dated October 21, 2015) also makes it explicit that the stadium is made possible by Measure J bond money. The fact that the trustees have made this a priority over the veterans center – despite the promises to both veterans and the voters and despite the existence of two other fully functional football stadiums already in the city of Fullerton – is an absolute outrage.

Very truly yours,

Sean Paden
RE: Concerns for inclusion in the EIR public record for Sherbeck Stadium and other college 'improvements'

My name is Damion Planchon and I've lived on Princeton Circle W adjacent to the college for 10+ years. It's a wonderful, friendly, safe, quiet and most importantly- peaceful neighborhood. Your plans for building a stadium at Sherbeck Field will ruin and destroy all that that this neighborhood enjoys. I along with 96% of the homeowners and residents vehemently oppose the building of an unnecessary and unneeded stadium at Fullerton College’s Sherbeck Field that will literally poison our beloved neighborhood with unwanted noise, traffic and light pollution.

While we appreciate the needs of the school wanting lighting to teach nighttime instruction, the installation of 4,500 seats and a loudspeaker system defies all logic and sense. What could those possibly be needed for? We believe the plan for the stadium is to rent it out to other schools, teams and sports clubs, despite what President Schulz said (and didn’t say) to us residents at the PEIR public scoping session on 11/17/2016 at FJC or what he has apparently been telling Jesus Silva, our newest elected Fullerton city council member. Not one official will give us a straight answer on the stadium. Why?

Greg Schulz and the DUDEK consultant were extraordinarily vague in how they answered my very specific questions regarding Sherbeck Stadium field use policy, Musco lighting illumination summaries and the lack of any renderings of the proposed stadium. Why were the stadium plans not made available for the public to view? We homeowners have every right to view the plans, diagrams, sketches, etc. since we’ll be the ones permanently affected by this most unnecessary stadium. We beg you to please respect our right to peace- and quiet.

We residents of Raymond Hills at the very least are owed the courtesy of knowing your full plans for the stadium. Is the installation of six-100’ light standards, 4500 seats and a loudspeaker system truly necessary for ‘student instruction’? Why build a stadium when there are two, better alternatives available right now in Fullerton. CSUF Titan Stadium which holds 10,000, and FUHS stadium which holds 6,700. Either of these venues is a more responsible choice for the very quiet and compact neighborhood that surrounds Fullerton College. There is absolutely no need for another football stadium at FJC when there is a larger, equally equipped stadium at FUHS which is just over a block away from the Fullerton College practice field (which itself is quite beautiful and functional and should remain as-is; a practice field).

It also a terrible burden to put on the residents and homeowners of Fullerton (who depend on Berkeley as a shortcut to take them around the busy intersections of downtown) to build a 4-story parking structure that will have a net gain of only 630 spaces which will only make traffic worse on Berkeley Ave. The Centennial parking structure will permanently create more air, noise and light pollution as well as mandate two new traffic signals to accommodate the additional inflow and outflow of vehicles. This again is an unfair burden to the residents of Fullerton, who will now have to deal with 75% more cars going in that small driveway just past the high school farm and yet Berkeley Ave will still be jammed with parked cars as students go there to park for free. Regardless of how much money you spend on parking structures, and new spaces you provide, remember that many students are poor and simply will never be able to afford parking passes. It’s these particular students that pose the greatest dangers to drivers on Berkeley as they tend to do U-turns and pull out into traffic from a stopped, parked position, on a blind curve no less. Certainly there are better alternatives to another structure which won’t really net that many parking spaces. How about a shared use and/or expansion of the Plummer structure on Chapman and Lemon?

The following environmental impacts cannot be mitigated: Light pollution. Increased traffic. Air pollution. Noise pollution. Do you know how loud the stomping, voices and cheers from 4500 screaming fans is? You wouldn’t want or wish this project in your backyard, that’s for certain. The draft EIR by DUDEK consultants already states the project will cause significant and permanent increases in light pollution, noise and traffic, should a stadium be built. If you lived in this neighborhood Dr. Marshall and our roles reversed, I guarantee you would be writing this letter to me pointing out all the reasons a stadium would not only not be suitable, but actually detrimental to your neighborhood and all the property values within it.

Even back in 1973, the city of Fullerton had the foresight to know that FJC is a poor place to put a stadium because the area is primarily residential, parking is historically a problem, and access is poor. This was actually an article written in the Fullerton Tribune 11/27/73, 43-years ago. If parking and access were poor then, how do you think it will be any better today in 2016? The answer is it won’t- and will in fact be much, much worse for all who reside in Fullerton and access the city via Chapman or Berkeley avenues. Even a brand new parking structure will only net 630 additional spaces. A full event at the stadium would easily draw 2,000 cars… Can you begin to understand why 466 residents from 400 nearby homes who signed a petition opposing this stadium have extremely grave concerns with the things we’re being told (and not told) about the stadium and its use?

It would be in everyone’s best interest if you permanently gave up any and all future plans to build a stadium at Sherbeck Field. Please be a good and responsible neighbor to the whole neighborhood. We love living here as it is a
very special place- especially around Christmas time and all the light globes/balls we residents get together and hang from the city owned Chinese elm trees... It really is a magical neighborhood. I'll show you around and introduce you to some of the kind people who live here if you'd like. I mean that with all sincerity.

Please feel free to call me at 714-873-5547 or email damion@dbplanchon.com or snail mail: 501 Princeton Circle W. Fullerton, CA 92831 should you wish do discuss anything in this letter.

Regards,

Damion Planchon
11/30/2016

cc: Mr. Richard Williams
District Director, Facilities Planning & Construction
North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819
RE: Concerns for inclusion in the EIR public record for Sherbeck Stadium and other college ‘improvements’

My name is Damion Planhon and I’ve lived on Princeton Circle W adjacent to the college for 10+ years. It’s a wonderful, friendly, safe, quiet and most importantly, peaceful neighborhood. Your plans for building a stadium at Sherbeck Field will ruin and destroy all that that this neighborhood enjoys. I along with 96% of the homeowners and residents vehemently oppose the building of an unnecessary and unneeded stadium at Fullerton College’s Sherbeck Field that will literally poison our beloved neighborhood with unwanted noise, traffic and light pollution.

While we appreciate the needs of the school wanting lighting to teach nighttime instruction, the installation of 4,500 seats and a loudspeaker system defies all logic and sense. What could possibly be needed for? We believe the plan for the stadium is to rent it out to other schools, teams and sports clubs, despite what President Schulz said (and didn’t say) to us residents at the PEIR public scoping session on 11/17/2016 at FJC or what he has apparently been telling Jesus Silva, our newest elected Fullerton city council member. Not one official will give us a straight answer on the stadium. WHY?

Greg Schulz and the DUDEK consultant were extraordinarily vague in how they answered my very specific questions regarding Sherbeck Stadium field use policy, Musco lighting illumination summaries and the lack of any renderings of the proposed stadium. Why were the stadium plans not made available for the public to view? We homeowners have every right to view the plans, diagrams, sketches, etc. since we’ll be the ones permanently affected by this most unnecessary stadium. We beg you to please respect our right to peace and quiet.

We residents of Raymond Hills at the very least are owed the courtesy of knowing your full plans for the stadium. Is the installation of six-100’ light standards, 4500 seats and a loudspeaker system truly necessary for ‘student instruction’? Why build a stadium when there are two, better alternatives available right now in Fullerton. CSUF Titan Stadium which holds 10,000, and FUHS stadium which holds 6,700. Either of these venues is a more responsible choice for the very quiet and compact neighborhood that surrounds Fullerton College. There is absolutely no need for another football stadium at FJC when there is a larger, equally equipped stadium at FUHS which is just over a block away from the Fullerton College practice field (which itself is quite beautiful and functional and should remain as-is; a practice field).

It also a terrible burden to put on the residents and homeowners of Fullerton (who depend on Berkeley as a shortcut to take them around the busy intersections of downtown) to build a 4-story parking structure that will have a net gain of only 630 spaces which will only make traffic worse on Berkeley Ave. The Centennial parking structure will permanently create more air, noise and light pollution as well as mandate two new traffic signals to accommodate the additional inflow and outflow of vehicles. This again is an unfair burden to the residents of Fullerton, who will now have to deal with 75% more cars going in that small driveway just past the high school farm and yet Berkeley Ave will still be jammed with parked cars as students go there to park for free. Regardless of how much money you spend on parking structures, and new spaces you provide, remember that many students are poor and simply will never be able to afford parking passes. It’s these particular students that pose the greatest dangers to drivers on Berkeley as they tend to do U-turns and pull out into traffic from a stopped, parked position, on a blind curve no less. Certainly there are better alternatives to another structure which won’t really net that many parking spaces. How about a shared use and/or expansion of the Plummer structure on Chapman and Lemon?

The following environmental impacts cannot be mitigated: Light pollution. Increased traffic. Air pollution. Noise pollution. Do you know how loud the stomping, voices and cheers from 4500 screaming fans is? You wouldn’t want or wish this project in your backyard, that’s for certain. The draft EIR by DUDEK consultants already states the project will cause significant and permanent increases in light pollution, noise and traffic, should a stadium be built. If you lived in this neighborhood Dr. Marshall and our roles reversed, I guarantee you would be writing this letter to me pointing out all the reasons a stadium would not only not be suitable, but actually detrimental to your neighborhood and all the property values within it.

Even back in 1973, the city of Fullerton had the foresight to know that FJC is ‘a poor place to put a stadium because the area is primarily residential, parking is historically a problem, and access is poor’. This was actually an article written in the Fullerton Tribune 11/27/73, 43-years ago. If parking and access were poor then, how do you think it will be any better today in 2016? The answer is it won’t and will in fact be much, much worse for all who reside in Fullerton and access the city via Chapman or Berkeley avenues. Even a brand new parking structure will only net 630 additional spaces. A full event at the stadium would easily draw 2,000 cars... Can you begin to understand why 466 residents from 400 nearby homes who signed a petition opposing this stadium have extremely grave concerns with the things we’re being told (and not told) about the stadium and its use?

It would be in everyone’s best interest if you permanently gave up any and all future plans to build a stadium at Sherbeck Field. Please be a good and responsible neighbor to the whole neighborhood. We love living here as it is a
very special place—especially around Christmas time and all the light globes/balls we residents get together and hang from the city owned Chinese elm trees... It really is a magical neighborhood. I'll show you around and introduce you to some of the kind people who live here if you'd like. I mean that with all sincerity.

Please feel free to call me at 714-873-5547 or email demiont@vanguardyluc.com or snail mail: 501 Princeton Circle W. Fullerton, CA 92831 should you wish do discuss anything in this letter.

Regards,

Damion Planchon
11/30/2016

cc: Mr. Richard Williams
District Director, Facilities Planning & Construction
North Orange County Community College District
1830A West Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819
Fullerton College
Facilities Master Plan
Program EIR

Please leave comment card in one of
the drop-off boxes or mail this card by the end
of the scoping period (December 3, 2016).

Name: 

Agency/Affiliation: 

Address: 

Email Address: 

Comment: I recommend a sleep
   eye mask for darkening
   light during sleep. And I do
   recommend ear plugs.

North Orange County Community
College District
ATTN: Richard Williams
1830A W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, California 92801
Comment continued: music through headphones for noise. Ear plugs
for noise during sleep. Until we can better solve this
issue.
Why not aces by football field?

Full to College desperately needs

football field in our expansion needs.

But student parking will easily access - will soon flow.

Of student parking will easily access - will soon flow.

But student parking will easily access - will soon flow.

Sounds like we're all addressing the parking.

A parking structure at the corner.

Problem.

Searching San Francisco North of Berkeley - hopefully

A parking structure for the future.

If we could in 1969 when we moved back.

Need environmental impact study on that one.
My family has owned my current home since 1951. My mother was the original owner and now I own the home. My daughter planned to become the third generation owner of the house. My dismay over the building of the stadium is so great that if it is actually built, I will be forced leave the neighborhood after 65 years. The idea of this is heartbreaking to my family and me.

PLEASE DO NOT BUILD THE STADIUM.

Sincerely,

Anne Richard

CC:
DR. Greg Schulz, Ed.D. President of Fullerton College
321 E. Chapman Ave.
Administration Building - 100
Fullerton, CA 92832

Dr. Cheryl Marshal, Chancellor of NOCCD
1830 W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819

Dr. Barbara Dunsheath, President of the Board of Trustee NOCCD
1830 W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819
Connie Richard  
605 N. Yale Ave.  
Fullerton, CA 92831  

December 3, 2016  

Re: Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan  

Dear Mr. Williams,  

I am writing regarding the current plan to build a stadium on the field at Fullerton College. My main concerns are the traffic, noise pollution and light pollution that it will bring to my neighborhood.  

My street is already used by students for parking. A stadium would draw more people into my neighborhood for parking. This will create traffic and safety issues in a residential area.  

A stadium will also create a great amount of noise and light pollution in my neighborhood. A stadium filled with cheering people will be too loud for a residential neighborhood. The stadium lights will shine into my yard and windows at night.  

Please do not build this stadium. It will make the surrounding neighborhoods urban and unlivable.  

Sincerely,  

Connie Richard  

CC:  
DR. Greg Schulz, Ed.D. President of Fullerton College  
321 E. Chapman Ave.  
Administration Building - 100  
Fullerton, CA 92832  

Dr. Cheryl Marshal, Chancellor of NOCCD  
1830 W. Romneya Drive  
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819  

Dr. Barbara Dunsheath, President of the Board of Trustee NOCCD  
1830 W. Romneya Drive  
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819
Laura Richard-Barasch  
221 W. Brookdale Pl.  
Fullerton, CA 92832

December 3, 2016

Re: Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan

Dear Mr. Williams,

I am very concerned about the impact of building a stadium on the current field. My family has lived on Yale Avenue for 65 years. While I don’t currently reside there, I planned to become the third generation owner of the family home.

A stadium will create traffic problems, noise pollution and light pollution in the surrounding neighborhoods. This will have a negative impact on the people who live in the neighborhoods as well as the value of their homes. Increased traffic means a higher likelihood of traffic accidents. Increased noise caused by 4500 people attending games will be disruptive to the quiet neighborhoods that surround the college. Light pollution from the stadium will make it difficult to sleep.

The college has been without a stadium on its campus for 103 years. To build one now is unnecessary. It appears that Fullerton College is more concerned with the possible profit created by the stadium than the quality of life for the residents who live around the college. The Fullerton High School Stadium seats 6700 and CSUF’s Stadium seats 10,000. These are reasonable alternatives for Fullerton College to rent and use.

Community colleges are essential to the cities and counties in which they are. They provide higher education to students who might not have afforded it otherwise. I attended a community college and have always voted in support of them. When the college in my city does not consider the impact of building a for profit stadium in close proximity to residential neighborhoods, I find I must withdraw my support.

Sincerely,

Laura Richard-Barasch

CC:  
DR. Greg Schulz, Ed.D. President of Fullerton College  
321 E. Chapman Ave.  
Administration Building - 100
Fullerton, CA 92832

Dr. Cheryl Marshal, Chancellor of NOCCD
1830 W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819

Dr. Barbara Dunsheath, President of the Board of Trustee NOCCD
1830 W. Romneya Drive
Anaheim, CA 92801-1819
Dear Mr. Williams,

I am a resident of 425 East Amerige Ave and am writing in response to the letter I received in regards to the FC Master Plan. I support the need for change to the campus but am concerned with the parking impact to Amerige Ave. Amerige is the only street close to the college that is not zoned 'permit parking only'. I recommend that this be changed so that the resident parking is unaffected. On a side note the trash problem has gotten out of hand on Bremaly, north of Chapman. Students park there for classes and throw their trash on the ground. A solution to this would be to add trash cans on both sides of the street from Chapman to Lemon.

Sincerely,

Mary Rock
425 East Amerige Ave, Fullerton, CA 92832 (562) 717-9340
Fullerton College
Facilities Master Plan
Program EIR

Please leave comment card in one of the drop-off boxes or mail this card by the end of the scoping period (December 3, 2016).

Name: Desi St. Amant
Agency/Affiliation: N/A
Address: 4221 Princeton Circle, West
Email Address: dstamant04@gmail.com

Comment: There is already a high volume of traffic in the neighborhood with a greater risk of collisions (I've been rear-ended by a student with no insurance). Has this been factored into the study? I noticed the traffic was monitored around Thurs.-Sun., but that's not an accurate reflection of the traffic volume we actually have.
Comment continued: Mondays through Thursdays are by far the most busy days, with students parking on residential streets that have not yet gone to required permits. One must also consider increased jaywalking across Berkeley and students speeding through our neighborhood streets (as a "shortcut"), which poses an increased danger to both students and residents alike and would be exacerbated by an increased number of people (drawn by the events at the stadium).
From: Cheryl Marshall <cmarshall@nocccd.edu>
Date: December 6, 2016 at 10:05:10 AM PST
To: Greg Schulz <GSchulz@fullcoll.edu>
Subject: FW: Message from a concerned Fullerton resident

Dear Mr. Brown,

I am writing to you to ask that you reconsider the proposed renovation to Sherbeck Field. I live with my wife and two young children on Princeton Circle West, directly across the street from the end zone of the field. We love where we live because we have close ties with our neighbors, enjoy the proximity to the downtown area, and are able to relax at night after our demanding work days. We are both teachers in different school districts.

We know that the addition of 2,000-5,000 seats, 100-foot lighting posts, and sound systems will absolutely destroy the tranquility of our neighborhood. Our backyard is roughly 80 feet from the eastern Sherbeck field goal post. The amount of noise from nightly games would prevent our 3 and 6-year old boys from getting a good night's sleep. They are typically in bed by 7pm. My wife and I are also early-risers--waking up at 4am to catch up on work, which means we go to bed by 9pm. We have no other choice if we are to keep up with our responsibilities. However, we fear the noise pollution caused by increased stadium activity would greatly disrupt the delicate balance that is our life.

I have heard the college president, Dr. Shulz, explain that the field would only be used two nights per week for Fullerton football games, but I find that hard to believe because we already see outside groups renting the field on a weekly basis. We hear the whistles blowing, track guns shooting, and crowds raucously cheering. These groups include soccer teams, track meets, teenage football leagues, and various others. This is fine, because it is on a smaller scale, and takes place during the day. Even if Dr. Shulz kept his word on the minimal nightly use of the stadium, what would stop the next president from putting it to use far more frequently?
If you can please consider working out a joint-use deal with the Fullerton High School stadium, it would be a tremendous relief to the hundreds of households surrounding and supporting Fullerton College. It would also save millions of dollars in spending that could be used to improve other areas of the college.

I really appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jonathan St. Amant
Sir/Madam,

For the last 25+ years my family and I have enjoyed living at 556 N. Cornell Ave, Fullerton. I am respectfully "speaking" against the proposed Sherbeck Stadium.

I have been in the Banking/Lending industry for over 30 years. In that period of time, I have completed thousands of loans for home purchases. Virtually every client has described their new home as "being on a quiet street, in an area safe for our children." I have never had a client say "my new home is in an area with heavy traffic, and parking problems and it is also has excessive noise and intrusive night time lights." And... I love it!!

In the mid 70's a stadium being built at FJC was deemed unrealistic because of the negative impact the stadium would have on neighborhood homes.

Nothing has changed since the mid 70's. The homes are still there, and the negative impact the stadium will cause are the same. With a new stadium, the very reasons families, including mine moved to this area of Fullerton will be changed forever...and not for the better.

Here is how this proposed stadium will affect my family's quality of life.

- Increased traffic and parking problems as 4,500 drive and look for a place to park.
- Safety concerns as residential areas become thoroughfares.
- Excessive noise from games and new stadium sound system.
- Excessive nighttime lights from high intensity lighting towers.
- Increased trash from those parking in adjoining neighborhood on game days.
- Declining property values caused by the loss of a quiet neighborhood.

The simple question to ask yourself is this "would you want to live in an area with excessive traffic and parking problems, as well as excessive noise and glaring nighttime lights"? If one were honest with themselves, the answer to this question would be no.

We are fortunate that we have many viable solutions available. The easiest and most cost effective approach is the upgrading of Fullerton Union High School Stadium to ADA compliance standards and the addition of artificial turf. Next would be the use of the field at Cal State Fullerton, followed by Bradford Stadium and Yorba Linda High Schools field.

Best Regards,

George Stephens

Stephens
556 N. Cornell Avenue
Fullerton, CA 92831

Richard William
NO, CCCD
I'm writing to protest the stadium you want to build at Fullerton College. Would be nice if you are dedicating and naming the stadium fees over the negative impact on the people who live nearby. Traffic, parking, noise, lights will be awful. Those of you who are pushing this wouldn't want to live next door. Please listen to the people who do live next door.

Many of your students want the classrooms & classes - not me fancy stadium.

Pacific Ampitheater in Costa Mesa to stop by 10 PM - because of houses nearby. The traffic
Thanks for listening

Jane Sylvester
804 Nutwood
Fullerton CA 92831
Dear Board Members,

I am writing you to express my concern about the plan to build a 4500 seat stadium on Berkeley Avenue between Hornet Drive and Brookdale Place.

In 2014 my wife and I purchased a house very close to the proposed site, on East Glenwood Ave. This was the first house we have owned in the City of Fullerton. We have two children in Fullerton schools and the neighborhood and community were a very important part of our decision.

This neighborhood, extending down to Princeton Circle and west to Lemon is a uniquely wonderful community, and is exceptionally quiet, peaceful, and safe. This was the main reason we chose to buy and move here.

Our children ride their bikes and play with other kids on the street. There is a very minimal amount of street traffic. Besides the people who live here, most other traffic is students who attend Fullerton college looking for parking or taking the wrong turn on our cul-de-sac.
The neighbors and the neighborhood are QUIET. Nobody has loud parties, dogs that bark all night, etc. People are friendly and considerate and as a result it is a great place to live for the many families who call it home.

The construction of a large stadium directly across Berkeley will shatter the piece and quiet of the neighborhood. It will enormously increase traffic, noise, and light pollution. The lights will shine directly into numerous backyards in the area. The noise from the planned audio sound system will be thundering through our windows. There will be hundreds of cars driving around our neighborhood looking for street parking. Simply put, it will severely affect our quality of life and lower property values. We would not have purchased a house in this neighborhood had we known this was coming.

In addition, the construction of a new stadium seems completely unnecessary. There is an existing stadium at Fullerton High School just a few blocks away. In addition, Cal State Fullerton, where I have worked and taught for 16 years has a large football stadium which is very infrequently used and has enormous amounts of parking. There is thus no compelling reason to destroy our neighborhood by building a new stadium when there are two alternatives already built and ready to be used.

As a professor of Geography I'm pretty good with maps and I have consulted the recent maps. The stadium would be extremely close to our house and as close as 100-200 feet to others in the neighborhood. The impact on us would be immense. Our property values would plummet, and our ability to get a good night sleep would be tremendously disrupted. This would be disastrous.

I urge you to please work with Fullerton High School and CSUF to use one of their stadiums instead.

Sincerely,
Jonathan Taylor
Professor of Geography
California State University, Fullerton
jstaylor@fullerton.edu
714 883-6768

Home address:
625 E Glenwood Ave
Fullerton, CA 92831
December 2, 2016

North Orange County Community College District  
Attn: Richard Williams  
1830A West Romneya Drive  
Anaheim, CA 92801

Dear Fullerton Elected Officials and NOCCCD:

We are writing in opposition to the expansion of Fullerton College.

Current traffic, noise and lights already make FJC a bad community neighbor. The present lack of transportation best practices, the Lemon parking structure placement and design already weigh heavily on the neighborhoods, student safety and our downtown areas. Expansion at FJC will exacerbate these issues and the present design goes against the very basics of good urban and regional planning.

At present, before any expansion, my immediate neighborhood of Hillcrest Drive and the other adjoining residential street are heavily impacted by student parking, traffic, trash and noise. We’ve also found used condoms, medical marijuana containers and alcohol bottles in the street immediately in front of our house and we have even had the pleasure of seeing a student drain his water bong on our front lawn, before going to class, when out picking up the paper. Car alarms, street racing and so much fast food trash makes us truly appreciate the quiet of the school holiday break periods that will soon be followed by the chaos that is the first few months of each semester.

I will say here now, that there will very likely be traffic related deaths at Hillcrest and Lemon as my neighbors and I try to exit the single point of access to our street. Occasionally, when my wife or I and our two young children are running late to get to Beechwood School, we attempt to save time and make a left out of our tract and go North on Lemon, instead of taking the safer/longer South on Lemon to northbound Harbor Blvd. Traffic can be backed up all the way over the top of Lemon blocking any visibility, left or right. Drivers racing up the hill from the Berkeley/Lemon intersection, hidden by the rounded road rise, come ever so close to T-bone collisions on a daily basis.

The chaotic off kilter intersections of East Valleyview Drive, Cannon Lane and the two entrances to the Hillcrest Glen Apartments add to the traffic safety challenge here. Lack of sidewalks in the area combined with FJC Students parking all the way up and over the crest of Lemon, in Hillcrest Park and the very active CSUF ZTA Sorority House foreshadows a student or park going pedestrian death. My own children, chasing balls or pets, have nearly been hit on Hillcrest Drive and in the alley to our East as hundreds of late students race around our loop to find precious parking, thumping their car radios and talking on cellphones while they drive.
As a Cub Scout leader, I have to pay and rent a facility to hold weekly Den meetings as my neighborhood can be completely parked out on Monday nights, from FJC students and/or ZTA sorority girls. When coaching during baseball season, we practice and play at Chapman Park in SE Fullerton, which is so parked out from CSUF students, we have to allow 10 minutes extra just to find a parking spot. When we are at Chapman Park, we can see what the FJC expansion will bring near year round... alleys completely parked out, residents unable to get in/out of their driveways and college students riding bikes on sidewalks late for their class as they had to park so far away.

Our comments on the existing plan are:

- Do not build a stadium on Sherbeck Field. Use the existing Fullerton High Stadium on Saturday nights as it is near always dark then. Help improve that stadium if you desire and use the coming downtown parking structures off Pomona to support the event crowds. Downtown vendors will appreciate the business and folks will enjoy the safe short walk before and after games. The pitch is Junior Varsity games on Thursday, Varsity on Friday and Junior College on Saturday night on the existing field. CSUF also has a swell largely unused football stadium that is right down the way and no football team to get in the way.

- Do not build new parking at the NE Corner of Berkeley and Lemon. Use the property for administration, housing or other quite, neighborhood adjacent appropriate use. Students jaywalking walk across the street will get hit. Hillside parking with a view is ridiculous, use it as Admin so you can oversee your campus. Staking a majority of your campus parking on the Westside of the campus isn’t good for air quality, student mobility or the neighbors, particularly with the way Lemon and Hornet flow off the hill and beget traffic collisions.

- Do not build a parking/structure south of the existing Lemon structure. Develop parking on the East, South and middle of your campus to balance out the traffic and serve student needs. Please build your parking structures with a setback, solar covers and vegetation, like the CSUF and City of Fullerton projects (Not like the Lemon prison styled structure right on the sidewalk). Gradual entrance and exit driveways are also smart design standards to help calm traffic and protect Fullerton High and FJC students crossing the street.

- Please challenge the horticulture program to green up the existing Lemon parking structure. Creeping Fig, Cat Claw, roof top boxes would be a stellar display and soothe the concrete bunker. Green up your campus and do demonstration projects at the vacant city islands at the NE Berkeley curve and the NW corner of Lemon and Berkeley.
• Talk to Riverside Community College, UC Riverside as well as CSU San Bernardino and San Bernardino Valley College to learn how they and their local transit agencies, RTA and Omnitrans respectively, used AB.774 – Asm. Paul Cook, to increase their student body and reduce their parking needs with amazing results. Something like a 50% increase with a 45% parking reductions (Cook, now Congressman CD-8, was actually a JC Professor and saw the need)
http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=200920100AB774

• Talk to CSUF, Hope University, developers, downtown businesses and OCTA about developing a circulator shuttle that would serve transit, business and residential needs alike. Grow the campuses and student body, don’t block off the 57 Freeway, clog downtown and destroy residential neighborhoods with more cars. Use one of SoCal’s busiest Metrolink stations and the vibrant youthful Fullerton downtown that is nearby to enable and enhance an institution for learning, not to become an institute of parking.

• Put in more EV Charging stations and develop Uber/Lyft/Carpool protocols to reduce car trips, emissions and wasted student time searching for a parking spot.

• Bring back the failed OCTA bike share program under another operator and talk to http://home.bikestation.com/ for ideas about connecting to the Metrolink station and other opportunities.

• Keep developing in the vintage period design that is appropriate for the campus, the adjoining Plummer Auditorium and Fullerton High. Visit the City of Riverside and see how they built a new parking structure just east of the restored Fox Theater that appears period and meshes with the nearby historic buildings. Fullerton’s former Planning Director, Al Zelinka, now at the City of Riverside will certainly show you about.

My wife and I are both products of the public education system and we appreciate your charge. We went to Orange Coast College, CSU Long Beach, Cal Poly Pomona and CSUF. At each institution we were required to pay for parking and/or took public transit. We could not park in the neighborhoods near campus as they were blocked off for residents, unlike the model here in Fullerton. Arterial streets served the campuses we attended and were appropriately sized for the traffic, while circulators served the campuses and municipal buses plied the borders.

Fullerton College needs to be respectful of their place in our civic fabric and learn from the examples of their sister campuses. School Board Members, Trustees and local elected officials will certainly be judged on their actions related to this matter.
Respectfully,

Linda and Todd Warden

155 Hillcrest Drive
Fullerton, CA 92832

(714)702-4181
nached@gmail.com

cc: Fullerton Planning
cc: Fullerton Traffic

*Parking pictures attached
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor’s quality of life for decades. Now they say, they “want our input.”
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name                                   Address                                    Signature
Mike Dickinson   613 Princeton Cirle West        [Signature]  
Martin Changw 625 Princeton Circle West         [Signature] 
Ty & Becky Stevens 628 Princeton Cirle West    [Signature]
John Williams  625 Princeton Circle East        [Signature] 
David Michael 628 Princeton Circle East         [Signature]
Carrie Winn  600 Princeton Cir E                [Signature]  
Wayne Dahl  629 Princeton Circle E              [Signature]  
Carlo Benslav  412 Princeton Circle            [Signature]  
Lance Winne  616 Princeton Circle E             [Signature]  
Julie Highland  629 Princeton Cir W             [Signature]  

PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor’s quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adair Gable</td>
<td>3100 E Palm Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Gable</td>
<td>3100 E Palm Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Romyn</td>
<td>637 E Elm Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Myers</td>
<td>640 Dorothy Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugan Merrick</td>
<td>636 Dorothy Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td>465 Dorothy Ln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Sawyer</td>
<td>633 Dorothy Ln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fontes</td>
<td>616 Dorothy Ln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Fontes</td>
<td>616 Dorothy Ln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fontes</td>
<td>616 Dorothy Ln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Bohn</td>
<td>613 Dorothy Ln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."

- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name                Address               Signature
Joshua Courtney    529 N Yale Ave Fullerton CA
Dan Ball           520 N Yale Fullerton CA
Danielle Lassen    512 N Yale Fullerton
Stephen Pisko      501 N Yale Fullerton
Kristin McDaniel   541 N Yale Ave Fullerton
Jonathan Heffernan 515 N Yale Ave
J. J. Parker       549 N Yale Ave
Robert J. Ford     1024 N Princeton Ave
Laura E Evans      1018 N Princeton Ave
Laura E Aune       651 E Fern Drive
Jamie Caissie     (51 E Fern Drive)
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name	Address	Signature
---
martin Martinez 1011 Hornet way
Hina Huizar 1021 Hornet way
Ruben Velarde 1021 Hornet way
Kyle Minic 412 East Fern Dr
Kevin Monk 412 East Fern Dr
Daryl Lee James 625 East Fern Dr
Roger Smith 631 E. Fern Dr
Robert Hughes 634 E. Fern Dr
Edward E. Stump 658 E. Fern Dr
L. Sue Hagmann Stump 658 E. Fern Dr
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patty Frigit</td>
<td>620 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna Loepke</td>
<td>610 E Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Petruis</td>
<td>600 E Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janis A.</td>
<td>600 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua D.</td>
<td>600 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>607 E. Glenwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kima Durgin</td>
<td>613 E. Glenwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Williams</td>
<td>615 E. Glenwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etsuko Taylor</td>
<td>625 E. Glenwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan M. Ryan</td>
<td>637 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Ryan</td>
<td>637 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a **4,500-seat stadium** with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

- Proposed stadium will be **TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!**

- The estimated **$3 million stadium would impact 1,000s** of people who live in the area.

- The proposed stadium would be **on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium** and will **DOUBLE IMPACT** the area. It's a **WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.**

- **WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS** that a new stadium will bring.

- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."

- This is our input: **WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!!**

We the undersigned **OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE** including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Hennes</td>
<td>640 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td>Linda Hennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Johnson</td>
<td>244 Princeton Circle, #</td>
<td>Benjamin Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Fields</td>
<td>1000 N. Princeton, P.</td>
<td>Elizabeth Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Gismona</td>
<td>1012 N. Princeton, #</td>
<td>Barbara Gismona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Craven</td>
<td>1006 N. Princeton, P.</td>
<td>Jack Craven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Canavan</td>
<td>1006 N. Princeton, P.</td>
<td>Maria Canavan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A. Jackson</td>
<td>659 E. Fern Drive</td>
<td>John A. Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammy Faddis</td>
<td>645 E. Fern Dr</td>
<td>Sammy Faddis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Birnbeck</td>
<td>1000 E. Fern Dr</td>
<td>Tina Birnbeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla Gilt</td>
<td>1001 Hertingweg</td>
<td>Marla Gilt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Simon</td>
<td>631 E. Glenwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Eggert</td>
<td>630 E. Glenwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Semp</td>
<td>605 Princeton Ct W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Garden</td>
<td>650 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renan Solorz</td>
<td>650 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex MacKenzie</td>
<td>600 N. Yale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Trong</td>
<td>612 N. Yale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer de Caila</td>
<td>544 N. Yale Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy Torres</td>
<td>536 N. Yale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Rosenberg</td>
<td>528 N. Yale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Garrett</td>
<td>638 Princeton Cir W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Ramirez</td>
<td>417 Dorothy Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Roet</td>
<td>511 Dorothy Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Mendell</td>
<td>515 Dorothy Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Higgins</td>
<td>515 Dorothy Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Lentz</td>
<td>413 Dorothy Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolly Lin</td>
<td>522 Dorothy Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Schumacher</td>
<td>525 Dorothy Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna P Zeeman</td>
<td>1106 Sheppard Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Steckler</td>
<td>541 Dorothy Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It’s a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor’s quality of life for decades. Now they say, "we want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Geller</td>
<td>606 E. Fern Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Lawhorn</td>
<td>607 E. Fern Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Tsai</td>
<td>628 E. Fern Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Vestri</td>
<td>528 Dorothy Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noël Vestri</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brice Hunt</td>
<td>518 Dorothy Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariana Hernandez</td>
<td>500 Dorothy Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Smith</td>
<td>408 Dorothy Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Low</td>
<td>408 Dorothy Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Gelman</td>
<td>409 Dorothy Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name          Address          Signature
---            ---             ---
Bob Wychman 520 Princeton Cir W  B. Wychman
Peggy Wychman 520 Princeton Cir W  P. Wychman
Peggy Wychman 520 Princeton Cir W  P. Wychman
Toni Lowry 528 Princeton Cir W  T. Lowry
Adele Lowery 528 Princeton Cir W  A. Lowery
Domin Prucha 521 Princeton Cir W  D. Prucha
Jason Pasel 513 Princeton Cir W  J. Pasel
Dawn Pasel 513 Princeton Cir W  D. Pasel
Tal Giwarant 517 Princeton Cir W  T. Giwarant
Roger Guimond 517 Princeton Cir W  R. Guimond
Bradley Ludleman 517 Princeton Cir W  B. Ludleman
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor’s quality of life for decades. Now they say, they “want our input.”
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WANT TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letha Selby</td>
<td>521 W Princeton Circle</td>
<td>Letha Selby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siv Meng Si</td>
<td>533 Princeton Circle West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Si</td>
<td>533 Princeton Cir W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Bemus</td>
<td>528 Princeton Cir W</td>
<td>Cynthia Bemus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Warren</td>
<td>533 Princeton Cir W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago and Maria Duran</td>
<td>540 Princeton Circle West</td>
<td>Santiago and Maria Duran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elana Kamincky</td>
<td>537 Princeton Circle West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Vanmetz</td>
<td>536 Princeton Circle West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming Villermay</td>
<td>536 Princeton Circle West</td>
<td>Ming Villermay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Murphy</td>
<td>525 Princeton Cir W</td>
<td>Anne Murphy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

• The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

• WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."

• This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name                  Address                        Signature
Clara Reyes          521 Princeton Cir E Fullerton   
Lisa Richards        508 Princeton Circle East Fullerton  
William Miller       512 E Princeton Cir Fullerton W Mall  
Brian Torres         516 Princeton Circle East Fullerton  
Baudela Licea        528 Princeton Cir E Fullerton   
John Castro          " " " "                           
John Dorn            525 Princeton Cir Fullerton   
Gabriel I. Giangrana 372 Princeton Cir Fullerton   
Emily Reed           540 Princeton Circle East  
Wayne Hargreaves 544 Princeton Cir East
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name |
--- |
Danielle Mercado 529 Princeton Cir W. |
Adam Mercado 529 Princeton Cir W. |
Bob Stevenson 525 Princeton Circle W. |
Mary E. Gable 637 Princeton Circle West |
Jane Jones 544 Princeton Circle West |
Sean Butler 545 Princeton Cir East |
Sam Castellanos 541 Princeton Cir E |
Mike Thomas 537 Princeton Cir E |
Keely Cassidy-Valdama 529 Princeton Cir E |
Mary Kovaciuk 520 Princeton Cir E |

Address |
--- |
529 Princeton Cir W. |
529 Princeton Cir W. |
525 Princeton Circle W. |
637 Princeton Circle West |
544 Princeton Circle West |
545 Princeton Cir East |
541 Princeton Cir E |
537 Princeton Cir E |
529 Princeton Cir E |
520 Princeton Cir E |

Signature |
--- |
[Signature] |
[Signature] |
[Signature] |
[Signature] |
[Signature] |
[Signature] |
[Signature] |
[Signature] |
[Signature] |
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Easton</td>
<td>616 Princeton Cir. W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbie Harrell</td>
<td>617 Princeton Cir. West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Turner</td>
<td>609 Princeton Cir. West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Gomez</td>
<td>608 Princeton Cir. W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Beiswelt</td>
<td>609 Princeton Cir. E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Alonso</td>
<td>605 Princeton Cir. E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Johnson</td>
<td>617 Princeton Cir. E 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Crisostomo</td>
<td>620 Princeton Circle East 9283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasey Morales</td>
<td>627 Princeton Circle East 9283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailyn Johnson</td>
<td>639 Princeton Cir E 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Harrington</td>
<td>1000 N. Yale 9283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Stanford</td>
<td>931 N. Yale Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Stanford</td>
<td>931 N. Yale Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Gamboldi</td>
<td>1008 N. Yale Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Kelly</td>
<td>600 Princeton West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Ayers</td>
<td>1134 E Whiting Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Storri</td>
<td>1061 Glenhaven Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Thiele</td>
<td>1307 LuAnne Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Thiele</td>
<td>1307 LuAnne Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc K. Gable</td>
<td>637 Princeton Circle West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

• The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

• WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor’s quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."

• This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Pickavance</td>
<td>937 N Yale Ave 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Tateen</td>
<td>1005 N Yale 92831</td>
<td>Sally Tateen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William La Russo</td>
<td>1009 N Yale Full 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Guth</td>
<td>1025 N Yale Ave Full 92831</td>
<td>Christine Guth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Konschuh</td>
<td>1030 N. Yale Ave, Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory B. Culley</td>
<td>1024 N. Yale Ave, Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusther McLanughlin</td>
<td>1018 N. Yale Ave Fullerton</td>
<td>Eusther McLanughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Vincent Campos</td>
<td>1000 S Maiden Ave Fullerton</td>
<td>Andrew Vincent Campos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Way</td>
<td>1006 N Yale Ave Fullerton</td>
<td>April Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan J. Harmston</td>
<td>1000 N. Yale Ave, Fullerton</td>
<td>Susan J. Harmston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."

- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Wahler</td>
<td>1008 E. Nutwood Ave.</td>
<td>Pauline Wahler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Welch</td>
<td>504 Princeton Circle East</td>
<td>Cathy Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Welch</td>
<td>504 Princeton Circle East</td>
<td>David Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Burns</td>
<td>640 Princeton Circle East</td>
<td>Anna Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Marek</td>
<td>632 Princeton Cir. East</td>
<td>Peggy Marek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Dennis</td>
<td>636 Princeton Cir. East</td>
<td>Matthew Dennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyne Scott</td>
<td>640 Princeton Circle East</td>
<td>Carolyne Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Pilla</td>
<td>517 N. Yale Ave.</td>
<td>Jennifer Pilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Caruso</td>
<td>509 N. Yale</td>
<td>Caruso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Maas</td>
<td>516 Yale</td>
<td>Maas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

• The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

• WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor’s quality of life for decades. Now they say, they “want our input.”

• This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ortiz</td>
<td>532 N. Yale Ave. 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Ortiz</td>
<td>532 N. Yale Ave 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyatt Barmore</td>
<td>548 N. Yale Ave 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Riga</td>
<td>604 N. Yale Ave 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elke Rodas</td>
<td>621 N. Yale Ave 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores McCluskey</td>
<td>625 N. Yale Ave 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jael Russell</td>
<td>1007 N. Kroger Ave. 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Rough</td>
<td>629 N. Yale Ave. 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Muir</td>
<td>633 N. Yale Ave 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Molina</td>
<td>1001 N. Yale Ave. 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARY L. SHEPHERD</td>
<td>539 N. LINCOLN AVE. FULLERTON</td>
<td>Mary Oliphant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKO KAIHARA</td>
<td>538 N. LINCOLN AVE FULL</td>
<td>Mike K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J G MURZ</td>
<td>527 N. LINCOLN AVE</td>
<td>J G MURZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Murz</td>
<td>527 N Lincoln Ave</td>
<td>Michele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA E. YATES</td>
<td>521 N. LINCOLN</td>
<td>Diana E Yates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie M. YATES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonnie M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Matsuyama</td>
<td>548 N. STANFORD AVE. FULLERTON</td>
<td>Linda Matsuyama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIFFANY KILCUP</td>
<td>517 N. LINCOLN FULLERTON</td>
<td>Tiffany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE JOHNSON</td>
<td>524 N. LINCOLN AVE</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Marquie</td>
<td>548 N. Lincoln Ave.</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Miller</td>
<td>641 Dorothy Dr</td>
<td>Lorraine Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Schell</td>
<td>1130 Shepard Dr</td>
<td>Ralph Schell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacional Davenport</td>
<td>1272 Mira Mar Dr</td>
<td>Nacional Davenport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe McBryan</td>
<td>1330 N Lincoln Falls</td>
<td>Joe McBryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Hickey</td>
<td>1621 Hollydale Fullerton CA 92831</td>
<td>Diane Hickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Van Horn</td>
<td>575 N. Lincoln Ave Fullerton CA 92831</td>
<td>Robert Van Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald E. Vesta</td>
<td>563 N. Lincoln Ave Fullerton CA 92831</td>
<td>Donald E. Vesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bond</td>
<td>551 N. Lincoln</td>
<td>Robert Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Tanner</td>
<td>551 N. Lincoln</td>
<td>Herb Tanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Peterson</td>
<td>539 N. Lincoln</td>
<td>Edna Peterson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It’s a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor’s quality of life for decades. Now they say, they “want our input.”
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name                      Address                      Signature
Matt Buchanan             554 North Lincoln Ave, Fullerton  Matt Buchanan
Kean Fulton               554 N. Lincoln Ave, Fullerton Ken H. Fullerton
Carolyn J.                554 N. Lincoln Ave, Fullerton Carolyn J.
Rolando de la Rampa       572 N. Lincoln Ave, Fullerton Fullerton
Donald L. Whitehead       566 N. Lincoln Ave, Fullerton Donald L. Whitehead
Jonathan Whitehead        566 N. Lincoln Ave, Fullerton Jonathan Whitehead
Lois E. Krippenstein      569 N. Lincoln Ave, Fullerton Lois E. Krippenstein
Rebecca Montes de Oca     578 N. Lincoln Ave, Fullerton Rebecca Montes de Oca
Randall Youngblood         577 N. Lincoln Ave, Fullerton Randall Youngblood
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda L. Smith</td>
<td>624 Princeton Dr. East</td>
<td>Linda L. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Seaman</td>
<td>110 N. Correll Ave</td>
<td>Tracey Seaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Seaman</td>
<td>110 N. Correll Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Ike</td>
<td>649 Dorothy Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Hand</td>
<td>718 Dorothy Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil Talbot</td>
<td>641 N. Yale Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jackson</td>
<td>659 E. Fern Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Marshall</td>
<td>515 Dorothy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Pater</td>
<td>513 Princeton Cir. W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desi G. Amant</td>
<td>621 Princeton Cir. W</td>
<td>Desi G. Amant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

- Proposed stadium will be **TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!**

- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will **DOUBLE IMPACT** the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

- **WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS** that a new stadium will bring.

- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

- This is our input: **WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!**

We the undersigned **OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE** including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Phom</td>
<td>6254 Princeton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Nuyama</td>
<td>6241 Princeton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Steedman</td>
<td>6271 Princeton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chupinsky</td>
<td>908 Nutwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale &amp; Mark Lohn</td>
<td>1000 Nutwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Starr &amp;</td>
<td>1061 Glenhaven Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Starr &amp;</td>
<td>1061 Glenhaven Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Ramezani</td>
<td>1014 Nutwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Brauch &amp; Lang</td>
<td>1024 Nutwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reha Lewis</td>
<td>1025 Nutwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

• The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

• WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."

• This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name                      Address                      Signature
Damion Planchon         501 Princeton Cir W.                      
Ernest Zingg             600 Dorothy Haas                      
Makoto Tanimoto          624 Linanna Ave                       
Jeff Norman              533 Princeton Cir E                      
Savannah Johnson         600 Princeton Cir E                      
AMES HUMAN               645 N. Yale Ave                          
Suzanne Mihaly                  601 N. Yale Ave                        
William Frink              812 Nutwood Ave                         
Alicia Jimenez           900 Nutwood Ave                       
IRENE KUZIEMKOWSKI        900 Nutwood Ave                        

PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor’s quality of life for decades. Now they say, they “want our input.”
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name

Lindsey Flibbert
Mike Harding
Emiliano Alvarez
Dana Clark
Laura Rajda
Lisa Matos Wojnicki
Jane Sylvester
Jeff Fraud
Alan Poppoff
Francis Pierce

Address

1109 E. Nutwood
1108 Nutwood Ave
1104 Nutwood Ave
1116 E. Nutwood Ave
831 Raymond Ave
808 Nutwood Ave
804 Nutwood
521 N. Yale
524 N. Yale
513 N. Yale

Signature
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a **4,500-seat stadium** with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be **TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!**
- The estimated **$3 million stadium would impact 1,000s** of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be **on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium** and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a **WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.**
- **WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS** that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: **WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!**

We the undersigned **OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE** including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imogene Surfer</td>
<td>530 N. Lincoln Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Bauserman</td>
<td>536 N. Lincoln Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Bauserman</td>
<td>536 N. Lincoln Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Duke</td>
<td>601 N. Lincoln Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Duke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Mathes</td>
<td>612 N. Cornell Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benita Balbridge</td>
<td>561 N. Cornell Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Shean</td>
<td>1112 E. Bemidji Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Newman</td>
<td>535 N. Cornell Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Rytel</td>
<td>519 N. Cornell Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

• The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

• WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."

• This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kris Rumpah</td>
<td>513 N. Cornell</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Salmann</td>
<td>507 N. Cornell</td>
<td>Chuck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert WeDemeyer</td>
<td>514 N. Cornell</td>
<td>Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Williams</td>
<td>508 N. Cornell Ave</td>
<td>Dana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>600 N. Lincoln</td>
<td>Steven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lil Daillor</td>
<td>750 Harmony Ln</td>
<td>Lil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Mueller</td>
<td>730 Harmony Ln</td>
<td>Frances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Lillie</td>
<td>1217 Langirio Dr.</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivien C. Ide</td>
<td>609 Dorothy Lane</td>
<td>Vivien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Hernandez</td>
<td>601 Dorothy Ln</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

• The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It’s a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

• WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor’s quality of life for decades. Now they say, they “want our input.”

• This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name                      Address                      Signature

Philippe de Moraes        541 Princeton Circle West
Anita Sandlin              509 Princeton Cir. West
Melinda Kruzen             507 Princeton Cir. East
Daniele Torres             500 Princeton Circle E
Edward Napravnik           516 Princeton Cir. W
Edward Napravnik           516 Princeton Cir. W
Sara Dymul                524 Princeton Cir. West
Scott Hughes               "                      "
Hedley Urban               "                      "
Shana Dymul               "                      "

PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

• The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

• WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

• This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Hernandez</td>
<td>801 E Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alya Nisbet</td>
<td>805 Nutwood Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Hernandez</td>
<td>901 E Nantico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallen Vihnes</td>
<td>1021 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lewis</td>
<td>1025 Nantico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Kibbee</td>
<td>1109 Alton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Calvy</td>
<td>619 E Fern Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Benini</td>
<td>601 E Fern Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Jersy</td>
<td>608 Docking Ln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Semple</td>
<td>1203 Faireview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name                      Address                     Signature

David Hernandez 809 Nutwood Ave  
Jim Crum 817 Nutwood  
Steven Beers 1009 E Nutwood Ave Steven Beers  
Wendy Castillo 1101 Nutwood Ave  
Debbie Dunn 600 N. Cornell Ave  
Arlene Seibert 600 N. Cornell Ave  
Donna Lawrence 520 N. Cornell Ave Donna Lawrence  
Carrie Ormond 543 N Cornell Ave  
Carol Mlodzik 664 Dorothy Lane  
Ann Mlodzik 664 Dorothy Lane  
We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

• The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

• WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

• This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name | Address | Signature
---|---|---
Tiffany Jones | 801 E Union Ave Fullerton | 
David Barcenas | 813 E Union Ave Fullerton | 
Tiffany Winfield | 817 E Union Ave Fullerton | 
Kenneth Hoskinson | 817 E Union Ave Fullerton | 
Jeff Tanner | 905 E Union Ave Fullerton | 
David Quiroz | 909 E Union Ave Fullerton | 
Kiran Shah | 913 East Union Ave Fullerton | 
Nicholas Nikoladis | 1013 E Union Ave Fullerton | 
Edwin O. Henderson | 1017 E Union Ave Fullerton | 
Elizabeth Wurster | 1021 E Union Ave Fullerton | 
Catherine M. Capps | 1025 E Union Ave Fullerton | 
Shannon Thompson | 1105 E Union Ave Fullerton CA 92831 |
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

This is our input: WE DO NOT WANT TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name          Address                      Signature
---           ----------------------------------
Paul Murphy   800 E Union Ave Fullerton    Paul Murphy
Mark Bazan    912 E Union Ave Fullerton    Mark Bazan
Irisa Oleksyn 912 E Union Ave Fullerton    Irisa Oleksyn
Ethan McNicol 1004 E Union Ave            Ethan McNicol
Lucy Torres   1016 E Union Ave Fullerton   Lucy Torres
Rigo Martinez 1020 East Union Ave Fullerton Rigo Martinez
MikeKVons     1024 E Union Ave Fullerton   MikeKVons
Lelina McNicol 1024 E Union Ave Fullerton  Lelina McNicol
Joanne Lyon   904 E Union Ave Fullerton    Joanne Lyon
David Earick  908 E Union Ave Fullerton    David Earick
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Dearman</td>
<td>6311 Princeton Cirl. W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger Moriarty</td>
<td>624 Princeton Cirl. W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Bayer</td>
<td>910 E. Glenwood Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therese Ralston</td>
<td>916 E. Glenwood Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester Welch</td>
<td>908 E. Glenwood Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Mendosa</td>
<td>916 E. Glenwood Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Lawrence</td>
<td>1000 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Virginia James</td>
<td>1004 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Lacenda</td>
<td>606 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Coakley</td>
<td>1100 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

**ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!**

- Fullerton College wants to build a **4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system** next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be **TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009**!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will **DOUBLE IMPACT** the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- **WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS** that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- **This is our input**: **WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!**

We the undersigned **OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE** including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jay &amp; Lori Zeller</td>
<td>633 Princeton Cir W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Viktoria Phillips</td>
<td>620 Princeton Cir W</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon and Desi St. Amand</td>
<td>621 Princeton Cir W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Coakley</td>
<td>1100 E. Glenwood Ave, Fullerton CA 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Heringer</td>
<td>1106 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Doyle</td>
<td>1118 E. Glenwood Ave, Fullerton CA 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Niemann</td>
<td>124 E. Glenwood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hernandez</td>
<td>1007 N Raymond Ave, Fullerton CA 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanca Botello</td>
<td>1035 N. Raymond Ave, Fullerton CA 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Green</td>
<td>1244 T. Pasadena Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Carter</td>
<td>1119 N. Raymond Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lloyd</td>
<td>925 N Raymond Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Riss</td>
<td>925 N Raymond Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Coopers</td>
<td>913 N Raymond Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilsa Rivera</td>
<td>905 N. Raymond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm Scharf</td>
<td>1117 Nutwood Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Conveyen</td>
<td>1105 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedi Goff</td>
<td>977 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Leshner</td>
<td>909 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana Leshner</td>
<td>909 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name                  Address                   Signature
Amber Sutter          905 E. Nutwood Fullerton 92831
Urminta Lowe           1830N Princeton Fullerton 92831
Kendis Nelson         416 Dorothy Dr. Fullerton 92831
Thomas A. Nelson       416 Dorothy Dr. Fullerton 92831
Brittany Lim          412 Dorothy Dr. Fullerton CA 92831
James Fite             414 Dorothy Dr. Fullerton CA 92831
Vicki Hatter           1132 Sheppard Dr. Fullerton CA 92831
Michael Savage         1125 Sheppard Dr. Fullerton CA 92831
Alma Hall Bean         1135 N. Sheppard Dr 92831
Robert Dildine         504 Cannon 92831
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name | Address | Signature
--- | --- | ---
Nate Chen | 412 Cannon Ln. | Nate Chen
Dave Engels | 1200 Juanne | Dave Engels
DALE MERRILL | 1217 LUANNE | Dale Merrill
SARI STARRETT | 408 VIRGINIA | Sari Starrett
Jeannine Pooler | 1249 Luanne Ave | Jeannine Pooler
ERIC WALTERS | 1247 LUANNE AVE | Eric Walters
Matt Sivarapar | 1246 Luanne Ave | Matt Sivarapar
Deborah Richly | 1233 Luanne Ave | Deborah Richly
WILSON PLANK | 1223 Luanne Ave | Wilson Plank
CLAUD VAN DORN | 1221 Luanne Ave | Claud Van Dorn
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Crawford</td>
<td>1215 Locarno Ave</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E. DeLellis</td>
<td>408 Cannon Lane</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinze Buck</td>
<td>106 Cannon Lane</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Sims</td>
<td>1801 E. Katella Ave #3021</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Barson</td>
<td>642 E. Fern Dr</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Yu-Chih</td>
<td>609 N. Yale Ave</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Lewis</td>
<td>1108 E. Union Ave</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosario Vera</td>
<td>1116 E. Union Ave</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viridiana Mardano</td>
<td>1113 E. Union Ave</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavelle Scott</td>
<td>1101 E. Union Ave</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned oppose a new stadium at Fullerton College including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Moore</td>
<td>900 E. Union Ave, 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Kibbel</td>
<td>1048 E. Camden Ave, 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas S. Norian</td>
<td>816 E. Union Ave, 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Carter</td>
<td>1119 N Raymond Ave, 92831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Tapayeva</td>
<td>865 E Union Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mejia</td>
<td>404 Cannon Ln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald McDaniels</td>
<td>404 Cannon Ln, H. H. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Clauke</td>
<td>313 Cannon Ln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Pennington</td>
<td>300 Cannon Ln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanita Nandhanu</td>
<td>1232 Frances Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Freeman</td>
<td>1236 Frances Fuller Rd 9878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayata Zichi</td>
<td>1244 Francis Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorian Hunter</td>
<td>400 Virginia Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon St. Jams</td>
<td>1239 Frances Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Dugger</td>
<td>518 Harmony Pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. D. Dugger</td>
<td>1233 Frances Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Dugger</td>
<td>1227 Frances Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Bohlman</td>
<td>1223 Frances Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Rogers</td>
<td>1203 Lorraine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Stephens</td>
<td>556 N. Cornell Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth McKeehan</td>
<td>1031 E Brookdale Pl.</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Stephens</td>
<td>S St. N. Cornell Ave.</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Gunn</td>
<td>1037 E. Brookdale Pl.</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Schade</td>
<td>1043 E. Brookdale Pl.</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lee</td>
<td>1049 E. Brookdale Pl.</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Nishi</td>
<td>1040 E. Brookdale Pl.</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Smith</td>
<td>5896 Olivia Dr. B. Pk, CA 90620</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celia Common</td>
<td>2001 Torrey Pines Ct La Habra Ca</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay Colmar</td>
<td>708 S. Orange Ave. 92833</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Woodhull</td>
<td>1519 Harmony Pk. 92831</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a **4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system** next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be **TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009**!

• The estimated **$3 million stadium would impact 1,000s** of people who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be **on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium** and will **DOUBLE IMPACT** the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

• **WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS** that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."

• **This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!**

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russ Marolf</td>
<td>1012 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy Gonzales</td>
<td>1025 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Jones</td>
<td>1013 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady Jones</td>
<td>1013 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Thompson</td>
<td>1112 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabor Villavicencio</td>
<td>825 N. Raymond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kenny</td>
<td>801 Nutwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Snowden</td>
<td>804 S. Lincoln Ave. Fullerton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne Compton</td>
<td>808 N. Glenwood Ave. Fullerton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayleen Beatty</td>
<td>1100 N. Lincoln Ave. Fullerton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Perello</td>
<td>708 S. Orange, Fullerton</td>
<td>Vincent Perello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Lomheim</td>
<td>435 N. Basque Ave, Bruce Lomheim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen H. Talbot</td>
<td>1780 N. Community Dr Apt 201, Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>Doreen Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Smith</td>
<td>2631 Beacon St, Fullerton</td>
<td>Edward Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Kennedy</td>
<td>4910 Florence Circle, Fullerton</td>
<td>Barry Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Starks</td>
<td>870 Morningside Dr, G 411, Fullerton</td>
<td>Alice Starks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen C. Wroblewski</td>
<td>9032 Leisure Dr, Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>Ellen C. Wroblewski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elwood Berry</td>
<td>118 Mencap Way 1A, Placentia, Fullerton</td>
<td>Elwood Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pear Moore</td>
<td>530 Princeton Circle East, Fullerton</td>
<td>Pear Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun Kim</td>
<td>604 Princeton Cir, W. Fullerton</td>
<td>Jun Kim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, they "want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name          Address          Signature

Sandra Copper  1001 N. Katzenjammer, Fullerton        
Kelsey Courtwright  1717 Nutwood Ave, Fullerton       
                    1017 N. Katzenjammer, Fullerton  
Francesca Vega  401 N. Raymond                      
Bradley N. Hoyt  1019 N. Raymond Ave, Bradley Hoyt     
Linda K. Hoyt  1019 N. Raymond Ave                    
Dennis, DiPietro  1112 E. Glenwood Ave, Dennis DiPietro  
Mary McNamara  1036 E. Glenwood Ave, Mary McNamara   
Ruth Wallis  1016 Glenwood Ave, Ruth Wallis             
Marc Nordstrom  1005 Glenwood Ave, Marc Nordstrom
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

• The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

• WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

• This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name                       Address                        Signature
David Ramzin               912 E. Glenwood Ave                   
Beau Matthew               672 Dorothy Lane                      
Danielle Betancourt        710 Harmony Ave                         
A. H. Wightman             700 Harmony In                          
Rex Lawrence               711 Harmony In                          
Bamaddion Hassan           545 N. Lincoln                         
Charlene Jones             601 N. Cornell Ave                      
Pamela Toy                 544 N. Cornell Ave                       
Robert Kluge               537 N Cornell Ave Fullerton        
Sam Gadow                  513 Stanford Ave                        

PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!

- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.

- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.

- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name | Address | Signature
---|---|---
Helen E. Woo | 519 Stanford | Helen E. Woo
Mark Kangas | 512 Stanford | Mark Kangas
Richard L. Leitner | 604 N. Yale Ave | Richard L. Leitner


PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

- Fullerton College wants to build a 4,500-seat stadium with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.
- Proposed stadium will be TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!
- The estimated $3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people who live in the area.
- The proposed stadium would be on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium and will DOUBLE IMPACT the area. It's a WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.
- WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS that a new stadium will bring.
- The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."
- This is our input: WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!

We the undersigned OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

Name                   Address                       Signature
Samuel Perez          1537 E Harmony Ln            
Joe Deidrunke         760 Harmonis Ln            John Doe
Don Hutch             900 E Alwood               John Doe
J.R. & Samoe Lewis    526 N. CORNELL AVE.      John Doe
Daniel Mackey         612 N. Lincoln Ave         
Carlos Alarcon        3361 RAYMOND ST AB Code
David Morgan          131-133- YALE AVE Fullerton    
Sean Tepeado          524 Stanford Ave. Fullerton
Gene Duncan           740 Harmony Ln. Fullerton
PETITION AGAINST A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!

• Fullerton College wants to build a **4,500-seat stadium** with six 100-foot lighting structures, plus a megawatt sound system next to our residential neighborhoods.

• Proposed stadium will be **TWICE AS LARGE AS THE STADIUM WE DEFEATED IN 2009!**

• The estimated **$3 million stadium would impact 1,000s of people** who live in the area.

• The proposed stadium would be **on the block next to the existing FUHS 6,700-seat stadium** and will **DOUBLE IMPACT** the area. It's a **WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.**

• **WE DO NOT WANT ALL THE TRAFFIC, NOISE, LIGHT, GLARE, VIBRATION, TRASH AND OTHER IMPACTS** that a new stadium will bring.

• The college has disregarded the neighbor's quality of life for decades. Now they say, "they want our input."

• This is our input: **WE DO NOT WISH TO SUFFER! ENOUGH is ENOUGH!!**

We the undersigned **OPPOSE A NEW STADIUM AT FULLERTON COLLEGE** including the addition of seating, lighting, and a sound system to Sherbeck Field. We join with the Fullerton College Neighborhood Action Council to protect our neighborhoods!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Gess</td>
<td>534 Dorothy Drive</td>
<td>G. Gess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcey Mayernik</td>
<td>1314 Luanne Ave</td>
<td>Darcey Mayernik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>