



CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: JOEL ROJAS, AICP, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

DATE: FEBRUARY 16, 2010

SUBJECT: MARYMOUNT COLLEGE FACILITIES EXPANSION PROJECT:
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 9 – REVISION “E”, GRADING
PERMIT, VARIANCE, MINOR EXCEPTION PERMIT, MASTER SIGN
PERMIT AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (CASE NO.
ZON2003-00317) / 30800 PALOS VERDES DRIVE EAST –
APPENDIX D TO THE FINAL EIR

REVIEWED: CAROLYN LEHR, CITY MANAGER

Project Manager: Ara Michael Mihranian, AICP, Principal Planner

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct a public meeting for the sole purpose of obtaining public comments on the Marymount College Facilities Expansion project Appendix D to the Final Environmental Impact Report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the onset of the City Council appeal hearing on the proposed Marymount College Expansion Project late last year, the College requested that the Council consider, as part of the appeal hearing, a change to its academic program to include a Bachelor of Arts degree program in addition to its Associates of Arts degree program. In light of this request, the City Council directed Staff to analyze the potential environmental impacts in connection with the proposed academic program change, as well as the athletic field design alternatives proposed by the City Council and the College to address safety concerns with errant balls entering the public roadway.

This additional analysis has been completed, in a new Appendix D. The 45-day public comment period on Appendix D concludes on March 8, 2010. Tonight's meeting is intended to provide the public with an added opportunity to provide verbal comments solely on the analysis contained in the new Draft Appendix D. The public hearing to consider the appeal of the Planning Commission's decision on the proposed Marymount College Project along with the project changes identified in new Appendix D are tentatively scheduled to

occur in early April 2010.

BACKGROUND

In advance of the September 12, 2009 appeal hearing related to the Planning Commission's decision on the proposed Marymount College Expansion Project, the College announced to the City its desire to offer a Bachelor of Arts degree program (BA Program) in addition to its existing Associates of Arts degree program (AA Program). At the September 12, 2009 public hearing, the College requested that the City Council consider the potential change in programming while considering the appeal of the Planning Commission's decision.

Based on the discussions at the September 12, 2009 meeting, the City Council directed Staff to prepare the necessary environmental studies for the BA degree program proposed by the College to assess if new environmental impacts or an increase in the severity to previously identified impacts may occur. In response to safety concerns related to errant balls leaving the proposed athletic field, the Council also directed Staff to perform additional analysis of the potential environmental impacts related to Athletic Field alternatives proposed by the College and the City Council. As such, the City's environmental consultants for this project, RBF Consulting, were asked to prepare the necessary environmental studies as an appendix to the Final EIR.

The potential impacts resulting from the proposed changes discussed on September 12, 2009 (implementation of the proposed BA Program, as well as Athletic Field Alternatives) have been evaluated in a new Appendix D of the Final EIR. As directed by the City Council, Appendix D was released on January 21, 2010 for a 45-day public comment period. The public comment period will conclude on March 8, 2010. As an added opportunity for the public to provide comments on the Draft Appendix D, the City Council is being asked tonight to conduct a meeting to solely hear oral comments on the analysis contained in new Appendix D. Written comments can be submitted until the end of the comment period, March 8, 2010.

PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following is a summary of the proposed project revisions resulting from the September 12th City Council meeting.

Bachelor of Arts Degree Program

The College proposes to offer a Bachelor of Arts Degree Program (BA Program), in addition to its existing Associates of Arts Degree Program (AA Program), at the existing campus. The College has an application pending with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) for accreditation to offer BA degrees in three areas of study: Business, Liberal Arts, and Media Studies. If accreditation is timely granted by the WASC, the College would like to begin offering courses to satisfy requirements for Bachelor's of Arts degrees in the fall of 2010.

**MARYMOUNT COLLEGE FACILITIES EXPANSION PROJECT – DRAFT APPENDIX D
CITY COUNCIL MEMO – FEBRUARY 16, 2010**

Marymount College has offered BA Degrees and MA degrees on its campus through its partnership with Webster University (which is accredited to offer such degrees), as part of its “Non-Traditional Program” for over a decade. The College’s decision to seek its own accreditation to offer a Bachelor’s degree as part of its Traditional Degree Program is intended to meet the needs of its students. As part of its “Traditional Degree Program” Marymount College currently offers and would continue to offer Associates of Arts and Associates of Science degrees in over 30 areas of study.

The following table outlines the degrees currently offered and those that would be offered with the BA Program.

Existing	Project With Bachelor of Arts Program
Traditional Degree Program	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Associates in Arts and Sciences (over 30 areas of study) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Associates in Arts and Sciences (over 30 areas of study) ▪ Bachelors of Arts (3 areas of study – Business, Liberal Arts, Media)
Non-Traditional Degree Program	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Associates in Arts and Sciences ▪ Bachelors in Arts and Sciences (2 areas of study) ▪ Masters (2 areas of study) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bachelors in Arts and Sciences (over 2 areas of study) Masters (2 areas of study)

Student Enrollment

The Proposed BA Degree program will not involve changes to the 793 student enrollment cap analyzed in the FEIR. Additionally, no changes to the College’s Weekend/Continuing Education Program limit of 150 students, as set forth in the 2009 adopted Planning Commission’s Conditions of Approval, are proposed. In terms of the Traditional and Non-Traditional degree programs, the College is not proposing any change in the maximum permitted student enrollment for its Traditional Degree Program from the numbers studied in the EIR. The Non-Traditional Degree Program would be limited to 150 students as shown in the following Table

Existing	Project With Bachelor of Arts Program
Traditional Degree Program	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 793 Students (AA Program) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 793 Students (combined AA and BA Programs)
Non-Traditional Degree Program	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unrestricted Enrollment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 150 Students

The College forecasts the following enrollment levels beginning in Fall 2010, as outlined in the table on the following page, assuming accreditation approval is granted by WASC for the three Bachelor’s degree programs:

**Table 2-3
 Estimated Student Enrollment According to Area of Study**

Year	Business	Liberal Arts	Media Studies	Total 4-Year Enrollment
Fall 2010	Juniors: 17	Juniors: 10	Juniors: 18	45
Fall 2011	Juniors/Seniors: 32	Juniors/Seniors: 19	Juniors/Seniors: 34	85
Fall 2012	Juniors/Seniors: 34	Juniors/Seniors: 20	Juniors/Seniors: 36	90

According to the College, the data presented in the table above is an estimate, since the College itself has not offered Bachelor’s degrees in recent years, and has no information or experience upon which it can predict enrollment in these programs. However, the College anticipates that the majority of students seeking Bachelor’s degrees would be existing enrolled students that desire to remain at Marymount, instead of transferring to another institution, which is the only option currently available to its Traditional Degree Program students. As such, enrollment in and growth of the Bachelor’s degree programs would be phased in over time. At this time, based on the above projections, it is estimated that by 2013, Marymount would have fewer than 100 upper division students pursuing a Bachelor’s degree. This estimate would represent less than 15 percent of its current maximum permitted Traditional Degree Program enrollment.

For purposes of the environmental analysis, the maximum enrollment considered for the BA Program is 250 students. Since the College’s overall Traditional Degree Program of 793 students is not proposed to change, the maximum permitted enrollment for the AA Program would be reduced each term by the current BA Program enrollment so that the combined enrollment in the AA Program and BA Program would not exceed 793 students. To summarize, the maximum enrollment for the AA Program is 793 students minus current BA Program students.

It is noted that because one of the College’s underlying goals is to retain students for the period necessary to complete a Bachelor’s degree, student enrollment may become more evenly distributed by class year at some undefined point in the future. Admission for all first and second year students represents admission to the College, and not to any particular degree program. This would not change with the addition of BA Programs. Students electing to stay at the College for a Bachelor’s degree would apply separately for admission in their second year as would any third or fourth year transfer students. The College’s first Bachelor’s degrees would not be conferred until Spring 2012 at the earliest. The annual graduation ceremony awarding Bachelor’s degrees would be combined with the ceremony awarding Associate’s degree resulting in one annual graduation ceremony.

Athletic Field Alternatives

The proposed Athletic Field Alternatives are intended to address concerns, among other things, regarding the potential for errant field balls entering Palos Verdes Drive East and potential impacts to neighboring properties. The City Council directed Staff to study the following two alternatives:

Athletic Field Alternative No. D-1 – This Alternative was directed by the City Council and consists of the existing athletic field remaining in its current location but enlarged to regulation size. The athletic field would be constructed at the finished grade of the proposed parking lot analyzed in Appendix A of the FEIR, therefore, no additional grading would be required; refer to Exhibit 2-4. As with the Project analyzed in Appendix A of the FEIR, a 42-inch high wrought iron fence embedded within a 42-inch high landscape hedge and a 20-foot high retractable net are proposed along the athletic field's perimeter, in order to contain errant field balls from entering the parking lot and neighboring properties. The fence would be shielded from view by the proposed landscaping. Additionally, in order to accommodate the construction of an enlarged athletic field in its existing location, the proposed parking lot would have to be modified. Specifically, approximately 90 parking spaces would be relocated from the eastern parking lot to a new parking lot located west of the proposed tennis courts. The tennis courts would be relocated south by approximately 15-feet to accommodate a driveway to the proposed parking area. It is anticipated that some minor grading would be required to level the site to accommodate the parking lot, and that parking lot lighting and landscape planters would be installed to resemble the proposed parking throughout the campus.

Athletic Field Alternative No. D-2 – This Alternative was proposed by the College and consists of the athletic field moving approximately 60-feet to the east (closer to the location of the proposed tennis courts) and two of the four tennis courts would be relocated to the west of the athletic field. No change to the size of the field is proposed. The two westerly tennis courts would serve as a buffer between the curvature of Palos Verdes Drive East and the athletic field to minimize the potential for errant balls to enter the roadway. The playing surface of the athletic field is designed with slope banks ranging from 20 to 34 percent (i.e., 20 percent slope for the area west of the field, 28 percent slope for the area north of the field, and 34 percent slope for the area south of the field) similar to the athletic field analyzed in Appendix A of the FEIR. As with the Project analyzed in Appendix A of the FEIR, a 42-inch high wrought iron fence embedded within a 42-inch high landscape hedge is proposed along Palos Verdes Drive East, set back 3.0-feet from the property line, in order to contain errant field balls from entering Palos Verdes Drive East. The fence would be shielded from view by the proposed landscaping. As a result of the athletic field's relocation, as well as the additional buffering provided by the northerly tennis courts (see discussion below), a retractable net would not be required.

The tennis courts have been reconfigured, placing two on either side of the athletic field. The northerly tennis courts would serve as an additional buffer between the athletic field and Palos Verdes Drive East and containing errant field balls. The tennis courts would be enclosed with a retaining wall, fence or combination wall/fence that would not exceed a maximum height of 10-feet, as measured from the lowest adjacent grade on the side of the tennis courts. The size and number of the courts remain unchanged (four courts). Further, lighting of the tennis courts is not proposed. The proposed chain link fence with a green or black mesh would be 80 percent open to light and air.

DISCUSSION

The following discussion summarizes the environmental impacts analyzed in Appendix D of the Final EIR. For detailed information, refer to Appendix D that was provided to the City Council under a separate cover on January 27, 2010. According to the analysis contained in Appendix D, the proposed project modifications would not result in environmental effects not previously considered in the Final EIR and Appendix A, with the exception of the issue areas outlined on the following page. These issue areas involve modifications to the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR May 2009 Appendix A (as certified by the Planning Commission), or new mitigation measures intended to minimize the potential environmental impacts to a level of insignificance for the proposed project revision. As such, the proposed revisions to the Project would result in less than significant impacts with the incorporated mitigation measures for the issue areas below.

BA Degree Program

- Land Use and Relevant Planning (consistency with the RPVMC); and
- Traffic and Circulation (traffic generation and parking capacity).

Athletic Field Alternative D-1

- Geology and Soils (erosion and unstable geologic units); and
- Hydrology and Water Quality (drainage).

Athletic Field Alternative D-2

- Hydrology and Water Quality (drainage).

For Athletic Field Alternative D-1, project implementation would result in significant and unavoidable impacts involving Aesthetics/Light and Glare (long-term visual character of western portion of the site) in connection with the new parking lot located on the western portion of the campus. As for Athletic Field Alternative D-2, the environmental impacts to the topic area listed above can be mitigated to a less than significant level with the adoption of the recommended mitigation measures.

The proposed mitigation measures, intended to address the environmental impacts in connection with the proposed project revisions, are listed in Section 4.0 of Appendix D, Inventory of Mitigation Measures. The mitigation measures are organized into the following three sections:

- Bachelor of Arts Degree Program
- Athletic Field Alternative D-1
- Athletic Field Alternative D-2

The mitigation measures found in Appendix D augment the final mitigation measures identified in Appendix A of the Final EIR. Previously identified mitigation measures have been updated with new, modified or deleted text which is shown in a redline format (~~strikeout~~ for deleted text underlined for added text). It should be pointed out that each of the three sections above contains a comprehensive list of the mitigation measures for the proposed project including the respective section. In other words there are three separate

sets of mitigation measures. Based on the Council's decision on the proposed project revisions, the three sets of mitigation measures found in Section 4.0 of Appendix D will be combined into one comprehensive list as part of the Final Appendix D.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Notice of Availability of Appendix D

Pursuant to CEQA guidelines, a Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft Appendix D was sent to property owners within a 500-foot radius of the project site, interested parties (including adjacent HOA's), agencies and organizations, and list-serve subscribers. Additionally, the NOA was published in the *Peninsula News* on Thursday, January 21, 2010. The NOA included the dates of the comment period on the Draft Appendix D (January 21, 2010 through March 8, 2010) and announced the date, time and location of the City Council public meeting to receive comments on the Draft Appendix D.

The Draft EIR Appendix D was posted on the City's website for public review on January 21, 2010. Additionally, the document was made available during regular business hours at the following locations:

- City of Rancho Palos Verdes, Department of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement, 30940 Hawthorne Boulevard, Rancho Palos Verdes, California 90275
- Palos Verdes Peninsula Library, Miraleste Branch, 29089 Palos Verdes Drive East, Rancho Palos Verdes, California 90275
- Palos Verdes Palos Verdes Main Library, 650 Deep Valley Drive, Rolling Hills Estates, California 90274
- Fred Hesse Park Community Building, 29301 Hawthorne Blvd., Rancho Palos Verdes, California 90275

Correspondence Received

At this time, Staff has received no comment letters from the public on Draft Appendix D. Staff will provide all comment letters received prior, during and after the February 16th meeting to the City's EIR consultant for responses. Ultimately, all comment letters will be presented to the City Council when the appeal hearing resumes for the project.

Previously Transmitted Background Information

As a reminder, background information, such as the Planning Commission Staff Reports, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, public comments (including late correspondence), environmental documents (including the Final EIR Appendix A), and other relevant documents relating to the proposed applications were transmitted to the City Council, under separate cover, in advance of the August 18, 2009 meeting. The background information was assembled in three project binders titled Marymount College 2009 City Council Appeal Binder. Each binder includes an Index of Documents. This information has also been provided to the newly elected Councilmen. The background information

contained in the binders is also available on the City's website, under the August 18, 2009 City Council heading on the Marymount College page.

Allocated Time to Speak

This is not a public hearing where the merits of the project are being considered. This meeting solely serves as an opportunity to allow individuals to provide verbal comments on new Appendix D which will then be provided to the EIR Consultant to respond to. As such, each speaker should be allocated the usual three minutes to speak.

Grading Plans

At the September 12th meeting, a concern was raised by the public that the grading plans do not accurately reflect the amount of earth movement needed to accommodate the construction of the project approved by the Planning Commission (that is currently under appeal). Specifically, concerns were expressed with the quantity of the requested remedial grading presented to the Commission during its deliberations on the project. Staff has requested, and the College has agreed, to provide the City with grading plans that have been updated to reflect the Commission's decision. Moreover, the College will be providing the City with a break-down of the quantities of earth movement for the areas under the proposed building footprint and the areas outside the building footprint, as requested in the City's grading applications. This information will be provided to the Council at the time the appeal hearing is resumed.

City Council Appeal Hearing

The Council's appeal hearing of the entitlements approved by the Planning Commission was put on hold on September 12, 2009. The reason was to allow Staff time to prepare the required environmental documents for the proposed project revisions to be considered by the Council at the same time as the overall project. At this time, Staff anticipates that the appeal hearing will resume at the Council's April 6, 2010 meeting. Once this is confirmed, a public notice announcing the meeting date, time and location will be sent to property owners within a 500-foot radius of the project site, interested parties (including adjacent HOA's), agencies and organizations, and list-serve subscribers.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Appendix D – Transmitted to the Council under separate cover
- September 12, 2009 City Council Meeting Minutes

**MINUTES
RANCHO PALOS VERDES CITY COUNCIL
ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING
SEPTEMBER 12, 2009**

The meeting was called to order at 9:08 A.M. by Mayor Pro Tem Wolowicz at the Peninsula Montessori School Auditorium, 31100 Hawthorne Boulevard, notice having been given with affidavit on file.

City Council roll call was answered as follows:

PRESENT: Dyda, Long, Stern, and Mayor Pro Tem Wolowicz

ABSENT: Mayor Clark (excused/recused)

Also present were Carolyn Lehr, City Manager; Carol Lynch, City Attorney; Joel Rojas, Director of Community Development; Ara Mihranian, Principal Planner; Carla Morreale, City Clerk; and Teresa Takaoka, Deputy City Clerk.

Also present was Jeff Lewis, Chair of the Planning Commission.

FLAG SALUTE:

The Flag Salute was led by City Manager Lehr.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Councilman Stern moved, seconded by Councilman Dyda, to approve the agenda as presented.

Without objection, Mayor Pro Tem Wolowicz so ordered.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Appeal of the Planning Commission's Conditional Approval of the Marymount College Facilities Expansion Project: Conditional Use Permit No. 9 – Revision "E," Grading Permit, Variance, Minor Exception Permit, Master Sign Permit and Environmental Assessment (Case No. ZON2003-00317) - 30800 Palos Verdes Drive East [Continued from August 18, 2009] (1203)

City Clerk Morreale reported that this public hearing was continued from August 18, 2009.

Mayor Pro Tem Wolowicz reported on a recent announcement from Marymount College representatives regarding conditional approval from a governing accreditation agency for the college to offer baccalaureate degrees and requested that City Attorney Lynch provide information to the Council and public regarding the matter.

City Attorney Lynch reported that the City of Rancho Palos Verdes first heard of the issue on September 4, 2009, at which time staff engaged Marymount College representatives in discussions with the applicant's attorney. She reported that the difficulty with the present situation was that the City of Rancho Palos Verdes staff does not have a clear picture of what the environmental ramifications would be with the modification of Marymount College from a two-year to four-year institution regarding traffic impacts. She noted that it would be required by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to have further analysis of the issue so that the Council would understand the environmental ramifications and mitigation measures if any. She suggested possible processing alternatives at this point to allow additional information to be evaluated regarding the potential issues that have been raised recently.

Council discussion ensued regarding the need for further environmental review with a possible re vision to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to analyze the impacts that may exist as a result of the recent news that Marymount College is planning to expand from a two-year to four-year institution; the fact that California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not allow the project to be broken up into smaller pieces; issues that should be addressed in the project EIR such as remedial grading.

Dr. Michael Brophy, Marymount College, stated that Marymount College would address questions regarding the entitlement and the baccalaureate program and introduced Don Davis, counsel for Marymount College.

Don Davis, counsel for Marymount College, Burke, Williams & Sorensen, stated that he believed there was a misunderstanding of the CEQA process, which is to review the environmental impacts of a project. He stated that Marymount College was not seeking approval of the baccalaureate program as that program was not part of the original application or part of the application at any of the critical points of approval in the process. He noted that CEQA allows for changes, addendums, and the issuance of mitigated negative declarations, if necessary, regarding a project once it is approved.

Discussion ensued between Council, staff, and the applicant regarding possible further EIR studies and analysis regarding the probable expansion of the College to a four-year program in the reasonably foreseeable future; traffic analysis based on the Junior College student rate versus the facility rate; remedial grading; location of the sports field; athletic building/gymnasium and parking; and, the hours of operation for the college.

Dr. Brophy stated that Marymount College has received much support from the public regarding the proposed four-year baccalaureate degree especially since the College has been offering baccalaureate and Master's degrees for a decade through the Weekend College program. He commented on the College's Summer International School Program; the numerous delays in the approval process; and, the College's cooperation at every step in the process. He reported that the Board of Directors first authorized the College to seek information regarding the possibility of the baccalaureate degree in June 2009

RECESS AND RECONVENE:

Mayor Pro Tem Wolowicz called a brief recess from 10:13 A.M. to 10:23 A.M.

Director of Community Development Rojas provided a preliminary timeline based on the Council discussion and outlined the following steps: to obtain information from Marymount College regarding the proposed baccalaureate program, the revision of the EIR focused only on this topic, and the recirculation of the EIR, which he estimated would be ready to return in February 2010 to either the Planning Commission or the City Council.

Douglas Carstens, counsel for Concerned Citizens Coalition/Marymount Expansion (CCC/ME), Chatten-Brown & Carstens, Santa Monica, stated that CCC/ME desires the item to be remanded to the Planning Commission with instructions regarding the athletic building, the athletic field, remedial grading and drainage, the extended construction schedule of eight years, and the hours of operation of the college. He also noted issues related to parking, traffic, and the size of the parcel in relation to the use of the property as a four-year college.

Lois Karp, Concerned Citizens Coalition/Marymount Expansion (CCC/ME), Rancho Palos Verdes, spoke in opposition to the project and noted that the EIR as presented cannot be certified in light of the recently announced proposal to change the college to a four-year program. She noted that CEQA requires that all foreseeable aspects of the project should be studied. She stated that additional EIR studies should be made to address the following issues: traffic, hours of operation, crime statistics, remedial grading and related landscaping changes, drainage, and the construction schedule of eight years.

Council, appellant, and applicant discussion ensued on the possibility of the Marymount College project being remanded to staff and then brought back to Council instead of the Planning Commission.

Jeff Lewis, Chair, Planning Commission, stated that he was in favor of the item being brought back to the Council and noted that the EIR certified by the Planning Commission was no longer valid since the announced proposal to change the college

from a two-year to four-year institution. He observed that the announcement by Marymount College may operate in the school's favor.

Mr. Davis stated that Marymount College desired that any of the facility-related issues be raised at this meeting in order to avoid a second remand of the project.

Ms. Karp stated that there should be a limit on the items discussed at this meeting.

George Zugsmith, Concerned Citizens Coalition/Marymount Expansion (CCC/ME), Rancho Palos Verdes, spoke in opposition to the project and inquired as to the issues that would be able to be discussed as a result of the issuance of the EIR.

Kenneth Goldman, El Prado Homeowners Association, Rancho Palos Verdes, spoke in opposition to the project. He opined that the existing athletic field and tennis courts should be retained, and the expansion of the project restricted to the proposed building additions, excluding the dormitories, which would result in a 67% reduction in grading, improved air quality, less noise, sufficient site parking for the college, and a shortened construction period.

Grace Maholepsay, Rancho Palos Verdes, spoke in opposition to the project noting traffic concerns with the use of the athletic field, which could bring in large crowds.

Jim Gordon, Concerned Citizens Coalition/Marymount Expansion (CCC/ME), Rancho Palos Verdes, spoke in opposition to the project noting the errors and omissions regarding the project including the actual amount of grading, geologic hazard issues, and drainage issues.

Laura McSherry, Rancho Palos Verdes, spoke in opposition to the projects based on concerns regarding hydrology and geology.

Mike DeNardo, Rancho Palos Verdes, spoke in opposition to the project based on concerns regarding drainage and the retaining wall which is adjacent to his property.

Franklin Melton, Rancho Palos Verdes, spoke in opposition to the project with concerns regarding access and traffic during emergencies such as the recent wildfire.

RECESS AND RECONVENE:

Mayor Pro Tem Wolowicz called a lunch recess from 11:58 A.M. to 12:41 P.M.

Cliff Van Wagner, Rancho Palos Verdes, spoke in opposition to the project noting concerns with the proposed change to a four-year college and possible on-campus dormitories. He endorsed the Council's consideration to remand the project back for further studies.

Terri Glidden, Rancho Palos Verdes, spoke in favor of the project noting that Marymount College has been a positive force in the community and has served the community beyond its student body.

Ms. Karp stated that CCC/ME was never against Marymount College and that their only objectives were to minimize the impact that the college may have on the residents who live nearby and to request that the size of the site be used appropriately.

Council discussion ensued regarding an alternate location for the athletic field as being one of the aspects of the project to be examined and the appropriateness of the future meeting to be an appeal hearing.

Councilman Long moved, seconded by Councilman Stern, to remand the item back to staff with further environmental studies to address the following two issues: 1) The affect, if any, that the proposed four-year college program would have on each component of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR); and, 2) The examination of all of the appropriate environmental impacts related to the alternative location for the athletic field, as recommended by staff. The public hearing was continued to a date uncertain, but will be brought back to Council expeditiously, with a 45-day public comment period on the new EIR analysis, as recommended by staff.

The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Dyda, Long, Stern, and Mayor Pro Tem Wolowicz
NOES: None
ABSENT: Clark

ADJOURNMENT:

At 1:07 P.M., Mayor Pro Tem Wolowicz adjourned the meeting to Tuesday, September 15, 2009 at 6:00 P.M. for an Adjourned Regular Meeting to conduct interviews for the Finance Advisory Committee.

/s/ Larry Clark
Mayor

Attest:

/s/ Carla Morreale
City Clerk

W:\City Council Minutes\2009\20090912 CC MINS ADJ MTG.doc