CHAPTER 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Note: This Chapter contains revisions to the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report prepared in 2009 ("2009 DSEIR") for the San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update 2021 ("Update"). Deletions will appear as ~~strikethrough~~ and additions will appear in **bold** and together will constitute this Revised DSEIR. These revisions are being made to reflect a planning time horizon of 2011 rather than 2021. Revisions were also required to analyze the potential environmental impacts from modifications to the College that were not consistent with the Prior Plan EIR for the Facilities Master Plan as well as replacement of the Baseball Field Complex with a Multi-Use Athletic Field. The change in the duration of the Update to 2011 was due to the state law requirement that the District undertake a long-range master planning process for its educational curriculum and facilities. The plan will utilize a time period from 2012 through 2025. Because the 2009 DSEIR conflicted with the required duration of the master planning process, the Update was revised to be completed by December 2011.

The 2009 DSEIR was circulated for public review and comment from February 24, 2009 through April 10, 2009. These revisions do not include responses to comments made during that 2009 public review period because there will be a 45-day opportunity to comment on this Revised DSEIR as reflected on the Notice of Completion and Notice of Availability. Responses to all comments to the District on the 2009 DSEIR and the Revised DSEIR will be included in the Final SEIR for the project as modified by the change in planning horizon to 2011 and the replacement of the Baseball Field Complex with a Multi-Use Athletic Field.

This Executive Summary for San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update ~~2021~~ **2011** (Update) **Revised** Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (**Revised** DSEIR) summarizes the environmental effects that are forecast to occur from implementation of the Update. It also contains a summary of the Project background, Project objectives, and Project approvals and a summary of the Alternatives. Subchapter 1.7 summarizes the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation.

1.1 INTENDED USE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This **Revised** DSEIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes and Guidelines, 2004, pursuant to Section 21151 of CEQA. The San José/Evergreen Community College District (District) is the local Lead Agency for the Update and has supervised the preparation of this **Revised** DSEIR. This **Revised** DSEIR is an information document which will inform and assist public agency decision makers and the general public of the potential environmental effects of the Update, including significant effects that will be caused by implementing the Update. Possible ways to minimize significant effects of implementation of the Update and reasonable alternatives to the Update are also identified in the **Revised** DSEIR. This document assesses the impacts, including unavoidable adverse impacts and cumulative impacts, related to the construction and operation/occupancy of the Update.

This **Revised** DSEIR is also intended to support the permitting process of all agencies from which discretionary approvals must be obtained for particular elements of this Update.

1.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

~~The Update is a refinement of the Prior Plan. The Prior Plan was approved in 2000 and allowed for the overall facilities development of approximately 639,002 Outside Gross Square Feet (OGSF) of which 423,402 is designated Assignable Square Feet (ASF).~~

~~The Update will allow for the overall facilities development of approximately 533,577 OGSF/357,241 ASF. This is a reduction of 105,425 OGSF/66,161 ASF from the Prior Plan (please reference Table 4-1).~~

The San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update 2011 (hereafter "Update") is a refinement of the 2000 Facilities Master Plan (hereafter "Prior Plan") and a modification of the Project analyzed in the 2009 DSEIR. The Prior Plan was approved in 2000 and allowed for the overall facilities development of approximately 700,000 Gross Square Feet (~~O~~GSF) of which 414,325 Assignable Square Feet (ASF)/617,151 Outside Gross Square Feet (OSGF), which has been constructed to date. Gross square feet was utilized in the Prior Plan EIR; whereas, outside gross square feet is utilized by the State Title 5 Standards.

It should be noted that 617,151 OGSF is the current inventory on campus at this time; however, that square footage includes buildings that will be demolished (such as the 100, 200, 300 Wings and the Men's and Aux. Gyms). These buildings may not be demolished within the planning horizon of 2011, but will be shortly thereafter (as early as 2012 but no later than 2014). For purposes of this Revised DSEIR, these have been left into the overall square footage to represent a "worse case" scenario for analysis purposes. This is a short-term effect which may be changed when the 2025 Plan is adopted and implemented.

The Update will allow for the overall facilities development of approximately 784,018 OGSF/601,853 ASF. This is an increase of 84,018 OGSF and a decrease of 15,298 ASF from what is currently constructed on the campus.

A detailed Project Overview, Project Description, and Project Chronology ~~and Phasing~~ are contained in Chapter 4.0 of this **Revised** DSEIR.

The District prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) **for the 2009 DSEIR** for the Update. The NOP **for the 2009 DSEIR** review period began on October 8, 2008 and ended 30 days later, on November 7, 2008. Respondents were requested to send their suggestions for and comments on environmental information and issues that should be addressed in the SEIR no later than thirty days after receipt of the NOP. The NOP was distributed to interested agencies, the State Clearinghouse, and surrounding property owners and residents along with the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR**. Six (6) letter responses and two (2) e-mail responses to the NOP **for the 2009 DSEIR** were submitted.

No new issues for consideration in the DSEIR, not already identified in the Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR, were raised by the comment letters. This Draft SEIR (DSEIR) was been prepared to address the issues identified above and provide an informational

document intended for use by the District, interested and responsible agencies and parties, and the general public in evaluating the potential environmental effects of implementing this project in 2009. The public review period for the 2009 DSEIR was from February 24, 2009 through - April 9, 2009. A copy of the Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR is attached in Chapter 9, Subchapter 9.1 and a copy of the NOP, comment letters and e-mails for the 2009 DSEIR are provided in Chapter 9, Subchapter 9.2 of this Revised DSEIR.

As a result of the public review and comment on the 2009 DSEIR, modifications were made to the Update which, upon review of the District, would necessitate the preparation of this Revised DSEIR, and a second 45-day review period. It was determined by the District that the issues raised during the 45-day review period for the 2009 and the resultant changes to the Update would result in lesser impacts than those identified in the 2009 DSEIR. The scope of these changes are discussed below and in greater detail in Chapter 4.0 of this DSEIR.

The District made the determination that the information contained in the Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR was still applicable to this Revised DSEIR. In addition, the District determined that there was no need to re-circulate a Notice of Preparation (NOP) or hold another scoping meeting for the Update and this Revised DSEIR, as the pertinent issues relating to the Update had been raised at multiple times during the 2009 DSEIR process and that the scope of this Revised DSEIR was well defined. Additional details about this issue are discussed in the sections below.

1.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Update is being proposed under the jurisdiction of the District. The objectives of the Update, which were originally listed in the *San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan EIR*, prepared by Impact Sciences, Inc., dated May 11, 2000 (reference the Technical Appendices to this DSEIR in the enclosed CD**, Volume 2**) are:

- To support the current instructional programs and student services and identify instructional programs and support services which need to be modified to meet the needs of the College's service area population;
- To keep pace with, and anticipate the changing needs of the students and the communities served by the College;
- To develop partnerships with business and industry within the service area;
- To develop alternative strategies for delivering instruction to students;
- To develop a plan that would fully incorporate technology into all aspects of the operation of the courses, programs and services of the College;
- To develop a Facilities Plan that supports the anticipated courses, programs and services of the College for the next decade, and to assure that the plan is flexible enough in design to accommodate changes in instructional methodology technology, and delivery systems;
- To emphasize comprehensive planning and how it should be used as a basis for decision-

making;
- To develop a stronger educational program basis to substantiate future facility needs; and
- To up-date the existing campus and provide modern, attractive facilities appropriate for the instructional programs and support services offered.

The following objective is added for purposes of the Revised DSEIR:

- **To limit the duration of the Facilities Master Plan to 2011 so that the District can complete a Master Plan for Education Programs, Support Services and Facilities for the period from 2012 to 2025.**

1.4 PROJECT APPROVALS

As previously stated, before any development can occur, the District must adopt the Update and certify the **Revised D**SEIR. It is the approval of the Update that will allow the proposed development to proceed and allow the corresponding changes to the physical environment. This **Revised** DSEIR is expected to be used as the information source and CEQA compliance document for adoption of the Update by the District.

This **Revised** DSEIR may also be used by the following responsible agencies, dependent upon the review, approval or permit requirements of each in regards to the Update:

- Division of the State Architect (DSA);
- City of San Jose;
- City of San Jose Fire Department;
- Santa Clara Valley Water District;
- San Jose Water Company;
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA); and
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

1.5 IMPACTS

Based on data provided in this **Revised** DSEIR, it is concluded the proposed project could result in significant impacts to the following environmental issues: ~~Aesthetics, Land Use/Planning, Recreation and~~ Transportation/Traffic. All other potential impacts were determined to be less than significant without mitigation or can be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this **Revised** DSEIR or the attached Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** (Subchapter 9.1). Subchapter 1.7 summarizes the environmental impacts and proposed mitigation and monitoring measures.

The following issues ~~(related to the Initial Study Checklist)~~ have been determined to experience either: no impact, a less than significant impact, or a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated, either in the Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1) or in this **Revised** DSEIR.

Aesthetics: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway**, and substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.**

Agricultural Resources: 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; conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contact; or involve other changes in the existing environmental which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

Air Quality: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people; conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; 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); or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations

Biological Resources: Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any specifics identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, polices, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service; 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; 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; conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Cultural Resources: Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Geology/Soils: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on

the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; 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; 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; or 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.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; 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; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; 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, the project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, the project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or 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.

Hydrology/Water Quality: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; 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); 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; 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; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; otherwise substantially degrade water quality; 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; place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows; expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or

inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

Land Use/Planning: Physically divide an established community; or conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan, or natural community conservation plan, **and 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 mitigation an environmental effect**.

Mineral Resources: The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; 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.

Noise: Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels (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); exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels (for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip); 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; a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; or a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Population/Housing: 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); displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Public Services: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services (Fire Protection, Police Protection, Schools, Parks, Other public facilities).

Recreation: 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**, and include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment**.

Transportation/Traffic: Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment); result in inadequate emergency access; result in inadequate

parking capacity; or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

Utilities/Service Systems: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; 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; 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; have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed; 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 anticipated demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Based on the analysis contained in the **Revised** DSEIR, the following issue areas have been determined to have a potential for significant impact. More detail is summarized in subchapter 1.7 (below) and contained in Chapter 5.0 (Environmental Evaluation) of this **Revised** DSEIR.

1. Aesthetics: The Aesthetic analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR (~~sub~~Chapter 5.3) indicates that implementation of the Update will **not** substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
2. Land Use/Planning: The Land Use/Planning analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR (~~sub~~Chapter 5.4) indicates that implementation of the Update will **not** 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 mitigation an environmental effect.
3. Recreation: The Recreation analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR (~~sub~~Chapter 5.6) indicates that implementation of the Update will **not** include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
4. Transportation/Traffic: The Transportation/Traffic analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR (~~sub~~Chapter 5.7) indicates that implementation of the Update will cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections) and exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designate roads or highways.

1.6 ALTERNATIVES

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines require an evaluation of alternatives to the proposed action. Section 15126 of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that the "discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives capable of eliminating

any significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to a level of not significant...." For this project, four alternatives have been selected for evaluation in an effort to reduce the proposed project impacts to a less than significant level.

The no project alternative evaluated in this **Revised** DSEIR assumes that ~~the property develops as envisioned under the Prior Plan scenario~~ **there are no changes to the campus and it will remain the same as is currently developed in April 2010**. The no project alternative was determined to be environmentally superior to the proposed Update. The no project alternative has been evaluated as not being a feasible alternative because it does not meet any of the project objectives contained in ~~Sub~~Chapter 4.2 of this document.

In addition to the no project alternative, three other alternatives were evaluated in Chapter 6.0. An "Alternative Location" was found to be environmentally inferior to the Update and was also determined not to meet the objectives of the Update due to the potentially increased air quality impacts at the alternative location and the surrounding circulation system impacts anticipated to be increased, the impacts would be greater at the EVC. The alternative location alternative does not meet the objectives of the District by providing the educational programs in the SJCC vicinity to meet the needs of the students that attend the SJCC campus. By relocating the Update components to the EVC campus, the District cannot get the desired student participation rate, as the student demographics differ at the two Colleges. Lastly, the baseball program has been well established at the San Jose City College campus and must remain on this campus, along with the other components of the sports program.

~~A "No Closing of the Southern Campus Entry" alternative was analyzed and also found to be environmentally superior to the implementation of the Update.~~ Lastly, an "Intersection Improvements to Project Entry at Leland Avenue" alternative was analyzed and found to have the same environmental impacts as the Update. The last two alternatives also met the objectives of the Update.

1.7 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES DISCUSSED IN THIS REVISED DSEIR

The following is a summary of the impacts, mitigation, and level of significance (with mitigation incorporated) from implementation of the Update. Mitigation measures have been carried forward from the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** and extracted from Chapters 2.0 and 5.0 of this **Revised** DSEIR. The source of the mitigation measure is identified after the issue area.

Aesthetics (Source – Revised DSEIR)

~~Implementation of the Update is anticipated to have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect adjacent to the location of the proposed Baseball Field Complex.~~

~~5.2.5-1 The poles shall be painted a light blue color to provide compatibility with the color of the sky.~~

~~5.2.5-2 The District shall explore options for the color of the netting. The District shall use the lightest color netting available. In the event that either green~~

~~***or black netting are the only colors available, then the color of the netting shall be black.***~~

~~***5.2.5-3 A low-maintenance, evergreen vine shall be planted on the 20' high wooden wall.***~~

~~***5.2.5-4 Trees shall be planted to the north and south of the 90' high wall along Leigh Avenue to provide screening for long-range views of the Baseball Field Complex, poles and netting.***~~

~~Even with mitigation incorporated, impacts are still considered significant.~~

The following mitigation measure has been ~~refined from the Prior Plan EIR and the Initial Study~~ **added** for tree removal:

5.2.5-1 Prior to the final design of each component of the Update, a landscape architect shall review the construction footprint for that project. All possible measures shall be used to preserve and protect mature and memorial trees identified as very healthy. Trees that cannot be saved should be considered for re-location or replaced with new trees (due to the costs of tree re-location, trees that cannot be saved would most likely be replaced).

5.2.5-2 The District shall ~~conduct an update to the 1998~~ comply with the recommendations contained in the "Tree Survey and Inventory San Jose City College," prepared by HortScience, Inc., dated October 2009.

With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts from tree removal will be considered less than significant.

The following mitigation measures ~~have been refined from the Prior Plan EIR~~ **has been added** for light and glare impacts:

5.2.5-3 For all new development the College should install low-profile, low intensity lighting, directed downward to minimize light and glare.

~~***5.2.5-4 The final design of the 120-foot tall light tower shall include lighting design that minimizes negative impacts to the surrounding residential neighborhood. There shall be no spill-over of light or glare from the tower onto sensitive off-Campus uses. The light tower will be lit from within and incandescent or fluorescent bulbs should be used. The light tower will be designed to be visible to be a "translucent lantern." The tower shall not emit light like a parking lot light.***~~

With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts from light and glare will be considered less than significant.

Agricultural Resources (Source – Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR)

No impacts are forecast; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Air Quality (Source – Revised DSEIR)

Construction and operation of the Update will result in less than significant adverse impacts to air quality. **Construction and operation of the Update will result in temporary significant**

adverse impacts to air quality. Since these impacts of short duration they are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures for impacts are outlined below for construction, construction airborne toxins, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. No mitigation is required for operational impacts.

Construction Emissions Mitigation

5.3.5-1 Construction activities must comply with the "Basic Control Measures" and "Enhanced Control Measures" and applicable "Optional Control Measures" for dust emissions and recommendations for exhaust emissions as outlined in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. The appropriate level of mitigation shall be determined based on the total area of disturbance resulting from all planned projects occurring simultaneously. These requirements include:

Basic Dust Control Measures (apply to all construction sites)

- ***Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.***
- ***Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose debris or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.***
- ***Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.***
- ***Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.***
- ***Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.***

Enhanced Dust Control Measures (apply to construction sites greater than four acres)

- ***Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).***
- ***Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).***
- ***Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.***
- ***Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.***
- ***Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.***

Optional Dust Control Measure (apply to construction sites that are large in area, located near sensitive receptors, or which for any other reason may warrant additional emissions reductions)

- ***Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.***

Equipment Exhaust Control Measures (apply to all construction projects to the extent feasible)

- ***Require 90-day low-NOx tune-ups for off-road equipment.***
- ***Limit allowable idling to 5 minutes for trucks and heavy equipment.***
- ***Utilize equipment whose engines are equipped with diesel oxidation catalysts if available.***
- ***Utilize diesel particulate filter on heavy equipment where feasible.***

With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts remain less than significant.

Construction Airborne Toxics Mitigation

5.3.5-2 All structures to be demolished must be surveyed for the possible presence of ACMs. If ACMs are within the structure, they must be removed following the detailed procedures in BAAQMD Rule 11-2.

With the incorporation of this mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Operational Emissions Mitigation

Impacts are less than significant; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigation

Project-specific mitigation recommendations to reduce the global cumulative impact from project implementation include the following:

5.3.5-3 The District shall develop a Sustainability Master Plan which shall serve to guide future development on the campus. Contents of the Plan may include, but not be limited to the following mitigation measures to reduce emissions of GHG's:

Land Use and Transportation

- ***Distribute information that will promote increased utilization of public transit***
- ***Provide support for the existing rideshare program to encourage the use of alternatives to the single occupant vehicle (SOV) for campus access***

Energy Conservation

- ***Construct the new classroom and office buildings to meet LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Silver Certification***
- ***Maximize use of low pressure sodium and/or fluorescent lighting***
- ***Require acquisition of new appliances and equipment to meet Energy Star certification***

Urban Forestry

- ***Plant trees or vegetation to shade buildings and thus reduce heating/ cooling demand.***
- ***Select landscaping that is fast-growing while minimizing water demand to sequester carbon while reducing electrical loads associated with***

regional water transportation.

- ***Participate in green waste collection and recycling programs for landscape maintenance***

Biological Resources (Source – Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR and the Revised DSEIR)

There is potential for trees to be removed as a result of ~~the Proposed Project~~ **implementation of the Update**. The following mitigation measures will be required:

4-1 No earlier than 45 days and no later than 20 days prior to the removal of any woodland habitat that would occur during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting on the site (March 1 through August 1), a qualified biologist will conduct a survey. This biologist will determine if active nests of special-status birds or common bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or California Fish and Game Code are present in the construction zone or within 50 feet of the construction zone (100 feet for raptors). If active nests are found within the survey area, clearing and construction within 50 feet (100 feet for raptors) would be postponed or halted, at the discretion of the biological monitor, until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting.

~~***4-2 The District shall conduct an update to the 1998 Arborist Report. Based on the findings within the Updated Arborist Report, all existing mature and memorial tress determined as very healthy shall be preserved and protected during Campus renovations.***~~

5.2.5-5 The District shall comply with the recommendations contained in the "Tree Survey and Inventory San Jose City College," prepared by HortScience, Inc., dated October 2009.

After implementation of the mitigation measures (above), impacts will be reduced to a *less than significant level*. No other mitigation measures are required.

Cultural Resources (Source – Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR)

The Proposed Project may cause a substantial change in significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 and may disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The following mitigation measure will still be required:

5-1 Archaeological spot check monitoring would be conducted by a qualified archaeologist during earthmoving activities to minimize potential impacts to unknown historic resources.

With the incorporation of the above referenced mitigation measure, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Geology/Soils (Source – Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR)

All construction components of the Update will be required to comply with the latest version of

the California Building Code (CBC), and specifically with the requirements for public school facilities (which are more stringent than those for general structures). Also, the Update calls for the removal of older campus buildings and replacement with new ones that could increase seismic safety on the campus. The following mitigation measure will still be required:

6-1 Structural designs for buildings and other improvements constructed as part of the Facilities Master Plan will comply with the current version of the California Building Code (California standards for seismic risk, for Seismic Zone 4, and requirements for public school structures).

6-2 The College shall have geotechnical investigations prepared for each future project within the Facilities Master Plan, on a case-by-case basis. The geotechnical investigations shall provide detailed geotechnical recommendations for the conditions at the particular development site. The individual project design and construction shall incorporate and implement all of the recommendations in site-specific geotechnical investigations.

6-3 All grading and earthwork for each project shall be performed under the observation of the geotechnical consultant.

6-4 During the design and prior to any earth disturbance from any of the proposed Facilities Master Plan projects, the College shall develop an erosion control plan. During each individual project, construction personnel shall implement all relevant measures of the plan during earthmoving and other construction activities. Said erosion control plan shall comply with the regulations and recommendations of local, State and Federal Agencies with jurisdiction over issues related to erosion.

With the compliance with the latest version of the CBC, demolition of older structures and the incorporation of the above referenced mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials (Source – Revised DSEIR)

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) commented on the NOP **for the 2009 DSEIR**. They recommend environmental concerns from demolition of the older structures on-site be investigated and mitigated in accordance with the DTSC's *"Interim Guidance, Evaluation of School Sites and Potential Soil Contamination as a Result of Lead from Lead-Based Paint, Organochloride Pesticides from Termiticides, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls from Electrical Transformers, dated June 9, 2006."* The following mitigation measure will be required for any demolition of older structures.

7-1 The District shall investigate and mitigate environmental concerns from demolition of older structures on-site in accordance with the DTSC's "Interim Guidance, Evaluation of School Sites and Potential Soil Contamination as a Result of Lead from Lead-Based Paint, Organochloride Pesticides from Termiticides, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls from Electrical Transformers, dated June 9, 2006."

With the incorporation of the above referenced mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced to

a less than significant level.

Hydrology/Water Quality (Sources – Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR and the Revised DSEIR)

Implementation of the Update could have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated that would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The following mitigation measure (renumbered from the Initial Study) will be incorporated to the construction phase of any project.

5.4.5-1 A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP – which is required for any development over five acres) will be prepared prior to any construction activities. The District will also implement standards (BMP's) to reduce construction-related impacts to water quality.

~~Since the certification of the Prior Plan EIR, new r~~ **R**egulations have been enacted to protect water quality during the operational phases of a project. This is achieved through the development of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). The requirement for the preparation and implementation of the WQMP is contained in the following mitigation measure ~~(renumbered from the Initial Study)~~:

5.4.5-2 Prior to site grading the District shall approve a Water Quality Management Plan as required by the program requirements in effect at that time.

With the incorporation of the above referenced mitigation measure, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Land Use/Planning (Source – Revised DSEIR)

~~Reference mitigation measures pertaining to conflicts 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 mitigation an environmental effect (Aesthetics, Hydrology/Water Quality). *Implementation of the Update is anticipated to have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect adjacent to the location of the proposed Baseball Field Complex. Even with mitigation incorporated, impacts are still considered significant*.~~

***No impacts are forecast; therefore, no mitigation is required*.**

Mineral Resources (Source – Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR)

No impacts are forecast; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Noise (Source – Revised DSEIR)

Although construction noise is identified as being a less than significant impact, the following mitigation measures were identified in the noise study to reduce due to the implementation of the Update:

> ***5.5.5-1 Short-term construction noise intrusion and vibration impacts will be limited by conditions on construction permits requiring compliance with the City of San Jose Noise Ordinance. The allowed hours of construction are from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday. Pile driving, if required, should be restricted to the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday.***

Noise generation from campus activities will generally have a minimal impact on surrounding residential uses. The following conditions will maintain impacts at less than significant:

> ***~~5.5.5-2 Baseball field improvements will incorporate a "user friendly" PA system of distributed small speakers.~~***
> ***~~5.5.5-3~~ 5.5.5-2 Repair activities at the new Operations and Maintenance Building shall be conducted indoors with closed doors.***

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, noise impacts from the implementation of the Update are reduced to a less than significant level.

Population (Source – Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR)

No impacts are forecast; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Public Services (Source – Initial Study for the 2009 DSEIR)

The Proposed Project could have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas which would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection and other governmental services. To ensure that all impacts are addressed, the following mitigation measures will be implemented:

Police Protection Services

> ***13-1 The Facilities Master Plan will place night-time lighting and security phones at selected locations on the campus, based on a review by the District. In addition, a signage plan for emergency services shall be implemented in the pedestrian areas and parking lots to provide an increased measure of safety.***

Fire Protection Services

13-2 The District will comply with applicable fire and life safety standards and code requirements such as fire hydrant flows, hydrant spacing, adequate fire turning-radius, access and design.

13-3 The District will comply with the Division of State Architect/Office of Regulatory Services standards and the City of San Jose Fire Department's requirements regarding the installation of automatic sprinkler systems.

13-4 The District shall utilize their Emergency Response Plan that includes a plan for responding to fires.

13-5 The detailed architectural plans shall be reviewed by the San Jose Fire Department for emergency access.

With the incorporation of the above referenced mitigation measure, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Recreation (Source – Revised DSEIR)

~~Reference mitigation measures pertaining to recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment (Aesthetics).~~ *~~Implementation of the Update is anticipated to have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect adjacent to the location of the proposed Baseball Field Complex. Even with mitigation incorporated, impacts are still considered significant~~*.

***No impacts are forecast; therefore, no mitigation is required*.**

Transportation/Traffic (Source – Revised DSEIR)

VTA

VTA provided a comment letter on the NOP **for the 2009 DSEIR**. They have requested that the following mitigation measure be included for the Update to address their concerns regarding the configuration of the existing bus turnouts:

5.7.5-1 The project include bus stop improvements, consistent with the design parameters provided by VTA in their letter dated November 6, 2008, for the existing bus stops on Leigh Avenue (south of Moorpark Avenue) and on Leigh Avenue (opposite Kingman).

Incorporation of this mitigation measure addresses the concern raised by VTA.

On-Site Campus Parking

A mitigation measure has been added to ensure that any impact generated by new development on campus does not create a significant impact to parking.

5.7.5-2 Prior to the approval of any additional development project on campus, the District shall conduct a parking needs assessment to determine if adequate parking exists on site. If it is determined through the assessment that addition parking is needed as development occurs, then the District shall install the parking prior to occupancy of the new development.

With the implementation of this mitigation measure, any impacts due to on-site campus parking will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Special Events

A mitigation measure has been added to ensure that any impact generated by special events on campus does not create a significant impact to adjacent residential neighborhoods.

5.7.5-3 The District shall create a special event parking management plan in conjunction with the San Jose Police Department to mitigate the effects of parking intrusion on the surrounding neighborhoods. This parking plan should include, but not be limited to, a plan to guide spectators to open parking spaces in the western parking lots on campus.

With the implementation of this mitigation measure, any impacts due to special events on campus will be reduced to a less than significant level.

The following mitigation measures have been added to ensure that any impact generated by the Multi-Use Athletic Field on campus does not create a significant impact to adjacent residential neighborhoods.

5.7.5-4 As part of the lease/rental agreements with off-campus entities, the College shall issue temporary parking permits to groups who regularly use the fields.

5.7.5-5 To supplement providing parking on the San Jose City College campus for the Multi-Use Athletic Field, educational programs or brochures may be developed and distributed to the soccer leagues to encourage carpooling to the Multi-Use Athletic Field for practices.

With the implementation of these mitigation measures, any impacts due to the Multi-Use Athletic Field on campus will be reduced to a less than significant level.

~~Bascom Avenue/Moorpark Avenue~~

~~Implementation of the Update will have significant impact at the Bascom Avenue/Moorpark Avenue study intersection during the PM peak hour. The following mitigation measure will be required:~~

~~5.7.5-6 Bascom Avenue/Moorpark Avenue. The District shall pay a fair-share contribution payment to mitigate the project's impact to the intersection of Bascom Avenue/Moorpark Avenue. This fair-share contribution is determined by dividing the added project trips by the total number of added trips to an intersection. Under the fair-share contribution~~

~~***calculation methodology, District would be responsible for 14.2% of the cost of the mitigation.***~~

~~The intersection of Bascom Avenue/Moorpark Avenue is controlled and operated by the City of San Jose. While the mitigation would reduce the impact to a *less than significant level*, San Jose City College has no authority to ensure that the proposed mitigation can be in place to mitigate the project's impacts. If an agreement is reached between the college and the City for mitigation, then this impact could be considered mitigated and less than significant. *Until the time that an agreement is in place the impact at the Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue intersection would be considered significant and unavoidable*.~~

Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue

Implementation of the Update will have significant impact at the Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue intersection because the unsignalized intersection satisfies the PM peak hour signal warrant. The following mitigation measure will be required:

5.7.5-6 Two mitigation options for the Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue intersection are proposed to mitigate the impact at this location.

- ***Option 1: Restrict westbound left-turns on Kingman Avenue. This configuration would increase the amount of vehicles making right-turns onto Bascom Avenue and would also increase the number of northbound left-turns (U-turns) at the Bascom Avenue/Renova Drive intersection. The increase in U-turns is due to traffic that previously turned left that is now forced to turn right and make a U-turn at Renova Drive to head southbound on Bascom Avenue. Even with the additional U-turn volume, the Bascom Avenue/Renova Drive intersection would operate acceptably at LOS C during both peak hours. This option will result in LOS B operations at the Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue intersection during the both peak hours (see Appendix E).***
- ***Option 2: Signalize the Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue intersection. This option would maintain the existing lane geometry at the intersection. The southbound left-turn would operate under permitted phasing. Implementation of a signal at this location would likely require coordination with the adjacent signal at the Bascom Avenue/Renova Drive intersection. It is possible that further signal coordination may be required at the Bascom Avenue/Fruitdale Avenue intersection as well. This option would result in LOS B operations at the Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue intersection during the AM peak hour and LOS A operations during the PM peak hour.***

The intersection of Bascom Avenue and Kingman Avenue is controlled and operated by ~~the City of San José~~ **Santa Clara County**. While either mitigation option would reduce the impact to a *less than significant level*, San Jose City College has no authority to ensure that the proposed mitigation can be in place to mitigate the project's impacts. If an agreement is reached between the college and the ~~City~~ **County** for mitigation, then this impact could be considered mitigated and less than significant*. Until the time that an agreement is in place the impact at the Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue intersection would be considered significant and unavoidable*.

~~Bascom Avenue/Fruitdale Avenue~~

~~Implementation of the Update will have significant impact at the Bascom Avenue/Fruitdale Avenue study intersection during the PM peak hour. The following mitigation measure will be required:~~

> ~~***5.7.5-7 A fair-share contribution payment would be an appropriate solution to mitigate the project's impact at this intersection. Fair-share contributions are determined by dividing the added project trips by the total number of added trips to an intersection. Under the fair-share contribution calculation methodology, San Jose City College would be responsible for 38.2% of the cost of the mitigation.***~~

~~The intersection of Bascom Avenue/Fruitdale Avenue is controlled and operated by the City of San Jose. While the mitigation would reduce the impact to a *less than significant level*, San Jose City College has no authority to ensure that the proposed mitigation can be in place to mitigate the project's impacts. If an agreement is reached between the college and the City for mitigation, then this impact could be considered mitigated and less than significant. *Until the time that an agreement is in place the impact at the Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue intersection would be considered significant and unavoidable*.~~

Utilities/Service Systems (Source – 2009 DSEIR)

The Update would have a less than significant impact, with mitigation incorporated, so that it would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. No new or expanded entitlements are needed. The following mitigation measures~~, some of which were required in the Prior Plan EIR~~ to mitigate water supply, will be implemented. Mitigation measure 16-2 has been expanded to address the comments regarding drought tolerant plants received from Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) on the NOP **for the 2009 DSEIR**.

> ***16-1 The District will implement water conservation measures in new buildings, including low-flow showers, toilets and faucets.***
>
> ***16-2 The irrigation watering system shall be designed utilizing the latest, state-of-the-art equipment to conserve water. In addition, drought tolerant plants shall also be utilized for all new construction or replacement.***
>
> ***16-3 At the start of each individual project, pipe capacity shall be reviewed, and upgraded as needed, to meet fire flow requirements and water demand.***

With the incorporation of the above referenced mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.