

## CHAPTER 7 – TOPICAL ISSUES

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

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

### 7.1 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Traditionally, significant growth is induced in one of three ways. In the first instance, a project is located in an isolated (meaning that it is not currently or routinely served by public service or utility infrastructure) area and when developed it brings sufficient urban infrastructure to cause new or additional development pressure on the intervening and surrounding land. This type of induced growth leads to conversion of adjacent acreage to higher intensity uses, either unexpectedly or through accelerated development. This conversion occurs because the adjacent land becomes more suitable for development and, hence, more valuable because of the availability of the new infrastructure. This type of growth inducement is typically termed “leap frog” or “premature” development because it creates an island of higher intensity developed land within a larger area of lower intensity land use.

The growth inducement issue is inherently tied to the land ownership issue because of the manner in which access and development of the project site is envisioned and whether growth on adjacent land can be induced to occur as a result of such extension. For a project to be growth inducing, it must cause certain changes in circumstances affecting development constraints that are required for growth and the adjacent properties must be available to support such growth.

For the San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update ~~2021~~ **2011** (“Update”), no infrastructure extensions are required. All utilities and services are currently available at the site. Due to the developed and urban nature of the area surrounding the Update, the Update has no potential to induce “premature” or “leap frog” growth.

The second type of growth inducement is caused when a project of large size, relative to the surrounding community or area, is developed within a community and impacts the surrounding

community by producing a “multiplier effect,” which results in substantial indirect community growth, not necessarily adjacent to the development site or of the same type of use as the project itself. This type of stimulus to community growth is typified by the development of major destination recreation facilities, such as Disney World near Orlando, Florida, or around a military facility, such as the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center near Twenty-nine Palms. The proposed Project does not propose any new major facilities that will cause growth “through a multiplier effect”. The Update will meet an existing and growing demand in the area. Development is consistent with growth expectations identified in the Update and the adjacent City of San Jose 2020 General Plan, as well as regional plans. No “large” project is proposed that is not envisioned in these Plans and no potential for this type of growth inducement will result from this project.

A third, and more subtle type of growth inducement, occurs when land use plans are established that create a potential for growth because the available land and the land uses permitted result in the attraction of new development. This type of growth inducement is also attributed to other plans developed to provide the infrastructure necessary to meet the land use objectives, or community vision, contained in the governing land use agency’s general plan. In this case, the ultimate vision of future growth and development within the Update area **was has** already **been** established in the ~~Prior Plan~~ and reflected/respected in the City of San Jose 2020 General Plan **in terms of land use designation(s)**. The net effect of the Update is to establish a set of expectations regarding future land use and growth that may or may not occur in the future. Thus, it can be determined that implementation of the proposed Update is not forecast to cause or induce significant growth beyond that anticipated **within the current campus boundaries** in the ~~Prior Plan~~.

In summary, implementation of the proposed Update will not result in major extension of infrastructure into an undeveloped area, inducing premature development. It will not result in development of a new large project that could induce growth beyond that anticipated **within the current campus boundaries** in the ~~Prior Plan~~. No alternatives or mitigation is required to prevent significant growth inducement from occurring. No significant growth inducement is forecast occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Update.

## **7.2 IRREVERSIBLE AND/OR UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES WHICH WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTION, SHOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED**

If the Update is adopted and effectively implemented, the following irreversible and/or unavoidable environmental changes are forecast to occur:

**Aesthetics:** Implementation of the Update will contribute to the change of the general area. New, two-story buildings will replace existing single-story buildings on campus. These new buildings will be consistent in terms of architecture, massing and scale with the buildings that have been developed under the Prior Plan. Parking Garage No. 2 will be located in the area currently occupied by a surface parking lot. This Garage will be similar in size, scale and massing to the existing Parking Structure located at the northeastern portion of the campus. Based on site reconnaissance and review of the site photos taken during that reconnaissance, these components of the Update will have limited visibility both from on and off-campus and their impacts are considered less than significant.

There is the potential for the removal of mature or memorial trees as a result of the implementation of the Update. **According to the “Tree Survey and Inventory San Jose City College,” prepared by HortScience, Inc., dated October 2009, six hundred ninety-eight (698) trees were surveyed on the campus in August 2009 representing 63 species. The most frequently occurring species were coast redwood (169 trees) followed by sweetgum (55), silver dollar gum (39), Chinese pistache (34), Canary Island pine (32), London plane and coast live oak (25 each), cork oak (21), mayten (20), and Southern magnolia (17). The 10 most-frequently occurring species comprised 438 trees, or 63% of those surveyed. The majority of trees had been planted as part of the College’s landscape and were not indigenous to the site. While there may be a few coast live oaks that have arisen naturally, there are no large areas of native vegetation. Overall, the condition of the surveyed trees was good with 60% of the trees in the good and excellent categories. One hundred seventy-four (174) trees, or 25%, were in fair condition and 105 poor (15%). Several trees were dead, including coast redwood and three Japanese maples surveyed as part of larger group. This impact is considered cumulative; however, with the implementation of mitigation measures, the impacts are considered less than significant.**

There is also the potential for additional light and glare as a result of the implementation of the Update. **However, one light source, a transparent light tower, which would be approximately five stories high (roughly 120 feet), lit at night, and would be visible from I-280, was proposed at the main entrance as part of the Multidisciplinary Classroom Building under the Prior Plan. This light tower will be removed as part of the Update.** This impact is also **Light and glare impacts are** considered cumulative; however, with the implementation of mitigation measures, the impacts are considered less than significant.

~~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 will result in a significant irreversible and unavoidable adverse change in the visual setting or aesthetic character within the vicinity of the Campus. The removal of the Baseball Field Complex eliminates another major contributor to what were unavoidable significant impacts caused by the Update.~~

Agricultural Resources: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded that the Update would not cause any increase in cumulative impacts to Agricultural Resources and would not adversely impact any of these Resources. ~~There have been no changes to Agricultural Resources since the certification of the Prior Plan EIR for the Prior Plan.~~ The campus has not historically been used for agricultural purposes and is not classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency and will not conflict with the existing zoning or an existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. The historic use of the campus has been for non-agricultural land uses. There are no existing agricultural zoning or agricultural land use on the campus and no agricultural uses envisioned in the future. Lastly, the implementation of the Update will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. The campus and the adjacent urban development are not being utilized for agricultural

cultivation. As a result, no impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required. Thus, no significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Agricultural Resources impacts will result from implementation of the Update.

Air Quality: According to the analysis in Chapter 5.3 of this **Revised** DSEIR, 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. Even when** 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. Based on the analysis in the **Revised** DSEIR, no significant reversible or avoidable adverse impact for air quality emissions will result from the proposed action.

Biological Resources: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1) 2009 DSEIR~~ concluded that the Update would not cause any increase in cumulative impacts to Biological Resources and would not adversely impact any of these Resources. Implementation of the Update will have a less than significant effect after mitigation, to either directly or through habitat modifications, on any specifics identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and with a potential conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. ~~Many of the conditions that applied to biological resources present in 2000 are still currently applicable.~~ Implementation of 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. Mature trees have been removed, in compliance with the mitigation measures contained in the Prior Plan EIR, as a result of implementing the Prior Plan. There is also the potential for~~ **Pursuant to the recommended Tree Survey and Inventory San Jose City College** trees ~~to~~ **will** be removed through the implementation of the Update. After implementation of mitigation measures, ~~it was determined that these~~ impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level. **Please see the discussion above under Aesthetics.** No other mitigation measures were required.

~~The Initial Study~~ **2009 DSEIR** also concluded that implementation of the Update would have no impacts that could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; or conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. As a result, no additional impacts are anticipated and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Thus, no significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Biological Resources impacts will result from implementation of the Update.

Cultural Resources: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded that no significant adverse Cultural Resource impacts would result from implementation of the Update. Implementation of the Update will not cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 or directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. **The District obtained updated historic resource evaluations from historic resource experts Archaeological Resource Management, dated October 23, 2009. These reports are attached to the Stage II 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. There have been no changes to relative to these resources since the certification of the Prior Plan EIR that would result in any impacts. As a result, no impacts were anticipated and no mitigation measures were required for these resources.**

~~As was the case with the Prior Project,~~ Implementation of the Update may cause a substantial change in significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 and may disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. It should be noted that no subsurface conditions relative to Cultural Resources have changed since the certification of the Prior Plan EIR. With the incorporation of a mitigation measure, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level. The potential Cultural Resource impacts were considered to be avoidable and reversible. Thus, no significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Cultural Resource impacts will result from implementation of the Update.

Geology/Soils: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded that no significant adverse Geology/Soils Resource impacts would result from implementation of the Update. Implementation of the Update could have a potentially significant impact that would expose people to potentially significant impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; strong seismic ground shaking; 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. Many of the conditions that apply to Geology/Soils that were present in 2000 are still currently applicable **in 2010**. The underlying geology and soils on the campus have not changed. The issues pertaining to seismicity are still applicable. Implementation of 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; however, 90' high poles and netting will be installed at the baseball field. 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.** All construction components of the Update will be required to comply with the latest version of the California Building Code (CBC), and specifically with the requirements for public school facilities (which are more stringent than those for general structures). Also, implantation of the Update calls for the removal of older campus buildings and replacement with new ones that could increase seismic safety on the campus. With the compliance with the latest version of the CBC, demolition of older structures and the incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level. Implementation of the Update would have no impact which would result in or expose people to potential impacts involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; 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. ~~Consistent with the Prior Project, ‡~~ There are no active faults within the campus. The campus topography is flat and not subject to landslides. Lastly, implementation of the Update will not include the use of alternative wastewater systems. No impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

Thus, no significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Geology/Soils Resources impacts will result from implementation of the Update.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials: ~~The Initial Study for 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 **to date, April 2010** ~~since the certification of the Prior EIR 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.** 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 Section 5.4 (Land Use and Planning) of this DSEIR.~~ **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.** The Hazard issue areas listed above ~~was~~ **were** 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 Section 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 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 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~~ **this Revised DSEIR**.

Thus, no significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Hazard Resources impacts will result from implementation of the Update.

Hydrology/Water Quality: According to ~~the Initial Study~~ **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~~ **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~~ **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. There were no impacts from the Prior Plan on these issue areas and the same conclusions apply to the Proposed Project.~~ **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.** 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~~ **this Revised DSEIR.**

Thus, no significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Hydrology/Water Quality Resource impacts will result from implementation of the Update.

Land Use/Planning: Based on the evaluation in this Chapter 5 of this **Revised DSEIR**, the implementation of the Update ~~will~~ **would not** 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 may result in unavoidable adverse impacts, as described in the other Sections of this **Revised DSEIR**. 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 if agreements cannot be reached with ~~the City of San Jose~~ **Santa Clara County** pertaining to intersection improvements. ~~Based on the analysis in this document, long term air quality and noise impacts are forecast to be significant and unavoidable.~~ The basis for these findings is further detailed and explained in the discussions in this Section for Hazards, Noise, **Transportation/Traffic** and Air Quality.

Mineral Resources: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded that no significant adverse Mineral Resource impacts would result from implementation of the Update. The campus has not historically been to extract mineral resources and implementation of the Update will not result in the 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. As a result, no impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.



Thus, no significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Mineral Resources impacts will result from the proposed action.

Noise: 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. ~~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.~~

Based on the analysis and mitigation presented above, implementation of the Update will not cause a significant unavoidable adverse ~~N~~ noise impact.

Population and Housing: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1) 2009 DSEIR~~ concluded that implementation of the Update would not result in any significant increase in Population/Housing Resources. ~~There were no “Unavoidable Significant Impacts,” or “Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes” in the Prior Plan EIR. There were no “Effects Found Not to be Significant” in the Prior Plan EIR. As was the case with the Prior Project, Implementation of the Update may induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. 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, 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. However, any impacts will be considered to be further lessened. Impact will continue to be considered less than significant and no mitigation measures will be required.~~

Implementation of the Update will 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 are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

Thus, no significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Population and Housing Resources impacts will result from implementation of the Update.

Public Services: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1) 2009 DSEIR~~ concluded implementation of the Update project would result in a lesser demand for services than the Prior Plan **which anticipated an ultimate enrollment of 15,000 students**, and with the incorporation of mitigation measures, it would not cause significant irreversible or unavoidable environmental changes.

Implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas which would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically

altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection and other governmental services. 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 and police protection services. Many of the requirements/mitigation measures have been implemented since the adoption of the Prior Plan and the certification of the Prior Plan EIR **up to April 2010**. 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. This would result in lesser impacts than were anticipated under the Prior Plan.~~ **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.** To ensure that all impacts are addressed, mitigation measures will be implemented for impacts to Police Protection Services and Fire Protection Services. With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

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. As stated prior, the Update involves the reorganization of campus **buildings and facilities**. **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.** ~~and the reconfiguration of Campus access and circulation from the Prior Plan. The Update will result in an overall decrease in OGSF and ASF. There were no impacts from the Prior Plan on these issue areas and the~~ **The** same conclusions apply to the implementation of the Update.

Thus, no significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Public Service Resources impacts will result from the proposed action.

Recreation: 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, ~~with the exception of the Baseball Field Complex. The installation of the Baseball Field Complex poles, netting, batter's eye and wall results in an unavoidable adverse impact from the implementation of the Update and this impact has been determined to be an unavoidable adverse impact from the selected viewpoints (VP 5-9, 12-13), a less than significant impact (VP 4 and VP 11) and no impact for others (VP 1, VP 3, VP 10, VP 14, VP 14, VP 16, VP 17, VP 19).~~ Based on the data and analysis presented in Chapter 5.2 (Aesthetics), the Update ~~cannot~~ **can** be implemented without causing an unavoidable adverse impact ~~from the Baseball Field Complex poles, netting, batter's eye and wall.~~

~~Thus,~~ **No** significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Recreation impacts will result from implementation of the Update.

Transportation/Traffic: Implementing the Proposed Project will generate new trips and that will have an unavoidable adverse impact **on** the local circulation system. 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~~ **this** intersections. ~~These~~ **This** intersections is controlled and operated by the ~~City of San José~~ **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.

Thus, significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Transportation/Traffic impacts will result from implementation of the Update.

Utilities and Service Systems: The ~~Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded implementation of the Update project would result in a lesser demand for Utilities/Service Systems Resources ~~than the Prior Plan~~, and with the incorporation of mitigation measures, it would not cause significant irreversible or unavoidable environmental changes.

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 Project~~. 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.~~ Since the ~~Proposed Project~~ **Update** would result in similar types of uses as those on the campus currently, ~~and there is an overall reduction in the total OGSF and ASF~~, impacts will be less than **significant** ~~the Prior Project~~. ~~Since the adoption of the Prior Plan, a~~ Older, less water efficient buildings have been demolished, new water efficient buildings have been constructed and water efficient landscaping has been installed. Mitigation measures, ~~some of which were required in the Prior Plan EIR~~ to mitigate water supply, will be implemented for water demand and conservation. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

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 Project 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 and 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 facilities would be similar in function to existing facilities. All of these issue areas will have an incremental impact; however, ~~since they are less than the Prior Project, for purposes of this analysis, they are considered less than significant.~~

Thus, no significant irreversible or unavoidable adverse Utilities and Service Systems Resources impacts will result from implementation of the Update.

### **7.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

The intent of a cumulative impact evaluation is to provide the public and decision-makers with an understanding of a given project's contribution to area-wide or community environmental impacts when added to other **present and reasonably foreseeable** development occurring in the region. Typically, cumulative impacts are discussed in relation to a list of past, present and reasonably anticipated projects or in relation to broad growth projections contained in general or regional plans (refer Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines). ~~For the proposed Update, cumulative impacts are evaluated in the context of both types of cumulative impact forecasts. The cumulative impact projections were made using local and regional planning documents and site specific technical studies. The planning horizon for the Update has been changed to from 2021 to 2011. Because of this 10 year shortening of the planning horizon, many of the cumulative projects that would have been developed in the ensuing years (i.e., 2012 through 2021) will not be implemented during the scope of this Revised DSEIR are no longer applicable.~~ Cumulative impacts are discussed in each issue subchapter of Chapter 5.0 in this **Revised DSEIR**. The following is a summary of cumulative impacts that are forecast to occur if the proposed Update is implemented as proposed and a restatement of ~~the cumulative impacts from the Initial Study and Chapter 5.~~

**Aesthetics:** Implementation of the Update will contribute to the change of the general area. New, two-story buildings will replace existing single-story buildings on campus. These new buildings will be consistent in terms of architecture, massing and scale with the buildings that have been developed under the Prior Plan. Parking Garage No. 2 will be located in the area currently occupied by a surface parking lot. This Garage will be similar in size, scale and massing to the existing Parking Structure located at the northeastern portion of the campus. Based on site reconnaissance and review of the site photos taken during that reconnaissance, these components of the Update will have limited visibility both from on and off-campus and their impacts are considered less than significant.

There is the potential for the removal of mature or memorial trees as a result of the implementation of the Update. **According to the "Tree Survey and Inventory San Jose City College," prepared by HortScience, Inc., dated October 2009, six hundred ninety-eight**

**(698) trees were surveyed on the campus in August 2009 representing 63 species. The most frequently occurring species were coast redwood (169 trees) followed by sweetgum (55), silver dollar gum (39), Chinese pistache (34), Canary Island pine (32), London plane and coast live oak (25 each), cork oak (21), mayten (20), and Southern magnolia (17). The 10 most-frequently occurring species comprised 438 trees, or 63% of those surveyed. The majority of trees had been planted as part of the College's landscape and were not indigenous to the site. While there may be a few coast live oaks that have arisen naturally, there are no large areas of native vegetation. Overall, the condition of the surveyed trees was good with 60% of the trees in the good and excellent categories. One hundred seventy-four (174) trees, or 25%, were in fair condition and 105 poor (15%). Several trees were dead, including coast redwood and three Japanese maples surveyed as part of larger group. This impact is considered cumulative; however, with the implementation of mitigation measures, the impacts are considered less than significant.**

There is also the potential for additional light and glare as a result of the implementation of the Update. **One light source, a transparent light tower, which would be approximately five stories high (roughly 120 feet), lit at night, and would be visible from I-280, was proposed at the main entrance as part of the Multidisciplinary Classroom Building under the Prior Plan. This light tower will be removed as part of the Update. This Light and glare impacts is** are also considered cumulative; however, with the implementation of mitigation measures, the impacts are considered less than significant.

~~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 analysis indicates that this change will create a cumulative significant aesthetic or visual resource impact.~~

~~There are no known adjacent projects that would impact the same viewshed as Baseball Field Complex poles, netting and wall, nor are there any that are planned based on the surrounding General Plan designations. Therefore, implementation of the Update is forecast to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to visual/aesthetic impacts on the local visual setting/environment. Based on the data available at this time and the analysis in this subchapter, there appears to be any cumulatively considerable degradation in visual character or quality that will result from implementing the Update.~~

Agricultural Resources: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded that the Update would not cause any increase in cumulative impacts to Agricultural Resources and would not adversely impact any of these Resources. ~~There have been no changes to Agricultural Resources since the certification of the Prior Plan EIR for the Prior Plan. The campus has not historically been used for agricultural purposes and is not classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency and will not conflict with the existing zoning or an existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. The historic use of the campus has been for non-agricultural land uses. There are no existing agricultural zoning or~~



agricultural land use on the campus and no agricultural uses envisioned in the future. Lastly, the implementation of the Update will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. The campus and the adjacent urban development are not being utilized for agricultural cultivation. As a result, no impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

The potential Agricultural Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are not considered cumulatively considerable.

~~Air Quality: According to the analysis in Chapter 5.3 of this DSEIR, 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.~~

**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 28, 2010, implementation of the Update 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 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 potential Air Quality Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable, with mitigation incorporated.

~~Biological Resources: The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1) 2009 DSEIR~~ concluded that the Update would not cause any increase in cumulative impacts to Biological Resources and would not adversely impact any of these Resources. Implementation of the Update will have a less than significant effect after mitigation, to either directly or through habitat modifications, on any specifics identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and with a potential conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Many of the conditions that applied to biological resources present in 2000 are still currently applicable. Implementation of 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.** Mature trees have been removed, in compliance with the mitigation measures contained in the

Prior Plan EIR, as a result of implementing the Prior Plan **to date, April 2010**. There is also the potential for trees to be removed through the implementation of the Update. **According to the “Tree Survey and Inventory San Jose City College,” prepared by HortScience, Inc., dated October 2009, six hundred ninety-eight (698) trees were surveyed on the campus in August 2009 representing 63 species. The most frequently occurring species were coast redwood (169 trees) followed by sweetgum (55), silver dollar gum (39), Chinese pistache (34), Canary Island pine (32), London plane and coast live oak (25 each), cork oak (21), mayten (20), and Southern magnolia (17). The 10 most-frequently occurring species comprised 438 trees, or 63% of those surveyed. The majority of trees had been planted as part of the College’s landscape and were not indigenous to the site. While there may be a few coast live oaks that have arisen naturally, there are no large areas of native vegetation. Overall, the condition of the surveyed trees was good with 60% of the trees in the good and excellent categories. One hundred seventy-four (174) trees, or 25%, were in fair condition and 105 poor (15%). Several trees were dead, including coast redwood and three Japanese maples surveyed as part of larger group. After implementation of mitigation measures, it was determined that impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level. No other mitigation measures were required.**

The ~~Initial Study~~ **2009 DSEIR** also concluded that implementation of the Update would have no impacts that could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; or conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. As a result, no additional impacts are anticipated and no additional mitigation measures are required.

The potential Biological Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable, with mitigation incorporated.

Cultural Resources: The ~~Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded that no significant adverse Cultural Resource impacts would result from implementation of the Update. Implementation of the Update will not cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 or directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. **The District obtained updated historic resource evaluations from historic resource experts Archaeological Resource Management, dated October 23, 2009. These reports are attached to the Stage II 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.** There have been no changes to relative to these resources since the certification of the Prior Plan EIR **to date, April 2010**, that would result in any impacts. As a result, no impacts were anticipated and no mitigation measures were required for these resources.

~~As was the case with the Prior Project,~~ Implementation of the Update may cause a substantial change in significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 and may disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. It should be noted that no subsurface conditions relative to Cultural Resources have changed since the certification of the Prior Plan EIR **in 2000 to date, April 2010**. With the incorporation of a mitigation measure, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

The potential Cultural Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable, with mitigation incorporated.

Geology/Soils: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded that no significant adverse Geology/Soils Resource impacts would result from implementation of the Update. Implementation of the Update could have a potentially significant impact that would expose people to potentially significant impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; strong seismic ground shaking; 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. Many of the conditions that apply to Geology/Soils that were present in 2000 are still currently applicable **to date, April 2010**. The underlying geology and soils on the campus have not changed. The issues pertaining to seismicity are still applicable. Implementation of 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; however, 90' high poles and netting will be installed at the baseball field.~~ **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.** All construction components of the Update will be required to comply with the latest version of the California Building Code (CBC), and specifically with the requirements for public school facilities (which are more stringent than those for general structures). Also, implantation of the Update calls for the removal of older campus buildings and replacement with new ones that could increase seismic safety on the campus. With the compliance with the latest version of the CBC, demolition of older structures and the incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the Update would have no impact which would result in or expose people to potential impacts involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; 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. Consistent with the Prior Project, there are no active faults within the campus. The campus topography is flat and not subject to landslides. Lastly, implementation of the Update will not include the use of alternative wastewater systems. No impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

The potential Geology/Soils Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable, with mitigation incorporated.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials: The ~~Initial Study~~ **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. 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 Section 5.4 (Land Use and Planning) of this DSEIR.~~ **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.** The Hazard issue areas listed above was not be analyzed in the **Revised DSEIR**.

Two additional mitigation measures were added under the ~~Update~~ **2009 DSEIR that will be included as part of this Revised DSEIR**. 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 Section 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 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 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~~ **this Revised DSEIR**.

The potential Hazards/Hazardous Materials Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable, with mitigation incorporated.

Hydrology/Water Quality: According to the ~~Initial Study~~ **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~~ **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~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded that the Update involves the reorganization of campus 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.~~ 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.

The potential Hydrology/Water Quality Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable, with mitigation incorporated.

Land Use/Planning: Based on the evaluation in this **Revised** DSEIR, the implementation of the Update will **not** 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 this 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. Please refer to subchapters 5.2 (Aesthetics) and 5.6 (Recreation) for additional and more specific findings regarding cumulative impacts for these aspects of land use incompatibility.~~

Based on this information, implementation of the Update is **not** forecast to cause or contribute to cumulatively considerable adverse impacts to Land Use/Planning Resources.

Mineral Resources: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded that no significant adverse Mineral Resource impacts would result from implementation of the Update. The campus has not historically been to extract mineral resources and implementation of the Update will not result in the 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. As a result, no impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

The potential Mineral Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are not considered cumulatively considerable.

Noise: 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. 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.

The potential Noise Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable, with mitigation incorporated.

Population/Housing: The ~~Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded that implementation of the Update would not result in any significant increase in Population/Housing Resources. ~~There were no “Unavoidable Significant Impacts,” or “Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes” in the Prior Plan EIR. There were no “Effects Found Not to be Significant” in the Prior Plan EIR. As was the case with the Prior Project, i~~ Implementation of the Update may induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. ~~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 will continue to be considered less than significant and no mitigation measures will be required.

Implementation of the Update will 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 are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

The potential Population/Housing Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable.

Public Services: The ~~Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded implementation of the Update project would result in a lesser demand for services than the Prior Plan, and with the incorporation of mitigation measures, impacts would be considered less than significant.

Implementation of the Update would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated 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 and police protection services. Many of the requirements/mitigation measures have been implemented since the adoption of the Prior Plan and the certification of the Prior Plan EIR **to date, April 2010**. The Update involves the reorganization of campus 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. This would result in lesser impacts than were anticipated under the Prior Plan.~~ **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.** To ensure that all impacts are addressed, mitigation measures will be implemented for impacts to Police Protection Services and Fire Protection Services. With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

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. As stated prior, 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. There were no impacts from the Prior Plan on these issue areas and t~~ The same conclusions apply to the implementation of the Update.

The potential Public Services Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable, with mitigation incorporated.

Recreation: 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, ~~with the exception of the Baseball Field Complex. The installation of the Baseball Field Complex poles, netting, batter's eye and wall results in an unavoidable adverse impact from the implementation of the Update and this impact has been determined to be an unavoidable adverse impact from the selected viewpoints (VP 5-9, 12-13), a less than significant impact (VP 4 and VP 11) and no impact for others (VP 1, VP 3, VP 10, VP 14, VP 14, VP 16, VP 17, VP 19).~~ Based on the data and analysis presented in Chapter 5.2 (Aesthetics), the Update ~~cannot~~ **can** be implemented without causing an unavoidable adverse impact ~~from the Baseball Field Complex poles, netting, batter's eye and wall.~~

Based on this information, implementation of the Update is forecast to cause or contribute to cumulatively considerable adverse impacts to Recreation Resources.

Traffic and Circulation: **Implementing the Update will generate new trips and that will have an unavoidable adverse impact on the local circulation system.** All study intersections affected by the implementation of the Update operate acceptably under City of San Jose, VTA, and Caltrans standards except the ~~intersection of 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~~ **this** intersections. ~~These~~ **This** intersections ~~are~~ **is** 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.

Utilities/Service Systems: ~~The Initial Study (Subchapter 9.1)~~ **2009 DSEIR** concluded implementation of the Update project would result in a lesser demand for Utilities/Service Systems Resources than the Prior Plan, and with the incorporation of mitigation measures, impacts would be considered less than significant.

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 Project. 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. Since the Proposed Project would result in similar types of uses as those on the campus currently, and there is an overall reduction in the total OGSF and ASF, impacts will be less than the Prior Project. 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.~~ Since the adoption of the Prior Plan, ~~older,~~ † Less water efficient buildings have been demolished, new water efficient buildings have been constructed and water efficient landscaping has been installed. Mitigation measures, ~~some of which were required in the Prior Plan EIR to mitigate water supply,~~ will be implemented for water demand and conservation. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

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 Project 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 and 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, this determination can be made because the campus is fully developed and the proposed facilities would be similar in function to existing facilities. All of these issue areas will have an incremental impact; however, since they are ~~less than the Prior Project comparable to what currently exists on campus,~~ for purposes of this analysis, they are considered less than significant.

The potential Utilities/Service Systems Resource impacts from implementation of the Update are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable, with mitigation incorporated.