

## CHAPTER 6 – ALTERNATIVES

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 ~~striketrough~~ 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.

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines require an evaluation of alternatives to the proposed action. The purpose of the alternatives evaluation under CEQA is to determine whether one or more feasible alternatives is capable of reducing potentially significant impacts of a preferred project to a less than significant level. The applicable text in the State CEQA Guidelines occurs in Section 15126 as follows:

Section 15126.6 (a): *Alternatives to the Proposed Project. An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation.*

Section 15126.6 (b) *Purpose. Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly.*

One of the alternatives that must be evaluated is the “no project alternative,” regardless of whether it is a feasible alternative to the Project, i.e. would meet the project objectives or requirements. Under this alternative, the environmental impacts that would occur if the Project

is not approved and implemented are identified. **The current campus configuration, as of April 2010 will be utilized as the “no project alternative.”** In addition to the no project alternative (which would in essence result in the implementation of the Prior Plan), ~~a No Closing of the Southern Campus Entry alternative,~~ **additional alternatives include an** Intersection Improvements to Project Entry at Leland Avenue alternative and an alternative location (Evergreen Valley College) ~~will be analyzed in this document.~~ **The No Closing of the Southern Campus Entry alternative is no longer applicable because the southern campus entry was closed in April 2010 as part of implementation of the Prior Plan.**

The project objectives are defined in Chapter 4.0 as follows:

- 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.**

The unavoidable significant adverse impacts identified from implementation of the Update are from ~~Aesthetics, Land Use Compatibility and Traffic.~~ The no project alternative is being analyzed, as it represents the current, **baseline for the analysis used for this DSEIR – the campus as of April 2010 approved Facilities Master Plan (Prior Plan).** The ~~“no closing of the southern Campus entry” alternative is being analyzed, as this closure creates a potentially considered cumulative and significant impact to another Campus entry intersection (Bascom and Kingman Avenues).~~ The “intersection improvements to the campus entry at Leland Avenue” is analyzed to determine if it presents a better ~~circulate~~ **circulation** alternative to the one utilized for the Update. Lastly, an alternative location alternative is analyzed, as the Evergreen Valley College is within the same Community College District as the San Jose City College. No other alternatives to the Project are given consideration or evaluated in this chapter due to them either being impractical or infeasible. Thus, the alternatives considered in this chapter include:

- 1 No Project (utilize existing ~~Facilities Master Plan~~ **current campus baseline configuration – 2010**)
- ~~2 No Closing of the Southern Campus Entry~~
- 32** Intersection Improvements to Project Entry at Leland Avenue
- 43** Alternative Location – Evergreen Valley College

The following evaluation also includes identification of an environmentally superior alternative as required by the State CEQA Guidelines. The ~~four (4)~~ **three (3)** alternatives were developed during review of the Update by the District Staff and include all components of the Update. No other alternatives were identified during the review process for consideration in this **Revised DSEIR**.

**The following sources were used for the analysis in this Chapter:**

- **San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan 2000.**
- **San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan 2000 Draft EIR.**
- **San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan 2000 Final EIR.**
- **San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan 2009 Draft EIR.**

## **6.2 NO PROJECT**Error! Bookmark not defined.

The no project alternative consists of no modifications to the existing, ~~adopted San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan (1999)~~ **campus as depicted on 3.2-1: San Jose City College Campus – Existing, which depicts the campus as of April 2010**. The no project alternative assumes that the ~~Campus Facilities will be constructed in accordance with the Prior Plan and none of the Update components, including the current (halted) construction of the Baseball Field Complex would occur.~~

Under the no project alternative all construction and operational impacts from implementation of the Update would be eliminated. Selection of the no project alternative would eliminate the significant impacts identified in this **Revised DSEIR**, specifically the significant impacts to Update-related ~~Aesthetics, Land Use and Planning and Recreation~~ **Transportation/Traffic** conflicts.

**A The following is a summary comparative discussion comparing the Update and the No Project Alternative with respect to the issues analyzed** ~~of the no project alternative in terms of the specific issues evaluated in this Revised DSEIR follows.~~

**Aesthetics:** ~~Development of the Prior Plan will contribute to the change the visual setting of the general area. There will be an associated change in the visual setting, both to and from the project site, which is consistent with the analysis presented in the Prior Plan EIR. Under the no project alternative, the Baseball Field Complex will be located in the southern central portion of the Campus. The associated poles, netting, batter's eye and wall would not be located adjacent to Leigh Avenue and the existing apartments east of Sherman Oaks Drive. Under the proposed Update, installation of the Baseball Field Complex components will result in a significant impact that cannot be fully mitigated. This impact is considered cumulative and an unavoidable adverse impact. Under the no project alternative, installation of the Baseball Field Complex components would result in a less than significant impact. The issues pertaining to~~

tree removal and light and glare would remain the same as the Update under the no project alternative. **The assessment for the 2009 DSEIR included the Baseball Field Complex and a Translucent Light Tower as components of the Update. The Baseball Field Complex and the Translucent Light Tower have been deleted from the Update and a Multi-Use Athletic Field will be constructed in the place of the prior Baseball Field Complex.**

**Because of this, ~~the~~ the no project alternative would not result in a change to the visual setting of consistent with the Prior Plan and Prior Plan EIR as of the April 2010 campus configuration. Based on the Aesthetic Analysis contained in Chapter 5.0 of this Revised DSEIR, ~~It would be environmentally superior~~ the no project alternative and the Update would have comparable impacts to in terms of Aesthetic Resources than implementation of the Update.**

Agricultural Resources: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, ~~t~~The campus is completely developed and is surrounded by urban uses. Therefore there would be no impacts that would 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 contract; 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. This would not be an issue with the no project alternative or the Update. Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have the same environmental affect.~~

Air Quality: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout could result in potentially significant impacts that could 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). The Initial Study stated that the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is currently designated as a Federal non-attainment area for ozone and as a State non-attainment area for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>. Development of the Prior Plan would result in construction emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> and traffic related to increased student and community use of the campus would generate emissions of mobile source pollutants. It was concluded that the Prior Plan EIR would evaluate the potential air quality impacts of the Prior Plan, using the thresholds identified in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines. The Initial Study identified the Valley Medical Center, churches and residential units in the vicinity of the campus as possible sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and that these impacts needed to be analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR. Lastly, the Initial Study determined there was no impact from the Prior Plan that would create objectionable odors affecting substantial numbers of people. This determination was made because the campus is fully developed and the proposed facilities would be similar in function to existing facilities.~~

~~Air Quality was analyzed in Section 5.3 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, implementation of the Prior Plan would result in the generation of air pollutants during construction and operation activities. Fugitive dust generated by on-site grading activities would~~

~~be less than significant given that the College would implement dust control measures recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Operational emissions from stationary sources and vehicle trips would not exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the BAAQMD and, therefore, would not be considered individually significant. Given that the San Jose 2020 General Plan EIR identified unavoidably significant impacts related to regional air quality, and that the Prior Plan would generate more vehicle trips than accounted for in the General Plan EIR, it was concluded that the Prior Plan's contribution toward operational emissions impacts would also be significant. Mitigation measures could reduce operational emissions; but it was determined that there was no guarantee that these measures were feasible or that they would be maximally effective in reducing operational emissions. Cumulative impacts related to operational emissions remained significant and unavoidable.~~

~~The Prior Plan EIR determined that the Prior Plan impacts related to localized carbon monoxide (CO) emissions along all study roadway intersections and freeway segments of SR-87 and SR-17 would not exceed the State or Federal standards and therefore would not be significant. Localized CO emissions generated by the Prior Plan would contribute to the exceedances of the 8-hour CO standard at the freeway segments along I-880 and I-280. However, the CO 8-hour standard was already exceeded along the I-880 and I-280 under the existing conditions, and the project-generated traffic would not result in a measurable increase in CO levels over existing conditions. Therefore, project-specific impacts from the Prior Plan related to CO emissions along freeway segments of I-880 and I-280 would be less than significant. It was concluded that the localized CO levels generated by cumulative projects (including the Prior Plan) would not exceed Federal or State standards and would not be significant.~~

~~Subsection G of Section 5.3 of the Prior Plan EIR (Level of Significance After Mitigation) concluded that implementation of the measures identified in the Prior Plan EIR would reduce construction-related impacts to less than significant levels; however, cumulative impacts related to operational emissions would remain unavoidably significant.~~

~~Air Quality impacts did generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0). As stated above, cumulative impacts related to operational emissions would remain significant and unavoidable. Only the Prior Plan's non-impacts to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people were considered an "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0).~~

~~Ultimately, the District adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations as the Prior Plan resulted in significant unavoidable impacts related to this issue area.~~

Based on the information contained in the *Air Quality Analysis San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update 2021, City of San Jose, California*, prepared by Giroux and Associates, dated February 6, 2009 and the ***Air Quality Analysis San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update, City of San Jose, California***, prepared by Giroux and Associates, dated April 22, 2010, implementation of the Update will not result air quality impacts that will exceed the thresholds of significance established for individual projects **will result in temporary significant adverse impacts to air quality. Since these impacts are of short duration they are considered less than significant.** Combined with other **reasonably foreseeable** projects in the local area, future emissions, when measured against the

established thresholds, will not be cumulatively significant and will result in less than significant adverse impacts to air quality.

Mitigation measures for air quality impacts have been included for construction, construction airborne toxins, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. No mitigation is required for operational impacts. With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts remain less than significant and are not considered cumulatively significant.

~~The Prior Plan has significant impacts that could not be mitigated to a less than significant level.~~ All air quality impacts are considered less than significant with the implementation of the Update. Implementation of the Update would be environmentally **less** superior in terms of Air Quality Resources over the no project alternative, **as the no project alternative would not result in the construction and operational omissions anticipated with the implementation of the Update.**

Biological Resources: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, ‡~~ The campus is completely developed and is within an urban area. There is limited habitat value on the campus. The existing trees and lawns may provide habitat to birds and mammals that occur in urban areas, such as pigeons and starlings. The campus has no natural areas, and the existing landscaping does not provide suitable habitat for special status species. Therefore, ~~the Prior Plan would not have~~ **there would not be** any impacts on such species. However, removal or relocation of existing trees could affect birds nesting in the trees. A mitigation measure was added to reduce any impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the campus is not identified in any adopted plan as having natural communities; therefore, ~~the Prior Plan~~ **no project alternative** would not have any impacts on sensitive communities. There are no wetlands on campus; therefore, there would be no impacts to these resources. Also, the campus does not provide any wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites, as it is located in an urban area surrounded by development and major transportation corridors. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans that apply to the campus.

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that ‡~~ There are no impacts with respect to biological resources protected by local policies except for trees that would be removed for construction reasons. The City of San Jose has a tree ordinance that requires a permit for removal of any trees on private property that have a trunk circumference of 56 inches or more, measured two feet above grade. It was noted that this ordinance would not apply to the campus, as the College District is under the jurisdiction of the State of California. An arborist report was prepared in 1998, **and updated in 2009**, and it identified the location, type and health of the existing trees on campus. Some trees were recommended for removal due to their health. ~~Others would be removed due to implementation of the Prior Plan.~~ A mitigation measure was added to ensure that all existing mature and memorial trees determined as very healthy be preserved and protected during campus renovations. ~~It should be pointed out that there has been demolition, renovation and new construction on the Campus with Phase 1 and portions of Phase 2 of the Prior Plan (see Project Description in the Initial Study – Chapter 9 of the DSEIR).~~ All impacts were considered less than significant after the incorporation of the mitigation measure.

~~Biological Resources issues were not required to be analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR. They did not generate an “Unavoidable Significant Impact” (Section 6.0). They did not generate~~

~~“Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes” (Section 8.0). And every issue generated an “Effect Found Not to be Significant” (Section 10.0).~~

Based on the information above, and because there were no changes that would affect Biological Resources, Biological Resources were not analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update. **With the development proposed under the Update**, Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have the a same **superior** environmental affect, **as no additional Biological Resources would be affected.**

Cultural Resources: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, t~~ The campus is completely developed, and almost all **buildings and** facilities would be constructed within the campus boundaries. ~~(The High Technology Center proposed in the Prior Plan has been completed. The land for the Center, adjacent and contiguous to the campus, was acquired by the District. The land parcel and the Center have been fully integrated into the campus.)~~ The San Jose 2020 General Plan does not mention paleontological resources as an area of concern at the City. The Geotechnical Report indicates that the campus is underlain by alluvium, and does not indicate any bedrock unit(s) underlying the campus. Therefore, it appears that there would not be any impacts to unique paleontological resources, but the evidence is not conclusive.

~~The Prior Plan EIR Geology and Geotechnical Hazards Section included a confirmation as to the sensitivity of the bedrock unit(s) underlying the campus (if proposed excavation would go into bedrock). The campus is developed and flat, and this has no unique geologic features. According to Section 5.2 (Geology, Seismicity, and Soils) of the Prior Plan EIR, surface soils are classified as Yolo series soils, which are well drained medium and moderately fine textured soils underlain by alluvium. Borings on-site (for proposed Parking Garage #1) found a layer of dark, medium stiff to stiff clay at the surface, ranging from 4 to 8 feet in thickness. Under the dark clay layer, the borings found medium stiff to stiff silty clays, generally between about 10 and 30 feet below grade. Based on this information, it can be assumed that the probability of excavation into bedrock would be very low.~~

A cultural resource evaluation conducted in November 1999 by Archaeological Resource Management ~~for the Initial Study~~ found that there were no recorded archaeological sites located on campus or within a half-mile radius of the campus. This would indicate that the probability of finding any archaeological resources is very low. ~~The Initial Study further indicated that, The~~ the Santa Clara Valley is known for having buried archaeological resources. A mitigation measure was added to require archaeological monitoring during earthmoving activities; thereby, reducing any impacts to a less than significant level. This mitigation measure was also applied to item 5 (d) of the Initial Study Checklist which asked if implementation of the Prior Plan would “disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.” With incorporation of this mitigation measure, impacts were considered less than significant.

~~Lastly, the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that, based on a cultural resource evaluation conducted in November 1999 by Archaeological Resource Management, it was determined that the buildings (built in 1950s to the 1980s) proposed to be demolished have no architectural or historical significance and do not appear to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources. The study consisted of an archival record search and a surface reconnaissance of the campus. It was determined that there would be no impacts~~

~~from implementation of the Prior Plan that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. The District obtained updated historic resource evaluations from historic resource experts Archaeological Resource Management, dated October 23, 2009. These reports are attached to this letter. A report entitled “Stage I: Historical Background & Photography of 12 Structures on the San Jose City College campus in the City Of San José,” was prepared to address the status of any potential historical structures located on the SJCC campus. This evaluation concluded that three (3) sets of Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms be completed for the structures scheduled for demolition for the purpose of evaluation and documentation. A Stage II Analysis was also prepared, entitled “Stage II Historic Evaluation of 12 Structures on the San José City College Campus,” prepared by Archaeological Resource Management. In it are three (3) sets of Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms for the purpose of documenting the subject structures prior to demolition; one set for the five structures included in the Athletic Complex, one set for the 100, 200, and 300 Classroom Blocks and the Old Central Plant, and one set for the three structures that make up the Fine Arts Complex. This report concluded that none of the twelve structures that were evaluated appear to be potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources.~~

~~Cultural Resources were not required to be analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR and this element was designated in Section 10.0 “Effects Found Not to be Significant.”~~

Based on the information above, and because there were no changes that would affect Cultural Resources, Cultural Resources were not analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update. **With the development proposed under the Update**, ~~Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have the a same superior environmental affect, as no additional Cultural Resources would be affected.~~

~~As a result, both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have the same environmental affect on Cultural Resources.~~

Geology/Soils: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout Any building on campus could result in or expose people to potentially significant impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; location 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; or location on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property. The Initial Study stated that the City of San Jose Geotechnical Report indicates that the The campus is subject to a moderately high potential for liquefaction; however, that Report also rated the resultant ground failure potential as moderately low to low. The Initial Study indicated that s Some earth movement would be required for construction on campus, resulting in potential soil erosion. Weak soil layers and lenses occur at random locations and depths beneath the campus, and the campus has been subjected to subsidence in the past. Lastly, soils the potential for expansive soils were identified. It was determined that these issues needed to be analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR determined there a less than significant impact from implementation of the Prior plan due to strong seismic ground shaking. There is always the potential for a seismic event and with an increase in the number if students and faculty on-campus, risk exposure is increased. However, the Initial Study indicated that t~~ The State of California would require all construction on the campus to comply with the latest version of the Uniform Building Code (UBC), and specifically with the requirements for public school facilities (which are more stringent than those for general structures). Impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. ~~In addition, the Prior Plan called for the removal of e~~ Older campus buildings **have been removed** and replaced ~~ment~~ with new ones that ~~could have~~ increased seismic safety on the campus. ~~Based on this information, this issue area was not evaluated in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

The following issue areas were determined to have no impact ~~in the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR~~: 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; landslides; and 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. There are no active faults within the campus. The campus topography is flat and not subject to landslides. Lastly, ~~the Prior Plan did not include the~~ **there is no** use of alternative wastewater systems. ~~Based on this information, these issue areas were not evaluated in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Geological, Seismicity and Soils was analyzed in Section 5.2 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan site~~ The campus is situated in the Santa Clara Valley above alluvial fan deposits. The site **campus** is fully developed. The site **campus** would be subject to severe seismic shaking in case of a major earthquake in the region. Compliance with the California Building Code and State requirements would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Although the site is flat and grading would be minimal, impacts relating to soil erosion would be significant unless mitigation measures ~~identified in the Prior Plan EIR~~ are followed. There could be potentially weak soils under the campus and the soils may undergo settlement under high loads. With implementation of recommendations in project-specific geotechnical reports, this impact would be less than significant. Given ~~that the Prior Plan would result in the replacement of older, existing buildings with new structures and utilities built to current Building Code and State requirements, there would not be a significant impact with respect to expansive soils.~~

~~Subsection I of Section 5.2 of the Prior Plan EIR (Level of Significance after Mitigation) concluded that all geological impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Prior Plan EIR and compliance with the requirements of the California Building Code.~~

~~Geological, Seismicity and Soils impacts did result in "Unavoidable Significant Impacts" (Section 6.0) and did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0). The 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; landslides; and 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; and strong seismic ground shaking were all~~

considered an "Effect Found not to be Significant" (Section 10.0).

Based on the information above, and because there were no changes that would affect Geology/Soils Resources, Geology/Soils Resources were not analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update. **With the development proposed under the Update**, Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have the a same superior environmental affect, **as no additional Geology/Soils Resources would be affected.**

Hazards: According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout could result in potentially significant impacts that could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Prior Plan would not involve any changes to the existing arterial street network, including emergency routes. Proposed changes with the Prior Plan could improve emergency access by providing more roadway access to the campus interior and two entrances connected to the internal roadway. Increased traffic from the increase in enrollment and employment could result in an increase in congestion on area streets, including streets used for emergency routes. Therefore, this issue area was analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.

The Initial Study stated that the Prior Plan would result in a less than significant impact to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The proposed Science and Math Educational Complex, Corporate Yard, Professional Education Center, Reprographics Facility, and Photo Laboratories would involve activities that use hazardous materials and result in the generation of small amounts of hazardous waste. The High Technology Center would be used for business and computer information systems, data processing, applied science, and general classrooms; some of these activities could also result in the generation of small amounts of hazardous waste. The College would follow all City, County, State and Federal requirements to prevent employees or student exposure and ensure safe use, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials or wastes. The Prior Plan was determined to not result in any significant hazards to the public or the environment through routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, or through upset and accident conditions. Lastly, buildings to be demolished as part of the Prior Plan could contain asbestos. If asbestos was to be found, the District would implement standards (required) safety procedures to prevent any exposure. For these reasons, any impacts were considered less than significant without any other mitigation required.

No impacts were anticipated from the Prior Plan that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; 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 Sect 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (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); result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip); 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. The College has been designated by the California State Water Resources Control Board as having leaking underground storage tanks. They were removed around 1994. The campus is not located within two miles of a public airport and there are no private airstrips within two miles of the campus. The site is located in an urbanized area and will not involve the placement of structures in areas containing flammable brush.~~

~~Hazards, as they pertain to emergency access were not analyzed in one specific Section of the Prior Plan EIR. "Result in inadequate emergency access" is a significance criterion according to Subsection E (Significance Criteria and Project Impacts) of the Transportation and Circulation (Section 5.1) of the Prior Plan EIR. Based on a review of Section 5.1 this was not a significant impact. Transportation and Circulation mitigation measures were provided to improve circulation to, from, around and within the campus.~~

~~Hazard impacts did not result in an "Unavoidable Significant Impact." Hazards were discussed in "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0). According to this Section, the College does not use or transport large amounts of hazardous materials. The College would follow all applicable requirements to ensure safe use, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials or wastes on campus; therefore there would not be any significant hazards. In addition, the District would implement standard (required) safety procedures to prevent worker exposure to asbestos, should asbestos be found during building demolition.~~

~~The following issue areas were determined to have no impacts from the Prior Project and were included in "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0) of the Prior Plan EIR: 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 Sect 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, would the project 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.~~

The Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** concluded that implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact that would 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; or impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. These issues were determined to be less than significant under the Prior Plan and there have been no changes or no new issues relative to Hazards since the certification of the Prior EIR **to April 2010**, that would alter these conclusions. The Update involves the reorganization of campus

**buildings and facilities and the reconfiguration of campus access and circulation from the Prior Plan, and in an overall decrease in OGSF and ASF. 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.** ~~One particular hazard issue, hazards created by potential errant baseballs exiting the baseball field (not related to hazardous substances contained in this Section of the Initial Study), was addressed in Chapter 5.4 (Land Use and Planning) of this DSEIR. The Hazard issue areas listed above was not be analyzed in the Revised DSEIR.~~

Two additional mitigation measures were added under the Update. One was recommended by the Department of Toxic Substances Control. potential environmental concerns from demolition of the older structures on-site. They recommend these concerns 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."* Another mitigation measure was added under Chapter 5.3 (Air Quality) as it pertains to toxic airborne contaminants. These two mitigation measures further implement the demolition of older structures.

Lastly, comments were made on the NOP regarding the adequacy of emergency service response in the vicinity of the campus. Follow-up conversations were made with the San Jose/Evergreen campus Police Department (College PD), the San Jose Police Department (SJPD), the San Jose Fire Department (SJFD) and the American Medical Response (AMR-ambulance service). The following is a synopsis of the conversations:

- Ray Aguirre, Chief of Police for the San Jose/Evergreen Valley Community College Police Department (College PD). The College PD has primary jurisdiction over both San Jose City College and Evergreen Valley College (located 14 miles away). The College PD has four (4) permanent officers to police both Colleges. They work two (2) shifts each and work Monday through Saturday. The San Jose Police Department (SJPD) takes all calls (after hours). The College has four (4) reserve officers for coverage of sick/vacationing officers. He indicated that reportable crimes in the area are pretty standard and not above or beyond what is normal. The College PD has become more pro-active and engaged in the community and they try to be seen on and off campus and in the neighborhoods. He indicated that he has seen no upsurge of crime but he could definitely use 6-7 more officers ideally to work graveyard and not depend on SJPD and for better man power in general. As for large events, they contract with SJPD for the number of officers they need per event. Six years ago they had an incident where things were not organized well and there was a problem. Since then they have formed an events committee and they organize and staff officers as needed, handle custodial services and IT and the organizers of the events pay for security and the College reserves the right to turn down any event that they feel would not be good for the college or the community. As far as auto theft and burglary in general, he says it is about normal and compared to De Anza College in Cupertino, which is in a nicer area even, the San Jose City College has a lower rate for these problems. Trespassing is an issue as the campus is open and anyone can walk onto campus or the surrounding neighborhood and vagrancy can be an issue as well.
- Brad Cloutier, Bureau of Fire Prevention. Station 4 on Leigh Avenue provides both truck and

engine service. The engines are the first to respond to any emergency; then any subsequent emergencies are dispatched by the truck company. He indicated that the only way response times would be hindered near the campus or on-site is if there are emergencies in progress that the trucks and engines responded to already then station 10 (next closest) or other stations would have to cover. While Moorpark is sometimes congested – Leigh is usually open and easily accessible. American Medical Response handles ambulance service in the area.

- Geoff Kady, Fire Department Bureau of Support Services. He indicated that Station 4 achieves the eight minute response time at 98.3% of the time. Their goal is an eight (8) minute 8 response time 80% of the time. He also indicated that Station 10 is operating with an 82.1% efficiency.
- Chris Moore, Deputy Chief (San Jose Police Department). He indicated that the City is safe overall and that particular neighborhood is doing well because the neighbors are so involved.
- Marcie Morrow, American Medical Response (AMR). AMR is meeting their contracted requirement for response times and other than normal rush hour traffic. It was indicated that there is no problem with congestion near the College; especially since the response times are being met.

The information obtained from the pertinent public services entities (above), indicated that any impacts from the Update would be less than significant. No additional analysis was required in the **Revised** DSEIR.

Based on the information above, and because there were no changes that would affect Hazard Resources, Hazard Resources were not analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update. Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact to Hazard Resources. Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have the same environmental affect.

~~Hydrology/Water Quality: According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout could create or contribute potentially significant impacts related to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The Initial Study stated that development of the Prior Plan could result in declining quality of stormwater runoff due to non-point source urban pollutants (from increased traffic on areas streets, for example) and increased soil erosion and downstream sedimentation during project related local construction. Construction related impacts would be avoided through preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which is required under NPDES for development over five acres. The District would implement Best Management Practices (BMP's – included as a mitigation measure) to reduce non-point source pollution during project operations. It was determined that the impacts from this issue would be analyzed in the Public Services and Utilities Sections of the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR determined there would be a less than significant impact with mitigation required that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. With the~~

~~above referenced mitigation incorporated, impacts were determined to be reduced to a less than significant level. Based on this information, this issue area was not evaluated in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The following issue areas were determined to have no impact in the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR: 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; 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.~~

~~The uses anticipated within the campus would not create effluent discharges from point sources, and thus would not violate any waste discharge requirements. The existing campus is already developed and the uses proposed in the Prior Plan would be similar to existing uses; therefore, there would be no impacts related to groundwater discharge. Groundwater in the region is replenished by percolation of stream flows and rainfall from hill areas, not by recharge from the campus area. The existing campus is developed and drains into the City of San Jose storm drain system. There would be no change in the nature of the existing use. There are no streams or rivers on or near the campus. There would be no substantial alteration of current drainage patterns that would result in erosion or siltation. The campus is not within a 100-year floodplain and does not propose the construction of any housing. The campus is not within a dam inundation and would not expose people to seiche, tsunami or mudflow hazards. Based on this information, these issue areas were not evaluated in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Hydrology and Water Quality impacts (through analysis in Public Utilities) did not result in "Unavoidable Significant Impacts" (Section 6.0) and did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0). The following were all considered an "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0): 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; 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.~~

According to the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR**, 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. Construction related impacts would be avoided through preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which is required under NPDES for development over five acres. A mitigation measure was incorporated to the construction phase of any project.

~~Since the certification of the Prior Plan EIR, new r~~ Regulations 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 WQMP contains best management practices (BMP's) and other measures necessary to protect water quality. These best management practices can include management activities, as well as mechanical and infiltrative treatment measures.

The implementation of these practices is expected to minimize or eliminate any impacts to water quality. The requirement for the preparation and implementation of the WQMP was contained in a mitigation measure for the Update. With the incorporation of the mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. These issue areas ~~will~~ **were** not be analyzed further in the **Revised DSEIR**.

The Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** also concluded that the Update would have no impact which would 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; 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.

Lastly, the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** concluded that the Update involves the reorganization of campus **buildings and facilities** and the reconfiguration of campus access and circulation from the Prior Plan. The Proposed Project will result in an overall decrease in

~~OGSF and ASF. 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. There were no impacts from the Prior Plan on these issue areas and the same conclusions apply to the Proposed Project. The existing campus is already developed and the uses proposed in the Proposed Project Update would be similar to existing uses; therefore, there would be no impacts related to groundwater discharge. Groundwater in the region is replenished by percolation of stream flows and rainfall from hill areas, not by recharge from the campus area. The existing campus is developed and drains into the City of San Jose storm drain system. There would be no change in the nature of the existing use. There are no streams or rivers on or near the campus. There would be no substantial alteration of current drainage patterns that would result in erosion or siltation. The campus is not within a 100-year floodplain and does not propose the construction of any housing. The campus is not within a dam inundation and would not expose people to seiche, tsunami or mudflow hazards. These issue areas were determined to not need any further analyzed in the Revised DSEIR.~~

Based on the information above, and because there were no changes that would affect Hydrology/Water Quality Resources, Hydrology/Water Quality Resources were not analyzed in the **Revised DSEIR** for the Update. **With the development proposed under the Update,** Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have the **a same superior** environmental affect, **as no additional Hydrology/Water Quality Resources would be affected.**

Land Use/Planning: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the changes proposed within the Prior Plan are a reorganization of the campus buildings and circulation patterns within the existing campus boundaries, with the exception of the new High Technology Center (preferred site), to be located on adjacent land. The Initial Study concluded there would not be a related impact. Since the time of the certification of the Prior Plan EIR, the High Technology Center has been constructed and the land parcel has been incorporated into the campus. This issue was not analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that the Prior Plan had a potentially significant impact and might 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. According to the Initial Study, the San Jose 2020 General Plan does not have jurisdictional authority over the campus, as the College is part of the State Community College System. However, the Prior Plan EIR included a discussion of consistency with policies of the General Plan as they pertain to adjacent land uses. The Prior Plan EIR also considered applicable policies if the Santa Clara County General Plan relative to the homes north of the campus. This analysis is contained in Chapter 4.0 (Environmental and Regulatory Setting) of the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR further indicated that the parcel proposed for the High Technology Center (preferred site) is zoned C-1, Commercial. According to the San Jose Staff, use of the site for classrooms may require rezoning of the parcel. This approval would be processed separately by the City as part of the private development of the High Technology Center. It should also be noted that the High Technology Center site has been rezoned from~~

~~“C-1: Commercial” to “A (PD): Planned Development” and the Center has been constructed; therefore, this is no longer an issue.~~

~~The Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR also indicated that there are no adopted habitat conservation plans that apply to the campus and that there would be no related impact. No habitat conservation plan has been adopted that would apply to the campus to date. This issue was not analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Land Use and Planning Resources were not required to be analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR and were included in Section 10.0 “Effects Found Not to be Significant.”~~

Land Use and Planning was analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update. According to this evaluation, implementation of the Update will exceed the thresholds set by the City of San Jose; however, it should be noted that the City does not have jurisdiction over the College. Conflicts with other applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdictions over the project are cumulative, as described in the other Chapters of the **Revised** DSEIR. With the incorporation of mitigation measures, implementation of the Update will have a less than significant cumulative impact for **Aesthetics**, Air Quality and Noise. ~~Impacts from Aesthetics are considered cumulative and significant.~~ Transportation/Traffic impacts are considered cumulative and significant if agreements cannot be reached with the City of San Jose **Santa Clara County** pertaining to intersection improvements.

Conflicts with other applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdictions over the project may also result in unavoidable adverse impacts. With the incorporation of mitigation measures, implementation of the Update will not result in unavoidable adverse impacts for **Aesthetics**, Air Quality and Noise. ~~Impacts from Aesthetics are considered an unavoidable adverse impact.~~ Transportation/Traffic impacts are considered an unavoidable adverse impact for the reasons discussed above.

Based on this information, the no project alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative as it relates to Land Use and Planning.

Mineral Resources: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, † The San Jose City College is already developed and thus was not available as a mineral resource. The San Jose 2020 General Plan did not designate the campus as a mineral resource. Therefore there would be no impacts on loss of availability of a known mineral that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or 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. Because of this, Mineral Resources were not analyzed the Prior Plan EIR. This would not be an issue with the no project alternative or the Update.~~

Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have the same environmental affect.

Noise: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan could have a potentially significant impact that would result in the 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; in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise~~

~~levels in the Proposed Project vicinity above levels existing without the Proposed Project; and a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Proposed Project vicinity above levels existing without the Proposed Project. Vehicular noise was determined to be the dominant noise source in the vicinity of the campus. Physical development on the site could result in construction noise impacts. The Initial Study stated that the Prior Plan would allow the College to accommodate a larger student population and could draw more community members to campus events. Increased traffic on area roadways could result in higher noise levels at off-site noise sensitive locations. In addition, construction within the campus could cause short-term noise impact in the campus neighborhood. Implementation of the standard construction noise measures, including scheduling, use of proper equipment, shielding, notifying neighbors of upcoming construction, and use of a noise disturbance coordinator may reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. The Initial Study concluded that the Prior Plan EIR would evaluate those potential noise sources.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that implementation of the Prior Plan had no impacts that would result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The types of uses anticipated as part of the Prior Plan include classrooms, student facilities, and other support facilities — uses which would not create excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels. Lastly, the Initial Study determined that based on their review of area maps, the campus is not located within two miles of a public airport, a public use airport or a private airstrip that would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. These issues were not analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Noise was analyzed in Section 5.4 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, the existing noise environment in the campus is variable, being relatively loud in the northern part of the campus, near I-280 and Moorpark Avenue and relatively quiet in the southern part of the campus, away from traffic noise. Buildout of the Prior Plan would generate short-term construction noise which could affect on-site and off-site uses. This was deemed a significant impact; however, with the implementation of mitigation measures, impacts related to short-term construction noise would be reduced to a less than significant level. On-site noise levels from project and cumulative traffic would not expose any new buildings or the athletic fields to noise levels above 70 dB(A); therefore, impacts related to on-site noise would be less than significant. Project-generated traffic would not result in any significant noise increases at any off-site receptors along any area roadways; therefore, impacts related to off-site noise would be less than significant. Increased activity on the campus would result in noise of a similar type and magnitude to existing noise, and would not result in any significant impacts to on or off-site users. Cumulative impacts were determined to be less than significant. After mitigation, noise impacts were considered less than significant.~~

~~Noise was not considered an “Unavoidable Significant Impact” (Section 6.0), did not generate “Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes” (Section 8.0) and was considered an “Effect Found Not to be Significant” (Section 10.0).~~

Noise was analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update. According to this evaluation, Implementation of the Update will generate new noise emissions in an existing relatively high background noise environment. Based on the noise evaluation, the Update’s contributions to cumulative noise impacts, particularly adjacent to roadways, will be less than significant. The project’s contributions to background noise were also determined to be less than a cumulatively

considerable contribution. Although construction noise is identified as being a less than significant impact, mitigation measures will be required as part of the implementation of the Update. Noise generation from campus activities will generally have a less than significant impact on surrounding residential uses with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Implementation of the Update will generate project specific noise and contribute to cumulative noise within the vicinity of the campus. This change will be an unavoidable adverse impact. However, based on the analysis and mitigation presented above, implementation of the Update will not cause a significant unavoidable adverse noise impact.

Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact to Noise Resources. ~~Both the no project alternative and the Implementation of the Update would have the same environmental affect.~~ be **less** superior in terms of Noise Resources over the no project alternative, **as the no project alternative would not result in additional construction and operational impacts anticipated with the implementation of the Update.**

Population/Housing: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan would help the campus accommodate an increase in the enrollment from 10,000 to 15,000 students at buildout. An increase in faculty at the College is also anticipated. To the extent that the increase in students and faculty attracts additional residents to the San Jose area, the growth caused by the increase in population could be considered induced by the project; therefore, that issue was addressed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study indicated that implementation of the Prior Plan would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There is no housing on the campus and no element of the Prior Plan contemplates expansion beyond the established campus boundaries.~~

~~The Prior Plan EIR did not find any "Unavoidable Significant Impacts" (Section 6.0) to Population and Housing. The Prior Plan EIR also did not find any "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0) to Population and Housing. Section 9.0 "Growth Inducement" of the EIR stated the following:~~

- ~~• The increase in students could lead to increased use of local businesses that serve the campus (e.g., restaurants), and lead to indirect economic growth.~~
- ~~• The projected increase in full-time faculty and classified staff, could help induce people to move to the area.~~
- ~~• The proposed project could also induce growth by introducing additional short-term employment opportunities during construction of the Facilities Master Plan projects.~~
- ~~• The proposed project could be considered growth-inducing based on this criterion.~~

~~According to the Prior Plan EIR "Effects Found Not to be Significant" (Chapter 10, Section B12 - Population and Housing, p. 10.0-10), the Prior Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There is no housing on the campus and no element of the Prior Plan contemplates expansion beyond the established campus boundaries. No significant impacts were determined and no mitigation measures were required for Population and Housing Resources.~~

The Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** concluded that, ~~as was the case with the Prior Plan,~~ implementation of the Update may induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. ~~; however, due to the overall decrease in overall proposed square footage with the Proposed Project of 105,425 OGSF/66,161 ASF from the Prior Plan, any impacts will be considered to be further lessened.~~ **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.** Impacts would continue to be considered less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required. This issue area was determined to not need any further analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR. In addition, the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** indicated that implementation of the Update would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There is no housing on the campus and no element of the Update contemplates expansion beyond the established campus boundaries. As a result, no impacts were anticipated, no mitigation measures were required and this issue did not require any further analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR.

Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact to Population and Housing Resources. Due to the anticipated ~~decrease in~~ the **similar** number of students at buildout, implementation of the Update would have a slightly lesser ~~the same~~ environmental affect ~~than as~~ the no project alternative.

Public Services: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout could potentially have significant impacts upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following area 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. Implementation of the Prior Plan would bring additional students, employees and visitors to the campus. It was determined that this could result in an increased demand for fire protection services, police protection services and other governmental services. Based on those conclusions, the impacts from these issue areas would be analyzed in the Public Services of the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The following issue areas were determined to have no impact in the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR: an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools and parks.~~

~~Implementation of the Prior Plan would not result in any direct increase in the residential population of the area; therefore, it was determined that there would be no impact on elementary, junior high or high schools. The Prior Plan would provide a beneficial impact on the community college capacity by allowing the campus to accommodate additional students.~~

~~Public Services were analyzed in Section 5.5 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, the buildout of the Prior Plan would increase the demand for police services from the San Jose - Evergreen Community College Police Department, possibly requiring the need for~~

~~additional staff and/or equipment. Impacts related to additional demand on police services was determined to be less than significant as were impacts related to response times. The increase in student population and building square footage was anticipated to potentially result in a demand for additional security and safety features, such as implementation of a lighting plan, signage plan and installation of security phones. These measures were determined to reduce the impact related to campus safety to a less than significant level. The new access road and the new location for the campus police were determined to be positive impacts.~~

~~The San Jose Fire Department Station #4 is located across from the campus on Leigh Avenue. It is the primary responder to fires on the campus. According to the Prior Plan EIR, it was estimated that the Prior Plan would result in an additional 20 to 40 calls from the campus. This increase was not expected to result in the need for more staff or equipment. In addition, the Prior Plan would have to comply with state and Fire Department requirements regarding the installation of automatic sprinkler systems. For these reasons, it was concluded that impacts to fire services would be less than significant and that cumulative impacts from the implementation of the Prior Plan would also be less than significant.~~

~~Public Services were not considered an "Unavoidable Significant Impact" (Section 6.0); did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0) and the need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following area 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 schools and parks was considered an "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0).~~

The Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** indicated that implementation of the Update would have no 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 schools, parks and other public facilities. The ~~Proposed Project~~ **Update** involves the reorganization of campus **buildings and** facilities and the reconfiguration of campus access and circulation from the Prior Plan. ~~The Update will result in an overall decrease in OGSF and ASF. 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.~~ There were no impacts from the Prior Plan on these issue areas and the same conclusions apply to the Update **to date, April 2010**. ~~It was determine that For this reason these~~ issue areas will not be analyzed further in the **Revised DSEIR**.

A detailed discussion of Police, Fire and Ambulance services is contained in the Hazards analysis above.

Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact to Public Services Resources. Due to the anticipated ~~decrease in the similar~~ number of students at buildout, implementation of the Update would have a ~~slightly lesser the same~~ environmental affect ~~than as~~ the no project alternative.

~~Recreation: According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan would not result in any 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. It was concluded that there would not be a direct increase in the residential population in the area; therefore, there would be no increase in park usage by area residents. Implementation of the Prior Plan would bring additional students, employees and visitors to the campus. The closest neighborhood parks are about one mile from the campus and it was determined that it was unlikely that students would use these parks because of the facilities available for recreation on campus (and because of the campus' function as a community college). This issue was not analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that implementation of the Prior Plan had a potentially significant impact and might include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The Initial Study stated that the Prior Plan includes sports facilities that may be used for recreational purposes; and that the impacts of these facilities on the environment will be addressed in the Prior Plan EIR. There was no specific Section of the Prior Plan EIR that addressed Recreational Resources. The sports facilities were discussed in the Noise Section (5.4) of the Prior Plan EIR. Impacts from noise generated by these facilities were considered less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures D.1.1. (landscaping) and D.1.3. ("user friendly" high-tech public address system). Noise was not considered an "Unavoidable Significant Impact" (Section 6.0), did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0) and was considered an "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0).~~

~~The sports facilities were also discussed in the Visual Quality Section (5.7) of the Prior Plan EIR. Impacts from noise generated by these facilities were considered less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures E.1.3. (landscape buffer) and E.1.6. (sports fields would be organized as a contiguous green band along the southern boundary). Visual Quality was not considered an "Unavoidable Significant Impact" (Section 6.0), did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0) and was considered an "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0).~~

According to the analysis contained in the **Revised** DSEIR, implementation of the Update will contribute to the change of the general area. ~~The Baseball Field Complex poles, netting, batter's eye and wall present the most apparent change in the aesthetic setting in the area of the campus. There is no other structure of this nature in the area in terms of type, scale and function. There will be an associated change in views, both to and from the campus. Even with the proposed mitigation incorporated, the impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level with the poles and netting at a maximum height of 90' adjacent to Leigh Avenue and the apartments to the west. Implementation of the Update does contribute to the cumulative change that will be experienced at this location, and the aesthetic analysis indicates that the construction or expansion of recreational facilities will be significant and will have a cumulative impact on the environment. Based on the data and analysis presented in Chapter 5.2 (Aesthetics) of the DSEIR, the Update cannot be implemented without causing an unavoidable adverse impact from the Baseball Field Complex poles, netting, batter's eye and wall.~~  
**Implementation of the Update will not contribute to the cumulative change that will be experienced at this location due to implementation of reasonably foreseeable projects,**

**and the aesthetic analysis indicates that the construction or expansion of recreational facilities will not be significant or have a cumulative impact on the environment. The existing visual setting of the campus will be permanently altered. The implementation of the components of the Update can be completed; and with mitigation incorporated will not result in unavoidable adverse impacts.**

The no project alternative would **not** result in a change to the visual setting of ~~consistent with the Prior Plan and Prior Plan EIR as this setting is the April 2010 campus.~~ **The no project alternative** It would be environmentally superior in terms of Recreation Resources than implementation of the Update.

~~Transportation/Traffic: According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout could result in a potentially significant impacts and 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. The Prior Plan would result in an increase in the number of trips to, from and within the campus. Use of the campus in the morning and evening could overlap with a.m. and p.m. peak commuting periods; there could also be localized peak traffic associated with the use of the campus only. The proposed new parking structures and circulation changes could affect circulation patterns within the campus and along adjacent roadways. It was concluded that the Prior Plan EIR would evaluate these potential impacts.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR also identified potentially significant impacts from the Prior Plan that could 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; and conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks). It was concluded that roadway safety issues be included in the Prior Plan EIR transportation and circulation analysis. Increased traffic from the increase in enrollment would increase the demand for parking. This issue was identified to be analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR. It was stated that the Prior Plan was not expected to conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation; however, that issue was also analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Lastly, the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that there would be no impact from implementation of the Prior Plan that would 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. The campus is more than 3 miles from the San Jose International Airport, and is about 6 miles from the Reid-Hillview Airport. The campus is not located within the San Jose International Airport Land Use Plan boundaries. The campus is not within the safety areas for any of the area airports. The Prior Plan was not expected to result in increased air traffic because the campus is used by area residents.~~

~~Transportation and Circulation was analyzed in Section 5.1 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, under existing and future conditions, all of the signalized intersections in the campus operate at LOS D or better. Vehicles turning left at the intersection of South Bascom~~

~~Avenue and Kingman Avenue have difficulty finding gaps in the South Bascom Avenue traffic; this condition would worsen with the increase in student enrollment envisioned by the Prior Plan (and with increased traffic on Bascom Avenue from other growth in the area). This impact would not be significant because a signal would not be warranted at the intersection. However, there is the potential for two significant impacts relating to queuing and left-turning vehicles. Restricting the intersection to right turns only would address the impacts, if they occur. All freeway segments near the campus currently operate at unacceptable levels of service during the peak hours. In the near term, the traffic associated with the Prior Plan would not exceed the significance threshold for impacts to freeway congestion. However, the increase in traffic from the Prior Plan buildout volumes would be equal to, or greater than, one percent of the capacity of 12 of the study freeway segments. Therefore, the Prior Plan made a significant contribution to cumulative impacts for those segments. Those significant impacts would not be mitigated because there were no planned improvements for I-280 or SR17 in the vicinity of the campus. Conditions related to parking and pedestrian circulation would be improved with the implementation of the Prior Plan, which included provision of up to 2,990 parking spaces on campus at buildout, a reorganized pedestrian circulation system, as well as other circulation improvements.~~

~~Subsection G of Section 5.4 of the Prior Plan EIR (Level of Significance After Mitigation) concluded that impacts related to left-turning vehicles at the intersection of Kingman Avenue and Bascom Avenue would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of left-turn restrictions. Impacts from the Prior Plan buildout to freeway segments in the area would be unavoidably significant, due to the lack of funding mechanisms or planned or programmed mitigation measures for the freeways (reiterated in Section 6.0 – Unavoidable Significant Impact of the Prior Plan EIR. Safety impacts related to the crosswalk on Laswell Avenue would be mitigated with the relocation of the crosswalk.~~

~~Transportation and Circulation did not generate “Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes” (Section 8.0). Only the Prior Project’s no impact to change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks was considered an “Effect Found Not to be Significant” (Section 10.0).~~

All study intersections currently operate at acceptable levels of service according to the standards set forth by the City of San Jose, VTA, and Caltrans. According to the analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR, all study intersections affected by the implementation of the Update operate acceptably under City of San Jose, VTA, and Caltrans standards except the ~~Bascom Avenue/San Carlos Street, Bascom Avenue/Moorpark Avenue, Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue, and Bascom Avenue/Fruitdale Avenue~~ intersections. Implementation of the Update will contribute an incremental contribution to the operation of these intersections. These intersections are controlled and operated by the ~~City of San Jose~~ **Santa Clara County**. 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~~ **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 an unavoidable adverse impact.

~~Both the Prior Plan and the Implementation of the Update~~ resulted in significant impacts for Transportation/Traffic Resources; ~~however, the no project alternative would be environmentally superior to implementation of the Update in terms of Transportation/Traffic Resources than implementation of the Update.~~

~~Utilities and Service Systems: According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). It was stated that the campus was already developed and generated wastewater and that the Prior Plan would result in similar types of uses as those on the campus currently. No uses were proposed (i.e., industrial uses) that might generate wastewater that exceeds the RWQMB treatment requirements. Therefore, this issue area was not analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study stated that the Prior Plan would result in potentially significant impacts that could 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; or be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Implementation would result in an increase in wastewater generation and demand for potable water. The Prior Plan drainage system would connect to the City of San Jose drainage system. Impervious surfaces were not expected to increase substantially; therefore, it was determined that there would not be a substantial increase in storm drainage from the project. Solid waste generation was anticipated to increase with the increased student enrollment. All of these issue areas were analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Lastly, the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that the types of uses proposed under the Prior Plan raised no specific issues related to compliance with solid waste laws and regulation. There would be no related impact and this issue would not be addressed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Public Utilities were analyzed in Section 5.6 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, buildout of the Prior Plan would result in an increased demand for potable water. It was estimated that the 15,000 students accommodated by buildout of the Prior Plan and the increase in landscaped area would result in an increase in water use to about 314,000 gallons per day. The College obtains water from the San Jose Water Company (SJWC). SJWC indicated that it did not expect any shortage in the near future. The College would employ water conservation measures in the new buildings and landscaped areas. The impacts were considered less than significant. It was also stated that construction of the new buildings would require installation of new water distribution lines within the campus boundaries. Water pipe capacity would be evaluated and upgraded, if necessary, at the beginning of each individual project. It was concluded that the upgrades would address any potential impacts related to fire flow requirements and water line condition.~~

~~The Prior Plan EIR indicated that buildout of the Prior Plan would generate 0.09 million gallons of wastewater per day. It was stated that the San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) and the City of San Jose's collection pipes had sufficient capacity to accommodate that increase of wastewater; therefore, the impact to wastewater collection and treatment was considered less than significant.~~

~~Subsections B7 and C7 of Section 5.6 of the Prior Plan EIR (Significance after Mitigation) concluded the following as it related to water supply and wastewater capacity, respectively: the Water Company does not expect any supply problems and the impact would be less than significant after mitigation; and all impacts to wastewater services would be less than significant.~~

~~Public Utilities did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0). Impacts related to storm water drainage and solid wastes were considered an "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0).~~

The Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** concluded that implementation of 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. These impacts were determined to be less than significant impacts (with mitigation incorporated) ~~from implementation of the Prior Plan~~. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. It was determined that no additional analysis would be required in the **DSEIR**.

Lastly, the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** indicated that implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact that would 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; 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. ~~Impacts from the implementation of the Prior Plan were considered less than significant or no impact on these issue areas. The Update involves the reorganization of campus buildings and facilities and the reconfiguration of campus access and circulation from the Prior Plan. The Update will result in an overall decrease in OGSF and ASF. 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. Consistent with the Prior Plan, t~~ This determination can be made because the campus is fully developed and the proposed **buildings and facilities** would be similar in function to existing **buildings and facilities**. All of these issue areas will have an incremental impact; however, ~~since they are less than the Prior Plan~~, they were considered less than significant. It was determined that these issue areas would no be further analyzed in the **Revised DSEIR**.

Both the no project alternative and the implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact to Utility and Service System Resources. Due to the anticipated decrease in the **similar** number of students at buildout, implementation of the Update would have a slightly lesser **the same** environmental affect than **as** the no project alternative.

### **~~6.3 NOT CLOSING THE SOUTHERN CAMPUS ENTRY~~**

**This alternative has been deleted, as the southern campus entry was closed in April 2010 as implementation of the Prior Plan.**

~~This alternative consists of leaving the southerly Campus access open for vehicular traffic instead of closing it as proposed in the implementation of the Update. Closure of this Campus access results in adding additional traffic to the other Campus entries. With this scenario, the bulk of the additional traffic will be placed at the intersection of Bascom and Kingman Avenues. Under this alternative, the analysis, impacts, mitigation, significance, etc., contained in the Initial Study and DSEIR would be identical for the following issue areas: Aesthetics, Land Use/Planning, Recreation, Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Hazards, Hydrology/Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Population/Housing, Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems. Therefore, no additional analysis will be provided below.~~

~~Under this alternative, there is the potential for changes to the following issue areas: Air Quality, Noise and Transportation/Traffic. A summary comparative discussion of this alternative in terms of the specific issues evaluated in this DSEIR follows.~~

#### ~~Air Quality~~

~~Based on the information contained in the *Air Quality Analysis San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update 2021, City of San Jose, California*, prepared by Giroux and Associates, dated February 6, 2009, implementation of the Update will not result air quality impacts that will exceed the thresholds of significance established for individual projects. Combined with other projects in the local area, future emissions, when measured against the established thresholds, will be not be cumulatively significant and will result in less than significant adverse impacts to air quality.~~

~~Mitigation measures for air quality impacts have been included for construction, construction airborne toxins, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. No mitigation is required for operational impacts. With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts remain less than significant and are not considered cumulatively significant. In addition, there will not be any unavoidable adverse impacts from implementation of the Update.~~

~~With the southerly access to the Campus remaining open, it is anticipated that the congestion at the intersection of Bascom and Kingman Avenues will be reduced. With this reduction comes a reduction in emissions from automobiles. This alternative would be slightly environmentally superior in terms of Air Quality Resources over the Update.~~

#### ~~Noise~~

Noise was analyzed in the DSEIR for the Update. According to this evaluation, Implementation of the Update will generate new noise emissions in an existing relatively high background noise environment. Based on the noise evaluation, the Update's contributions to cumulative noise impacts, particularly adjacent to roadways, will be less than significant. The project's contributions to background noise were also determined to be less than a cumulatively considerable contribution. Although construction noise is identified as being a less than significant impact, mitigation measures will be required as part of the implementation of the Update. Noise generation from Campus activities will generally have a less than significant impact on surrounding residential uses with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Implementation of the Update will generate project specific noise and contribute to cumulative noise within the vicinity of the Campus. This change will be an unavoidable adverse impact. However, based on the analysis and mitigation presented above, implementation of the Update will not cause a significant unavoidable adverse noise impact.

An impetus for the proposed closure of the southerly Campus access has come from the residents along Sherman Oaks Drive, Rexford Way and Kingman Avenue (the portion adjacent to the southerly Campus access). The District has received on-going comments, as well as comments at the public scoping meeting regarding noise intrusion into the neighborhood. The primary noise source was determined to be from service vehicles accessing the Campus. This access is unrestricted and can occur at any hour of the day. Based on the noise thresholds utilized for the DSEIR, it does not appear that the noise generated by these service vehicles is significant; however, it is perceived as a nuisance to the residents. With Campus control over timing or access for these service vehicles, this noise source can be reduced and even eliminated. Mitigation can be incorporated by limiting the time of day/week that the service vehicles can utilize the southerly Campus entry. In addition, the District can require that service vehicles utilize other Campus access points.

Implementation of the Update eliminates all vehicles (including service vehicles) from the southerly Campus entry. This eliminates any potential noise impacts. These noise impacts are not considered significant, but rather, more of a nuisance. With the incorporation of mitigation measures, the District can reduce and even eliminate the noise impacts in the neighborhood adjacent to the southerly Campus access. Based on this analysis, both the Update and this alternative potentially have the same environmental impact.

#### Transportation/Traffic

According to the analysis in the DSEIR, all study intersections affected by the implementation of the Update operate acceptably under City of San Jose, VTA, and Caltrans standards except the Bascom Avenue/San Carlos Street, Bascom Avenue/Moorpark Avenue, Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue, and Bascom Avenue/Fruitdale Avenue intersections. Implementation of the Update will contribute an incremental contribution to the operation of these intersections. These intersections are 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 cumulative and significant.

~~As stated in the preamble to the analysis of this alternative, closure of the southerly Campus access is resulting in adding additional traffic to the other Campus entries. With this scenario, the bulk of the additional traffic will be placed at the intersection of Bascom and Kingman Avenues. If the southerly Campus entry remained open, the impacts to the Bascom/Kingman intersection would be lessened to the point that impacts would be considered less than significant (as was the case with the Prior Plan). As a result, this alternative is environmentally superior in terms of Transportation/Traffic Resources than the implementation of the Update.~~

## **6.4 6.3 PROJECT ENTRY AT LELAND AVENUE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS**

This alternative consists of allowing additional turning movements at the intersection of Moorpark and Leland Avenues. Currently, this entry is only allows right-in and right-out turning movements. An analysis was conducted by Fehr & Peers, as part of the TIA (reference the Technical Appendices to this **Revised** DSEIR in the enclosed CD) for an alternative configuration to provide a full access intersection which would allow northbound and southbound through movements.

Under this alternative, the analysis, impacts, mitigation, significance, etc., contained in the Initial Study and **the Revised** DSEIR would be identical for the following issue areas: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Land Use/Planning, Recreation, Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Hazards, Hydrology/Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population/Housing, Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems. Therefore, no additional analysis will be provided below.

~~Under this alternative, there is the only potential issue area affected is for changes to the following issue areas: and Transportation/Traffic. The following is a A summary comparative discussion of comparing this alternative to the Update in terms of the specific issues with respect to Transportation/Traffic issues evaluated in this Revised DSEIR follows.~~

### Transportation/Traffic

The following is an analysis of the intersections and roadways that would be affected by the reconfiguration of the Moorpark Avenue/Leland Avenue intersection.

Daily roadway segment counts were performed at select locations near the campus before and after school was in session in August and September 2007, respectively. These counts were performed for a 72-hour period on a Tuesday through Thursday. The average of the three days was calculated based on these counts and used to represent the daily volume in both directions for each segment.

The volumes on Leland Avenue reflect a moderate increase in traffic volumes between the two time periods which is likely due to school being in session. Based on historical counts throughout the greater San Jose area, traffic volumes on arterials and freeways are generally higher while schools are in session. This usually occurs even on roadways where there are no schools present or nearby. The increases on Leland Avenue of 6% and 11% are also approximately within the range of a typical day-to-day fluctuation in traffic volume. However, it is possible that College generates approximately 200 vehicles per day on Leland Avenue north

of Parkmoor Avenue. In comparison it is likely that the College generates all of the increases on Mansfield Drive and Sherman Oaks Drive. Because these two roadways are primarily used for local residential traffic it is assumed that the large increase would be attributed to the College.

Access patterns to campus are projected to change minimally with the full access intersection. For example, vehicles destined to the parking garage from northbound I-280 would most likely follow the same travel pattern and continue to turn left at Leigh Avenue. However, a few other patterns may change on Leigh and Leland Avenues. For example, vehicles exiting the parking garage and heading for northbound Interstate 280 will no longer turn right out of the campus driveway at Leland Avenue, then make a left at Leigh Avenue, and then make another left at Parkmoor Avenue. Instead, they would continue through the Moorpark Avenue/Leland Avenue intersection and make a left at Parkmoor Avenue to access the northbound I-280 on-ramp.

The levels of service at the study intersections were also calculated to determine the effect that an alternate access at Moorpark Avenue and Leland Avenue would have on the roadway system. The results of the level of service analysis indicate that the study intersections would operate at the same levels of service as Project Conditions with slight changes to the delays compared to the existing configuration. Therefore, it is expected that this alternate access option would not create any new significant impact at the study intersections. It should also be noted that the Mansfield Drive and Sherman Oaks Drive roadways are expected to have substantially less traffic during times when school is in session with the closure of the southern access point.

The buildout of the campus is expected to generate additional trips on Leland Avenue. Based on the trip generation and distribution, the Update is estimated to add approximately 20 daily trips to Leland Avenue north on Parkmoor Avenue with the existing access option. It is likely that additional vehicles (more than the 20 daily trips estimated) would use Leland Avenue to access the campus if this alternate configuration is adopted. Although this is not the primary route for most vehicles, creating this type of intersection would likely increase the volume on Leland Avenue by providing a more convenient access option. Additional studies may be needed after the opening of this access point to monitor the potential impact to this roadway.

With this alternative additional flexibility in terms of turning movements would be allowed at this campus entry. Additional trips would be added from the implementation of the Update and even more trips would be generated with the implementation of the Update and the re-configuration of this intersection. According to the TIA, this intersection operates within the established thresholds of the City of San Jose and the VTA. Based on this analysis, both the Update and this alternative potentially have the same environmental impact to Transportation/Traffic Resources.

## **6.5 6.4 ALTERNATIVE LOCATION**

The Project could theoretically be developed at alternative locations within the vicinity of the San Jose City College. However, the California Supreme Court determined that examination of infeasible alternatives need not be given exhaustive evaluation. Specifically the court case Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors, 1988 the court stated:

*[A] Project alternative which cannot be feasibly accomplished need not be exhaustively considered. A feasible alternative is one which can be accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, legal, social and technological factors [Citations.] Surely whether a property is owned or can reasonably be acquired by the project proponent has strong bearing on the likelihood of a project's ultimate costs and the chances for an expeditious and successful accomplishment.*

The State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(f)(1) state: *Feasibility. Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of alternatives.*

The Project is designed to provide a Community College level educational facility to serve the residents of the City of San Jose and the surrounding communities. The campus is located in San Jose, which is primarily an urbanized area, with limited properties with adequate acreage to facilitate the development of a campus. Therefore, it is feasible to meet the objectives of the Update at another location and an alternative location will be analyzed. The Evergreen Valley College (EVC) is within the same Community College District as San Jose Community College (SJCC) **and is an educational facility located in a highly urbanized area. It meets the Goleta test because it is located in the same community college district and is located in proximity to SJCC.** ~~In addition, the EVC campus was used in some of the alternatives analysis for the Prior Plan EIR. For those reasons, the EVC campus will be utilized as the alternative location alternative. For the purpose of this alternative location alternative analysis it is assumed that the new revised Update components would all be built at EVC rather than SJCC, including the Baseball Field Complex would be constructed at the EVC campus.~~

The information contained in the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** and the other Chapters of this **Revised** DSEIR, as well some of the baseline discussion in the alternative analysis contained in the Prior Plan EIR will serve as the basis for the evaluation that follows.

Aesthetics: ~~Under the proposed Update, installation of the Baseball Field Complex components will result in a significant impact that cannot be fully mitigated. All other impacts to Aesthetic Resources as a result of implementation of the Update are considered less than significant, with mitigation incorporated.~~

Although there are views of across the EVC campus to the San Felipe Hills, views from within the campus that are of high quality, development on the EVC campus would not interfere with these visual resources because the campus is already developed, and because additional development would be similar in type and scale to what is already present. However, construction on the campus could affect the existing visual character of the site or result in light or glare.

~~The Baseball Field complex could be installed at the EVC campus with little aesthetic impact. The alternative project alternative would have a less than significant impact to Aesthetic~~

Resources. As a result, the alternative location alternative would have a ~~superior~~ **comparable** environmental affect on Aesthetic Resources than the Update.

Agricultural Resources: The SJCC campus is completely developed and is surrounded by urban uses. Therefore there would be no impacts that would 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 contract; 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.

According to the Prior Plan EIR, impacts to Agricultural Resources at the EVC campus would be less than significant.

The alternative project alternative would have a less than significant impact to Agricultural Resources. Implementation of the Update would have no impact upon Agricultural Resources. As a result, both the alternative location alternative and the implementation of the Update would in essence have the same environmental affect on Agricultural Resources.

Air Quality: Based on the information contained in the *Air Quality Analysis San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update 2021, City of San Jose, California*, prepared by Giroux and Associates, dated February 6, 2009, **and *Air Quality Analysis San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update, City of San Jose, California*, prepared by Giroux and Associates, dated April 22, 2010** implementation of the Update ~~will not result air quality impacts that will exceed the thresholds of significance established for individual projects~~ **will result in temporary significant adverse impacts to air quality. Since these impacts of short duration they are considered less than significant.** Combined with other **reasonably foreseeable** projects in the local area, future emissions, when measured against the established thresholds, will not be cumulatively significant and will result in less than significant adverse impacts to air quality

Mitigation measures for air quality impacts have been included for construction, construction airborne toxins, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. No mitigation is required for operational impacts. With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts remain less than significant and are not considered cumulatively significant. In addition, there will not be any unavoidable adverse impacts from implementation of the Update.

According to the Prior Plan EIR, similar to the SJCC campus, construction at the EVC campus would involve the implementation of all feasible dust control measures to minimize impacts related to construction dust. ~~The Prior Plan would not result in significant impacts to air quality other than the cumulative contribution to regional air pollutant emissions, due to the increase in auto traffic.~~ Development at the EVC would result in similar impacts to regional air quality because development at EVC would result in fewer trips to and from the SJCC campus, but could result in more trips in eastern San Jose (plus, some students may need to drive further to get to the EVC campus, resulting in more vehicle miles traveled). There was no discussion of GHG's at the time of the Prior Plan EIR and the Alternative Analysis contained therein **because there was no existing regulatory or analytic framework available.**

The alternative project alternative would result in additional on site development at the EVC campus. Impacts from construction impact could be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of dust control measures and other mitigation measures. Additional vehicle miles traveled to the EVC campus would result in additional emissions. Air Quality impacts from the implementation of the Update were determined to be less than significant. As a result, implementation of the Update would have a potentially lesser environmental affect on Air Quality ~~Cultural Resources~~ than at the EVC campus due to less vehicle miles required to travel to the SJCC campus.

Biological Resources: The SJCC campus is completely developed and is within an urban area. There is limited habitat value on the campus. The existing trees and lawns may provide habitat to birds and mammals that occur in urban areas, such as pigeons and starlings. The campus has no natural areas, and the existing landscaping does not provide suitable habitat for special status species. Therefore, **implementation of the Prior Plan Update** would not have any impacts on such species. However, removal or relocation of existing trees could affect birds nesting in the trees. A mitigation measure was added to reduce any impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the campus is not identified in any adopted plan as having natural communities; therefore, **implementation of the Prior Plan Update** would not have any impacts on sensitive communities. There are no wetlands on campus; therefore, there would be no impacts to these resources. Also, the campus does not provide any wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites, as it is located in an urban area surrounded by development and major transportation corridors. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans that apply to the campus.

Development on the EVC campus could result in impacts to special status species because a portion of the campus is undeveloped grassland that may provide biological resource values. Potential impacts to these values are unknown at this time, but it can be assumed that any development in these areas would require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The alternative project alternative may require mitigation measures for project impacts to Biological Resources. Implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact to Biological Resources. As a result, implementation of the Update would have a potentially lesser environmental affect on Biological Resources than at the EVC campus.

Cultural Resources: The SJCC campus is completely developed, and almost all facilities would be constructed within the campus boundaries. ~~(The High Technology Center proposed in the Prior Plan has been completed. The land for the Center, adjacent and contiguous to the campus, was acquired by the District. The land parcel and the Center have been fully integrated into the campus.)~~ The San Jose *2020 General Plan* does not mention paleontological resources as an area of concern at the City. The Geotechnical Report indicates that the campus is underlain by alluvium, and does not indicate any bedrock unit(s) underlying the campus. Therefore, it appears that there would not be any impacts to unique paleontological resources, but the evidence is not conclusive.

A cultural resource evaluation conducted in November 1999 by Archaeological Resource Management for the Initial Study found that there were no recorded archaeological sites located on campus or within a half-mile radius of the campus. This would indicate that the probability of

finding any archaeological resources is very low. The Initial Study further indicated that, the Santa Clara Valley is known for having buried archaeological resources. A mitigation measure was added to require archaeological monitoring during earthmoving activities; thereby, reducing any impacts to a less than significant level. This mitigation measure was also applied to item 5 (d) of the Initial Study Checklist which asked if implementation of the Prior Plan would “disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.” With incorporation of this mitigation measure, impacts were considered less than significant.

~~Lastly, the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that, based on a cultural resource evaluation conducted in November 1999 by Archaeological Resource Management, it was determined that the buildings (built in 1950s to the 1980s) proposed to be demolished have no architectural or historical significance and do not appear to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources. The study consisted of an archival record search and a surface reconnaissance of the campus. It was determined that there would be no impacts from implementation of the Prior Plan that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. The District~~ **obtained updated historic resource evaluations from historic resource experts Archaeological Resource Management, dated October 23, 2009. These reports are attached to this letter. A report entitled “Stage I: Historical Background & Photography of 12 Structures on the San Jose City College Campus in the City Of San José,” was prepared to address the status of any potential historical structures located on the SJCC campus. This evaluation concluded that three (3) sets of Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms be completed for the structures scheduled for demolition for the purpose of evaluation and documentation. A Stage II Analysis was also prepared, entitled “Stage II Historic Evaluation of 12 Structures on the San José City College Campus,” prepared by Archaeological Resource Management. In it are three (3) sets of Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms for the purpose of documenting the subject structures prior to demolition; one set for the five structures included in the Athletic Complex, one set for the 100, 200, and 300 Classroom Blocks and the Old Central Plant, and one set for the three structures that make up the Fine Arts Complex. This report concluded that none of the twelve structures that were evaluated appear to be potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources.**

~~Cultural Resources were not required to be analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR and this element was designated in Section 10.0 – “Effects Found Not to be Significant.”~~

Based on the information above, and because there were no changes that would affect Cultural Resources, Cultural Resources were not analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update.

There could be impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources at the EVC campus if they are disturbed during construction. Potential impacts to these resources are unknown at this time, but it can be assumed that any development in these areas would require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The alternative project alternative may require mitigation measures for project impacts to Cultural Resources. Implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact to Cultural Resources, with mitigation required. As a result, implementation of the Update would

have a potentially lesser environmental affect on Cultural Resources than at the EVC campus since the SJCC campus is full developed and situated in an urban setting.

~~Geology/Soils: According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan~~  
~~buildout~~ **Any building on campus** could result in or expose people to potentially significant impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; location 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; or location on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property. ~~The Initial Study stated that the City of San Jose Geotechnical Report indicates that the~~ **The** campus is subject to a moderately high potential for liquefaction; however, ~~that Report also rated the resultant ground failure potential as moderately low to low. The Initial Study indicated that~~ **s** Some earth movement would be required for construction on campus, resulting in potential soil erosion. Weak soil layers and lenses occur at random locations and depths beneath the campus, and the campus has been subjected to subsidence in the past. Lastly, soils the potential for expansive soils were identified. ~~It was determined that these issues needed to be analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR determined there a less than significant impact from implementation of the Prior plan due to strong seismic ground shaking. There is always the potential for a seismic event and with an increase in the number if students and faculty on-campus, risk exposure is increased. However, the Initial Study indicated that~~ **t** The State of California would require all construction on the campus to comply with the latest version of the Uniform Building Code (UBC), and specifically with the requirements for public school facilities (which are more stringent than those for general structures). Impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. ~~In addition, the Prior Plan called for the removal of~~ **e** Older campus buildings **have been removed** and replaced ~~ment~~ with new ones that ~~could~~ **have** increased seismic safety on the campus. ~~Based on this information, this issue area was not evaluated in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

The following issue areas were determined to have no impact ~~in the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR:~~ 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; landslides; and 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. There are no active faults within the campus. The campus topography is flat and not subject to landslides. Lastly, ~~the Prior Plan did not include the~~ **there is no** use of alternative wastewater systems. ~~Based on this information, these issue areas were not evaluated in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Geological, Seismicity and Soils was analyzed in Section 5.2 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan site~~ **The campus** is situated in the Santa Clara Valley above alluvial fan deposits. The ~~site~~ **campus** is fully developed. The ~~site~~ **campus** would be subject to severe seismic shaking in case of a major earthquake in the region. Compliance with the California Building Code and State requirements would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Although the site is flat and grading would be minimal, impacts relating to soil erosion would be significant unless mitigation measures ~~identified in the Prior Plan EIR~~ are

followed. There could be potentially weak soils under the campus and the soils may undergo settlement under high loads. With implementation of recommendations in project-specific geotechnical reports, this impact would be less than significant. Given that the Prior Plan would result in the replacement of older, existing buildings with new structures and utilities built to current Building Code and State requirements, there would not be a significant impact with respect to expansive soils.

~~Subsection I of Section 5.2 of the Prior Plan EIR (Level of Significance after Mitigation) concluded that all geological impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Prior Plan EIR and compliance with the requirements of the California Building Code.~~

~~Geological, Seismicity and Soils impacts did result in "Unavoidable Significant Impacts" (Section 6.0) and did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0). The 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; landslides; and 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; and strong seismic ground shaking were all considered an "Effect Found not to be Significant" (Section 10.0).~~

Based on the information above, and because there were no changes that would affect Geology/Soils Resources, Geology/Soils Resources were not analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update.

Development at the EVC campus could result in significant impacts related to seismicity because the campus may or may not be on or near the Evergreen Fault line. In addition, the surrounding area is hilly, there could be impacts related to landslides and erosion. Potential impacts to these resources are unknown at this time, but it can be assumed that any development in these areas would require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The alternative project alternative may require mitigation measures for project impacts to Geology/Soils Resources. Implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact to Geology/Soils Resources, with mitigation required. As a result, implementation of the Update would have a potentially lesser environmental affect on Geology/Soils Resources than at the EVC campus since the SJCC campus is fully developed, situated in an urban setting and not proximate to any fault lines.

Hazards: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout could result in potentially significant impacts that could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Prior Plan would not involve any changes to the existing arterial street network, including emergency routes. Proposed changes with the Prior Plan could improve emergency access by providing more roadway access to the campus interior and two entrances connected to the internal roadway. Increased traffic from the increase in enrollment and employment could result in an increase in congestion on area streets, including streets used for emergency routes. Therefore, this issue area was analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study stated that the Prior Plan would result in a less than significant impact to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The proposed Science and Math Educational Complex, Corporate Yard, Professional Education Center, Reprographics Facility, and Photo Laboratories would involve activities that use hazardous materials and result in the generation of small amounts of hazardous waste. The High Technology Center would be used for business and computer information systems, data processing, applied science, and general classrooms; some of these activities could also result in the generation of small amounts of hazardous waste. The College would follow all City, County, State and Federal requirements to prevent employees or student exposure and ensure safe use, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials or wastes. The Prior Plan was determined to not result in any significant hazards to the public or the environment through routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, or through upset and accident conditions. Lastly, buildings to be demolished as part of the Prior Plan could contain asbestos. If asbestos was to be found, the District would implement standards (required) safety procedures to prevent any exposure. For these reasons, any impacts were considered less than significant without any other mitigation required.~~

~~No impacts were anticipated from the Prior Plan that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; 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 Sect 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (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); result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip); 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. The College has been designated by the California State Water Resources Control Board as having leaking underground storage tanks. They were removed around 1994. The campus is not located within two miles of a public airport and there are no private airstrips within two miles of the campus. The site is located in an urbanized area and will not involve the placement of structures in areas containing flammable brush.~~

~~Hazards, as they pertain to emergency access were not analyzed in one specific Section of the Prior Plan EIR. "Result in inadequate emergency access" is a significance criterion according to Subsection E (Significance Criteria and Project Impacts) of the Transportation and Circulation (Section 5.1) of the Prior Plan EIR. Based on a review of Section 5.1 this was not a significant impact. Transportation and Circulation mitigation measures were provided to improve circulation to, from, around and within the campus.~~

~~Hazard impacts did not result in an "Unavoidable Significant Impact." Hazards were discussed in "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0). According to this Section, the College does not use or transport large amounts of hazardous materials. The College would follow all applicable requirements to ensure safe use, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials or wastes on campus; therefore there would not be any significant~~

~~hazards. In addition, the District would implement standard (required) safety procedures to prevent worker exposure to asbestos, should asbestos be found during building demolition. The following issue areas were determined to have no impacts from the Prior Project and were included in "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0) of the Prior Plan EIR: 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 Sect 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, would the project 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.~~

The Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** concluded that implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact that would 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; or impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. These issues were determined to be less than significant under the Prior Plan and there have been no changes or no new issues relative to Hazards since the certification of the Prior EIR that would alter these conclusions **to date, April 2010**. The Update involves the reorganization of campus **buildings and** facilities and the reconfiguration of campus access and circulation from the Prior Plan, and in an overall decrease in OGSF and ASF. **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.** One particular hazard issue, hazards created by potential errant baseballs exiting the baseball field (not related to hazardous substances contained in this Section of the Initial Study), was addressed in Chapter 5.4 (Land Use and Planning) of this Revised DSEIR. The Hazard issue areas listed above was not be analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR.

Two additional mitigation measures were added under the Update. One was recommended by the Department of Toxic Substances Control for potential environmental concerns from demolition of the older structures on-site. They recommend these concerns 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."* Another mitigation measure was added under Chapter 5.3 (Air Quality) as it pertains to toxic airborne contaminants. These two mitigation measures further implement the demolition of older structures.

Lastly, comments were made on the NOP for the 2009 DSEIR regarding the adequacy of emergency service response in the vicinity of the campus. Follow-up conversations were made with the San José/Evergreen Community College Police Department (College PD), the San Jose Police Department (SJPD), the San Jose Fire Department (SJFD) and the American Medical Response (AMR- ambulance service). The following is a synopsis of the conversations:

- Ray Aguirre, Chief of Police for the San José/Evergreen Community College Police Department (College PD). The College PD has primary jurisdiction over both San Jose City College (SJCC) and Evergreen Valley College (EVC - located 14 miles away). The College PD has four (4) permanent officers to police both Colleges. They work two (2) shifts each and work Monday through Saturday. The San Jose Police Department (SJPD) takes all calls (after hours). The College PD has four (4) reserve officers for coverage of sick/vacationing officers. He indicated that reportable crimes in the area are pretty standard and not above or beyond what is normal. The College PD has become more proactive and engaged in the community and they try to be seen on and off campus and in the neighborhoods. He indicated that he has seen no upsurge of crime but he could definitely use 6-7 more officers ideally to work graveyard and not depend on SJPD and for better man power in general. As for large events, they contract with SJPD for the number of officers they need per event. Six years ago they had an incident where things were not organized well and there was a problem. Since then they have formed an events committee and they organize and staff officers as needed, handle custodial services and IT and the organizers of the events pay for security and the College PD reserves the right to turn down any event that they feel would not be good for the college or the community. As far as auto theft and burglary in general, he says it is typical for area and compared to De Anza College in Cupertino, which is in a nicer area even, the SJCC has a lower rate for these problems. Trespassing is an issue as the campus is open and anyone can walk onto campus or the surrounding neighborhood and vagrancy can be an issue as well.
- Brad Cloutier, Bureau of Fire Prevention. Station 4 on Leigh Avenue provides both truck and engine service. The engines are the first to respond to any emergency; then any subsequent emergencies are dispatched by the truck company. He indicated that the only way response times would be hindered near the campus or on-site is if there are emergencies in progress that the trucks and engines responded to already then station 10 (next closest) or other stations would have to cover. While Moorpark is sometimes congested – Leigh is usually open and easily accessible. American Medical Response handles ambulance service in the area.
- Geoff Kady, Fire Department Bureau of Support Services. He indicated that Station 4 achieves the eight minute response time at 98.3% of the time. Their goal is an eight (8) minute 8 response time 80% of the time. He also indicated that Station 10 is operating with an 82.1% efficiency.
- Chris Moore, Deputy Chief (San Jose Police Department). He indicated that the City is safe overall and that particular neighborhood is doing well because the neighbors are so involved.
- Marcie Morrow, American Medical Response (AMR). AMR is meeting their contracted

requirement for response times and other than normal rush hour traffic. It was indicated that there is no problem with congestion near the College; especially since the response times are being met.

The information obtained from the pertinent public services entities (above), indicated that any impacts from the Update would be less than significant. No additional analysis was required in the **Revised** DSEIR.

Based on the information above, and because there were no changes that would affect Hazard Resources, Hazard Resources were not analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update.

According to the information contained in the Alternatives (Section 7.0) of the Prior Plan EIR, impacts to hazardous materials at the EVC campus would be less than significant.

The alternative location alternative would have a less than significant impact to Hazard Resources. Implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact upon Hazard Resources with mitigation incorporated. As a result, the alternative project alternative would have a slightly greater environmental superiority since there are older structures on the SJCC campus that will be demolished as part of the Update that will require additional attention during demolition.

~~**Hydrology/Water Quality:** According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout could create or contribute potentially significant impacts related to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The Initial Study stated that development of the Prior Plan could result in declining quality of stormwater runoff due to non-point source urban pollutants (from increased traffic on areas streets, for example) and increased soil erosion and downstream sedimentation during project-related local construction. Construction related impacts would be avoided through preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which is required under NPDES for development over five acres. The District would implement Best Management Practices (BMP's — included as a mitigation measure) to reduce non-point source pollution during project operations. It was determined that the impacts from this issue would be analyzed in the Public Services and Utilities Sections of the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR determined there would be a less than significant impact with mitigation required that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. With the above referenced mitigation incorporated, impacts were determined to be reduced to a less than significant level. Based on this information, this issue area was not evaluated in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The following issue areas were determined to have no impact in the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR: 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; 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.~~

~~The uses anticipated within the campus would not create effluent discharges from point sources, and thus would not violate any waste discharge requirements. The existing campus is already developed and the uses proposed in the Prior Plan would be similar to existing uses; therefore, there would be no impacts related to groundwater discharge. Groundwater in the region is replenished by percolation of stream flows and rainfall from hill areas, not by recharge from the campus area. The existing campus is developed and drains into the City of San Jose storm drain system. There would be no change in the nature of the existing use. There are no streams or rivers on or near the campus. There would be no substantial alteration of current drainage patterns that would result in erosion or siltation. The campus is not within a 100-year floodplain and does not propose the construction of any housing. The campus is not within a dam inundation and would not expose people to seiche, tsunami or mudflow hazards. Based on this information, these issue areas were not evaluated in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Hydrology and Water Quality impacts (through analysis in Public Utilities) did not result in "Unavoidable Significant Impacts" (Section 6.0) and did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0). The following were all considered an "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0): 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; 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.~~

According to the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR**, 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. Construction related impacts

would be avoided through preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which is required under NPDES for development over five acres. A mitigation measure was incorporated to the construction phase of any project.

~~Since the certification of the Prior Plan EIR, new~~ Regulations 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 WQMP contains best management practices (BMP's) and other measures necessary to protect water quality. These best management practices can include management activities, as well as mechanical and infiltrative treatment measures.

The implementation of these practices is expected to minimize or eliminate any impacts to water quality. The requirement for the preparation and implementation of the WQMP was contained in a mitigation measure for the Update. With the incorporation of the mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. These issue areas ~~will~~ **were** not be analyzed further in the **Revised DSEIR**.

The Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** also concluded that the Update would have no impact which would 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; 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.

Lastly, the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** concluded that the Update involves the reorganization of campus **buildings and facilities** ~~and the reconfiguration of campus access and circulation from the Prior Plan.~~ ~~The Proposed Project will result in an overall decrease in OGSF and ASF.~~ **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.** ~~There were no impacts from the Prior Plan on these issue areas and the same conclusions apply to the Proposed Project.~~ The existing campus is already developed and the uses proposed in the Proposed Project would be similar to existing uses; therefore, there would be no impacts related to groundwater discharge. Groundwater in the region is replenished by percolation of stream flows and rainfall from hill areas, not by recharge from the campus area. The existing campus is developed and drains into the City of San Jose storm drain system. There would be no change in the nature of the existing use. There are no streams or rivers on or near the campus. There would be no substantial alteration of current drainage patterns that would result

in erosion or siltation. The campus is not within a 100-year floodplain and does not propose the construction of any housing. The campus is not within a dam inundation and would not expose people to seiche, tsunami or mudflow hazards. These issue areas were determined to not need any further analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR.

Development at the EVC campus could result in hydrology or water quality impacts to Yerba Buena Creek, which is south of Yerba Buena Road, Thompson Creek, which is west of San Felipe Road. Potential impacts include increased runoff, nonpoint source pollution and decreased water quality. Potential impacts to these resources are unknown at this time, but it can be assumed that any development in these areas would require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The alternative project alternative may require mitigation measures for project impacts to Hydrology/Water Quality Resources. Implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact to Geology/Soils Resources, with mitigation required. As a result, implementation of the Update would have a potentially lesser environmental affect on Geology/Soils Resources than at the EVC campus since the SJCC campus is fully developed, situated in an urban setting and not proximate to any natural streams or creeks.

Land Use and Planning: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the changes proposed within the Prior Plan are a reorganization of the campus buildings and circulation patterns within the existing campus boundaries, with the exception of the new High Technology Center (preferred site), to be located on adjacent land. The Initial Study concluded there would not be a related impact. Since the time of the certification of the Prior Plan EIR, the High Technology Center has been constructed and the land parcel has been incorporated into the campus. This issue was not analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that the Prior Plan had a potentially significant impact and might 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. According to the Initial Study, the San Jose 2020 General Plan does not have jurisdictional authority over the campus, as the College is part of the State Community College System. However, the Prior Plan EIR included a discussion of consistency with policies of the General Plan as they pertain to adjacent land uses. The Prior Plan EIR also considered applicable policies if the Santa Clara County General Plan relative to the homes north of the campus. This analysis is contained in Section 4.0 (Environmental and Regulatory Setting) of the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR further indicated that the parcel proposed for the High Technology Center (preferred site) is zoned C-1, Commercial. According to the San Jose Staff, use of the site for classrooms may require rezoning of the parcel. This approval would be processed separately by the City as part of the private development of the High Technology Center. It should also be noted that the High Technology Center site has been rezoned from "C-1: Commercial" to "A (PD): Planned Development" and the Center has been constructed; therefore, this is no longer an issue.~~

~~The Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR also indicated that there are no adopted habitat~~

~~conservation plans that apply to the campus and that there would be no related impact. No habitat conservation plan has been adopted that would apply to the campus to date. This issue was not analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Land Use and Planning Resources were not required to be analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR and were included in Section 10.0 – “Effects Found Not to be Significant.”~~

Land Use and Planning was analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update. According to this evaluation, implementation of the Update will exceed the thresholds set by the City of San Jose; however, it should be noted that the City does not have jurisdiction over the College. Conflicts with other applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdictions over the project are cumulative, as described in the other Chapters of the **Revised** DSEIR. With the incorporation of mitigation measures, implementation of the Update will have a less than significant cumulative impact for **Aesthetics**, Air Quality and Noise. ~~Impacts from Aesthetics are considered cumulative and significant.~~ Transportation/Traffic impacts are considered cumulative and significant if agreements cannot be reached with the City of San Jose **Santa Clara County** pertaining to intersection improvements.

~~Conflicts with other applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdictions over the project may also result in unavoidable adverse impacts. With the incorporation of mitigation measures, implementation of the Update will not result in unavoidable adverse impacts for Air Quality and Noise. Impacts from Aesthetics are considered an unavoidable adverse impact. Transportation/Traffic impacts are considered an unavoidable adverse impact for the reasons discussed above.~~

~~The Baseball Field complex could be installed at the EVC campus with minimal impacts to Land Use/Planning Resources. This relates to aesthetics, land use compatibility and a reduced risk from errant baseballs. The alternative project alternative would have a less than significant impact to Land Use/Planning Resources. As a result, the alternative location alternative would have a superior **similar** environmental affect on Land Use/Planning Resources than as the Update.~~

Mineral Resources: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, ‡ The San Jose City College is already developed and thus was not available as a mineral resource. The San Jose 2020 General Plan did not designate the campus as a mineral resource. Therefore there would be no impacts on loss of availability of a known mineral that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or 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. Because of this, Mineral Resources were not analyzed the Prior Plan EIR.~~

According to the information contained in the Alternatives (Section 7.0) of the Prior Plan EIR, impacts to Mineral Resources at the EVC campus would be less than significant.

The alternative project alternative would have a less than significant impact to Mineral Resources. Implementation of the Update would have no impact upon Mineral Resources. As a result, both the no project alternative and implementation of the Update would in essence have the same environmental affect on Mineral Resources.

~~Noise: According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan could have a potentially significant impact that would result in the 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; in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Proposed Project vicinity above levels existing without the Proposed Project; and a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Proposed Project vicinity above levels existing without the Proposed Project. Vehicular noise was determined to be the dominant noise source in the vicinity of the campus. Physical development on the site could result in construction noise impacts. The Initial Study stated that the Prior Plan would allow the College to accommodate a larger student population and could draw more community members to campus events. Increased traffic on area roadways could result in higher noise levels at off-site noise sensitive locations. In addition, construction within the campus could cause short-term noise impact in the campus neighborhood. Implementation of the standard construction noise measures, including scheduling, use of proper equipment, shielding, notifying neighbors of upcoming construction, and use of a noise disturbance coordinator may reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. The Initial Study concluded that the Prior Plan EIR would evaluate those potential noise sources.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that implementation of the Prior Plan had no impacts that would result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The types of uses anticipated as part of the Prior Plan include classrooms, student facilities, and other support facilities—uses which would not create excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels. Lastly, the Initial Study determined that based on their review of area maps, the campus is not located within two miles of a public airport, a public use airport or a private airstrip that would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. These issues were not analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Noise was analyzed in Section 5.4 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, the existing noise environment in the campus is variable, being relatively loud in the northern part of the campus, near I-280 and Moorpark Avenue and relatively quiet in the southern part of the campus, away from traffic noise. Buildout of the Prior Plan would generate short-term construction noise which could affect on-site and off-site uses. This was deemed a significant impact; however, with the implementation of mitigation measures, impacts related to short-term construction noise would be reduced to a less than significant level. On-site noise levels from project and cumulative traffic would not expose any new buildings or the athletic fields to noise levels above 70 dB(A); therefore, impacts related to on-site noise would be less than significant. Project-generated traffic would not result in any significant noise increases at any off-site receptors along any area roadways; therefore, impacts related to off-site noise would be less than significant. Increased activity on the campus would result in noise of a similar type and magnitude to existing noise, and would not result in any significant impacts to on or off-site users. Cumulative impacts were determined to be less than significant. After mitigation, noise impacts were considered less than significant.~~

~~Noise was not considered an “Unavoidable Significant Impact” (Section 6.0), did not generate “Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes” (Section 8.0) and was considered an “Effect Found Not to be Significant” (Section 10.0).~~

Noise was analyzed in the **Revised** DSEIR for the Update. According to this evaluation, Implementation of the Update will generate new noise emissions in an existing relatively high background noise environment. Based on the noise evaluation, the Update's contributions to cumulative noise impacts, particularly adjacent to roadways, will be less than significant. The project's contributions to background noise were also determined to be less than a cumulatively considerable contribution. Although construction noise is identified as being a less than significant impact, mitigation measures will be required as part of the implementation of the Update. Noise generation from campus activities will generally have a less than significant impact on surrounding residential uses with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Implementation of the Update will generate project specific noise and contribute to cumulative noise within the vicinity of the campus. This change will be an unavoidable adverse impact. However, based on the analysis and mitigation presented above, implementation of the Update will not cause a significant unavoidable adverse noise impact.

Under this alternative, additional construction would occur on the EVC campus. Sensitive receptors on or near the campus (such as the residential uses to the north) could be exposed to significant noise impacts from construction activities. Given that the EVC campus is already used as a community college and any additional facilities would be similar to those already present, there would be no significant increase in noise from daily EVC campus activities.

Both the alternative location alternative and the implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact to Noise Resources. As a result, both the alternative location alternative and the implementation of the Update would have the same environmental affect on Noise Resources.

~~Population/Housing: According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan would help the campus accommodate an increase in the enrollment from 10,000 to 15,000 students at buildout. An increase in faculty at the College is also anticipated. To the extent that the increase in students and faculty attracts additional residents to the San Jose area, the growth caused by the increase in population could be considered induced by the project; therefore, that issue was addressed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study indicated that implementation of the Prior Plan would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There is no housing on the campus and no element of the Prior Plan contemplates expansion beyond the established campus boundaries.~~

~~The Prior Plan EIR did not find any "Unavoidable Significant Impacts" (Section 6.0) to Population and Housing. The Prior Plan EIR also did not find any "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0) to Population and Housing. Section 9.0 "Growth Inducement" of the EIR stated the following:~~

- ~~• The increase in students could lead to increased use of local businesses that serve the campus (e.g., restaurants), and lead to indirect economic growth.~~
- ~~• The projected increase in full-time faculty and classified staff, could help induce people to move to the area.~~
- ~~• The proposed project could also induce growth by introducing additional short-term employment opportunities during construction of the Facilities Master Plan projects.~~

- ~~• The proposed project could be considered growth-inducing based on this criterion.~~

~~According to the Prior Plan EIR – “Effects Found Not to be Significant” (Chapter 10, Section B12 – Population and Housing, p. 10.0-10), the Prior Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There is no housing on the campus and no element of the Prior Plan contemplates expansion beyond the established campus boundaries. No significant impacts were determined and no mitigation measures were required for Population and Housing Resources.~~

The Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** concluded that, ~~as was the case with the Prior Plan,~~ implementation of the Update may induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. ~~; however, due to the overall decrease in overall proposed square footage with the Proposed Project of 105,425 OGSF/66,161 ASF from the Prior Plan, any impacts will be considered to be further lessened.~~ **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.** Impacts would continue to be considered less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required. This issue area was determined to not need any further analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR. In addition, the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** indicated that implementation of the Update would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There is no housing on the campus and no element of the Update contemplates expansion beyond the established campus boundaries. As a result, no impacts were anticipated, no mitigation measures were required and this issue did not require any further analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR.

According to the Prior Plan EIR, impacts to Population/Housing Resources at the EVC campus would be less than significant.

The alternative project alternative would have a less than significant impact to Population/Housing Resources. Implementation of the Update would have no impact upon Population/Housing Resources. As a result, both the alternative location alternative and implementation of the Update would in essence have the same environmental affect on Population/Housing Resources.

Public Services: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout could potentially have significant impacts upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following area 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. Implementation of the Prior Plan would bring additional students, employees and visitors to the campus. It was determined that this could result in an increased demand for fire protection services, police protection services and other governmental services. Based on those conclusions, the impacts from these issue areas would be analyzed in the Public Services of the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The following issue areas were determined to have no impact in the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR: an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools and parks.~~

~~Implementation of the Prior Plan would not result in any direct increase in the residential population of the area; therefore, it was determined that there would be no impact on elementary, junior high or high schools. The Prior Plan would provide a beneficial impact on the community college capacity by allowing the campus to accommodate additional students.~~

~~Public Services were analyzed in Section 5.5 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, the buildout of the Prior Plan would increase the demand for police services from the San Jose Evergreen Valley College Police Department, possibly requiring the need for additional staff and/or equipment. Impacts related to additional demand on police services was determined to be less than significant as were impacts related to response times. The increase in student population and building square footage was anticipated to potentially result in a demand for additional security and safety features, such as implementation of a lighting plan, signage plan and installation of security phones. These measures were determined to reduce the impact related to campus safety to a less than significant level. The new access road and the new location for the campus police were determined to be positive impacts.~~

~~The San Jose Fire Department Station #4 is located across from the campus on Leigh Avenue. It is the primary responder to fires on the campus. According to the Prior Plan EIR, it was estimated that the Prior Plan would result in an additional 20 to 40 calls from the Campus. This increase was not expected to result in the need for more staff or equipment. In addition, the Prior Plan would have to comply with state and Fire Department requirements regarding the installation of automatic sprinkler systems. For these reasons, it was concluded that impacts to fire services would be less than significant and that cumulative impacts from the implementation of the Prior Plan would also be less than significant.~~

~~Public Services were not considered an "Unavoidable Significant Impact" (Section 6.0); did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0) and the need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following area 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 schools and parks was considered an "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0).~~

The Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** indicated that implementation of the Update would have no 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 schools, parks and other public facilities. The Proposed Project involves the reorganization of campus **buildings and facilities** and the reconfiguration of campus access and circulation from the Prior Plan. The Update will result in an overall decrease in OGSF and ASF. **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.** There were no impacts from the Prior Plan on these issue areas and the same conclusions apply to the Update **to date, April 2010**. It was determine that issue areas will not be analyzed further in the **Revised DSEIR**.

A detailed discussion of Police, Fire and Ambulance services is contained in the Hazards analysis above.

According to the information contained in the Alternatives (Section 7.0) of the Prior Plan EIR, impacts to Public Services Resources at the EVC campus would be less than significant.

The alternative project alternative would have a less than significant impact to Public Services Resources. Implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact upon Public Services Resources. As a result, both the alternative location alternative and implementation of the Update would in essence have the same environmental affect on Public Services Resources.

Recreation: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan would not result in any 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. It was concluded that there would not be a direct increase in the residential population in the area; therefore, there would be no increase in park usage by area residents. Implementation of the Prior Plan would bring additional students, employees and visitors to the campus. The closest neighborhood parks are about one mile from the campus and it was determined that it was unlikely that students would use these parks because of the facilities available for recreation on campus (and because of the campus' function as a community college). This issue was not analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that implementation of the Prior Plan had a potentially significant impact and might include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The Initial Study stated that the Prior Plan includes sports facilities that may be used for recreational purposes; and that the impacts of these facilities on the environment will be addressed in the Prior Plan EIR. There was no specific Section of the Prior Plan EIR that addressed Recreational Resources. The sports facilities were discussed in the Noise Section (5.4) of the Prior Plan EIR. Impacts from noise generated by these facilities were considered less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures D.1.1. (landscaping) and D.1.3. ("user friendly" high tech public address system). Noise was not considered an "Unavoidable Significant Impact" (Section 6.0), did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0) and was considered an "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0).~~

~~The sports facilities were also discussed in the Visual Quality Section (5.7) of the Prior Plan EIR. Impacts from noise generated by these facilities were considered less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures E.1.3. (landscape buffer) and E.1.6. (sports fields would be organized as a contiguous green band along the southern boundary). Visual Quality was not considered an "Unavoidable Significant Impact" (Section 6.0), did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0) and was considered an "Effect~~

~~Found Not to be Significant” (Section 10.0).~~

According to the analysis contained in the **Revised** DSEIR, implementation of the Update will contribute to the change of the general area. ~~The Baseball Field Complex poles, netting, batter’s eye and wall present the most apparent change in the aesthetic setting in the area of the campus. There is no other structure of this nature in the area in terms of type, scale and function. There will be an associated change in views, both to and from the campus. Even with the proposed mitigation incorporated, the impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level with the poles and netting at a maximum height of 90’ adjacent to Leigh Avenue and the apartments to the west. Implementation of the Update does contribute to the cumulative change that will be experienced at this location, and the aesthetic analysis indicates that the construction or expansion of recreational facilities will be significant and will have a cumulative impact on the environment. Based on the data and analysis presented in Chapter 5.2 (Aesthetics) of the DSEIR, the Update cannot be implemented without causing an unavoidable adverse impact from the Baseball Field Complex poles, netting, batter’s eye and wall.~~ **Implementation of the Update will not contribute to the cumulative change that will be experienced at this location, and the aesthetic analysis indicates that the construction or expansion of recreational facilities will not be significant and will not have a cumulative impact on the environment. The existing visual setting of the campus will be permanently altered. The implementation of the components of the Update can be completed; and with mitigation incorporated will not result in unavoidable adverse impacts.**

~~The Baseball Field complex could be installed at the EVC campus with minimal impacts to Recreation Resources. This relates to aesthetics, land use compatibility and a reduced risk from errant baseballs. The alternative project alternative would have a less than significant impact to Recreation Resources. As a result, the alternative location alternative would have a superior similar environmental affect on Recreation Resources than as the Update.~~

Transportation/Traffic: ~~According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout could result in a potentially significant impacts and 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. The Prior Plan would result in an increase in the number of trips to, from and within the campus. Use of the campus in the morning and evening could overlap with a.m. and p.m. peak commuting periods; there could also be localized peak traffic associated with the use of the campus only. The proposed new parking structures and circulation changes could affect circulation patterns within the campus and along adjacent roadways. It was concluded that the Prior Plan EIR would evaluate these potential impacts.~~

~~The Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR also identified potentially significant impacts from the Prior Plan that could 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; and conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks). It was concluded that roadway safety issues be included in the Prior Plan EIR transportation and circulation analysis. Increased traffic from the increase in enrollment would increase the~~

~~demand for parking. This issue was identified to be analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR. It was stated that the Prior Plan was not expected to conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation; however, that issue was also analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Lastly, the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that there would be no impact from implementation of the Prior Plan that would 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. The campus is more than 3 miles from the San Jose International Airport, and is about 6 miles from the Reid Hillview Airport. The campus is not located within the San Jose International Airport Land Use Plan boundaries. The campus is not within the safety areas for any of the area airports. The Prior Plan was not expected to result in increased air traffic because the campus is used by area residents.~~

~~Transportation and Circulation was analyzed in Section 5.1 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, under existing and future conditions, all of the signalized intersections in the campus operate at LOS D or better. Vehicles turning left at the intersection of South Bascom Avenue and Kingman Avenue have difficulty finding gaps in the South Bascom Avenue traffic; this condition would worsen with the increase in student enrollment envisioned by the Prior Plan (and with increased traffic on Bascom Avenue from other growth in the area). This impact would not be significant because a signal would not be warranted at the intersection. However, there is the potential for two significant impacts relating to queuing and left turning vehicles. Restricting the intersection to right turns only would address the impacts, if they occur. All freeway segments near the campus currently operate at unacceptable levels of service during the peak hours. In the near term, the traffic associated with the Prior Plan would not exceed the significance threshold for impacts to freeway congestion. However, the increase in traffic from the Prior Plan buildout volumes would be equal to, or greater than, one percent of the capacity of 12 of the study freeway segments. Therefore, the Prior Plan made a significant contribution to cumulative impacts for those segments. Those significant impacts would not be mitigated because there were no planned improvements for I-280 or SR17 in the vicinity of the campus. Conditions related to parking and pedestrian circulation would be improved with the implementation of the Prior Plan, which included provision of up to 2,990 parking spaces on campus at buildout, a reorganized pedestrian circulation system, as well as other circulation improvements.~~

~~Subsection G of Section 5.4 of the Prior Plan EIR (Level of Significance After Mitigation) concluded that impacts related to left turning vehicles at the intersection of Kingman Avenue and Bascom Avenue would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of left turn restrictions. Impacts from the Prior Plan buildout to freeway segments in the area would be unavoidably significant, due to the lack of funding mechanisms or planned or programmed mitigation measures for the freeways (reiterated in Section 6.0 – Unavoidable Significant Impact of the Prior Plan EIR. Safety impacts related to the crosswalk on Laswell Avenue would be mitigated with the relocation of the crosswalk.~~

~~Transportation and Circulation did not generate “Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes” (Section 8.0). Only the Prior Project’s no impact to change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks was considered an “Effect Found Not to be Significant” (Section 10.0).~~

**All study intersections currently operate at acceptable levels of service according to the standards set forth by the City of San Jose, VTA, and Caltrans.** According to the analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR, all study intersections affected by the implementation of the Update operate acceptably under City of San Jose, VTA, and Caltrans standards except the ~~Bascom Avenue/San Carlos Street, Bascom Avenue/Moorpark Avenue, Bascom Avenue/Kingman Avenue, and Bascom Avenue/Fruitdale Avenue~~ intersections. Implementation of the Update will contribute an incremental contribution to the operation of these intersections. These intersections are controlled and operated by the ~~City of San Jose~~ **Santa Clara County**. 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~~ **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 cumulative and significant **and an unavoidable adverse impact**.

Any additional students attending the EVC campus as a result of this alternative could result in traffic impacts to nearby streets such as Yerba Buena Road and San Felipe Road. It is assumed that adequate parking will be provided as the need arises. Students traveling to the EVC campus from other parts of San Jose would likely use Highway 101 or I-280., and thus would continue to contribute to increased congestion on these freeway segments. Cumulative impacts to freeway segments could still be significant because this alternative would shift some of the traffic to other parts of the San Jose area.

~~Both the Prior Plan and the~~ **Implementation of the** Update would result in significant impacts for Transportation/Traffic Resources. Due to the potential for an increase in vehicle miles traveled the Update would have a slightly greater environmental affect on Transportation/Traffic Resources than the alternative location alternative (EVC campus).

~~Utilities and Service Systems: According to the Initial Study prepared for the Prior Plan EIR, the Prior Plan buildout would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). It was stated that the campus was already developed and generated wastewater and that the Prior Plan would result in similar types of uses as those on the campus currently. No uses were proposed (i.e., industrial uses) that might generate wastewater that exceeds the RWQMB treatment requirements. Therefore, this issue area was not analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~The Initial Study stated that the Prior Plan would result in potentially significant impacts that could 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; or be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Implementation would result in an increase in wastewater generation and demand for potable water. The Prior Plan drainage system would connect to~~

~~the City of San Jose drainage system. Impervious surfaces were not expected to increase substantially; therefore, it was determined that there would not be a substantial increase in storm drainage from the project. Solid waste generation was anticipated to increase with the increased student enrollment. All of these issue areas were analyzed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Lastly, the Initial Study for the Prior Plan EIR indicated that the types of uses proposed under the Prior Plan raised no specific issues related to compliance with solid waste laws and regulation. There would be no related impact and this issue would not be addressed in the Prior Plan EIR.~~

~~Public Utilities were analyzed in Section 5.6 of the Prior Plan EIR. According to the Prior Plan EIR, buildout of the Prior Plan would result in an increased demand for potable water. It was estimated that the 15,000 students accommodated by buildout of the Prior Plan and the increase in landscaped area would result in an increase in water use to about 314,000 gallons per day. The College obtains water from the San Jose Water Company (SJWC). SJWC indicated that it did not expect any shortage in the near future. The College would employ water conservation measures in the new buildings and landscaped areas. The impacts were considered less than significant. It was also stated that construction of the new buildings would require installation of new water distribution lines within the campus boundaries. Water pipe capacity would be evaluated and upgraded, if necessary, at the beginning of each individual project. It was concluded that the upgrades would address any potential impacts related to fire flow requirements and water line condition.~~

~~The Prior Plan EIR indicated that buildout of the Prior Plan would generate 0.09 million gallons of wastewater per day. It was stated that the San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) and the City of San Jose's collection pipes had sufficient capacity to accommodate that increase of wastewater; therefore, the impact to wastewater collection and treatment was considered less than significant.~~

~~Subsections B7 and C7 of Section 5.6 of the Prior Plan EIR (Significance after Mitigation) concluded the following as it related to water supply and wastewater capacity, respectively: the Water Company does not expect any supply problems and the impact would be less than significant after mitigation; and all impacts to wastewater services would be less than significant.~~

~~Public Utilities did not generate "Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes" (Section 8.0). Impacts related to storm water drainage and solid wastes were considered an "Effect Found Not to be Significant" (Section 10.0).~~

The Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** concluded that implementation of 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. These impacts were determined to be less than significant impacts (with mitigation incorporated) ~~from implementation of the Prior Plan.~~ With the incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. It was determined that no additional analysis would be required in the **DSEIR**.

Lastly, the Initial Study **for the 2009 DSEIR** indicated that implementation of the Update would

have a less than significant impact that would 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; 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. Impacts from the implementation of the Prior Plan were considered less than significant or no impact on these issue areas. The Update involves the reorganization of campus **buildings and facilities** and the reconfiguration of campus access and circulation from the Prior Plan. The Update will result in an overall decrease in OGSF and ASF. **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.** Consistent with the Prior Plan, ~~t~~ This determination can be made because the campus is fully developed and the proposed **buildings and facilities** would be similar in function to existing **buildings and facilities**. All of these issue areas will have an incremental impact; however, ~~since they are less than the Prior Plan,~~ they were considered less than significant. It was determined that these issue areas would no be further analyzed in the **Revised DSEIR**.

According to the information contained in the Alternatives (Section 7.0) of the Prior Plan EIR, impacts to Utilities and Service Systems Resources at the EVC campus would be less than significant.

The alternative project alternative would have a less than significant impact to Utilities and Service Systems Resources. Implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact upon Utilities and Service Systems Resources. As a result, both the alternative location alternative and implementation of the Update would in essence have the same environmental affect on Utilities and Service Systems Resources.

## **6.6 6.5 DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

Of the ~~four~~ **three (3)** alternatives considered, the no project alternative has been determined to be the environmentally superior alternative. Section 15126.6(e)(2) indicates that where the no project alternative is environmentally superior, “the DSEIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” 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 Subchapter 4.2 of this document.

~~The “No Closing of the Southern Campus Entry” has been evaluated as an alternative to the Update. This alternative is similar to the Update in every respect, with the exception of Transportation/Traffic. By keeping this southerly Campus entry open, pressure is taken off of the other Campus entrances. The intersection of Bascom and Kingman Avenues is most impacted by this closure and the impacts could be significant since the control and timing for intersection improvements are beyond the control of the District. By keeping the southerly Campus entry open, this impact would not be as severe. Noise impact from this alternative can be reduced to a less than significant level. This alternative is also environmentally superior to the implementation of the Update.~~

The “Intersection Improvements to Project Entry at Leland Avenue” was evaluated as an alternative to the Update. Currently this entry is only allows right-in and right-out turning movements. With this alternative additional flexibility in terms of turning movements would be allowed at this campus entry. Additional trips would be added from the implementation of the Update and even more trips would be generated with the implementation of the Update and the re-configuration of this intersection. According to the TIA, this intersection operates within the established thresholds of the City of San Jose and the VTA. Based on this analysis, both the Update and this alternative potentially have the same environmental impacts.

The potential for an alternative location was evaluated and determined not to be an environmentally superior alternative. 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. It should be noted that the curriculums for SJCC and EVC are approved by the State and locally by the Board of Trustees and are designed to provide a balance of curriculums between the two campuses. 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.~~

*This page left intentionally blank for pagination purposes.*