De Anza College
Facilities Master Plan

Draft EIR

Lead Agency:
Foothill-De Anza
Community College District

Impact Sciences, Inc.
One Kaiser Plaza, Suite 1520
Oakland, California 94612
(510) 267-0494

March 27, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

This introduction provides information on the environmental review process being conducted by the Foothill-De Anza Community College District for the proposed Facilities Master Plan in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This information is provided to assist the reader in understanding the planning and regulatory context in which the proposed project is being reviewed.

B. PROJECT APPROVALS REQUESTED

The Foothill-De Anza Community College District has developed a Facilities Master Plan for the 112-acre De Anza College campus, which is located east of State Route (SR) 85, in the city of Cupertino in Santa Clara County. The proposed Facilities Master Plan includes a series of projects for the campus that involve construction of new buildings, renovations of most existing buildings, revisions to the existing campus entries, probable new campus entries/exits, construction of a parking deck, expansion of parking lots, probable realignment of the campus loop road, demolition of the Faculty House, and renovation of the campus landscaping.

The development proposed under the Facilities Master Plan is intended to accommodate the projected enrollment of approximately 30,850 students by 2010 and would result in a net increase of 147,260 gross square feet of new building space. The Foothill-De Anza Community College District is the Lead Agency for consideration and approval of the proposed Facilities Master Plan. After Facilities Master Plan approval, the College District Governing Board will review specific campus development projects for consistency with the Plan.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the College District determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared to analyze the potential impacts associated with the Facilities Master Plan. On November 1, 2000 the College distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) describing the proposed project and stating that the College District would prepare an EIR. The NOP was distributed to the State Clearinghouse and various other local agencies and organizations. In accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the District provided a 30-day period for responses to the NOP. The District requested that each commenter identify in a written response any specific topics of environmental

concern that should be studied in the EIR. Responses to the NOP were received from the following public agencies and other commenters:

- Native American Heritage Commission
- City of Cupertino Community Development Department

The Initial Study, NOP, and comment letters received by the College District are contained in **Appendix 1.0** to this EIR.

Based on the Initial Study, the following general topics are analyzed in this EIR:

- Land Use and Planning
- Transportation and Circulation
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Public Services
- Public Utilities
- Visual Quality

These topics are discussed in **Section 4.0**, and **Sections 5.1** through **5.6** of the EIR.

This Draft EIR is being circulated for a 45-day public review period, as required by CEQA. During this review period, written comments concerning the adequacy of the document may be submitted by all interested public agencies and private parties to the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, 12345 El Monte Road, Los Altos Hills, California, 94022, Attention: John Schulze, Director of Facilities, Operations and Construction Management. After the 45-day public review period has ended, the District will prepare written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIR. These responses will be incorporated into the Final EIR. The Final EIR will be reviewed and considered and must be certified prior to any actions on the proposed Facilities Master Plan.

D. SCOPE OF EIR

The De Anza College Facilities Master Plan constitutes a series of projects that are related geographically, are logical parts of a series of contemplated actions, are connected with plans prepared by the District, and are projects that will be carried out by the College District. As such, the projects are considered a

"program" under CEQA and this EIR is a Program EIR per CEQA (as described in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines).

Each activity carried out as part of the Facilities Master Plan will be examined by the District in light of the Program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared. If the District finds that all of the effects of the later activity have been addressed by the Program EIR (considering the specific characteristics of the activity, potential changes in conditions that might have occurred since the Program EIR was completed, and new information that might have become available), the District can approve the project as being within the scope of the project addressed in the Program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required. If the later activity could have effects not covered by the Program EIR, additional environmental review (an Initial Study, ending in a Negative Declaration or an EIR) may be required under CEQA.

E. FORMAT AND CONTENT OF EIR

This section provides a description of the organization of this EIR and the contents of each section, to assist the reader in using this EIR as a source of information about the proposed project and its potential effects on the environment. The sections following this introduction are organized as follows:

Section 2.0, Executive Summary, includes a description of the proposed project, a description of project alternatives and the conclusions of the alternatives analysis, and a table showing the significant impacts and mitigation measures identified in the EIR.

Section 3.0, Project Description, presents a detailed description of the proposed Facilities Master Plan. The topics addressed in this section include the project objectives, the proposed new buildings and additions, proposed demolition, access, circulation and parking, campus infrastructure, landscaping, and a preliminary project schedule.

Section 4.0, Environmental Setting and Plan Consistency, includes a general description of the existing environmental characteristics of the region, local area, and the project site to help orient the reader. Additionally, this section provides a summary and analysis of relevant regional and local planning programs and policies.

Section 5.0, Existing Conditions, Project Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, contains the analysis of each of the environmental topics addressed in this EIR. Each topic is addressed in a separate sub-section organized as follows: introduction; environmental setting; project impacts; mitigation measures; cumulative impacts; and level of significance after mitigation.

Section 6.0, Unavoidable Significant Impacts, summarizes the conclusions of **Section 5.0** regarding those impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Section 7.0, Alternatives, provides an analysis of the alternatives to the proposed project. As required by the CEQA *Guidelines*, a discussion of the reasons for selecting the alternatives analyzed in this section is provided, along with a comparative analysis of each alternative with the project and identification of the "environmentally superior" alternative.

Section 8.0, Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes, addresses the potential use of nonrenewable resources during the project, and project features that would commit future generations to significant changes.

Section 9.0, Growth Inducing Impacts, discusses the ways in which the proposed project could remove an impediment to growth, foster economic expansion or growth in the area, establish a precedent-setting action, or represent isolated development or encroachment in an isolated or adjacent area of open space.

Section 10.0, Impacts Found Not to be Significant, includes a discussion of impacts found not to be significant, based on the District's Initial Study and the analyses in **Section 5.0** of the EIR.

Section 11.0, Organizations and Persons Consulted, provides a list of all persons contacted during preparation of this EIR.

Section 12.0, References, lists all documents used as a basis of information for this EIR.

Appendices to this EIR include the Initial Study, Notice of Preparation and comment letters, and information from the transportation, air quality, and noise studies used in the analysis contained in this EIR.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. PURPOSE

It is the intent of the Executive Summary to provide the reader with a clear and simple description of the proposed project and its potential environmental impacts. Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the summary identify each significant impact, and recommended mitigation measures and alternatives that would minimize or avoid potential significant impacts. The summary is also required to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. This section focuses on the major areas of the proposed project that are important to decision-makers and utilizes non-technical language to promote understanding.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

B1. Project Site Location

De Anza College is located in central Cupertino in Santa Clara County. The campus is immediately east of State Route (SR) 85 and is bounded by Stevens Creek Boulevard to the north, Stelling Road to the east and McClellan Road to the south. The campus encompasses about 112 acres. Local access is currently provided from Stevens Creek Boulevard, Stelling Road and McClellan Road. Regional access is provided by SR 85 and Interstate 280 (I-280). The campus is within the jurisdiction of the Foothill-De Anza Community College District.

B2. Description of the Facilities Master Plan Area

The campus is completely developed with buildings, parking lots, roadways and pathways, athletic fields and landscaping. Existing buildings are mainly in the northern and western parts of the campus, and include instructional buildings, services and support facilities. Existing sports facilities are located in the south part of the campus and include the baseball field, softball/soccer field, football/track field, tennis courts, and swimming pool.

B3. Description of the Proposed Project

The proposed Facilities Master Plan involves the expansion and renovation of campus facilities and modifications to campus access and circulation. The proposed projects would involve construction of

new facilities (approximately 149,400 gross square feet), renovation of most existing facilities, probable revisions to existing campus entries, probable new campus entries/exits, construction of a parking deck, expansion of parking lots, probable realignment of the campus loop road, demolition of the Faculty House, and renovation of the campus landscaping (including upgrades to the irrigation system). All of the proposed facilities would be developed within the existing campus boundaries. The development proposed under the Facilities Master Plan is intended to meet the needs of the College for an anticipated enrollment of 30,850 (inclusive of on-site, distance learning and off-campus growth) total students by the year 2010.

C. TOPICS OF KNOWN CONCERN

The environmental factors addressed in this EIR are listed below by general category:

- Transportation and Circulation
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Public Services
- Public Utilities
- Visual Quality

D. IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

This EIR assesses each potentially significant impact that could result from implementation of the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA, a summary of the project's significant impacts is provided in the Summary Table at the end of this chapter (see **Table 2.0-1, Summary of Significant Project Impacts**). Also provided in the Summary Table is a list of the mitigation measures that are identified to address each significant impact, as well as a determination of the level of significance of the impact after implementation of the mitigation measures.

Impacts that would be reduced to a less-than-significant level solely by the features proposed as part of the Facilities Master Plan are not shown in the Summary Table.

E. ALTERNATIVES

Three alternatives to the De Anza College Facilities Master Plan were considered, and two were evaluated, based on the potential to reduce identified significant impacts of the project. The two alternatives analyzed include the No Project Alternative (alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario) and the Leased Facilities Alternative. Under the alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario, an alternative Facilities Master Plan would be developed to support the Educational Master Plan, address existing conditions, and accommodate the expected increase in enrollment at the College. Under the Leased Facilities Alternative, only limited renovation and infrastructure projects would be completed on site. This alternative would attempt to avoid or reduce significant impacts by dispersing future growth at De Anza College to leased off-site locations. The proposed new facilities would not be built. The College District would address the increase in enrollment by housing new programs within leased facilities off site.

The No Project Alternative (alternative Facilities Master Plan) would likely result in impacts similar to those of the project, given the limited area available on the campus for construction, and the similar increase in enrollment that would occur.

The Leased Facilities Alternative would result in a reduction in some impacts at the De Anza College campus, but would shift some of the impacts of the project to the off-site leased facilities, the areas around those facilities, and (possibly) the areas between leased facilities and the De Anza campus. In addition, the Leased Facilities Alternative would raise a number of inconsistencies with project and College objectives.

A potential third alternative, involving construction of new facilities at an off-site location, was rejected. Construction of the proposed facilities at an alternative location was not included as a project alternative because of the likely infeasibility of such an alternative, and the lack of evidence that such an alternative would avoid or substantially reduce the significant impacts of the proposed project.

Based on the analysis in this section, there would be tradeoffs involved with the adoption of any of the alternatives. As required by CEQA (*Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(e)(2)), the "environmentally superior" alternative must be selected from one of the alternatives to the project. Therefore, the Leased Facilities alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative (of the No Project Alternative and Leased Facilities Alternative) under CEQA.

F. ISSUES AND AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

Issues or areas of known controversy relate mainly to the traffic and circulation as well as air quality impacts in the vicinity of the campus.

Table 2.0-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT PROJECT IMPACTS

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION		
At the intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive, the level of service during the mid-day peak hour under Project Conditions and the level of service during the P.M. peak hour would operate at unacceptable levels. These impacts would be significant.	1. The College District would install, or provide funding to the City of Cupertino for installation of, yield signs for left turns on the east and westbound approaches at the intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive. With this improvement, the intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive would operate at LOS C during the A.M. and Mid-Day peak hours, and LOS D during the P.M. peak hour. This measure would improve the overall safety and operation of this intersection, and would mitigate project-specific and cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.	Less than significant.

Topic/Impact	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance After Mitigation**
Under Project conditions, the segment of SR-85 southbound between I-280 and Stevens Creek Boulevard would operate at LOS "F" during the P.M. peak hour. The increase in traffic from the proposed project would be equal to or greater than one percent of the freeway capacity.	2. The College would continue to implement its Commute Alternative Program, to the extent feasible (and consistent with State law), in order to reduce the number of vehicles traveling to and from the College. The individual program components are listed below with estimates of effectiveness, based on Altrans or the BAAQMD. (The estimates of effectiveness are noted following each measure. • The Direct Transit Route Marketing Program and GIS Trip Planning (already being implemented) (0.5 to 2 percent trips); • The VTA ECO Pass Program(estimated trip reduction has not been calculated); • The College Shuttle Bus System (1,000 students per day, about 3 percent of total future student trips or about 20 percent of the additional student trips); • Interactive Carpool Program (already being implemented) (1 to 4 percent trips); • The Bicycle Safety and Encouragement Program (0.5 to 2 percent trips); and • The Distance Learning and Tele-Commute Program (0.5 to 1.5 percent trips).	At SR-85 southbound between I-280 and Stevens Creek Boulevard, it is not known whether impact would be substantially reduced. Mitigation is within the jurisdiction of another agency. Transportation measure 2 has the potential for substantial reduction of impacts at the freeway segment, but feasibility of implementation is not known.

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	3. The College would monitor the effectiveness of the Commute Alternative Program at reducing student and employee trips. The monitoring activities would establish a baseline (pre-program level) for student and employee trips and trip characteristics, and shall provide a quantitative measurement of future student and employee trips on at least a yearly basis. The monitoring activities may include, but would not be limited to, regular surveys and the use of trip counters at College entrances. If the measures are found to not be effective (that is, if they do not meet at least the minimum level of trip reduction estimated), the College would consider and implement corrective actions (to the extent feasible and consistent with State law).	
	4. The College would coordinate with the City to consider joint development of the area near Stevens Creek Boulevard and Stelling Road, in uses designed to reduce vehicle trips. Such uses could result in other environmental impacts, depending on the location and characteristics of the use. The impacts cannot be determined at this time, and would need to be addressed in a separate environmental review under CEQA. Also, it is not known to what extent the City is willing to participate in this measure.	
With the projected increase in students and the proposed increase in parking, there could be bus/vehicle and bus/pedestrian conflicts. It is reasonable to assume that the projected increase in students could lead to increased congestion near the campus entries and exits. Therefore, potential impacts to access are considered to be significant.	5. When designing the new (relocated) Stevens Creek entry, the College would work with the City of Cupertino to ensure that the entry is designed to minimize delays along Stevens Creek Boulevard.	Less than significant.

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	6. The College would extend vehicle stacking areas on campus, where feasible, for both ingress and egress movements.	
	7. The College would work with the City of Cupertino to consider construction of additional entries and exits, including a new exit along McClellan Road and new entries/exits along Stelling Road. The construction of additional entries/exits could result in temporary construction noise and dust impacts, similar to those described in this EIR. Depending on their location and design, additional entries/exits could require the removal of additional trees.	
	8. The College would design the reconfigured/expanded parking areas to ensure ease of entry for vehicles entering from College roadways.	
	9. The College would work with the VTA to ensure that adequately sized and safe queuing areas are provided and maintained for both vehicles and pedestrians.	

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
With the projected increase in students, the project would create a long-term deficit of 432 to 732 parking spaces (6,170 space demand - 5,438 to 5,738 spaces provided). In the short term the project would create a deficit of up to 1,232 to 1,332 parking spaces (6,170 space demand – 4,838 to 4,938 spaces provided). A parking deficit would mean that vehicles might continue driving around within the campus looking for parking, resulting in congestion within campus parking lots and along the perimeter road. Vehicles might also drive around looking for parking off campus, including along Mary Avenue and within the church parking lot, leading to increased congestion on nearby roads. Therefore, the project's impact with respect to parking supply (and associated congestion within and off the campus) is considered significant.	10. The transportation demand management measures listed for the freeway impact (measures 2-4) would also help to mitigate the parking impact by reducing student and employee trips.	At their maximum effectiveness, the measures would substantially reduce the parking impacts, and therefore adequately mitigate them. However, the feasibility of implementation is not known.
	11. Adding parking spaces could help encourage automobile trips to and from the campus and discourage the use of transit and other transportation alternatives. Therefore, the College would expand parking only after parking demand has been assessed with the implementation of the Commute Alternative Program measures. If deemed necessary, the full complement of additional parking would be built as soon as possible.	

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	12. The College would also consider the addition of parking spaces, either on site or off site. The construction of additional parking on site could result in additional impacts, including impacts to traffic and visual quality, as well as construction impacts. The construction of additional parking off site may not be feasible, and could also result in additional impacts, depending on the particular site chosen.	

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
During the construction phase of the proposed project, the parking facilities on the east portion of the campus may not be available for use. To offset the net reduction in parking during construction, valet parking and alternate transportation programs should be increased at available sites (i.e. the Flint Center garage). To the extent that these types of impacts would lead to a substantial increase in congestion off campus, they would be considered potentially significant.	13. The College would prepare, before the start of construction, a construction mitigation plan that would be tailored to the construction schedule, and, at a minimum, would consider: • The number of truck trips; • Time of day and location of street closures; • Time of day arrival and departure of trucks; • Limitations on the size and type of trucks; • Provision of a truck staging area, with limitations on the number of trucks that can be waiting; • Provision of a truck circulation pattern; • Construction parking for patients, visitors, staff and construction workers; • Mobile office placement and associated parking; • Manual traffic control when necessary; • Proper advance warning and posted signage concerning street closures; • Provisions for pedestrian safety; • Provisions for parking management (i.e. valet or stacked parking operation) at available locations (i.e. Flint Center Garage) to offset any temporary reduction in on-campus parking; • Shuttle bus service to any off-site parking facilities; and • Temporary relocation of VTA Transit Bus stops.	At their maximum effectiveness, the measures would substantially reduce parking impacts, and therefore adequately mitigate them. However, without the shuttle program, the measures might not adequately mitigate short-term parking impacts. The feasibility of implementation is not known at this time.

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY		
Construction of individual Facilities Master Plan projects would generate emissions of PM_{10}. Although the College District intends to require dust controls as part of its construction contracts, currently, the District does not have a formal or standard dust control program. Without implementation of all feasible measures for dust control, impacts related to construction emissions would be considered significant.	1. In accordance with the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*, the College would require all construction contractors working on new construction projects for the Facilities Master Plan to implement a dust control plan. The dust control plan would include the following measures from Table 2 of the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines* as applicable and feasible and consistent with College Best Management Practices, in efforts to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. The program would be applied to all construction activities involving grading, excavation, use of unpaved areas for staging, extensive hauling of materials, or building demolition.	Less than significant.
	Basic Control Measures (for all construction sites) • If necessary, water all active construction areas at least twice daily (with recycled water, if possible).	
	• Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials.	
	• Apply water two times daily to all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.	
	• Sweep daily all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.	
	• Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.	
	Enhanced Control Measures (for individual or combined construction sites of larger than four acres) • Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.	
	• Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).	

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	• The College already enforces a traffic speed limit of 15 miles per hour; this limit would be consistent with the recommended measure in Table 2.	
	• Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.	
	• Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.	
	Optional Measures (to be implemented at the discretion of the District) • Wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site.	
	• Install wind breaks, where necessary, at the windward side(s) of construction areas.	
The proposed project would generate average daily direct and indirect emissions that would exceed the BAAQMD-recommended ROG (reactive organic gases, a component of ozone) threshold for individual projects. This would be a significant project-specific and cumulative impact.	2. The College would continue to implement its Commute Alternative Program, to the extent feasible (and consistent with State law), in order to reduce operational emissions related to vehicles traveling to and from the College. The individual program components are listed below with estimates of effectiveness, based on Altrans or the BAAQMD. (The estimates of effectiveness are noted following each measure.)	Implementation of all of the features of the College Commute Alternative Program would substantially reduce operational emissions to a less-than-significant level. However, the feasibility of implementation is not known at this time.
	a. The Direct Transit Route Marketing Program and GIS Trip Planning (already being implemented) (0.5 to 2 percent trips);	

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	b. The VTA ECO Pass Program(estimated trip reduction has not been calculated);	
	c. The College Shuttle Bus System (1,000 students per day, about 3 percent of total future student trips or about 17 percent of the increase in student trips);	
	d. Interactive Carpool Program (already being implemented) (1 to 4 percent trips);	
	e. The Bicycle Safety and Encouragement Program (0.5 to 2 percent trips); and	
	f. The Distance Learning and Tele-Commute Program (0.5 to 1.5 percent trips).	

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	3. The College would monitor the effectiveness of the Commute Alternative Program at reducing student and employee trips. The monitoring activities would establish a baseline (pre-program level) for student and employee trips and trip characteristics, and would provide a quantitative measurement of future student and employee trips on at least a yearly basis. The monitoring activities may include, but would not be limited to, regular surveys and the use of trip counters at College entrances. If the measures are found to not be effective (that is, if they do not meet at least the minimum level of trip reduction estimated), the College would consider and implement corrective actions (to the extent feasible and consistent with State law).	

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	4. The College would coordinate with the City to consider joint development of the area near Stevens Creek Boulevard and Stelling Road, in uses designed to reduce vehicle trips. Such uses could result in other environmental impacts (including the attraction of additional vehicle trips to the campus), depending on the location and characteristics of the use. The impacts cannot be determined at this time, and would need to be addressed in a separate environmental review under CEQA. Also, it is not known to what extent the City is willing to participate in this measure.	
	5. The College would not expand its parking supply without the implementation of all feasible transportation demand management measures (see above) and an assessment of parking demand.	
NOISE		
Construction of individual Facilities Master Plan projects would generate noise levels that could affect some nearby sensitive receptors, as well as students and staff on the campus. Construction noise impacts to uses within the campus and to churches within 800 feet of the campus could be potentially significant.	1. For any exterior construction activity within 750 feet of off-campus residential uses and/or 800 feet of churches, the College would limit construction activity to the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on weekdays, and 7:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. on Saturdays and Sundays.	Less than significant.

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	2. For any exterior construction activity within 750 feet of off-campus residential uses and/or 800 feet of churches, construction contractors would implement appropriate additional noise reduction measures that may include using noise-reducing mufflers and other noise abatement devices, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, notifying adjacent residences and businesses in advance of construction work, and installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources. (Acoustic barriers would reduce the noise level by 5 to 10 dB(A).) In addition, the College District would require the posting of signs prior to construction activities with a phone number for residents to call with noise complaints. Depending on the type of equipment and type of control used, noise controls can also substantially reduce noise levels (by 1 dB(A) to 16 dB(A) at 50 feet).	
	3. In the event that construction activities would occur for an extended period of time adjacent to classrooms, or that construction noise could not be attenuated to an acceptable level inside classrooms, the College would temporarily relocate classes to a different location on campus.	
	4. Prior to construction activities anticipated to exceed 82 dB(A), the construction contractor shall coordinate with churches within 800 feet of the construction site so that construction occurs outside of scheduled church activities.	
PUBLIC SERVICES		
No significant impacts were identified.		

Topic/Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC UTILITIES		
Development of the Facilities Master Plan would increase the amount of impervious area on the project site, thereby potentially increasing runoff quantities. The City drainage system in the project vicinity is currently operating above capacity. Without mitigation, the proposed Facilities Master Plan could result in a net increase in peak flow; this potential impact on the City drainage system would be significant.	1. As individual Facilities Master Plan projects are designed, the College District would incorporate features into the projects or elsewhere on the campus to maintain peak flows during a 10-year storm event at the existing level. These features may include, but are not limited to, the following: offsetting increase in permeable surfaces elsewhere on the campus, permeable pavements, bio-swales or infiltration ponds, storm-drain rehabilitation and/or sump drains. The District would provide a drainage analysis, or other comparable information, to demonstrate that there is no net increase in peak runoff leaving the campus during the 10-year storm. This measure would be implemented prior to any project that results in an increase in peak runoff leaving the De Anza campus.	Less than significant.
	2. The District would consult with the City of Cupertino Department of Public Works regarding the drainage techniques to be used for individual Facilities Master Plan projects.	
VISUAL QUALITY		

Topic/Impact	**Mitigation Measures**	**Significance After Mitigation**
Individual Facilities Master Plan projects would result in the removal of trees on the campus. Although the removal of groups of trees would not result in a significant visual impact, the proposed project would result in significant impacts to individual trees. Approximately 27 trees meeting the definition of "specimen trees" under the City of Cupertino Code could be removed. This impact would be significant.	1. Prior to the final design of each project, a landscape architect would review the construction footprint of the project. All feasible measures, such as changes to the building footprint, shall be used to preserve and protect healthy trees meeting the definition of "specimen trees" in the City of Cupertino Code.	Less than significant.
	2. Based on recommendations from a qualified arborist, the District would relocate healthy trees meeting the definition of "specimen trees." The trees would be moved to locations consistent with the College landscape plan.	
	3. Specimen trees that cannot be saved (as the result of Measures 1 or 2 above) would be replaced with new trees of the same species at a ratio of 1 to 1. The 1 to 1 planting ratio would include replacing each existing tree with a 24-inch box oak tree. As an option for replacing larger trees, a grove of five 15-gallon sized oak trees could be planted instead of the 24-inch box tree, to create a small tree grove. The locations of the replacement trees would be selected by the College landscape architect to be consistent with the landscape plan, but the visibility of the existing trees would be considered. All trees would be monitored for at least 5 years to ensure the success of the new tree plantings. If a tree dies during this period, the tree would be replaced at a ratio of 1 to 1.	

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Project Description is to describe the project in a way that will be meaningful to the public, reviewing agencies, and decisionmakers. CEQA Guidelines Section 15124 requires that a project description contain the following information: 1) a statement of objectives sought by the proposed project (the underlying purpose should be included); 2) the precise location and boundaries of the proposed project shown on a detailed map; 3) a general description of the project's technical, economic, and environmental characteristics; and 4) a statement briefly describing the intended uses of the EIR, including a list of the agencies that are expected to use the EIR in their decision making, a list of the permits and other approvals required to implement the project, and a list of related environmental review and consultation requirements from federal, state, or local laws, regulations, or policies. According to the CEQA Guidelines, an adequate project description need not be exhaustive, but should supply the details necessary for project evaluation.

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

According to the Facilities Master Plan, "The Recommended Master Plan for De Anza College presents a campus model that will meet the needs of the college for its current enrollment of 25,000 and an anticipated enrollment of 32,000 students [inclusive of on campus distance learning and off campus growth] by the year 2010. [The forecast has since been revised, as discussed later in this section.] The Plan provides solutions to the educational needs described in the Educational Master Plan and addresses issues identified in the Existing Analysis. The Plan is an overall picture of the developed campus and includes both site development and facility projects." The District is obligated by State law to plan for and accommodate the defined post-secondary educational needs of the District population, which is projected to increase.

- The following objectives of the De Anza College Educational Master Plan are included to indicate the overall purposes of the College master planning process: achieve levels of excellence in a climate of learning for a diverse student body;
- provide effective pathways to learning for every student;
- improve student learning, student life, and the management of resources through the appropriate application of technology; and

- increase access through planned growth and fiscal soundness.

C. PROJECT LOCATION

De Anza College is located in central Cupertino in Santa Clara County. The campus is immediately east of State Route (SR) 85 and is bounded by Stevens Creek Boulevard to the north, Stelling Road to the east and McClellan Road to the south. The campus encompasses about 112 acres. Local access is currently provided primarily from Stevens Creek Boulevard, with minor access provided from Stelling Road and McClellan Road. Regional access is provided by SR 85 and Interstate 280 (I-280). See **Figure 3.0-1, Regional and Project Site Location**. The Assessor' s Parcel Numbers (APNs) for the campus are 359-01-002 and -004.

Existing buildings are mainly in the northern and western parts of the campus. The building names and sizes (shown in assignable square feet (ASF) and gross square feet) are summarized in **Table 3.0-1, Existing Building Inventory.** As shown, space in the existing buildings totals 531,102 ASF, or approximately 1,075,370 gross square feet. Existing sports facilities are located in the south end of the campus and include the baseball field, softball/soccer field, football/track field, tennis courts, and swimming pool. See **Figure 3.0-2, De Anza College Campus** for a map of the existing De Anza College campus. The current College enrollment is about 25,000 students (total, inclusive of on-campus students and distance learning); the College does not house students but is used extensively in the evenings and on weekends.

De Anza College is owned and operated by the Foothill-De Anza Community College District. The District also owns and operates Foothill College in Los Altos Hills. The proposed Facilities Master Plan referred to in this document is for the De Anza College campus only.

INSERT FIGURE 3.0-1

Project Site Location

BACK OF PAGE

Table 3.0-1
Existing Building Inventory

Building	Assignable Square Feet (ASF)	Gross Square Feet(GSF)
Administration	15,450	27,410
Choral Rehearsal	4,299	6,010
Piano Rehearsal	1,676	2,190
Instrumental Rehearsal	4,734	6,060
Fine Arts Division Offices	1,059	1,610
Design studio	3,575	4,080
Photography	5,008	5,750
Crafts Studio	3,567	4,080
Television Studio (Drama Hall)	4,895	9,510
Euphrat Gallery	5,900	6,410
Bookstore/Snack Bar	11,302	13,730
Campus Center	35,420	58,360
Cottage 1	1,841	2,760
Cottage 2	1,410	2,410
Automotive Technology	16,820	22,020
Machine Technology	10,307	13,150
Drafting	7,315	8,030
Faculty House	1,851	2,650
Forum	12,770	16,670
Faculty Offices 1	987	1,710
Faculty Offices 2	1,651	2,720
Faculty Offices 3	987	1,710
Faculty Offices 4	987	1,470
Faculty Offices 5	1,647	2,720
Faculty Offices 6	1,216	1,710
Learning Center	71,456	94,050
Social Science Division	3,459	4,040
Social Science 2	6,929	8,400
General Classrooms	3,474	4,060
Journalism/Foreign Language	7,285	8,540
General Classrooms	3,474,	4,060
Business Division	7,623	8,660
Business Classrooms	3,488	4,040
Auxiliary Gym	18,106	20,560
Main Gym	14,544	15,700
Pool and Faculty Offices	1,100	3,560
Faculty Offices	1,046	2,320
Faculty Offices	803	2,210
Locker Rooms	22,487	27,060

Table 3.0-1
Existing Building Inventory (continued)

Building	Assignable Square Feet (ASF)	Gross Square Feet(GSF)
Seminar/Physically Limited	4,085	6,240
Physics/Geology/Math	9,274	10,270
Science	7,277	11,620
Chemistry	13,638	15,530
Life Science	9,473	10,270
Home Economics/Biology	7,960	9,230
Nursing/Medical Assisting	5,616	6,100
Faculty Offices	876	1,380
Flint Center Auditorium	46,702	79,180
Child Development Center	9,715	13,260
California History Center	3,267	4,520
Multicultural Center	7,437	8,620
Hoeffler Building	5,343	7,440
Planetarium	4,453	4,680
G Building	8,741	10,200
Environmental Studies	580	740
International Student Office (temporary)	869	1,030
Student Transfer Academic Retention Services (temporary)	845	1,030
Transfer Center (temporary)	860	1,030
Construction Trailer (temporary)	596	660
Parking Structure	292	342,910
Outdoor Events Arena	206	1,750
Restrooms	0	2,220
Restrooms	0	2,220
Restrooms	0	2,220
Advanced Technology Center	45,906	70,570
Print Shop	7,547	8,130
Mechanical &Electrical Building	0	1,360
Maintenance Center (temporary)	1,229	1,410
Occupational Training Inst 1	1,774	1,920
Occupational Training Inst 2	1,159	1,280
Occupational Training Inst 3	1,820	1,920
Electrical Shop (temporary)	297	490
Mechanics Shop (temporary)	459	720
Gilbane (temporary)	858	1,030
Total:	**531,102**	**1,075,370**

Gross square footage numbers are rounded.
Source: Foothill/DeAnza Community College District

INSERT FIGURE 3.0-2

De Anza College Campus

BACK OF PAGE

D. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The Facilities Master Plan involves expansion of campus facilities and modifications to campus access and circulation. See **Figure 3.0-3, Proposed Facilities Master Plan, De Anza College**. The proposed projects would involve:

- construction of new buildings;
- renovation of most existing buildings;
- revisions to existing campus entries;
- probable new campus entries/exits;
- construction of a parking deck;
- expansion of existing parking lots;
- probable realignment of the campus loop road;
- demolition of the Faculty House; and
- renovation of the campus landscaping (including upgrades to the irrigation system).

The proposed Facilities Master Plan is available for review at the Foothill-De Anza Community College District Facilities Complex at 12345 El Monte Road in Los Altos Hills, and at the reference desk of the Library on the De Anza College campus. The development proposed under the Facilities Master Plan is intended to meet the needs of the College for an anticipated enrollment of 30,850 (inclusive of on-site, distance learning and off-campus growth) total students by the year 2010. The original forecast enrollment of 32,000 student was revised downward in January 2002, to reflect a shortfall in funding by Measure E bonds. Project downsizing as a result of the shortfall limits the number students the college can accommodate.[1]

All facilities would be developed within the existing campus boundaries. As shown in **Table 3.0-2, Proposed Master Plan Facilities**, there would be a total of approximately 149,400 gross square feet of new building space at Master Plan buildout. The existing campus has about 1,075,370 gross square feet of building space; of that total, about 1,065,830 gross square feet would remain when proposed demolition is included. When considered with proposed demolition, the proposed new buildings and additions would result in a total building space of about 1,215,230 gross square feet, or net increase in building space of about 147,260 gross square feet.

---

1 Brandy, Mike, Vice President, Finance & College Services, De Anza College, letter, January 17, 2002.

Table 3.0-2
Proposed Master Plan Facilities

Proposed Master Plan Facilities	Gross Square Feet[1]	Other
Proposed Facility		
Child Development Center Expansion	12,400	1 story
Science Center	45,000	2 stories
Kirsch Center for Environmental Studies	20,000	2 stories
Student and Community Services Building	46,000	2 stories
Plant Services/Warehouse	10,000	2 stories
E-1 Expansion	1,000	1 story
Future Facility	NA	NA
Future Performance/Lecture Hall	15,000	1 story/35 to 40′ tall
Subtotal:	***149,400***	
Total Existing Building Space to Remain	**1,065,830**	
Building Total at Master Plan Buildout	**1,215,230**	

Note:
1. The sizes of buildings are subject to program changes. All numbers are rounded to the nearest one hundred square feet.

Source: Foothill-De Anza Community College District

Existing and proposed land uses by major category are summarized in **Table 3.0-3, Campus Master Plan Existing and Proposed Land Uses.** All projects would be within the existing campus boundaries. With the exception of the construction of the Kirsch Center for Environmental Studies at the south end of the campus, the distribution of campus buildings would not be substantially altered by the proposed construction. All of the new buildings would be one to two stories high, similar to existing buildings, which are one to three stories high. The proposed parking deck would be one story high.

INSERT FIGURE 3.0-3

Proposed Facilities Master Plan, De Anza College

BACK OF PAGE

Table 3.0-3
Campus Master Plan Existing and Proposed Land Uses

	Area (acres)		
Land Use Category	**Existing**	**Proposed**	**Net Change**
Buildings	27.7	29.4	1.68
Vehicle and Circulation	45.4	45.2	-0.20
Landscape	28.9	25.1	-3.84
Athletic	10.1	12.5	2.36
Total	**112.1**	**112.1**	**0.0**

Note: totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: Foothill-De Anza Community College District

D1. Proposed New Buildings and Additions

Although the Facilities Master Plan does not specify specific "phases," the construction plan would be implemented in yearly intervals. In some cases, these components have only been conceptually designed. As a result, the specifics (e.g., grading requirements, architectural designs, and facade treatments) of the individual projects are not all known at this time. All building sizes noted below are approximate.

D1(a) In Progress

(i) Child Development Center Expansion

The 12,400-gross-square-foot expansion to the existing Child Development Center will be to the north of the existing facility. This project has been addressed by a separate Negative Declaration.

D1(b) 2002

(i) Science Center

The 45,000-gross-square-foot Science Center would be northwest of the football field/track, and east of the Automotive Technology Building. This facility would include biology and chemistry laboratories, computer/teaching resource laboratories, storage facilities, lecture areas, balance rooms, and offices.

D1(c) 2003

(i) Kirsch Center for Environmental Studies

The 20,000-gross-square-foot Kirsch Center for Environmental Studies would be in the southeast corner of campus (west of the Environmental Studies Area). This facility would include biological/ environmental sciences and interdisciplinary instructional space to support the college's educational program needs. The project will require the relocation of the existing tennis courts to the northeast.

(ii) Student and Community Services Building

The 46,000-square-foot Student and Community Services building would be in the northeast part of the campus, occupying the south portion of the existing Staff Lot A. This facility would consolidate student services that are currently distributed throughout the campus in a variety of locations. The construction of this new facility is intended to create a "front door" to campus and to free up space throughout the campus to develop additional instruction space.

(iii) Plant Services/Warehouse

The 10,000-gross-square-foot Plant Services/Warehouse would be on the west side of campus (south of the Flint Parking Structure). This facility would include a 6,000-gross-square-foot bookstore warehouse (with support offices), and a 4,000-gross-square-foot building shop area (to house carpentry, mechanical electrical, and landscape and grounds shops).

D1(d) 2004

(i) E-1 Building Expansion

A 1,000-gross-square-foot classroom addition to the E-1 building (which is in the southwest part of campus) would provide additional instructional space.

D1(e) 2005 and Later

(i) Future Facility

To address long term/future demand for instructional space on campus, a site for a future new facility is proposed (west of the Learning Center and California History Center) that would be used for expansion of academic classes. The size of the future facility is not known at this time, and the facility is not currently funded.

(ii) Future Performance/Lecture Hall

A 15,000-square-foot building would be constructed at some future date, to the northwest of the student and Community Services Building. The hall would be a one-story building, but would be 35 to 40 feet tall.

D2. Existing Buildings

D2(a) Proposed Buildings to Be Demolished

The Faculty House would be demolished. This building is approximately 2,140 gross square feet, and was on the campus property when it was purchased in 1939. The date the Faculty House was constructed is not known. In addition, eight temporary buildings, totaling about 7,400 gross square feet, would be removed.

D2(b) Proposed Buildings to Remain

With the exception of the Faculty House and the temporary buildings on campus, all other buildings would remain, and most would continue to be used for the same functions. Most existing buildings would be modernized and renovated. **Table 3.0-5, Proposed Building Renovations**, shows the buildings proposed for renovation and the expected project dates.

D3. Access, Circulation and Parking

D3(a) Roadways/Campus Circulation

The Facilities Master Plan includes possible new campus entry/exit points, revisions to existing campus entries along Stevens Creek Boulevard, and Stelling Road, and probable realignment of the campus loop road on the west side of campus.

(i) Changes to Stevens Creek Entries and Drop-Offs

Modifications to the existing campus entries along Stevens Creek Boulevard would facilitate vehicular access to the campus and correct some of the congestion and confusion that currently exist. The entry in front of the existing parking structure would be replaced with a new entry to the east to align with the Flint Center drop-off. The main entry would be improved with signage to lead vehicles off the perimeter road and into the campus at key access points in order to increase safety and access.

Table 3.0-5
Proposed Building Renovations

Proposed Building Renovation	Anticipated Project Dates
Faculty Office	2001
"L" Quad	2002
Administration	2004-2005
"A" Quad (phases 1 to 4)	2002-2005
Bookstore	2004
Campus Center	2004-2005
E-1	2004-2005
E-2	2002
E-3	2004-2005
Forum	2005
Learning Center	2005-2006
PE-1 & PE-2 Gym	2003
PE-3	2003
PE-4 & PE-5	2003
PE-6 Locker	2003-2004
SEM Building	2004-2005
"S" Quad	2004-2005
California History Center	2005-2006
Planetarium	2004-2005
"G" Building	2005-2006
Restroom	2001-2002
Advanced Technology Center	2005-2006
Print Shop	2005
Mechanical/Electrical Building	2005-2006
Athletic Field	2002-2003
Stadium Repairs	2002-2003
Child Development Center Renovation	2002-2003

Source: Foothill DeAnza Community College District

(ii) Changes to Stelling Entry and Drop-Off

As a separate project, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) will be building a new bus transit center. The new transit center will be designed to accommodate up to eight transit buses simultaneously and to function as a major gateway to the College. The center will include a passenger plaza, a shelter, and lighting, among other improvements. The transit center will be located within the campus just west of Stelling Road, between Parking Lots B and C. VTA will start construction on the

center in spring 2003, with opening planned for fall 2003. As part of the Facilities Master Plan, the Stelling Road entry would be modified to accommodate the new center.

(iii) Re-Alignment of Loop Road

Construction of the Plant Services/Warehouse building would include the realignment of the campus loop road on the west side of campus. The northwest section of the loop road would be further extended to the west. This realignment is intended to provide a service road access to the proposed Plant Services/Warehouse for trucks.

D3(b) Parking

The Facilities Master Plan proposes parking improvements that consist of a one-story parking deck, and expansion of the existing parking lots. The proposed parking deck would be constructed in the area of Parking Lot C. All existing lots would be redesigned and reconfigured. Trees and planting areas within lots may need to be removed or relocated to provide spaces. (There is potential for additional parking deck(s) at some future time over Parking Lots A and B. Although the size of, and number of parking spaces provided by, the proposed individual parking improvement projects are not known, it is anticipated that the parking improvements would add (in the short term) approximately 400 to 500 parking spaces. Future projects would add 600 to 800 more spaces in the long term. Near-term and long-term projects combined would add 1,000 to 1,300 parking spaces to the existing 4,438 spaces, for a total of 5,438 to 5,738 spaces.

D4. Campus Infrastructure

Exact details regarding proposed water and wastewater connections for the new buildings are not known at this time. The irrigation system would be changed to reflect changes to site layout.

D5. Landscaping

The campus landscape was planted approximately 30 years ago, and although well planned, changes in the campus structure and the maturity of the campus planting have left the landscape in need of renovation. New planning and campus expansion will create new areas, which will need to fit in with the established landscape structure and surrounding native landscape.

The proposed Facilities Master Plan includes a Landscape Master Plan. The intention for the renovation and addition of future landscape improvements is to reinforce a sense of place within the urban campus

setting, while weaving together newly renovated areas within the fabric of the original campus. Renovations to existing landscaped areas would incorporate innovative use of sustainable materials. Selection of new and replacement plant material would include those native to California and would require minimal supplemental water and maintenance. The irrigation system would be upgraded to accommodate landscape improvements.

The *Landscape Buffer* (consisting of a buffer of mixed evergreen trees) around the perimeter of the campus would be maintained, and would continue to screen the campus from adjacent activities, properties and vehicular corridors, and to identify the campus within the context of the neighboring community.

D6. Schedule

The Master Plan would be implemented in six phases. The anticipated schedules for projects beginning in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 are as shown in **Table 3.0-6, Proposed Project Phasing**. (Renovations would continue into 2006.)

Table 3.0-6
Proposed Project Phasing

Proposed Master Plan Component		Construction Start Date	Completion Date
2001			
	Child Development Center Expansion (already started)	2001	2002
2002			
	Science Center	2002	2004
2003			
	Student and Community Services Building	2003	2004
	Kirsch Center for Environmental Studies	2003	2004
	Plant Services/Warehouse	2003	2004
	Stelling Entry Modifications	2003	2003
	Parking Deck	2003	2004
	Stevens Creek Entries	2003	2003
2004			
	E-1 Expansion	2004	2005
2005 and later			
	Future Facility	NA	NA
	Public Performance Space	NA	NA

Source: Foothill-De Anza Community College District

D7. Projected Enrollment and Employment

De Anza College currently has a student enrollment of approximately 25,000 total students. This enrollment is equivalent to 19,200 full time equivalent students (FTES). The Educational Master Plan projects that attendance will increase to 30,850 students (about 23,690 FTES) by the year 2010, a 23 percent increase.

De Anza College currently employs 1,204 people. Of that total, 877 are full- and part-time certificated faculty, 292 are classified employees, and 35 are managers. It is expected that the number of employees will increase at the same rate as the increase in student enrollment; therefore there would be a total of about 1,485 employees in the year 2010. Of the total, there would be approximately 1,082 certificated faculty, 360 classified employees, and 43 managers.

E. PROJECT APPROVALS

As defined by CEQA, a Lead Agency is the public agency with the principal responsibility for approving a project. The Foothill-De Anza Community College District is the Lead Agency for consideration and approval of the proposed Facilities Master Plan. The College District Governing Board will hold at least one public hearing on the proposed Facilities Master Plan before deciding whether to approve it. The Board must certify the Final EIR before making its decision on the proposed Master Plan. The Governing Board will review specific campus development projects for consistency with the Master Plan.

The project may also require approval by the following public agencies:

- Division of the State Architect (DSA) for buildings, handicap accessibility, fire and life safety;
- City of Cupertino Public Works and Traffic for changes to campus entries;
- City of Cupertino Fire Department for site access and fire hydrants/ water pressure;
- Santa Clara County Fire Department; and
- State Fire Marshal.

Table 4.0-2
Project Consistency with the City of Cupertino General Plan -1993

Element	Policy Number	Policy	Project Consistency
Land Use/ Community Character	2-1: Diversity of Land Use	Provide adequate land area for employment, housing, shopping, entertainment, cultural activities, health care, personal services, recreation and open space. Encourage mixed use development of commercial/ office and housing.	The project site is already developed and used as a college campus. Buildout of the Facilities Master Plan would not reduce the land available for other uses in the area.
	2-2: Heart of the City	Coordinate the efforts of private owners on or near Stevens Creek Boulevard to plan and create a community focal point that expresses the character of Cupertino through a diversity of uses, serving City residents and scaled for pedestrians.	De Anza College is part of the Heart of the City Specific Plan area. The College serves as a resource to the community, and is scaled for pedestrian uses.
	2-3: Development Reallocation	Development activity should be controlled so that the City street system is not overwhelmed with traffic and the desired transportation level of service is maintained. To meet the City's goals and priorities, the remaining uncommitted development potential that achieves the City's transportation goals should be reallocated as described in Table 2-3 of the General Plan. Further adjustments to these allocations may be necessary to ensure that the City's transportation goals are met.	The College is not within the jurisdiction of the City, and thus is not considered as part of the development potential in Table 2-3 of the General Plan. However, the proposed project would not result in any level of service impacts to signalized intersections in the vicinity of the College. The levels of service would be maintained consistent with City standards at the unsignalized intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive by installation of yield signs (by the District as mitigation).
	2-5: Commercial Blight and Noise Intrusion	Work to ensure that blight and noise from commercial and industrial uses do not intrude upon residential neighborhoods.	The College is not a commercial or industrial use. Temporary construction-related noise impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation measures specified in **Section 5.3**. The Facilities Master Plan would not result in any other significant noise-related impacts.

Element	Policy Number	Policy	Project Consistency
	2-19: Neighborhood Protection	Protect residential neighborhoods from noise, traffic, light, and visually intrusive effects from more intense developments with adequate buffering setbacks, landscaping, walls, activity limitations, site design, and other appropriate measures.	Temporary construction-related noise impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation measures specified in **Section 5.3**. The Facilities Master Plan would not result in any other significant noise-related impacts. The proposed project would not result in any level of service impacts to signalized intersections in the vicinity of the College. The level of service would be maintained consistent with City standards at the unsignalized intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive by installation of yield signs (by the District as mitigation). Proposed parking improvements would not supply adequate on-campus parking, and as a result there could be parking spillover into neighboring residential areas. Mitigation measures are identified in the EIR to try to address that impact. The Initial Study prepared by the District specifies mitigation measures to address potential impacts from light and glare, and the Initial Study found that there would be no visually intrusive impacts (see Appendix 1.0).
	2-25: On-Site Environments	Emphasize attractive, on-site environments during the development review process by giving careful attention to building scale and mass, landscaping, placement, screening of equipment and loading areas and related design considerations.	The campus is surrounded by a tree buffer that screens views of the campus from the surrounding streets. Trees and planting areas within parking lots may need to be removed or relocated to provide spaces. However, the perimeter tree buffer would remain. Proposed buildings would be similar in type and scale to existing buildings.
	2-30: Parking Area Layout	Include clearly defined spaces for pedestrians in parking lots so that foot traffic is separated from the hazards of car traffic and people are directed from their cars to building entries.	Pedestrian spaces would be considered as part of the project-specific design of the proposed parking deck and parking expansions.

Element	Policy Number	Policy	Project Consistency
	2-34: Neighborhood Traffic Pattern Investigation	Investigate neighborhood traffic patterns comprehensively and find solutions to protect neighborhood streets from through-traffic spillover.	The traffic analysis prepared by the District examined local traffic patterns and analyzed the impact of Facilities Master Plan buildout on traffic patterns. There would not be any level of service impacts to signalized intersections in the vicinity of the College. Level of service impacts to the unsignalized intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by installation of yield signs (by the District as mitigation). Given that all local intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS, and that campus access is provided from Stevens Creek Boulevard, Stelling Road, and from McClellan Road (all arterial roadways), it is not anticipated that campus traffic would spill over into neighborhood streets. However, proposed parking improvements would not provide sufficient on-campus parking, and thus some student parking spillover into neighboring streets could occur. Mitigation measures are identified in the EIR to try to address that potential impact.
	2-48: Avoidance of Geologic Hazards	Identify geologic hazards on sites proposed for development and avoid or limit development in those areas.	There are no known active faults within the campus, there is no potential landslide hazard within the campus area, and there are no known unstable geologic units underlying the campus (see Appendix 1.0, De Anza College Facilities Master Plan Initial Study). A site-specific geotechnical/soil investigation would be conducted for each proposed facility on the De Anza College campus, and all consultant recommendations would be implemented.
	2-50: Outdoor Lighting	Outdoor lighting should be low intensity and shielded to minimize illumination off site.	The Initial Study conducted by the District (see Appendix 1.0) specifies measures proposed by the District to reduce the impact of new sources of light and glare to a less-than-significant level.

Element	Policy Number	Policy	Project Consistency
	2-54: Views of Public Facilities	Design and lay out public facilities, particularly public open spaces, so they include views of the foothills or other nearby natural features, and plan hillside developments to minimize visual and other impacts on adjacent public open space.	There are existing screened views of the foothills from the De Anza College campus. Proposed buildings would be similar in type and scale to existing buildings and would not further obstruct existing views.
	2-56: Land Disturbance During Development	Be sure that natural land forms and significant plants and trees are disturbed as little as possible during development. All cut and fill shall be rounded to natural contours and planted with natural landscaping.	The campus is generally flat and there are no unique natural land forms. As discussed in Section 5.6, all possible measures, such as changes to the building footprint, shall be used to preserve and protect healthy mature and specimen trees. Trees that cannot be saved shall be considered for re-location or replaced with new trees.
	2-62: Land in Natural Flood Plain	Allow public and quasi-public land in the natural flood plain after review of a specific zoning or use permit application.	The De Anza College campus is not within a floodplain.
	2-68: De Anza College	Allow land uses not traditionally considered part of a college, such as lodging or conference facilities and institutional office and research facilities, to be built at De Anza College. Final determination of the intensity, character and ultimate desirability will be evaluated with regard to the effects on traffic and the consistency with the college's educational nature.	The Facilities Master Plan is consistent with the College's educational nature, and does not include any uses not traditionally considered part of a college.
	2-74: Landmark Rehabilitation	Undertake an active partnership with private owners of landmark structures to rehabilitate the buildings for public or semi-private occupancy and retain their historic character.	Proposed development would not affect the one known historic resource (La Petit Trianon) on the De Anza College Campus.

Element	Policy Number	Policy	Project Consistency
	2-74: Archaeological Sensitive Areas	For development in sites in areas likely to be archaeologically sensitive, such as along stream courses and in oak groves, the City development review process should require a specific investigation to determine if significant archaeological resources may be affected by the project, and should also require appropriate mitigation measures in the project design.	The campus is completely developed, and all proposed facilities would be constructed within the campus boundaries. A cultural resource records search conducted in July 2000 by the Northwest Information Center (Sonoma State University) found that the project area contains no recorded Native American cultural resources. However, the Santa Clara Valley is known for having buried archaeological resources. In the event that areas are excavated that contain unidentified cultural resources, such impacts would be addressed with standard measures specified in the Initial Study prepared by the College District (see Appendix 1.0).
	2-75: Native American Burials	Recognize that Native American burials may be uncovered in unexpected locations and that State law prescribes the appropriate actions to take upon discovery of such burials during construction, including stoppage of work in surrounding area, notification of appropriate authorities and reburial of remains in an appropriate manner.	See above discussion. The College District would comply with applicable State law.
	2-76: Heritage Trees	Protect and maintain heritage trees in a healthy state. A heritage tree list shall be established and periodically revised to include trees of importance to the community.	According the City of Cupertino Heritage-Tree list, there are no heritage trees on the De Anza College campus. There are trees that meet the definition of "specimen trees" in the Cupertino Municipal Code; this EIR identifies measures to mitigate the removal of specimen trees.

Element	Policy Number	Policy	Project Consistency
Traffic	4-2: Traffic Capacity and Land Use Limitations	Maintain a reasonable minimum LOS D for major intersections during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours (highest single hours) by imposing reasonable limits on land use to ensure that principal thoroughfares are not unduly impacted by locally generated traffic during the peak traffic hour. In order to accommodate development which furthers a unique community gathering place on Stevens Creek Boulevard, the intersection of Stevens Creek and De Anza boulevards and De Anza Boulevard and Bollinger Road may maintain a LOS E+ (No more than 45 seconds weighted daily average). For land use and transportation planning purposes, the traffic peak hour should not be allowed to expand into the peak period. Staggering of work hours beyond current levels is not acceptable as a transportation demand management (TDM) technique. The TDM must benefit both the peak hour traffic and the average daily traffic volume.	The proposed project would not result in any level of service impacts (based on City standards) to signalized intersections in the vicinity of the College. The level of service will be maintained consistent with City standards at the unsignalized intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive by installation of yield signs (by the District as mitigation).
Environmental Resources	5-1: Williamson Act Properties	Designate properties under the Williamson Act contracts in the General Plan for their anticipated developed use to plan for future public service and utility demands and to ensure that development will be consistent with the community character.	The campus is completely developed, does not contain any farmland, and is not considered a Williamson Act Property.
	5-4: Air Pollution Effects	Continue to assess air pollution effects of future land use and circulation planning. Review projects for toxic air contaminants at time of approval.	This EIR includes an analysis of the air quality impacts of Facilities Master Plan buildout. There are no sources of toxic air contaminants on the campus.

Element	Policy Number	Policy	Project Consistency
	5-5: Dust Control	Continue to require the use of water or oil to control dust during the construction process.	The College District would implement all feasible measures from the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines* to control dust during all construction activities.
	5-10: Street Trees	Increase street trees on public property and tree planting on private property.	The Facilities Master Plan includes a Landscape Master Plan that would provide for the planting of additional trees on campus.
	5-13: Public Project Landscaping	Encourage public and quasi-public agencies to landscape their city area projects near native vegetation with appropriate native plants.	The College campus does not contain and is not adjacent to natural areas. Selection of new and replacement plant material would be native to California and would require minimal supplemental water and maintenance.
	5-14: Development Near Sensitive Areas	Encourage the clustering of new development away from sensitive areas such as riparian corridors, wildlife habitat and corridors, public open space preserves and ridgelines.	There are no biologically sensitive areas (including riparian areas) on the De Anza College campus. Proposed new buildings would be constructed in areas that are already paved, and would be in proximity to existing buildings.
	5-15: Landscaping Near Natural Vegetation	Emphasize drought tolerant native plants and ground covers when landscaping properties near natural vegetation, particularly for control of erosion from disturbance to natural terrain.	The College campus does not contain and is not adjacent to natural areas. Selection of new and replacement plant material would be native to California and would require minimal supplemental water and maintenance.
	5-16: Natural Area Protection	Minimize lawn area and maximize the number of native trees.	As discussed in **Section 5.6,** all possible measures, such as changes to the building footprint, shall be used to preserve and protect healthy mature trees and trees meeting the definition of "specimen trees" in the Municipal Code. Trees that cannot be saved shall be considered for re-location or replaced with new trees.
	5-28: Natural Creek Beds	Retain creek beds, riparian corridors, water sources and associated vegetation in their natural state to protect wildlife habitat and recreation potential and assist groundwater recharge	There are no riparian areas on the De Anza College campus, and there would not be a substantial increase in impervious surface at the campus. Therefore, groundwater recharge would no be affected.

Element	Policy Number	Policy	Project Consistency
	5-31: :Local Conservation Policies	Continue to keep citywide efforts of water conservation similar to those being conducted on a regional scale. Many of these conservation efforts are outlined in the Santa Clara Valley Water District Drought Plan and Countywide Water Use Reduction Program.	The College District would implement water conservation measures in the new buildings, including low-flow showers, toilets and faucets.
	5-35: Nonpoint Source Pollution	Continue to support and participate in the Santa Clara Valley Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program in order to cooperatively reduce nonpoint source pollution with other cities storm waters into the San Francisco Bay.	The District would implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to protect water quality. The BMPs to be implemented would be chosen in consultation with the RWQCB, and would include measures to reduce nonpoint source pollution.
	5-36: Storm Water Runoff	Encourage the reduction of impervious surface areas and investigate opportunities to retain or detain storm water runoff on new development.	The majority of new construction would occur in areas that are already paved. Therefore, Facilities Master Plan buildout would not result in a substantial increase in impervious surfaces at the campus. However, any increase in peak flows during the 10-year storm event could result in significant impacts to the downstream drainage system. The EIR identifies mitigation requiring the District to detain peak flows on site.
Public Health and Safety	6-1: Seismic/Geologic Review process	Adopt and use a formal seismic /geologic review process to evaluate new development proposals all over the City.	There are no known active faults within the campus, there is no potential landslide hazard within the campus area, and there are no known unstable geologic units underlying the campus (see Appendix 1.0, De Anza College Facilities Master Plan Initial Study). A site specific geotechnical/soil investigation would be conducted for each proposed facility on the De Anza College campus, and all consultant recommendations would be implemented.
	6-9: Early Project Review	Involve the Central Fire Protection District in the early design stage of all projects requiring public review to assure fire department input and plan modifications as needed.	The Santa Clara County Fire Department was contacted to evaluate potential impacts of the proposed Facilities Master Plan on fire services to the campus and to the City as a whole (see **Section 5.4**).

Element	Policy Number	Policy	Project Consistency
	6-14: Multi-Story Building fire Risks	Recognize that multi-story buildings of any land use type increase risks of fire. Ensure that adequate fire protection is built into the design and require on-site fire suppression materials and equipment to ensure safety of the community.	The College District would comply with applicable fire and life safety standards and code requirements such as fire hydrant flows, hydrant spacing, adequate fire lane turning-radius, access, and design. The College District would also comply with the Division of State Architect/Office of Regulatory Services (DSA/ORS) standards and the Santa Clara County Fire Department requirements regarding installation of automatic sprinkler systems.
	6-20: No New Construction in Flood Plains	Adopt stringent land use and building code requirements to prevent new construction in already urbanized flood hazard areas recognized by the Federal Flood insurance Administrator.	The De Anza College campus is not within a flood hazard zone.
	6-28: Solutions to Street Abuse	Continue to evaluate solutions to discourage through traffic in neighborhoods through modified street design. Examples include meandering streets, diverters, landscaped islands, street closures and wide parking strips.	Campus access is provided primarily from Stevens Creek Boulevard, with minor access provided from Stelling Road and McClellan Road; all of these roads are major arterials.
	6-33: Noise Control Techniques	Continue to require analysis and implementation of techniques to control the effects of noise from industrial equipment and processes for projects near homes.	The project does not involve the construction of industrial uses. The College District would implement construction noise mitigation measures (**see Section 5.3 Noise**) to lessen construction noise impacts to a less than significant level. The project would not result in any other significant noise impacts.
	6-34: Restrict Hours of Construction	Continue to restrict non-emergency building construction work near homes during evening, early morning, and weekends.	The College District would implement construction noise mitigation measures (**see Section 5.3 Noise**) that would prevent construction work during early mornings and evenings, and would limit construction work on weekends.

Element	Policy Number	Policy	Project Consistency
	6-39: Crime Prevention in Building Design	Consider the relationship between building design and crime prevention in reviewing all development. Develop criteria with help from the Sheriff's Office to determine the degree to which crime prevention should override esthetic concerns.	The District Police Department and the County of Santa Clara Office of the Sheriff were contacted to evaluate potential security impacts of Facilities Master Plan buildout; neither agency had concerns regarding the impact of the proposed project (**see Section 5.4**).
	6-41: Pre-hearing Review	Continue to request County Sheriff review and comment on development applications for security measures.	See above discussion.
	6-48: Hazardous materials Storage	Continue to require the proper storage and disposal of hazardous materials to prevent leakage, potential explosions, fire or the release of harmful fumes.	The College District would follow all City, County, State and federal requirements to prevent employee or student exposure and ensure safe use, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials or wastes.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SETTING

A. PURPOSE

The following discussion of the Environmental and Regulatory Setting addresses those physical and regulatory conditions which characterize not only the project site, but also include local and regional areas in the project vicinity. As required by Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines, this discussion should include the following:

"(a) An EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective. The description of the environmental setting shall be no longer than is necessary to provide an understanding of the significant effects of the proposed project and its alternatives.

[(b) pertains to military bases, and is not relevant to this EIR.]

"(c) Knowledge of the regional setting is critical to the assessment of environmental impacts. Special emphasis should be placed on environmental resources that are rare or unique to that region and would be affected by the project. The EIR must demonstrate that the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project were adequately investigated and discussed and it must permit the significant effects of the project to be considered in the full environmental context.

"(d) The EIR shall discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans. Such regional plans include, but are not limited to, the applicable air quality attainment or maintenance plan or State Implementation Plan, area-wide waste treatment and water quality control plans, regional transportation plans, regional housing allocation plans, habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans and regional plans for the protection of the coastal zone, Lake Tahoe Basin, San Francisco Bay, and Santa Monica Mountains.

"(e) Where a proposed project is compared with an adopted plan, the analysis shall examine the existing physical conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced as well as the potential future conditions discussed in the plan."

CEQA requires that an EIR include a description of the physical environment that currently exists on, and in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the purpose of this section is to generally describe the physical environment in which the project would be located. Emphasis should be afforded to local and regional land uses and environmental

conditions, such as geographic features, noise, and significant structures and/or landmarks. This section also provides a consistency analysis of the proposed project in relation to applicable local and regional plans. This approach allows the reader to formulate an understanding of the project site and the surrounding area, and to establish perspective on potential project impacts.

B. REGIONAL SETTING

B1. Location

The De Anza College campus (proposed Facilities Master Plan Area) is located in central Cupertino in Santa Clara County. The campus is immediately east of State Route (SR) 85 and is bounded by Stevens Creek Boulevard to the north, Stelling Road to the east and McClellan Road to the south. The campus is within the jurisdiction of the Foothill-De Anza Community College District.

Vehicular access to the De Anza College campus is currently provided primarily from Stevens Creek Boulevard, with minor access provided from Stelling Road and McClellan Road. Regional access is provided by SR 85 and Interstate 280 (I-280). The nearest major airport, San Jose International Airport, is approximately eight miles northeast of the campus.

B2. Public Services and Utilities

B2(a) Police and Fire

Police services are provided to the campus by the Foothill-De Anza Community College District Police Department and the Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department. Fire protection services are provided to the campus by the Santa Clara County Fire Department.

B2(b) Water

The San Jose Water Company provides domestic and fire flow water to most of Santa Clara County, including the De Anza College campus.

B2(c) Sewer

Wastewater collection services are provided by the Cupertino Sanitary District. The De Anza College campus wastewater is treated by the San Jose/ Santa Clara Wastewater Pollution Control Plant, which

has a design capacity of 167 million gallons per day (mgd) (although the plant is currently operating under a 120 mgd average dry weather effluent flow constraint).

C. LOCAL SETTING

C1. Surrounding Land Uses

The land uses in the vicinity of the campus are described as follows, and are also shown in **Figure 4.0-1, Site with Nearby Land Uses**:

North: Commercial uses and Memorial Park.

South: Mix of single-family and multi-family residential uses, College facilities, and two churches.

East: Single-family residential uses, a school/athletic field, and a church.

West: SR 85.

C2. Site Characteristics

The existing campus is approximately 112 acres and encompasses Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 359-01-002, and -004.

C2(a) Existing Land Uses

The existing campus is entirely developed with buildings, parking lots, roadways and pathways, athletic fields and landscaping. Buildings are mainly in the northern and western parts of the campus, sports facilities are located at the south end of the campus, and parking lots are mainly located in the northern and eastern parts of campus. Approximately 28 acres are used for buildings, 45 acres for vehicle and pedestrian circulation, 29 acres for landscaping, and 10 acres for athletic fields.

C2(b) Topography and Vegetation

The De Anza College campus is situated in the Santa Clara Valley, 80 to 90 feet above sea level, and approximately 9 miles south of the San Francisco Bay. The topography of the project site and surrounding area is generally flat. Vegetation on the campus consists of small landscaped areas outside the campus buildings, turf grass covering sports fields at the south end of the campus, and other

landscaping throughout the campus. Trees are located throughout the campus, including around the perimeter of campus, along pedestrian paths, and near a number of campus buildings.

C2(c) Drainage

There is no natural surface water on the campus (within the environmental studies area there is an artificial creek). Storm water percolates into the ground in landscaped parts of the campus. An underground storm drain system drains water from impervious surfaces on the campus into the City of Cupertino storm drain system.

C2(d) Geology and Seismicity

The project site is in the northern part of the South Coast Ranges of California. The structural geology of the Coast Ranges is complex, and is dominated by stresses along faults within the San Andreas Fault system. The site lies within the Santa Clara Valley, which is between the northwest-trending Santa Cruz Mountains to the west, and the northwest trending Diablo Range to the east. The valley is a large trough that has been infilled by sediment largely shed from these adjacent mountain ranges. The northern half of the valley is inundated by the San Francisco Bay.

The project site vicinity is underlain by Quaternary age and older alluvial deposits which consist of slightly consolidated and hardened deposits of sand, clay, silt and gravel. No active faults or potentially active faults are located in proximity to the site. The San Andreas, San Gregorio, Hayward and Calaveras faults, all which are active, are mapped about 5 miles southwest, 18 miles west, 13 miles northeast, and 16 miles northeast of the site, respectively. In addition, the Monta Vista-Shannon fault, considered potentially active, is located about 1.5 miles southwest of the site. These faults have historically generated earthquakes and could affect the project site in the future.

C3. Cumulative Development

According to the City of Cupertino Status of Development Activity (December 2000, updated per communication with City staff), development that is approved or pending includes: 1,360,490 square feet of commercial building space, 77 hotel rooms, and 1,126 housing units. Major approved or pending development activity in Cupertino is described in **Table 4.0-1, Cumulative Development**. The Compaq project and the Town Green (Civic Park) project sites are east of the campus, along Stevens Creek Boulevard.

Insert Figure 4.0-1, Site With Nearby Land Uses

BACK OF PAGE

Table 4.0-1
Cumulative Development

Project	Development Potential	Type of Development
Pending Development/Approved		
Compaq Computer	750,000 sq. ft./ 400 apartments	Commercial/Residential
Town Green (Civic Park)	345,000 sq. ft./230 apartments	
Cupertino Community Services	5,300 sq. ft. /24 housing units	Commercial/Residential
Santa Barbara Grill	40,000 sq. ft.	Commercial
Evershine Group, Marketplace	38,200 sq. ft.	Commercial
Pinn Brothers	11,300 sq. ft./46 housing units	Commercial/Residential
Adobe Inn Hotel	77 hotel units	Commercial
City Center	7,000 sq. ft./206 housing units	Commercial/Commercial/ Residential
Andronico's Market	32,160 sq. ft.	Commercial
Stanley Wang	8 housing units	Residential
Judy Chen	7 housing units	Residential
Under Construction		
Santa Clara County Fire Station	11,900 sq. ft.	Commercial
Oak Valley	178 housing units	Residential
Monica Villa	3,500 sq. ft/3 housing units	Commercial/Residential
Biltmore Apartments	24 housing units	Residential
Senior Center	15,300 sq. ft.	Commercial
North West YMCA	9,830 sq. ft.	Commercial
Total Cumulative Projects	**1,360,490 sq. ft commercial/77 hotel units/ 1,126 housing units**	

Source: City of Cupertino, Status of Development Activity, December 2000. Development Activity Highlights. Updated based on communication with the City of Cupertino Planning Department.

According to CEQA, the cumulative impacts of the Facilities Master Plan would be significant if the Facilities Master Plan's incremental effect is considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. The geographic area, size and type of development projects chosen for this evaluation vary for each type of impact discussed in **Chapter 5.0, Existing Conditions, Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**.

D. REGULATORY SETTING

Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* includes the following criteria for determining that a project may have a significant impact: "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." In addition, as mentioned earlier, CEQA requires an analysis of consistency with plans and policies as part of the environmental setting (see *Guidelines* Section 15125).

Based on this guidance, an EIR uses the analysis of policy consistency as an indicator of the resources that might be affected by a project, and considers the importance a policy gives a resource in determining the significance of the physical impact. Conversely, the EIR considers the potential significance of the related physical impacts when determining the consistency of a project with a particular policy. Inconsistency with a policy may indicate a significant physical impact, but the inconsistency is not itself the impact.

Using this approach, the Facilities Master Plan EIR provides a detailed analysis of consistency with policies of the City of Cupertino *General Plan* for the vicinity of the Plan area (since the College itself is not under the jurisdiction of the *General Plan*), and analyses of consistency with other applicable plans and policies. The physical impacts of the proposed project are analyzed in other sections of the EIR.

The *General Plan Guidelines* published by the State Office of Planning and Research define consistency as follows: "An action, program, or project is consistent with the *General Plan* if, considering all its aspects, it will further the objectives and policies of the *General Plan* and not obstruct their attainment." Therefore, the standard for consistency used in the EIR is based on general agreement with the policy language and furtherance of the policy intent (as determined by a review of the policy context). The project does not have to be in exact agreement with a policy for the project to be consistent with it.

Since the *General Plan* does not have jurisdiction over the campus (see discussion below), the City of Cupertino would not be making any formal determination regarding consistency of the proposed Facilities Master Plan with General Plan policies. However, in its review of the proposed project as an interested party, the City may comment on any impact of the project that would occur within the City. These comments will be based on standards derived from *General Plan* policies (and other applicable ordinances and regulations).

D1. The City of Cupertino General Plan (1993)

According to Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, the City of Cupertino *General Plan* does not have jurisdictional authority over the De Anza College campus. Therefore, the proposed Facilities Master Plan is exempt from the policies and programs of the *General Plan*. (These policies and programs are included in this EIR for advisory purposes only.)

The City of Cupertino *General Plan* was adopted in 1993, and guides land uses within the City of Cupertino. The De Anza College campus is in the City of Cupertino's Heart of the City Specific Plan Area. The current *General Plan* land use designation of the campus is Public Facilities; the proposed project would be consistent with the *General Plan* designation.

Figure 4.0-2, Existing General Plan Land Use Designations, shows the existing *General Plan* land use designations for the surrounding area, as follows:

North: Commercial/Residential, Parks.

South: Low Density Residential, Medium/High Density Residential, Commercial/Residential.

East: Low Density Residential, Quasi-Public/Institutional, Public Facilities, Medium/High Density Residential.

West: Industrial/Residential.

Project consistency with individual *General Plan* policies is evaluated in **Table 4.0-2, Project Consistency with the City of Cupertino General Plan**, at the end of this chapter. These policies focus on resources within the City that could potentially be affected by the proposed project.

D2. Cupertino Zoning Ordinance

Figure 4.0-3, Existing Zoning Designations, shows existing zoning designations for the campus and surrounding area. The campus is currently zoned as BA, Public Building. The Foothill-De Anza College District is part of the statewide California Community College system, and the proposed Facilities Master Plan is exempt from the Cupertino Zoning Ordinance.

D3. Regional Plans and Policies

Regional planning considerations and federal air and water quality laws have increased the relative importance of land use planning in a regional context. The proposed project's consistency with relevant regional planning documents is discussed below.

D3(a) ABAG Regional Population and Employment Forecasts

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is the federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the San Francisco Bay Area region, which consists of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties. Among ABAG's

responsibilities is the preparation of regional population and employment forecasts for use by other agencies in the Regional Air Quality Management Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan, and the Regional Water Quality Plan. Based on ABAG's 2000 forecasts, the entire San Francisco Bay region is expected to grow to a population of 8.03 million people by 2020 (from 6.9 million in 2000). This estimate represents an increase of 15.8 percent over year 2000 figures. The population within the City of Cupertino Sphere of Influence is projected to grow to about 66,400 by 2020, according to ABAG, an increase of about 19 percent over the 2000 population of about 55,900. The ABAG population forecasts, which have been guided by the *General Plan*, are prepared as planning tools and are not an exact prediction of the course of future events. Experience shows that these forecasts are most reliable at the regional level and less so for smaller areas such as cities.

The campus has a current enrollment of approximately 25,000 students (about 19,200 full time equivalent students, or FTEs). The development proposed under the Facilities Master Plan is expected to accommodate approximately 30,850 students (about 23,690 FTEs) by 2010; however, this increase is not considered population-generating because the campus does not provide housing. Therefore, consistency with ABAG population forecasts is not applicable.

Based on ABAG's 2000 employment forecasts, the total employment within the City of Cupertino is expected to grow to about 56,500 jobs by 2020 (from about 47,250 jobs in 2000). This forecast represents an increase of about 20 percent over 2000 figures. It is estimated that the number of employees on the De Anza College campus would increase by 23 percent to about 1,485 (from 1,204). Temporary employment for construction workers would be provided at the time site improvements are made. The 281 additional employees represents an increase of 0.60 percent over 2000 figures for the City of Cupertino; therefore, the proposed Facilities Master Plan is consistent with ABAG's employment forecasts.

D3(b) Air Quality Management Plan

The campus is within the San Francisco Bay Air Basin, under the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). For a discussion of the Facilities Master Plan's consistency with the BAAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan, see **Section 5.2, Air Quality**, of this EIR.

Insert **Figure 4.0-2, Existing General Plan Land Use Designations**

BACK OF PAGE

Insert Figure 4.0-3, Existing Zoning Designations

BACK OF PAGE

D3(c) Congestion Management Program

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was enacted by the State Legislature in order to address traffic congestion in California's urbanized counties. The Legislature noted that the existing transportation system relied upon an overcrowded street and highway system that affected the economic vitality of the state and diminished the quality of life in many communities. The current CMP for Santa Clara County was adopted in November 1997; the most recent guidelines were updated and adopted by the CMP in February 2001 (biennial updates are required by law).

The CMP was created for the purposes of linking land use, transportation, and air quality decisions; developing a partnership among transportation decision makers on devising appropriate transportation solutions that include all modes of travel; and proposing transportation projects eligible to compete for state gas tax funds.

By statute, the CMP has seven elements: 1) designation of a system of highways and roadways with minimum level of service performance standards; 2) development of a uniform transportation database for use in a countywide traffic model and for evaluating the transportation impacts of development proposals; 3) designation of a transit network with frequency, routing, and coordination measures; 4) a trip reduction and travel demand management element promoting alternative transportation methods; 5) a land use impact analysis program; 6) a seven-year capital improvement program; and 7) a biennial review of the jurisdiction's conformance with LOS standards, travel demand management requirements, and land use impact analyses.

Local jurisdictions are responsible for assessing the impacts of new development on the CMP highway system when preparing project EIRs and for selecting appropriate measures to mitigate such impacts from a "toolbox" of strategies. To be classified as a CMP roadway, the roadway must fall into one or more of the following categories:

- All existing state highways (both freeways and arterials);
- Principal arterials, defined as routes that complete gaps in the state highway system routes providing connectivity with the CMP systems in adjacent counties; or
- Routes along major inter-jurisdictional travel corridors, providing primary, high-volume, or multi-modal transportation.

According to the Santa Clara County CMP, the CMP intersections within the vicinity of the campus are Stevens Creek Boulevard and North De Anza Boulevard, and Stevens Creek and North Stelling Road.

There would be no significant impacts to these CMP intersections. The total traffic added by Facilities Master Plan buildout would add more than one percent of the freeway capacity to one freeway segment in the project vicinity, resulting in a significant impact to that segment. Although the freeway impact would be unavoidably significant, the Facilities Master Plan would be consistent with the CMP because mitigation identified in this EIR (i.e., implementation of a Transportation Demand Management program) is consistent with the requirements of the CMP.

For a detailed discussion of the proposed project's impacts to the local and regional circulation system, refer to **Section 5.1, Traffic and Circulation**, of this EIR.

5.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS, PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

A. PURPOSE

The purpose of this chapter is to inform readers of the type and magnitude of the project's environmental impacts. This chapter provides a detailed description of existing conditions on the De Anza College campus and in the vicinity, an evaluation of the impacts of the proposed Facilities Master Plan, lists of identified mitigation measures, and an analysis of cumulative impacts. The discussion of existing conditions defines the environmental conditions that currently exist within and near the project site. Project impacts are characterized as the effects of the Facilities Master Plan on the existing environment, defined as the conditions present at the time of the November, 2000 Notice of Preparation. Features of the Facilities Master Plan or standard procedures followed by the College that would help to avoid or reduce project impacts are referred to as appropriate, and analyzed for their effectiveness. If needed, additional mitigation measures are identified by this EIR. The analysis of cumulative impacts includes the impacts of general growth within the area near the campus (as projected by City of Cupertino staff).

5.1 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

A. SUMMARY

Under existing and future conditions, all of the signalized intersections in the De Anza College study area operate at acceptable levels of service; therefore, the project would not significantly affect congestion at those intersections. Under project and cumulative conditions, the unsignalized intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive would operate at LOS E or F; these impacts would be considered significant and would be mitigated by the installation of yield signs on the westbound and eastbound approaches.

The proposed project would result in significant impacts along one freeway segment (SR-85 southbound between I-280 and Stevens Creek Boulevard). TDM measures would reduce the number of automobiles associated with the proposed project; depending on the range of measures implemented and the measures' effectiveness the impact to the freeway segment could be reduced to a less-than-significant level or substantially reduced (and therefore adequately mitigated). If the College does not implement a shuttle program, and if the TDM measures are minimally effective, the measures would not be enough to adequately mitigate the freeway impact,

The proposed project would result in a parking deficit, and providing the needed parking may not be feasible. The TDM measures mentioned above could, depending on the range of measures implemented and the measures' effectiveness, completely eliminate the long-term parking deficit and substantially reduce (and therefore, adequately mitigate) the short-term deficit. If the College does not implement a shuttle program, and if the TDM measures are minimally effective,, the measures could still adequately mitigate the long-term parking impact,

Specific impacts related to access and project construction cannot be determined at this time, because the design and construction details of individual Facilities Master Plan projects are not known. Given the projected increase in students, the development of additional parking near the Stelling Road entrance, and the VTA transit center project at the Stelling entrance, it is reasonable to assume that there could be increased congestion at campus access points. There could also be temporary congestion and parking impacts related to construction activities. Measures are included in this section to adequately address these impacts.

B. INTRODUCTION

This section is based on traffic analyses prepared by DKS Associates. The supporting level of service calculations are in **Appendix 5.1**, and are incorporated herein by reference.

This section provides a general description of the transportation facilities in the project vicinity and summarizes potential transportation impacts within the study area. The analyses address the traffic

conditions during the weekday A.M., Mid-Day, and P.M. peak hours for the following facilities: study area intersections, parking, and bicycle, pedestrian and transit activity.

The transportation analysis represented in this study follows review and incorporation, where appropriate, of data from the following transportation studies.

- DKS Associates. *FINAL Parking Impact Analysis* – De Anza College Facilities Master Plan, September 2000.
- Barton-Aschman Associates, Inc. *Traffic Circulation and Parking Utilization Analysis at Foothill and De Anza Colleges* – Foothill-De Anza Community College District, September 1999.

In addition, information in this section is based on recent telephone conversations and data provided by City of Cupertino and De Anza College staff and site visits conducted in January 2001.

B1. Methodology

Traffic conditions have been analyzed in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the City of Cupertino and the Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP). To evaluate A.M. current traffic conditions, vehicle turning movement counts were conducted during the weekday A.M. (7:00-9:00 A.M.), Mid-Day (12:00-2:00 P.M.) and P.M. (5:00-7:00 P.M.) peak periods at nine of the fourteen study intersections (the study intersections are listed below). The remaining intersection traffic volumes were obtained from the City of Cupertino and the aforementioned traffic studies, and are incorporated herein by reference.

A table showing the dates of the traffic counts for each intersection is included in **Appendix 5.1**. Although the traffic counts are one to three years old, they are generally higher than what traffic counts would be would be if they were retaken in the current economic environment. Based on DKS' experience in other South Bay communities, overall traffic levels on major roads in the South Bay have stabilized or decreased.

Based on consultation with City of Cupertino staff, the following intersections were selected for analysis in this section, and are described in the following text. Those intersections marked with an asterisk (*) are also designated as Santa Clara County CMP intersections. The locations of the study intersections in relation to the College are shown in **Figure 5.1-1, Site Location and Study Intersections**. **Figure 5.1-2, Existing Lane Geometry and Traffic Control**, shows the existing lane configurations for the study intersections.

Signalized Intersections

1. Stevens Creek Boulevard/N. De Anza Boulevard*
2. Stevens Creek Boulevard/Bandley Drive
3. Stevens Creek Boulevard/Saich Way
4. Stevens Creek Boulevard/N. Stelling Road*

Figure 5.1-1

Site Location and Study Intersections

BACK OF PAGE

Figure 5.1-2

Existing Lane Geometry and Traffic Control

BACK OF PAGE

5. Stevens Creek Boulevard/Mary Avenue

6. Stevens Creek Boulevard/SR-85 Northbound (NB) Ramps*

7. Stevens Creek Boulevard/SR-85 Southbound (SB) Ramps

8. Stevens Creek Boulevard/Bubb Road

9. N. Stelling Road/Greenleaf Drive

10. N. Stelling Road/Homestead Road

11. N. Stelling Road/Pepper Tree Lane

12. N. Stelling Road/McClellan Road

13. McClellan Road/Bubb Road

Unsignalized Intersections

14. McClellan Road/Rose Blossom Drive

The operations of the key intersections were analyzed for the following scenarios:

- *Existing Conditions* – Existing morning, mid-day, and evening peak-hour volumes. The weekday morning, mid-day, and evening peak hours occur during the periods of 7:00-9:00 A.M., 12:00-2:00 P.M., and 5:00-7:00 P.M., respectively. The peak hour is the single hour within the peak period in which there is the most traffic.
- *Background Conditions* – Existing peak-hour volumes plus the traffic expected to be generated by the approved projects prior to completion of the proposed project.
- *Project Conditions* - Background Conditions volumes plus project-generated traffic.
- *Cumulative Conditions* – Project Conditions plus pending projects in the neighboring area plus a growth rate of 1.2 percent per year for 9 years (to 2010).

C. EXISTING CONDITIONS

C1. Roadway Network

State Route 85 (SR-85), Interstate 280 (I-280), De Anza Boulevard and Stevens Creek Boulevard provide regional access to the campus.

- *SR-85* is a state route that runs in the north-south direction through the project area. It has three

lanes in each direction (including a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane) near the project site. It extends from its interchange with US-101 at the southern end in the City of San Jose to its interchange with US-101 in the City of Mountain View. SR-85 provides access to the site via the interchanges at De Anza Boulevard and Stevens Creek Boulevard.

- *I-280* is an interstate highway that runs in the east-west direction through the project area. It has three mixed-flow lanes and an HOV lane in each direction near the project site. This facility provides access to the project site via interchanges with SR-85 and with De Anza Boulevard.

- *De Anza Boulevard* runs in a north-south direction, and is about 0.5 mile east of the project site. It has three northbound through lanes and four southbound through lanes. It has a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour (mph) in the vicinity of the project site. This roadway extends from Saratoga at the southern end to an interchange with I-280 at the northern end (where it becomes Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road).

- *Stevens Creek Boulevard* has three through lanes in each direction, and is an east-west roadway located along the northern boundary of the project site. It provides access to the campus via Mary Avenue. Stevens Creek Boulevard extends east from Foothill Boulevard to its terminus with I-280, where it becomes San Carlos Street, and has a posted speed limit of 35 mph in the vicinity of the project.

Stelling Road, McClellan Road, and Mary Avenue provide local access to the campus.

- *Stelling Road* is a north-south arterial with four lanes (two lanes in each direction), that abuts the eastern boundary of the De Anza College campus. It provides access to the campus via an intersection at Pepper Tree Lane. Stelling Road has a posted speed limit of 35 mph.

- *McClellan Road* is a local roadway with two lanes (one lane in each direction) that provides access to the campus via an intersection at Rose Blossom Avenue. This roadway operates in an east-west direction and extends from South Foothill Boulevard to the east to its terminus at De Anza Boulevard. It has a posted speed limit of 35 mph.

- *Mary Avenue* is a local roadway with two lanes (one lane in each direction), that serves the northern boundary of the campus, and provides an entry directly into the campus from Stevens Creek Boulevard. This roadway operates generally in a north-south direction and extends north from Stevens Creek Boulevard to I-280 in the City of Sunnyvale.

Internal circulation within the campus is provided by the Perimeter Road, which circles the entire campus. The Perimeter Road generally has one lane in each direction.

C2. Transit Service

Currently, there are five VTA routes that serve De Anza College.

- *Route 23* - This route provides service between Downtown San Jose and Mountain View on 15- to 20-minute headways during morning commute hours, 15-minute headways during Mid-Day peak hours and 10- to 15-minute headways during the evening peak hours. Route 23 travels along Stevens Creek Boulevard and has stops in the vicinity of the project site on Stevens Creek Boulevard.

- *Route 25* - This route provides service between East San Jose and De Anza College on 10-minute headways during morning peak hours, 15-minute headways during Mid-Day peak hours and 10- to 15-minute headways during evening peak hours.

- *Route 53* - This route provides service between the Sunnyvale Caltrain Station and Westgate on 25- to 30-minute headways during morning commute hours, and 60-minute headways during Mid-Day peak and evening peak hours. Route 53 travels along Bubb Road, Stevens Creek Boulevard and Stelling Road.

- *Route 54* - This route provides service between Sunnyvale/Lockheed Martin and West Valley College on 15- to 20-minute headways during morning commute hours, 30-minute headways during Mid-Day peak hours and 15- to 20-minute headways during evening peak hours. Route 54 travels along McClellan Road and Stelling Road.

- *Route 55* - This route provides service between Great America and De Anza College on 15- to 20-minute headways during morning commute hours, 25- to 30-minute headways during Mid-Day peak hours and 15- to 20-minute headways during evening peak hours. Route 55 travels along Stelling Road.

C3. Bicycle & Pedestrian Circulation

The 1997 Santa Clara County Bikeways Map indicates bicycle facilities in the vicinity of the campus. Bike lanes are located along Stevens Creek Boulevard, McClellan Road, Bubb Road and Stelling Road. Bike lanes are separate designated lanes, located on the edge of a roadway, identified by "Bike Lane" signs. De Anza Boulevard, Pepper Tree Lane and Bubb Road are designated "bike routes." Bike routes are roadways designated as bike routes and identified by "Bike Route" signs only. Bike routes have no special lanes for bicycles, and bike traffic shares the roadway with motor vehicles. Bicycle parking is provided on campus in various locations.

Pedestrian activity was observed to be heavy within the vicinity of the project site. Pedestrian movements along the perimeter of the campus are accommodated by the existing sidewalks along Stevens Creek Boulevard, Stelling Road and McClellan Road. Crosswalks and pedestrian signals are provided at all of the signalized intersections. Within the campus, sidewalks connect the buildings and parking areas to the sidewalks bordering the campus.

C4. Existing Intersection Operation

C4(a) Level of Service

Level of service (LOS) is a common measure of traffic service that uses letters A through F (least to most traffic congestion, respectively) to indicate the amount of congestion and delay. The LOS concept was developed to correlate numerical traffic volumes to subjective descriptions of traffic performance at intersections, which are the controlling bottlenecks of traffic flow. LOS A indicates free flow conditions; LOS B and C signify stable conditions with acceptable delays. LOS D is typically considered acceptable for the peak hour in urban areas, with average delays in the range of 25 to 40 seconds. LOS E is approaching capacity and LOS F represents conditions at or above capacity, with average delays of over 60 seconds.

Levels of service for signalized intersections are determined by an estimation of average delay per vehicle. **Table 5.1-1, Signalized Intersection LOS Thresholds,** provides definitions for levels of service for signalized intersections.

Table 5.1-1
Signalized Intersection LOS Thresholds

Level Of Service	Average Stopped Delay (seconds/vehicle)	Description
A	Delay ≤ 5.0	Free flow; minimal to no delay
B+ B B-	5.0 < Delay ≤ 7.0 7.0 < Delay ≤ 13.0 13.0 < Delay ≤ 15.0	Stable flow, but speeds are beginning to be restricted by traffic condition; slight delays.
C+ C C-	15.0 < Delay ≤ 17.0 17.0 < Delay ≤ 23.0 23.0 < Delay ≤ 25.0	Stable flow, but most drivers cannot select their own speeds and feel somewhat restricted; acceptable delays.
D+ D D-	25.0 < Delay ≤ 28.0 28.0 < Delay ≤ 37.0 37.0 < Delay ≤ 40.0	Approaching unstable flow, and drivers have difficulty maneuvering; tolerable delays.
E+ E E-	40.0 < Delay ≤ 44.0 44.0 < Delay ≤ 56.0 56.0 < Delay ≤ 60.0	Unstable flow with stop and go; delays
F	Delay > 60.0	Total breakdown; congested conditions with excessive delays.

Source: Santa Clara County Congestion management Program – 2000 Monitoring and Conformance Report, February 2001.

Traffic levels of service for unsignalized intersections were calculated using the 1997 Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board) methodology. At unsignalized intersections each approach to the intersection is evaluated separately and assigned a level of service. The level of service is based on average total delay at the intersection, in seconds per vehicle. **Table 5.1-2, Unsignalized Intersection LOS Thresholds,** provides definitions of LOS for unsignalized intersections.

Total delay is defined as the total elapsed time from when a vehicle stops at the end of the queue until the vehicle departs from the stop line. This time includes the time required for the vehicle to travel from the last-in-queue position to the first-in-queue position.

Table 5.1-2
Unsignalized Intersection LOS Thresholds

Level of Service	Average Total Delay (seconds per vehicle)	Description
A	≤ 10	Little or no delay
B	> 10 and ≤ 15	Short traffic delay
C	> 15 and ≤ 25	Average traffic delay
D	> 25 and ≤ 35	Long traffic delay
E	> 35 and ≤ 50	Very long traffic delay
F	> 50	Extreme delays potentially affecting other traffic movements in the intersection.

Source: Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, Special Report No. 209, Washington D.C. 1997

C4(b) Existing LOS

Table 5.1-3, Intersection Capacity Analysis-Existing Conditions, provides a summary of the existing intersection (signalized and unsignalized) service levels. Currently, no study intersection operates below LOS D.

Table 5.1-3
Intersection Capacity Analysis
Existing Conditions

#	Intersection	A.M. Peak Hour		Mid-Day Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Avg. Delay	LOS	Avg. Delay	LOS	Avg. Delay	LOS
1	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. De Anza Blvd.	24.9	C-	26.9	D+	25.5	D+
2	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bandley Dr.	6.6	B+	16.9	C+	13.7	B-
3	Stevens Creek Blvd/Saich Way.	4.8	A	10.9	B	11.7	B
4	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. Stelling Rd.	25.5	D+	24.8	C-	25.2	D+
5	Stevens Creek Blvd/Mary Av.	17.6	C	12.0	B	18.8	C
6	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 NB Ramps	31.9	D	21.9	C	20.9	C
7	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 SB Ramps	18.3	C	19.9	C	19.6	C
8	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bubb Rd.	25.6	D+	24.2	C-	26.1	D+
9	N. Stelling Rd/Greenleaf Dr.	8.2	B	13.2	B-	4.2	A
10	N. Stelling Rd/Homestead Rd.	26.2	D+	24.3	C-	26.2	D+
11	N. Stelling Rd/Pepper Tree Lane	13.1	B-	14.7	B-	12.2	B
12	N. Stelling Rd/McClellan Rd.	22.4	C	18.3	C	24.6	C-
13	McClellan Rd/Bubb Rd.	21.0	C	20.1	C	20.5	C
14	McClellan Rd/Rose Blossom Dr. [2]	24.5	C	23.3	C	32.1	D

[1] Average Delay per vehicle, in seconds.
[2] Worst Case Level of Service (unsignalized).

Source: DKS Associates

Traffic-related impacts to the surrounding freeway system were also analyzed. A freeway segment is required to be included in the transportation impact analysis if it meets either of the following requirements.

1. The proposed development project is adjacent to one of the freeway segment's access or egress points; or

2. Based on engineering judgment, lead agency staff determine that the freeway segment should be included in the analysis.

Based on those criteria, the following freeway segments were analyzed:

SR-85
Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road/South De Anza Boulevard to Stevens Creek Boulevard
Stevens Creek Boulevard to I-280
I-280 to Homestead Road
Homestead Road to Fremont Avenue

I-280
De Anza Boulevard to SR-85
SR-85 to Foothill Boulevard

Table 5.1-4, SOV Freeway Segments-Level of Service Analysis-Existing Conditions, provides a summary of the existing LOS for the mixed-flow or single occupant vehicle (SOV) freeway segments. **Table 5.1-5, HOV Freeway Segments-LOS Analysis-Existing Conditions,** provides a summary of the existing LOS for the HOV freeway segments. As shown in **Table 5.1-4**, according to the 1998 Santa Clara County Freeway Monitoring Report data, the following SOV freeway segments are currently operating at an unacceptable level of service "F":

AM Peak Hour

- Northbound SR-85, I-280 to Homestead Road
- Northbound SR-85, Homestead Road to Fremont Avenue
- Northbound I-280, De Anza Boulevard to SR-85
- Northbound I-280, SR-85 to Foothill Boulevard

PM Peak Hour

- Southbound SR-85, I-280 to Stevens Creek Boulevard

- Southbound SR-85, Stevens Creek Boulevard to Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road

As shown in **Table 5.1-5,** currently no HOV freeway segment operates below LOS D.

Table 5.1-4
SOV Freeway Segments – Level of Service Analysis
Existing Conditions

Freeway	Segment		Direction	Peak	EXISTING SOV				
	From	To			Lanes	Average Speed	Vol.	Density	LOS
SR 85	Sunnyvale/ Saratoga	Stevens Creek Blvd	NB	AM	2	35	3600	51.4	E
				PM	2	60	3150	26.3	D
SR 85	Stevens Creek Blvd	I-280	NB	AM	2	55	4550	41.4	D
				PM	2	65	950	7.3	A
SR 85	I-280	Homestead Rd	NB	AM	2	10	3590	179.5	**F**
				PM	2	60	2490	20.8	C
SR 85	Homestead Rd	Fremont Ave	NB	AM	2	10	2220	111.0	**F**
				PM	2	60	3540	29.5	D
SR 85	Fremont Ave	Homestead Rd	SB	AM	2	55	4510	41.0	D
				PM	2	35	3570	51.0	E
SR 85	Homestead Rd	I-280	SB	AM	2	65	3280	25.2	D
				PM	2	60	2490	20.8	C
SR 85	I-280	Stevens Creek Blvd	SB	AM	2	60	2480	20.7	C
				PM	2	10	2930	146.5	**F**
SR 85	Stevens Creek Blvd	Sunnyvale/ Saratoga	SB	AM	2	65	2340	18.0	C
				PM	2	25	3030	60.6	**F**
I-280	De Anza Blvd	SR-85	NB	AM	3	25	4470	59.6	**F**
				PM	3	50	6830	45.5	D
I-280	SR-85	Foothill Blvd	NB	AM	3	15	4180	92.9	**F**
				PM	3	60	3600	20.0	C
I-280	SR-85	Foothill Blvd	SB	AM	3	60	5140	28.6	D
				PM	3	60	4540	25.2	D
I-280	De Anza Blvd	SR-85	SB	AM	3	60	4260	23.7	C
				PM	3	55	6050	36.7	D

Source: 1998 Santa Clara County Freeway Monitoring Report

Table 5.1-5
HOV Freeway Segments – Level of Service Analysis
Existing Conditions

Freeway	Segment		Direction	Peak	EXISTING HOV				
	From	To			Lanes	Average Speed	Vol.	Density	LOS
SR 85	Sunnyvale/ Saratoga	Stevens Creek Blvd	NB	AM	1	65	530	8.2	A
				PM	1	65	360	5.5	A
SR 85	Stevens Creek Blvd	I-280	NB	AM	1	65	1040	16.0	B
				PM	1	65	170	2.6	A
SR 85	I-280	Homestead Rd	NB	AM	1	65	1270	19.5	C
				PM	1	65	320	4.9	A
SR 85	Homestead Rd	Fremont Ave	NB	AM	1	65	780	12.0	B
				PM	1	65	390	6.0	A
SR 85	Fremont Ave	Homestead Rd	SB	AM	1	65	650	10.0	A
				PM	1	65	1240	19.1	C
SR 85	Homestead Rd	I-280	SB	AM	1	65	0	0.0	A
				PM	1	65	480	7.4	A
SR 85	I-280	Stevens Creek Blvd	SB	AM	1	65	350	5.4	A
				PM	1	65	1680	25.8	D
SR 85	Stevens Creek Blvd	Sunnyvale/ Saratoga	SB	AM	1	65	110	1.7	A
				PM	1	65	480	12.0	B
I-280	De Anza Blvd	SR-85	NB	AM	1	65	740	11.4	B
				PM	1	65	300	4.6	A
I-280	SR-85	Foothill Blvd	NB	AM	1	65	760	11.7	B
				PM	1	65	1110	17.1	C
I-280	SR-85	Foothill Blvd	SB	AM	1	65	460	7.1	A
				PM	1	65	930	14.3	B
I-280	De Anza Blvd	SR-85	SB	AM	1	65	250	3.8	A
				PM	1	65	400	6.2	A

Source: 1998 Santa Clara County Freeway Monitoring Report

C5. Critical Traffic Movements

At the request of the City of Cupertino, this section includes an analysis of critical traffic movements. A critical movement is defined as a traffic movement (e.g., northbound left turn) that affects the average delay and overall intersection operation. Not all movements at an intersection are considered "critical" (e.g., a right turn typically has little impact on the average delay and overall intersection operation as there is no opposing traffic movement).

For each intersection under the Existing Conditions scenario, the worst critical traffic movements were evaluated and are shown in **Table 5.1-6, Critical Traffic Movements Summary-Existing Conditions**, based on the volume to saturation flow (V/S) ratio. Saturation flow is defined as the flow rate per lane at which vehicles can pass through a signalized intersection in a stable moving queue. It represents the number of vehicles per hour per lane that can pass through a signalized intersection if the green signal were available for the full hour and the flow of vehicles were never halted.[1] The V/S ratio does not relate to the LOS for the whole intersection; they are separate calculations and separate measures of effectiveness. For example, if a critical movement is operating at LOS E, it does not mean that the entire intersection is operating at LOS E. The worst critical movement will affect the overall intersection operation by increasing the delay and therefore decreasing the LOS, but the intersection as a whole may operate better than the worst critical traffic movement.

As shown in the table, the worst critical volume to saturation flow ratio would be 0.61, for the southbound through movement at the intersection of Stelling Road and Greenleaf Drive. This value is equivalent to LOS C. The volumes and vehicle delays for all study conditions are provided in **Appendix 5.1.**

C6. Existing Parking

Currently, the De Anza College campus has a total of about 4,438 parking spaces for 25,000 students (a ratio of 5.6 students per space). On-campus parking consists of Student and Staff parking lots A through K, Flint Circle, Flint Loading Dock and a disabled parking lot south of Parking Lot I, and the parking structure located at the northwest corner of the campus. Each of these lots contains designated parking for either students or staff. All "white" painted parking stalls designate student and visitor parking; all "yellow" painted stalls are for staff parking only. Based on the general "rule of thumb" for community colleges of 1 parking space per 5 students, there is not adequate parking available for students on campus.

Students make use of the free on-street parking on Mary Avenue north of the campus, and in the parking lot of the Church of Latter-Day Saints (the College has a parking arrangement with the church). Based on field observations, Stevens Creek Boulevard and Mary Avenue were identified as problem areas in terms of circulation surrounding the campus. These roads experience periods of traffic congestion due to delays in turning movements into and out of campus parking areas.

Parking along the residential area of Pepper Tree Lane is allowed by permit only.

---

1 Highway Capacity Manual, Traffic Characteristics, p. 2-7, 1997.

Table 5.1-6
Critical Traffic Movements Summary
Existing Conditions

#	Intersection	AM Peak		Mid-Day Peak		PM Peak	
		Crit. Mov.	V/S Ratio	Crit. Mov.	V/S. Ratio	Crit. Mov.	V/S Ratio
1	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. De Anza Blvd	NBT	.32	SBR	.18	SBT	.28
2	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bandley Dr	WBT	.21	WBT	.22	WBT	.26
3	Stevens Creek Blvd/Saich Way	WBT	.20	WBT	.23	WBT	.28
4	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. Stelling Rd	WBT	.17	NBR	.17	SBT	.22
5	Stevens Creek Blvd/Mary Ave	EBT	.26	EBT	.25	EBT	.26
6	Stevens Creek Blvd/ SR-85 NB Ramps	SBT	.34	WBR	.39	WBR	.34
7	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 SB Ramps	SBR	.27	SBR	.22	SBR	.31
8	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bubb Rd	WBL	.17	EBT	.17	WBL	.18
9	N. Stelling Rd/Greenleaf Dr	NBT	.58	SBT	.42	SBT	.61
10	N. Stelling Rd/Homestead Rd	NBT	.19	SBL	.19	SBT	.28
11	N. Stelling Rd/Pepper Tree Lane	SBR	.24	EBL	.23	SBR	.25
12	N. Stelling Rd/McClellan Rd	WBT	.23	EBT	.23	EBT	.32
13	McClellan Rd/Bubb Rd	WBT	.30	WBT	.18	WBL	.16
14	McClellan Rd/Rose Blossom Dr[2]	n/a		n/a		n/a	

V/S: Volume to Saturation Flow Ratio
NBT: North Bound Through
SBT: South Bound Through
WBT: West Bound Through
EBT: East Bound Through
EBL: East Bound Left
WBR: West Bound Right
SBR: South Bound Right
SBL: South Bound Left

Source: DKS Associates

D. POLICY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The campus is not subject to the jurisdiction of the City of Cupertino *General Plan*. However, the following policies and programs from the *General Plan* are presented below for informational purposes.

Traffic

Traffic Capacity and Land Use Limitations Level of Service Policy 2: Maintain a reasonable minimum LOS D for major intersections during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours (highest single hours) by imposing reasonable limits on land use to ensure that principal thoroughfares are not unduly impacted by locally generated traffic during the peak traffic hour.

In order to accommodate development which furthers a unique community gathering place on Stevens Creek Boulevard, the intersection of Stevens Creek and De Anza boulevards and De Anza Boulevard and Bollinger Road may maintain a LOS E+ (No more than 45 seconds weighted daily average).

For land use and transportation planning purposes, the traffic peak hour should not be allowed to expand into the peak period. Staggering of work hours beyond current levels is not acceptable as a transportation demand management (TDM) technique. The TDM must benefit both the peak hour traffic and the average daily traffic volume.

Public Health and Safety

Solutions to Street Abuse Policy 28: Continue to evaluate solutions to discourage through traffic in neighborhoods through modified street design. Examples include meandering streets, diverters, landscaped islands, street closures and wide parking strips.

E. SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA AND PROJECT IMPACTS

E1. Significance Criteria

According to Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form), a project could have a significant effect on the environment when it would:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways;

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns that results in substantial safety risks;

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses;

e) Result in inadequate emergency access;

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity; or

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

According to the City of Cupertino *General Plan*, the performance standard for most intersections is LOS "D" during the A.M. and P.M. Peak hours. (Policy 2 outlines certain exceptions to this standard.) The level of service methodology for City of Cupertino intersections is based on critical movements. Critical movements are used in the calculation of the volume-to-capacity ratio (v/c). The v/c ratio is calculated based on all of the critical movement volumes at the intersection.

For City of Cupertino intersections, a significant impact for a project is defined as:

- When the addition of project-generated traffic causes the intersection to deteriorate from an acceptable LOS (under the Background Conditions scenario) to LOS "E" or LOS "F"; or
- When an intersection already operates at LOS "E" or LOS "F" under the Background Conditions scenario, and the addition of project-generated traffic causes the critical movement delay to increase by 4 seconds or more.

For CMP facilities, the LOS standard is LOS "E." The level of service at CMP intersections is based on evaluations of all intersection movements (including critical traffic movements).

For CMP intersections, a significant impact for a project is defined as:

- When the addition of project-generated traffic causes the intersection to deteriorate from an acceptable LOS (under the Background Conditions scenario) to "LOS "F"; or
- When an intersection already operates at LOS "F" under the Background Conditions scenario, and the addition of project-generated traffic causes the critical movement delay to increase by 4 seconds or more, and
- Project-generated traffic increases the critical v/c value by 0.01 or more.

For CMP freeway segments, a significant impact for a project is defined as:

- When the addition of project-generated traffic causes the freeway segment to deteriorate from an acceptable level of service under the Background Conditions scenario to "LOS "F"; or
- When a freeway segment already operates at LOS "F", and project-generated traffic causes an increases of 1 percent or more of segment capacity.

An analysis of Critical Traffic Movements was performed at the City of Cupertino's request, to comply with the City's Traffic Impact Study requirements. As discussed above, critical movements are used (in part) to calculate the LOS of the entire intersection. The circulation, parking, and access impacts of the proposed project would be considered significant if construction or operation of the project would:

- Cause a substantial deterioration in LOS of intersections in the De Anza College campus vicinity;
- Cause a loss in parking availability on the campus such that a substantial increase in congestion could occur off campus; or
- Substantially affect access to the campus for staff, students and visitors.

E2. Programmed or Planned Improvements

As a separate project, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) will be building a new bus transit center in order to consolidate the various existing bus stops located around the perimeter of the campus. The new transit center will be designed to accommodate up to eight transit buses simultaneously and to function as a major gateway to the College. Bus stops along Stevens Creek Boulevard, Stelling Road, and McClellan Road will no longer be used once the transit center is in operation. The center will include a passenger plaza, a shelter, and lighting, among other improvements. The transit center will be located within the campus just west of Stelling Road, between Parking Lots B and C. VTA will start construction on the center in spring 2003, with opening planned for fall 2003.

De Anza College has worked with Altrans to develop a Commute Alternative Program for students, involving multiple elements. Initially, a Student Transportation Survey and Transportation Needs Analysis were conducted to determine current and potential transportation usage, cost justification, and programs that would be most successful at De Anza. Following the survey, six alternative transportation programs were identified for students including:

- a Direct Transit Route Marketing Program and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) Trip Planning;
- a VTA ECO Pass Program;
- a College Shuttle Bus System;
- an interactive Carpool and Bicycle Matchlist Program;

- a Bicycle Safety and Encouragement Program; and
- a Distance Learning and Tele-Commute Program.

The Needs Analysis determined that all of these alternative transportation services could be provided to De Anza students at an estimated cost of $10.00 per student, per quarter.

An Alternative Transportation Center has been established at De Anza College to provide outreach and personal trip planning services. The Center is staffed 30 hours a week by a Transportation Coordinator and is used as a base for personal trip planning sessions, classroom presentations, fairs, development of an information packet and other outreach materials. Altrans has a track record of a 10 to 15 percent effectiveness rate of placing a commuter in an alternative transit mode.

The Direct Transit Route Marketing Program, GIS Trip Planning, Associated Outreach and Marketing Planning, and Transit Route Identification System (including GIS-layered public transit routes, and GIS mapping for students within one quarter mile from a direct transit route to campus) are already being implemented at De Anza. An outside consultant provides GIS mapping for the College students and staff. Research shows that the average commute to De Anza College is 11 miles. According to a student survey, transit usage for students living within one quarter mile of a direct transit route has increased 10 percent as a result of the Transit Route Marketing Program.

The Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) ECO Pass Program is also being considered by the College. This program consists of a pre-paid pass that allows students to use all transit routes including Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) para-transit. The program cannot be implemented until the student body votes in favor of covering the additional cost for the program.

The College is also looking into a Shuttle Bus Program, targeting five neighborhoods for four shuttle bus routes to transport students directly to the College. The service could transport approximately 1,000 students per day. A Park and Ride Program with unlimited ridership would also be implemented to link De Anza with other community colleges in the area in order to be more cost effective. The College is looking into short-term options for next year and trying to get funding for Winter 2003. The College is currently in the process of identifying travel routes that are used frequently.

Th College is also looking into a Vanpool Program that may be subsidized by the District. This program would primarily target College staff and may be implemented by as early as next year.

The Interactive Carpool Program is currently running on campus. The program relies on enrollment data to create a pre-matching system to generate carpool match lists (according to commute patterns) to

be sent to student commuters each quarter. "Carpool Application Form" information was entered into a Web-based carpool program that incorporates commute needs and driving patterns.

The Bicycle Safety and Encouragement Program (targeting students living within three to five miles of campus) maps bicycle routes; establishes riding groups; and includes a number of other elements, such as bike and pedestrian trails, "Bicycle Buddy Program," bicycle safety training classes and maintenance classes, bicycle corrals, bicycle tours and bike-to-school events, and discounts at local bike shops. This program is moving forward, with planning occurring on a regional basis. A $60,000 grant has been secured for a bike trail. Construction of a bike corral is scheduled to begin in Spring 2002.

A Tele-Commute Program and Distance Learning Classes have also been expanded as part of the regular instruction program. The College is increasing hybrid-distance learning and is working on accommodating staff tele-commuting.

In addition, the College is considering designated parking lots on campus for carpooling and other incentives to encourage carpooling.

There are no major programmed improvements (new roads or major roadway modifications) in the vicinity of the campus.

E3. Features of the Proposed Project

E3(a) Roadways/Campus Circulation

Proposed new roadways and roadway modifications are shown in **Figure 3.0-3, Proposed Facilities Master Plan, De Anza College** in **Section 3.0, Project Description**. The proposed improvements are intended to address circulation issues on the internal loop roadway system by including realignment of roadways, as well as site distance and queue length improvements. These improvements would improve traffic safety and circulation for both on-site as well as off-site traffic accessing the campus.

Modifications to the existing campus entries and exits along Stevens Creek Boulevard are intended to facilitate vehicular access to the campus and correct some of the congestion and confusion that currently exist. The entry in front of the existing parking structure would be replaced with a new entry to the east to align with the Flint Center drop-off. The main entry would be improved with signage to lead vehicles off the perimeter road and into the campus at a key access point in order to increase safety and access.

As part of the Facilities Master Plan, the Stelling Road entry would be modified to accommodate the new VTA bus transit center.

Construction of the Plant Services/Warehouse building in the northwest part of the campus would include the probable realignment of the campus loop road. The northwest section of the loop road would be further extended to the west. This realignment is intended to provide a service road access to the proposed Plant Services/Warehouse building for trucks.

E3(b) Parking

It is anticipated that the parking improvements would add approximately 400 to 500 parking spaces in the short term and an additional 600 to 800 spaces in the long term, for a total of 1,000 to 1,300 additional spaces. The proposed project would increase the total to 5,438 to 5,738 on-site parking spaces, for 30,850 students plus staff. Additional (future) parking is not funded at this time.

E4. Background Conditions

This section discusses the traffic operating conditions at the study intersections under the Background Conditions scenario. The Background Conditions scenario includes the traffic expected to be generated by approved projects in the area. Summary reports of the intersection analysis files for the background traffic condition analysis are included in **Appendix 5.1**. Identifying the operational conditions under the background scenario allows for a comparative analysis between the proposed project and prior approved projects.

E4(a) Background Intersection Levels of Service

Based on a list of approved projects and trip generation factors provided by the City of Cupertino (see **Appendix 5.1**), the increase in traffic due to future development in the vicinity of De Anza College was estimated. Approved projects would generate an additional 4,350 A.M. peak hour, 4,626 Mid-Day peak hour and 3,850 P.M. peak hour vehicle trips. Based on consultation with City of Cupertino staff, the approved project trips were added to the existing turning movement volumes at each study intersection. The resulting numbers of trips that would travel through the study intersections were used for the intersection LOS analysis under Background Conditions.

The levels of service during the A.M., Mid-Day and P.M. peak hours under the Background Conditions scenario were calculated and compared to Existing Conditions (see **Table 5.1-3** for the Existing Conditions analysis). As shown in **Table 5.1-7, Intersection Capacity Analysis-Background Conditions**, based on the City standards and CMP guidelines, the addition of approved project trips would not result

in unacceptable levels of service at any of the study intersections.

E4(b) Background Critical Traffic Movements

For each intersection under the Background Conditions scenario, the worst critical traffic movements were evaluated and are shown in **Table 5.1-8, Critical Traffic Movements Summary-Background Conditions**, based on the volume to saturation flow ratio. For the intersections studied, the worst critical volume to saturation flow ratio (the southbound through movement at the intersection of Stelling Road and Greenleaf Drive) would be 0.61, which is equivalent to LOS C. The volumes and vehicle delays are provided in **Appendix 5.1.**

Table 5.1-7
Intersection Capacity Analysis
Background Conditions

#	Intersection	A.M. Peak Hour		Mid-Day Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Avg. Delay	LOS	Avg. Delay	LOS	Avg. Delay	LOS
1	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. De Anza Blvd	25.9	D+	27.2	D+	25.9	D+

2	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bandley Dr	6.5	B+	16.7	C+	13.5	B-
3	Stevens Creek Blvd/Saich Way	4.7	A	10.8	B	11.6	B
4	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. Stelling Rd	25.5	D+	24.7	C-	25.1	D+
5	Stevens Creek Blvd/Mary Ave	19.2	C	14.5	B-	18.8	C
6	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 NB Ramps	34.0	D	22.0	C	21.0	C
7	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 SB Ramps	18.2	C	19.8	C	19.7	C
8	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bubb Rd	25.5	D+	24.1	C-	26.1	D+
9	N. Stelling Rd/Greenleaf Dr	8.2	B	13.2	B-	4.2	A
10	N. Stelling Rd/Homestead Rd	26.3	D+	24.4	C-	26.2	D+
11	N. Stelling Rd/Pepper Tree Lane	13.0	B	14.6	B-	12.2	B
12	N. Stelling Rd/McClellan Rd	22.4	C	18.3	C	24.6	C-
13	McClellan Rd/Bubb Rd	21.0	C	20.2	C	20.6	C
14	McClellan Rd/Rose Blossom Dr[2]	24.8	C	23.8	C	33.0	D

[1] Average Delay per vehicle, in seconds.
[2] Worst Case Level of Service (unsignalized).
Source: DKS Associates

Table 5.1-8
Critical Traffic Movements Summary
Background Conditions

#	Intersection	AM Peak		Mid-Day Peak		PM Peak	
		Crit. Mov.	V/S Ratio	Crit. Mov.	V/S. Ratio	Crit. Mov.	V/S Ratio
1	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. De Anza Blvd	NBT	.32	SBR	.18	SBT	.28
2	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bandley Dr	WBT	.22	WBT	.22	WBT	.26
3	Stevens Creek Blvd/Saich Way	WBT	.20	WBT	.23	WBT	.28
4	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. Stelling Rd	WBT	.17	WBT	.20	SBT	.22
5	Stevens Creek Blvd/Mary Ave	EBT	.26	EBT	.26	EBT	.27
6	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 NB Ramps	SBT	.34	WBR	.41	WBR	.35
7	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 SB Ramps	SBR	.27	SBR	.22	SBR	.31
8	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bubb Rd	WBL	.17	EBT	.18	WBL	.19
9	N. Stelling Rd/Greenleaf Dr	NBT	.59	SBT	.42	SBT	.61
10	N. Stelling Rd/Homestead Rd	NBT	.19	SBL	.20	SBT	.28
11	N. Stelling Rd/Pepper Tree Lane	SBR	.24	EBL	.23	SBR	.25
12	N. Stelling Rd/McClellan Rd	WBT	.23	EBT	.23	EBT	.32
13	McClellan Rd/Bubb Rd	WBT	.30	WBT	.18	WBL	.17
14	McClellan Rd/Rose Blossom Dr[2]	n/a		n/a		n/a	

V/S: Volume to Saturation Flow Ratio, NBT: North Bound Through, SBT: South Bound Through, WBT: West Bound Through, EBT: East Bound Through, EBL: East Bound Left, WBR: West Bound Right, SBR: South Bound Right, SBL: South Bound Left
Source: DKS Associates

E5. Project Conditions

This section evaluates background traffic conditions plus estimated project-generated traffic. The amount of traffic associated with a project is estimated using a three-step process: (1) trip generation, (2) trip distribution, and (3) trip assignment. Trip generation is the process of predicting the number of peak hour trips a proposed development would contribute to the roadways, and whether the trips would be entering or exiting the site. After the number of trips is determined, the distribution process projects the

direction the trips use to approach and depart the site, from a regional perspective. Trip assignment involves determining which specific roadways a vehicle would use to travel between its origin and destination.

E5(a) Trip Generation, Distribution and Assignment

The trip generation for the proposed project was based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation* Manual, 6th Edition, 1997, as summarized in **Table 5.1-9, Trip Generation Summary-Project Conditions**. Based on the projected increase of 5,850 students at De Anza College, the proposed project would generate 819 trips (745 inbound, 74 outbound) during the A.M. peak hour, 1,638 trips (852 inbound, 786 outbound) during the Mid-Day peak hour, and 936 trips (608 inbound, 328 outbound) during the P.M. peak hour. A conservative approach was used to develop the trip generation estimates, in that they do not reflect the programs being implemented and planned for implementation under the College Commute Alternative Program. (The potential beneficial effect of these programs is discussed as part of the freeway segment and parking impact analyses, below.) In addition, the estimate of in-bound trips during the Mid-Day peak hour is considered to be conservatively high, based on College staff observation of actual traffic patterns. (The estimate presented in this EIR is consistent with studies of other colleges.)

Table 5.1-9
Trip Generation Summary
Project Conditions

Peak Period	Rate	Percentage		Trips		
		In	Out	In	Out	Total
A.M. Peak	0.14	91%	9%	745	74	819
Mid-Day Peak	0.28	52%	48%	852	786	1,638
P.M. Peak	0.16	65%	35%	608	328	936

Source: DKS Associates

The trip generation assumptions in this analysis do not consider reductions for pass-by or diverted trips. (Pass-by trips consist of vehicles that would be on the roadway network regardless of the project; therefore, these trips do not add new traffic to the roadway network. Diverted trips include traffic on

other roadways in the area that makes a short diversion from the normal route to the project.) It is likely that De Anza College receives pass-by trips from Stevens Creek Boulevard and North Stelling Road, as well as diverted trips from SR 85 and I-280. However, in the absence of empirical data and to provide a conservative analysis, all trips were assumed to be newly generated. Therefore, the actual number of new trips generated by the project could be less than shown in **Table 5.1-9**. (The LOS analysis for most of the study locations is based on the trip generation for the original College forecast of a 7,000-student increase. The intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive was re-analyzed with the current (revised) forecast of a 5,850-student increase. The results for the other study locations, in terms of the significant of project impacts, would not change.)

The directions of approach and departure for project trips were estimated based on the existing roadway network, the locations of De Anza College access points, existing and proposed parking, travel patterns and the locations of complementary land uses. Also, DKS analyzed existing turning movements at De Anza College access locations.

E5(b) Intersection Levels of Service

Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project were added to the background volumes at the study intersections to estimate Project Conditions. The levels of service during the A.M., Mid-Day and P.M. peak hours under Project Conditions were calculated and compared to Background Conditions (see **Table 5.1-7** for the results of the Background Conditions analysis.) The LOS results for the Project Conditions scenario are shown in **Table 5.1-10, Intersection Capacity Analysis-Project Conditions.** At the intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive, the level of service during the mid-day peak hour would change from LOS C under Background Conditions to LOS E under Project Conditions, and the level of service during the P.M. peak hour would change from LOS D under Background Conditions to LOS E under Project Conditions. These impacts would be significant, but could be easily mitigated with the installation of signage (see Mitigation Measures later in this section).

E5 (c) Project Critical Traffic Movements

For each intersection, the worst critical traffic movements and volume-to-saturation flow ratios were evaluated under the Project Conditions scenario and are shown in **Table 5.1-11, Critical Traffic Movements Summary-Project Conditions**. The worst critical V/S ratio (the southbound through movement at the intersection of Stelling Road and Greenleaf Drive) would be 0.62, which is equivalent to LOS C. The volumes and vehicle delays are provided in **Appendix 5.1.**

Table 5.1-10
Intersection Capacity Analysis
Project Conditions

#	Intersection	A.M. Peak Hour		Mid-Day Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Avg. Delay	LOS	Avg. Delay	LOS	Avg. Delay	LOS
1	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. De Anza Blvd	26.0	D+	27.3	D+	26.0	D+
2	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bandley Dr	6.3	B+	16.5	C+	13.4	B-
3	Stevens Creek Blvd/Saich Way	4.7	A	10.6	B	11.5	B
4	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. Stelling Rd	25.8	D+	25.5	D+	25.3	D+
5	Stevens Creek Blvd/Mary Ave	19.1	C	15.4	C+	18.8	C
6	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 NB Ramps	33.6	D	22.0	C	20.9	C
7	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 SB Ramps	18.3	C	19.7	C	19.8	C
8	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bubb Rd	25.5	D+	23.9	C-	26.0	D+
9	N. Stelling Rd/Greenleaf Dr	8.1	B	13.3	B-	4.2	A
10	N. Stelling Rd/Homestead Rd	26.3	D+	24.4	C-	26.3	D+
11	N. Stelling Rd/Pepper Tree Lane	12.9	B	15.4	C+	12.4	B
12	N. Stelling Rd/McClellan Rd	22.5	C	19.3	C	24.4	C-
13	McClellan Rd/Bubb Rd	21.0	C	20.3	C	20.5	C
14	McClellan Rd/Rose Blossom Dr[2]	28.6	D	**44.3**	**E**	**48.6**	**E**

[1] Average Delay per vehicle, in seconds.
[2] Worst Case Level of Service (unsignalized).
Note: Intersections 1 through 13 were analyzed based on the original college forecast of a 7,000 student increase. Intersection 14 was analyzed with the current (revised) forecast of a 5,850-student increase.
Source: DKS Associates

Table 5.1-11
Critical Traffic Movements Summary
Project Conditions

#	Intersection	AM Peak		Mid-Day Peak		PM Peak	
		Crit. Mov.	V/S Ratio	Crit. Mov.	V/S. Ratio	Crit. Mov.	V/S Ratio
1	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. De Anza Blvd	NBT	.32	SBR	.19	SBT	.28
2	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bandley Dr	WBT	.23	WBT	.23	WBT	.27
3	Stevens Creek Blvd/Saich Way	WBT	.21	WBT	.24	WBT	.29
4	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. Stelling Rd	SBT	.16	WBT	.20	SBT	.22
5	Stevens Creek Blvd/Mary Ave	EBT	.28	EBT	.27	EBT	.28
6	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 NB Ramps	SBT	.34	WBR	.42	WBR	.35
7	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 SB Ramps	SBR	.27	SBR	.22	SBR	.31
8	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bubb Rd	EBT	.18	EBT	.20	EBT	.20
9	N. Stelling Rd/Greenleaf Dr	NBT	.59	SBT	.43	SBT	.62
10	N. Stelling Rd/Homestead Rd	NBT	.19	SBL	.20	SBT	.29
11	N. Stelling Rd/Pepper Tree Lane	SBR	.27	EBL	.26	SBR	.28
12	N. Stelling Rd/McClellan Rd	WBT	.24	EBT	.28	EBT	.34
13	McClellan Rd/Bubb Rd	WBT	.30	WBT	.18	WBL	.17
14	McClellan Rd/Rose Blossom Dr[2]	n/a		n/a		n/a	

V/S: Volume to Saturation Flow Ratio, NBT: North Bound Through, SBT: South Bound Through, WBT: West Bound Through, EBT: East Bound Through, EBL: East Bound Left, WBR: West Bound Right, SBR: South Bound Right, SBL: South Bound Left
Note: Intersections 1 through 13 were analyzed based on the original college forecast of a 7,000 student increase.
Source: DKS Associates

E5(d) Freeway Segments Levels of Service

Appendix 5.1 provides a summary of the project trips on the freeway segments. **Table 5.1-12, SOV Freeway Segment – Level of Service Analysis-Project Conditions** summarizes the SOV freeway segment operation with the proposed project traffic. **Table 5.1-13, HOV Freeway Segment – Level of Service Analysis-Project Conditions** summarizes the HOV freeway segment operation with the proposed project traffic. As shown, there are a number of SOV freeway segments that would operate at

LOS "F." The increase in traffic from the proposed project would be equal to or greater than one percent of the capacity of one of the freeway segments (SR-85 southbound between I-280 and Stevens Creek Boulevard, during the PM peak hour). Therefore, based on CMP thresholds, there would be a significant impact to that freeway segment. None of the HOV freeway segments would operate at LOS F with project-generated traffic.

Table 5.1-12
SOV Freeway Segment – Level of Service Analysis
Project Conditions

Freeway	Segment		Direction	Peak	EXISTING SOV				
	From	To			Project Trips	Density	LOS	% Impact	Significant Impact
SR 85	Sunnyvale/ Saratoga	Stevens Creek Blvd	NB	AM	104	52.9	E	2.25%	No
				PM	87	27.0	D	1.89%	No
SR 85	Stevens Creek Blvd	I-280	NB	AM	15	41.5	D	0.32%	No
				PM	66	7.8	A	1.44%	No
SR 85	I-280	Homestead Rd	NB	AM	4	179.7	**F**	0.08%	No
				PM	20	20.9	C	0.44%	No
SR 85	Homestead Rd	Fremont Ave	NB	AM	4	111.2	**F**	0.08%	No
				PM	21	29.7	D	0.45%	No
SR 85	Fremont Ave	Homestead Rd	SB	AM	47	41.4	D	1.03%	No
				PM	97	52.4	E	2.11%	No
SR 85	Homestead Rd	I-280	SB	AM	54	25.6	D	1.17%	No
				PM	110	21.7	C	2.39%	No
SR 85	I-280	Stevens Creek Blvd	SB	AM	157	22.0	C	3.41%	No
				PM	277	160.4	**F**	6.02%	**Yes**
SR 85	Stevens Creek Blvd	Sunnyvale/ Saratoga	SB	AM	12	18.1	C	0.27%	No
				PM	42	61.4	**F**	0.92%	No
I-280	De Anza Blvd	SR-85	NB	AM	62	60.4	**F**	0.90%	No
				PM	167	46.6	E	2.42%	No
I-280	SR-85	Foothill Blvd	NB	AM	4	93.0	**F**	0.06%	No
				PM	18	20.1	C	0.25%	No
I-280	SR-85	Foothill Blvd	SB	AM	50	28.8	D	0.72%	No
				PM	109	25.8	D	1.58%	No
I-280	De Anza Blvd	SR-85	SB	AM	7	23.7	C	0.10%	No
				PM	29	36.8	D	0.42%	No

Note: the freeway segment analysis was based on the original College forecast of a 7,000-student increase. The current (revised) forecast of a 5,850-student increase would not change the conclusions of this table regarding the significant of project impacts.
Source: DKS Associates

Table 5.1-13
HOV Freeway Segment – Level of Service Analysis
Project Conditions

Freeway	Segment		Direction	Peak	EXISTING HOV				
	From	To			Project Trips	Density	LOS	% Impact	Significant Impact
SR 85	Sunnyvale/ Saratoga	Stevens Creek Blvd	NB	AM	15	8.4	A	0.66%	No
				PM	10	5.7	A	0.43%	No
SR 85	Stevens Creek Blvd	I-280	NB	AM	3	16.1	C	0.15%	No
				PM	12	2.8	A	0.51%	No
SR 85	I-280	Homestead Rd	NB	AM	1	19.6	C	0.06%	No
				PM	3	5.0	A	0.11%	No
SR 85	Homestead Rd	Fremont Ave	NB	AM	1	12.0	B	0.06%	No
				PM	2	6.0	A	0.10%	No
SR 85	Fremont Ave	Homestead Rd	SB	AM	7	10.1	B	0.30%	No
				PM	34	19.6	C	1.47%	No
SR 85	Homestead Rd	I-280	SB	AM	0	0.0	A	0.00%	No
				PM	21	7.7	A	0.92%	No
SR 85	I-280	Stevens Creek Blvd	SB	AM	22	5.7	A	0.96%	No
				PM	159	28.3	D	6.91%	No
SR 85	Stevens Creek Blvd	Sunnyvale/ Saratoga	SB	AM	1	1.7	A	0.03%	No
				PM	11	12.2	B	0.47%	No
I-280	De Anza Blvd	SR-85	NB	AM	10	11.5	B	0.44%	No
				PM	7	4.7	A	0.32	No
I-280	SR-85	Foothill Blvd	NB	AM	1	11.7	B	0.03%	No
				PM	5	17.2	C	0.24%	No
I-280	SR-85	Foothill Blvd	SB	AM	4	7.1	A	0.19%	No
				PM	22	14.7	B	0.97	No
I-280	De Anza Blvd	SR-85	SB	AM	0	3.9	A	0.02%	No
				PM	2	6.2	A	0.08%	No

Note: the freeway segment analysis was based on the original College forecast of a 7,000-student increase. The current (revised) forecast of a 5,850-student increase would not change the conclusions of this table regarding the significant of project impacts.
Source: DKS Associates

As noted previously, the trip generation estimates used in this EIR are based on the assumption that all trips related to the project would be newly-generated trips. No reductions for pass-by or diverted trips were assumed. Some of the trips related to the increased enrollment at the College would likely be pass-by or diverted trips, i.e., trips already on the roadway network. Therefore, the actual number of trips added to the freeway network (and the associated impacts to the freeway system) would be less than evaluated herein.

The transportation demand management programs already in place at the College (the Alternative Transportation Center and the Direct Transit Route Marketing and associated programs, and the Interactive Carpool Program) could result in a reduction of about 2.6 percent of existing and future project trips, or about 13 percent of the increase in trips (based on general estimates of effectiveness from the BAAQMD). In addition, the College campus already includes some features that are considered to reduce trips (such as availability of sidewalks, access to transit stops, and bicycle parking). However, these reductions would not be large enough to reduce the freeway segment impact to below the significance thresholds. Other programs are planned for implementation but have not been implemented at this time, and the College District's ability to move forward with several programs is uncertain. For those reasons, the project's impact to the freeway segment is considered significant.

E5(e) Summary of Stevens Creek Boulevard Operations

As requested by the City of Cupertino, an analysis was conducted of left-turn queues at Stevens Creek Boulevard intersections and the overall operation of the roadway. The proposed project would have an adverse effect on several left-turn queues along Stevens Creek Boulevard. Given that this analysis was requested by the City for informational purposes, is not a CEQA requirement, and there are no CEQA or City significance thresholds that are applicable, the results of the analysis will not be discussed in detail in this section. The results of the analysis are provided in **Appendix 5.1**.

E5(f) Public Transit Operations

The project site is well served by public transit, as discussed in the setting section. Based on observations of the capacity and occupancy rates of the public transit routes serving the project area, it was concluded that the transit trips generated by the proposed project would not significantly affect public transit service. With a transit mode share of one to two percent, the proposed project would generate about 15 to 35 peak-hour transit trips each weekday, spread out over several bus lines. The VTA transit center (which is being constructed by VTA as a separate project) will accommodate an anticipated 385 (one-way) bus trips per day. Even with the increase in transit usage anticipated as part of the ongoing De Anza

Commute Alternative Program, the additional trips can be accommodated by the current transit service.[2]

E5(g) Access and Internal Circulation Analysis

Depending on its location, width, geometrics, and interface with the internal campus roadway system, the proposed new (relocated) Stevens Creek entry could improve queuing on Stevens Creek Boulevard, as well as stacking of vehicles on campus. However, a detailed analysis of campus access cannot be performed at this time, because the proposed project is at a plan level of detail.

The proposed project would not alter on-campus circulation patterns. Most of the College parking is in the eastern/northeastern part of the campus; the proposed parking deck over Lot C and potential future parking deck(s) over Lots A and B would result in increases in vehicle use of that area. In particular, there would be increased vehicle use of the College entries and exits along Stevens Creek Boulevard and Stelling Road.

The VTA transit center will be located between two major parking areas on the campus. With the projected increase in students and the proposed increase in parking, there could be bus/vehicle and bus/pedestrian conflicts.

Given that the proposed project is a plan and has not been designed in detail, the exact nature of these impacts cannot be determined at this time. However, it is reasonable to assume that the projected increase in students could lead to increased congestion near the campus entries and exits. Therefore, potential impacts to access are considered to be significant.

E5(h) Pedestrian Analysis

As there are no significance criteria for impacts relating to pedestrian circulation, the following discussion is presented for informational purposes only.

All but one of the study intersections are currently signalized and equipped with pedestrian crossing signals and crosswalks. The expected moderate increase in vehicular traffic volumes at these intersections would not significantly impact the pedestrian movements. The pedestrian movements along the roadway network adjacent to the project site would continue to be accommodated by the provided sidewalks, and therefore no adverse pedestrian impacts are anticipated.

Pedestrian and vehicular paths within the campus would remain as they are today. With the addition of

---

2 **Molseed., Roy, Valley Transportation Authority, personal communication, March 19, 2002..**

approximately 5,000 students on the DeAnza College campus, care will be given in the design of new facilities to maintain pedestrian pathway widths and minimize potential pedestrian-vehicle conflict points. This is particularly true for the northeast corner of the campus, where a substantial amount of parking would be added. The addition of parking would increase the number of vehicles and pedestrians in this area of the campus.

Possible pedestrian safety measures that can be considered include:

- Replacement of any pedestrian pathways that are temporarily eliminated during construction;
- Maintaining adequate lighting throughout the campus for pedestrian safety; and
- Creating bicycle lanes along campus paths to accommodate existing and future bicyclists and any increases in bicyclist and pedestrian activity associated with the growing number of students on campus.

E5(i) Parking

Proposed parking improvements would add approximately 400 to 500 parking spaces in the short term, and 600 to 800 spaces in the long term, for a total of 1,000 to 1,300 additional spaces. The proposed project would increase the total to 5,438 to 5,738 on-site parking spaces. Using a "rule of thumb" estimate for community colleges, the recommended parking demand for the forecast 30,850 students would be 6,170 spaces, based a parking ratio of 1 space per 5 students.

In the long term, the projected deficit would be 432 to 732 spaces (6,170 space demand - 5,438 to 5,738 spaces provided). In the short term a deficit of up to 1,232 to 1,332 spaces would exist (6,170 space demand – 4,838 to 4,938 spaces provided). (The short-term deficit could be substantially less, in that the projected increase in students and associated parking demand would occur over a longer time period.) The continued availability of shared spaces at the Church of the Latter-Day Saints would reduce this deficit by about 100 spaces. A parking deficit would mean that vehicles might continue driving around within the campus looking for parking, resulting in congestion within campus parking lots and along the perimeter road. Vehicles might also drive around looking for parking off campus, including along Mary Avenue and within the church parking lot, leading to increased congestion on nearby roads.

The transportation demand management programs already in place at the College (the Alternative Transportation Center and the Direct Transit Route Marketing and associated programs, and the Interactive Carpool Program) could result in a reduction of about 2.6 percent of existing and future project trips, or about 13 percent of the increase in trips (based on general estimates of effectiveness from

the BAAQMD). In addition, the College campus already includes some features that are considered to reduce trips (such as availability of sidewalks, access to transit stops, and bicycle parking). However, these reductions would not be large enough to reduce the parking deficit to below the significance thresholds. Other programs are planned for implementation but have not been implemented at this time, and the College District's ability to move forward with several programs is uncertain. For those reasons, the project's impact with respect to parking supply (and associated congestion within and off the campus) is considered significant.

E5(j) Construction Impacts

Because individual projects have not been designed at this time, the phasing of construction activities, the routing of construction vehicles, the number of trucks and the number of construction personnel have not yet been defined. Examples of the type of impacts that would be anticipated with this type of project, as well as measures proposed by the College, are indicated below.

Typical Construction Impacts of the Proposed Project on Public Transit

Certain parking facilities would not be available during construction, which may temporarily increase the demand for transit service. The increased demand would not adversely affect transit operations due to existing availability of seats on local routes serving the campus.

Typical Construction Impacts of the Proposed Project on Bicycles and Pedestrians

During the construction phases, construction would disrupt the normal access and egress to the campus. Safe access and egress to the campus should be maintained at all times during the construction phase.

Impacts could be more pronounced if construction vehicles use more heavily traveled routes and access points to and from the DeAnza College campus. For example, entrances along Stevens Creek Boulevard are more congested during A.M. and P.M. commute and midday periods; however, these entrances are further away from residential areas to the east and south of the campus. Therefore, consideration should be given to the time-of-day and the types of vehicles that would be used for each construction activity.

Typical Construction Impacts of the Proposed Project on Parking

During the construction phase of the proposed project, the parking facilities on the east portion of the campus may not be available for use. To offset the net reduction in parking during construction, valet parking and alternate transportation programs should be increased at available sites (i.e. the Flint Center garage).

To the extent that these types of impacts would lead to a substantial increase in congestion off campus, they would be considered potentially significant.

E6. Cumulative Conditions

Vehicular traffic that would be generated by pending projects in the neighboring area, along with a growth rate of 1.2 percent per year for 9 years (to 2010), were added to Project Conditions turning movement volumes at the study intersections in order to evaluate the overall Cumulative Conditions. Based on City of Cupertino input, four projects were considered as pending projects in the cumulative analysis scenario. **Table 5.1-14, Trip Generation Summary, Pending Projects,** provides a summary of the trip generation of the pending projects (trip generation calculations are included in **Appendix 5.1**).

Table5.1-14
Trip Generation Summary
Pending Projects

Land Use	A.M. Trips		Mid-Day Trips		P.M. Trips	
	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
Summer Hill Apartments	3	12	7	7	12	6
Civic Park	568	214	715	715	255	553
Villa Serra Apartments	145	373	194	194	378	241
Compaq Campus	119	136	135	135	134	143
Grand Total	**835**	**734**	**1051**	**1051**	**779**	**943**

Source: DKS Associates

E6(a) Traffic Estimates

The levels of service during the A.M., Mid-Day and P.M. peak hours under the Cumulative Conditions were calculated and compared to the Background and Project Conditions (see **Tables 5.1-7** and **5.1-10** for the results of the Background and Project analyses). The results of the LOS analysis for Cumulative Conditions are summarized in **Table 5.1-15, Intersection Capacity Analysis-Cumulative Conditions.** In total, cumulative projects would add 1,570 A.M. peak hour, 2,102 Mid-Day peak hour, and 1,722 P.M. peak hour vehicle trips. As shown, based on City Standards and CMP guidelines, there would be no significant level of service (LOS) changes at most of the signalized study intersections with the addition of

cumulative traffic. The intersection of Stevens Creek Boulevard and the SR-85 Northbound Ramps would operate at LOS E during the A.M. peak hour, and the average delay would increase substantially over existing, background and Project conditions. However, the intersection is designated as a CMP intersection, and LOS E is acceptable for such intersections. Therefore, the impact at the intersection would be less than significant.

With the addition of cumulative traffic, the LOS at the unsignalized intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive during the A.M. peak hour would change from LOS D under Project Conditions to LOS E under Cumulative Conditions, and the average delay would increase by more than four seconds during the Mid-Day and P.M. peak hours. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to traffic delays at the intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive would be significant.

The detailed results of the Cumulative Scenario LOS analysis are included in **Appendix 5.1.**

Table 5.1-15
Intersection Capacity Analysis
Cumulative Conditions

#	Intersection	A.M. Peak Hour		Mid-Day Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Avg. Delay	LOS	Avg. Delay	LOS	Avg. Delay	LOS
1	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. De Anza Blvd	25.2	D+	29.2	D	27.8	D+

2	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bandley Dr	9.2	B	16.9	C+	13.6	B-
3	Stevens Creek Blvd/Saich Way	7.9	B	11.1	B	12.2	B
4	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. Stelling Rd	26.8	D+	26.5	D+	26.7	D+
5	Stevens Creek Blvd/Mary Ave	19.6	C	16.4	C+	20.6	C
6	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 NB Ramps	**51.6**	**E**	27.7	D+	24.8	C-
7	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 SB Ramps	19.6	C	20.2	C	20.6	C
8	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bubb Rd	26.4	D+	24.5	C-	27.2	D+
9	N. Stelling Rd/Greenleaf Dr	9.2	B	5.8	B+	4.8	A
10	N. Stelling Rd/Homestead Rd	27.3	D+	25.8	D+	29.0	D
11	N. Stelling Rd/Pepper Tree Lane	13.5	B-	16.1	C+	12.9	B
12	N. Stelling Rd/McClellan Rd	24.5	C-	20.3	C	24.9	C-
13	McClellan Rd/Bubb Rd	22.5	C	20.8	C	21.1	C
14	McClellan Rd/Rose Blossom Dr [2]	**36.5**	**E**	**77.8**	**F**	**90.0**	**F**

[1] Average Delay per vehicle, in seconds.
[2] Worst Case Level of Service (unsignalized)
Note: Intersections 1 through 13 were analyzed based on the original College forecast of a 7,000-student increase. Intersection 14 was analyzed with the current (revised) forecast of a 5,850-student increase.
Source: DKS Associates

E6(b) Cumulative Critical Traffic Movements

For each intersection under the Cumulative Conditions scenario, the worst critical traffic movements and V/S ratios were evaluated and are shown in **Table 5.1-16, Critical Traffic Movements Summary - Cumulative Conditions**. The worst critical V/S ratio (for the southbound through movement at Stelling Road and Greenleaf Drive) would be 0.69, which is equivalent to LOS C. The volumes and vehicle delays are provided in **Appendix 5.1.**

Table 5.1-16
Critical Traffic Movements Summary
Cumulative Conditions

#	Intersection	AM Peak		Mid-Day Peak		PM Peak	
		Crit. Mov.	V/S Ratio	Crit. Mov.	V/S. Ratio	Crit. Mov.	V/S Ratio
1	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. De Anza Blvd	NBT	.36	EBR	.21	SBT	.32
2	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bandley Dr	EBT	.16	WBT	.27	WBT	.31
3	Stevens Creek Blvd/Saich Way	WBT	.24	WBT	.28	WBT	.33
4	Stevens Creek Blvd/N. Stelling Rd	WBT	.20	WBT	.24	SBT	.25
5	Stevens Creek Blvd/Mary Ave	EBT	.31	EBT	.31	EBT	.32
6	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 NB Ramps	SBR	.37	WBR	.46	WBR	.38
7	Stevens Creek Blvd/SR-85 SB Ramps	SBR	.30	SBR	.24	SBR	.34
8	Stevens Creek Blvd/Bubb Rd	EBT	.21	EBT	.23	EBT	.23
9	N. Stelling Rd/Greenleaf Dr	NBT	.66	SBT	.49	SBT	.69
10	N. Stelling Rd/Homestead Rd	NBT	.21	SBL	.22	SBT	.32
11	N. Stelling Rd/Pepper Tree Lane	SBR	.30	EBL	.29	SBR	.30
12	N. Stelling Rd/McClellan Rd	WBT	.27	EBR	.31	EBT	.37
13	McClellan Rd/Bubb Rd	WBT	.33	WBT	.20	WBL	.19
14	McClellan Rd/Rose Blossom Dr[2]	n/a		n/a		n/a	

V/S: Volume to Saturation Flow Ratio, NBT: North Bound Through, SBT: South Bound Through, WBT: West Bound Through, EBT: East Bound Through, EBL: East Bound Left, WBR: West Bound Right, SBR: South Bound Right, SBL: South Bound Left
Note: Intersections 1 through 13 were analyzed based on the original forecast of a 7,000-student increase.
Source: DKS Associates

F. MITIGATION MEASURES

F1. Measures Proposed as Part of the Project

Features of the proposed Facilities Master Plan that would improve conditions related to traffic and circulation (as described earlier in this section) include:

F2. Measures Identified in this EIR

F2(a) Intersection Operations: McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive

1. The College District would install, or provide funding to the City of Cupertino for installation of, yield signs for left turns on the east and westbound approaches at the intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive. With this improvement, the intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive would operate at LOS C during the A.M. and Mid-Day peak hours, and LOS D during the P.M. peak hour. This measure would improve the overall safety and operation of this intersection, and would mitigate project-specific and cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.

F2(b) Freeway Operations

2. The College would continue to implement its Commute Alternative Program, to the extent feasible (and consistent with State law), in order to reduce the number of vehicles traveling to and from the College. The individual program components are listed below with estimates of effectiveness, based on Altrans or the BAAQMD. (The estimates of effectiveness are noted following each measure.)

    - The Direct Transit Route Marketing Program and GIS Trip Planning (already being implemented) (0.5 to 2 percent trips);
    - The VTA ECO Pass Program(estimated trip reduction has not been calculated);
    - The College Shuttle Bus System (1,000 students per day, about 3 percent of total future student trips or about 20 percent of the additional student trips);
    - Interactive Carpool Program (already being implemented) (1 to 4 percent trips);
    - The Bicycle Safety and Encouragement Program (0.5 to 2 percent trips); and
    - The Distance Learning and Tele-Commute Program (0.5 to 1.5 percent trips).

3. The College would monitor the effectiveness of the Commute Alternative Program at reducing student and employee trips. The monitoring activities would establish a baseline (pre-program level) for student and employee trips and trip characteristics, and shall provide a quantitative measurement of future student and employee trips on at least a yearly basis. The monitoring activities may include, but would not be limited to, regular surveys and the use of trip counters at College entrances. If the measures are found to not be effective (that is, if they do not meet at least the

minimum level of trip reduction estimated), the College would consider and implement corrective actions (to the extent feasible and consistent with State law).

4. The College would coordinate with the City to consider joint development of the area near Stevens Creek Boulevard and Stelling Road. Such uses could result in other environmental impacts (including the attraction of additional vehicle trips to the campus), depending on the location and characteristics of the use. The impacts cannot be determined at this time, and would need to be addressed in a separate environmental review under CEQA. Also, it is not known to what extent the City is willing to participate in this measure.

Parking fees for single-occupancy vehicle commuters and parking cash-out programs, two trip reduction measures recommended by the BAAQMD, are not identified as mitigation because they are not feasible for community colleges under State law.

F2(c) Access

5. When designing the new (relocated) Stevens Creek entry, the College would work with the City of Cupertino to ensure that the entry is designed to minimize delays along Stevens Creek Boulevard.

6. The College would extend vehicle stacking areas on campus, where feasible, for both ingress and egress movements.

7. The College would work with the City of Cupertino to consider construction of additional entries and exits, including a possible new exit along McClellan Road and possible new entries/exits along Stelling Road. The construction of additional entries/exits could result in temporary construction noise and dust impacts, similar to those described in this EIR. Depending on their location and design, additional entries/exits could require the removal of additional trees.

8. The College would design the reconfigured/expanded parking areas to ensure ease of entry for vehicles entering from College roadways.

9. The College would work with the VTA to ensure that adequately sized and safe queuing areas are provided and maintained for both vehicles and pedestrians.

F2(d) Parking Supply

10. The transportation demand management measures listed for the freeway impact would also help to mitigate the parking impact by reducing student and employee trips.

11. Adding parking spaces could help encourage automobile trips to and from the campus and discourage the use of transit and other transportation alternatives. Therefore, the College would expand parking only after parking demand has been assessed with the implementation of the Commute Alternative Program measures. If deemed necessary, the full complement of additional parking would be built as soon as possible.

12. The College would also consider the addition of parking spaces, either on site or off site. The construction of additional parking on site could result in additional impacts, including impacts to traffic and visual quality, as well as construction impacts. The construction of additional parking off site may not be feasible, and could also result in additional impacts, depending on the particular site chosen.

F2(e) Construction Impacts

13. The College would prepare, before the start of construction, a construction mitigation plan that would be tailored to the construction schedule, and, at a minimum, would consider:

- The number of truck trips;
- Time of day and location of street closures;
- Time of day arrival and departure of trucks;
- Limitations on the size and type of trucks;
- Provision of a truck staging area, with limitations on the number of trucks that can be waiting;
- Provision of a truck circulation pattern;
- Construction parking for patients, visitors, staff and construction workers;
- Mobile office placement and associated parking;
- Manual traffic control when necessary;
- Proper advance warning and posted signage concerning street closures;
- Provisions for pedestrian safety;
- Provisions for parking management (i.e. valet or stacked parking operation) at available locations (i.e. Flint Center Garage) to offset any temporary reduction in on-campus parking;

- Shuttle bus service to any off-site parking facilities; and
- Temporary relocation of VTA Transit Bus stops.

G. LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of all of the features of the College Commute Alternative Program would reduce the increase in vehicle trips (over existing levels) by approximately 44 percent at the low end of the effectiveness range provided and up to 81 percent at the high end of the range. The potential effectiveness at reducing trips is substantial because the measures would apply to existing as well as future trips.

Assuming all of the measures implemented are maximally effective at reducing emissions (and accounting for the current enrollment forecast), the project impact to the freeway segment (SR 85 southbound between I-280 and Stevens Creek Boulevard) would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. At their maximum effectiveness, the measures could completely offset the long-term parking deficit, and offset about 75 percent of the short-term parking deficit. At their maximum effectiveness, then, the measures would substantially reduce the parking impacts, and therefore adequately mitigate them, per Sections 15091 and 15092 of the CEQA *Guidelines*.

There is no guarantee that the implementation of these measures would reduce the emissions to the maximum degree estimated. At their minimum effectiveness, the measures would not reduce the project impact to SR 85 to below the one-percent threshold, but could reduce the project contribution to the impact substantially (the contribution could be reduced from about 6.0 percent to about 3.4 percent). The measures could completely offset the long-term parking deficit, and could offset about 40 percent of the short-term parking deficit. Assuming all of the measures are implemented, at their minimum effectiveness, the measures would substantially reduce the freeway and parking impacts, and therefore adequately mitigate them, per Sections 15091 and 15092 of the CEQA *Guidelines*.

There is also no guarantee that the implementation of all of the measures would be feasible. For example, the ECO pass program requires a student vote; in addition, College staff have indicated that the shuttle program would probably not be implemented on an ongoing basis.[3] Without a shuttle program, the measures (at their minimum effectiveness) would not reduce the project impact to SR 85 to below the one-percent threshold, and would not reduce the project contribution to the impact substantially (the contribution could be reduced from about 6.0 percent to about 4.4 percent). The long-term parking deficit

3 Brandy, Mike, Foothill College, personal communication, March 15, 2002.

could be reduced substantially (to about 130 spaces), but the short-term parking deficit would not be reduced substantially (it could still be about 930 spaces). Without the shuttle program, then, the measures might not adequately mitigate the freeway and short-term parking impacts.

All other impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

5.2 AIR QUALITY

A. SUMMARY

The proposed Facilities Master Plan would result in the generation of air pollutants during construction and operation activities. Fugitive dust generated by on-site grading activities would be significant. Implementation of the dust control measures recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) would reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Operational emissions from stationary sources and vehicle trips would exceed the threshold of significance for ROG recommended by the BAAQMD and, therefore, would be considered significant. Given that the BAAQMD California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines consider a project to have significant cumulative air quality impacts if the project would have individual significant air quality impacts, the project's contribution toward regional operational emissions impacts would therefore also be significant. Continued implementation of the College's Commute Alternative Program could (if all measures were implemented) reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level; however, there is no guarantee that all of these measures are feasible. Even assuming that not all measures are implemented, however, the Commute Alternative Program would substantially lessen (and therefore adequately mitigate) the air quality impact.

Project impacts related to localized carbon monoxide (CO) emissions near all study roadway intersections and along segments of State Route (SR) 85 and Interstate 280 (I-280) would not exceed the State or Federal CO standards and therefore would not be significant. Localized carbon monoxide levels generated by cumulative projects (including Facilities Master Plan buildout) would not exceed Federal or State Standards and would not be significant.

B. INTRODUCTION

This section was prepared in accordance with the BAAQMD's June 1996 (as revised December 1999) *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*.

C. EXISTING CONDITIONS

C1. Smog and Its Causes

Smog is a term based on the words smoke and fog that is used to describe dense, visible air pollution. Although some air pollutants are colorless, smog is commonly used to describe the general concentrations of pollutants in the air. Smog is formed when combustion emissions and gaseous

emissions, such as reactive organic gases (ROG) and (NO_x), undergo photochemical reactions in sunlight to form ozone. Ozone is a highly reactive gas that exists as a natural component of the atmosphere. A region of relatively high ozone concentration in the upper atmosphere, known as stratospheric ozone, helps to shield the Earth from harmful ultraviolet radiation. In the lower atmosphere where people live, elevated levels of ozone pose human health risks and can result in damage to crops, rubber, and other materials. Particulates, such as soil and dust materials and vehicle exhaust particulates, often mix with ozone, CO, and other compounds and create a brownish haze in the air.

The topography and climate of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (Basin) combine to make it an area of smog potential. The climate of the Bay Area is Mediterranean in character, with mild, rainy winter weather from November through March, and warm, dry weather from June through September. In summer, the Pacific high-pressure system typically remains near the coast of California; subsidence of warm air, associated with the Pacific high, creates frequent summer atmospheric temperature inversions. Subsidence inversions may be several hundred to several thousand feet deep, effectively trapping pollutants in a small volume of air near the ground. In winter, the Pacific high-pressure system moves southward, allowing ocean-formed storms to move through the region. The frequent storms and infrequent periods of sustained sunny weather are not conducive to smog formation. Radiational cooling during the evening, however, sometimes creates thin inversions and concentrates air pollutant emissions near the ground.

The project site is located in the Santa Clara Valley, bounded by the San Francisco Bay to the north and mountains to the south, west, and east. Temperatures are warm on summer days and cool on summer nights, and winter temperatures are relatively mild. Winds in the Santa Clara Valley are greatly influenced by terrain, resulting in a prevailing flow that roughly parallels the valley's northwest-southeast axis.

The air pollution potential of the Santa Clara Valley is high. High summer temperatures, stable air and mountains surrounding the valley combine to promote ozone formation. In addition to local sources of pollution, ozone precursors from San Francisco, San Mateo, and Alameda Counties are carried by prevailing winds to the Santa Clara Valley.

C2. Air Quality Regulation

Air quality within the Basin is addressed through the efforts of various Federal, State, regional, and local government agencies. These agencies work jointly, as well as individually, to improve air quality

through legislation, regulations, planning, policy-making, education, and a variety of programs. The agencies primarily responsible for improving the air quality within the Basin are discussed below along with their individual responsibilities.

C2(a) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is responsible for enforcing the 1990 amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and the national ambient air quality standards (Federal standards) that it establishes. These standards identify levels of air quality for six "criteria" pollutants which are considered the maximum levels of ambient (background) air pollutants considered safe, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect the public health and welfare. The six criteria pollutants include ozone, CO, nitrogen dioxide (NO_2—a form of NO_x), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), fine particulate matter (PM_{10}), and lead. The U.S. EPA also has regulatory and enforcement jurisdiction over emission sources beyond State waters (outer continental shelf), and those that are under the exclusive authority of the Federal government, such as aircraft, locomotives, and interstate trucking.

The Basin is currently classified by the U.S. EPA as a nonattainment area for ozone. In response to its enforcement responsibilities, the U.S. EPA requires each state to prepare and submit a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that describes how the state will achieve the Federal standards by specified dates, depending on the severity of the air quality within the state or air basin.

C2(b) California Air Resources Board

The California Air Resources Board (ARB), a department of the California Environmental Protection Agency (CALEPA), oversees air quality planning and control throughout California. It is primarily responsible for ensuring implementation of the 1989 amendments to the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), responding to the Federal CAA requirements, and for regulating emissions from motor vehicles and consumer products within the State. The ARB has established emission standards for vehicles sold in California and for various types of equipment available commercially. It also sets fuel specifications to further reduce vehicular emissions.

Like the U.S. EPA, the ARB has established ambient air quality standards for the State (State standards). These standards apply to the same six criteria pollutants as the Federal CAA, and also include sulfate, visibility, hydrogen sulfide, and vinyl chloride. They are also more stringent than the Federal standards and, in the case of PM_{10} and SO_2, far more stringent. The amendments to the CCAA require air pollution control districts to achieve the State standards by the earliest practicable date.

Based on monitored pollutant levels, the CCAA divides ozone nonattainment areas into four categories—moderate, serious, severe, and extreme—to which progressively more stringent requirements apply. Because it occasionally exceeds State standards, the Basin is classified as a nonattainment area for ozone and PM_{10}.

C2(c) Bay Area Air Quality Management District

The management of air quality in the Basin is the responsibility of the BAAQMD. The BAAQMD is responsible for bringing and/or maintaining air quality in the Basin within Federal and State air quality standards. Specifically, the BAAQMD has the responsibility to monitor ambient air pollutant levels throughout the Basin and to develop and implement attainment strategies to ensure that future emissions will be within Federal and State standards.

(i) Clean Air Plan

As discussed previously, the Federal and State Clean Air Acts require the preparation of plans to reduce air pollution to healthful levels. The BAAQMD has responded to this requirement by preparing a series of Clean Air Plans (CAPs), the most recent and rigorous of which was approved in December 2000. The 2000 CAP continues the air pollution reduction strategy established by the 1991 CAP. The 2000 CAP is the third triennial update to the 1991 CAP, following previous updates in 1994 and 1997. The 2000 CAP is designed to address attainment of the State standards for ozone.

The 1997 CAP contained stationary and mobile source control measures, which included: developing rules to reduce vehicle trips to and from major residential developments, shopping centers, and other indirect sources; encouraging cities and counties to plan for high density development; and clustering development with mixed uses in the vicinity of mass transit stations. The 2000 CAP includes changes in the organization and scheduling of some existing control measures, some new stationary source control measures, revisions to previous stationary source measures, and deletion of some control measures no longer deemed feasible by District staff. The transportation control measures (TCMs) are unchanged from the 1997 CAP. The 2000 CAP continues to discourages "urban sprawl," while strongly endorsing high-density mixed-use developments near transit centers that reduce the need for commuting by personal vehicles.

(ii) BAAQMD Rules and Regulations

The BAAQMD is responsible for limiting the amount of emissions that can be generated throughout the Basin by stationary sources. Specific rules and regulations have been adopted that limit the emissions that can be generated by various uses and/or activities, and identify specific pollution reduction measures that must be implemented in association with various uses and activities. These rules not only regulate the emissions of the six criteria pollutants, but also toxic emissions and acutely hazardous materials. They are also subject to ongoing refinement by the BAAQMD.

Emissions sources subject to these rules are regulated through the BAAQMD's permitting process. Through this permitting process, the BAAQMD also monitors the amount of stationary emissions being generated and uses this information in developing the CAP. Any emissions sources that would be constructed as part of the proposed project would be subject to the BAAQMD rules and regulations.

(iii) BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines

In April 1996, the BAAQMD prepared its *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines* as a guidance document to provide lead government agencies, consultants, and project proponents with uniform procedures for assessing air quality impacts and preparing the air quality sections of environmental documents for projects subject to CEQA. The *CEQA Guidelines* were revised by the BAAQMD in December 1999. The document describes the criteria that the BAAQMD uses when reviewing and commenting on the adequacy of environmental documents, such as this EIR. It recommends thresholds for use in determining whether projects would have significant adverse environmental impacts, identifies methodologies for predicting project emissions and impacts, and identifies measures that can be used to avoid or reduce air quality impacts. This EIR section was prepared following the recommendations of the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*.

C2(d) Association of Bay Area Governments

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is a council of governments for the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Sonoma, and Solano. ABAG is a regional planning agency and serves as a forum for regional issues relating to transportation, the economy, community development, and the environment. ABAG also serves as the regional clearinghouse for projects requiring environmental documentation under Federal and State law. In this role, ABAG reviews proposed projects to analyze their impacts on ABAG's regional planning efforts.

Although ABAG is not an air quality management agency, it is responsible for several air quality planning issues. Specifically, as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine counties, it is responsible, pursuant to Section 176(c) of the 1990 amendments to the Federal CAA, for providing current population, employment, travel, and congestion projections for regional air quality planning efforts. It is required to quantify and document the demographic and employment factors influencing expected transportation demand, including land use forecasts. Pursuant to *California Health and Safety Code* Section 40460(b), ABAG is also responsible for preparing and approving the portions of the Basin's CAP relating to demographic projections and integrated regional land use, housing, employment, and transportation programs, measures, and strategies.

C2(e) Local Governments

Local governments, such as those in the area of the College, have the authority and responsibility to reduce air pollution through their police power and land use decision-making authority. Specifically, local governments are responsible for the mitigation of emissions resulting from land use decisions and for the implementation of TCMs as outlined in the CAP. The CAP assigns local governments certain responsibilities to assist the Basin in meeting air quality goals and policies. In general, a first step toward implementation of a local government's responsibility is accomplished by identifying air quality goals, policies, and implementation measures in its general plan. Through capital improvement programs, local governments can fund infrastructure that contributes to improved air quality, by requiring such improvements as ridesharing, park and ride, bicycle facilities, and traffic signal timing improvements. In accordance with CEQA requirements and the CEQA review process, local governments assess air quality impacts, require mitigation of potential air quality impacts by conditioning discretionary permits, and monitor and enforce implementation of such mitigation.

De Anza College is part of the California Community Colleges, a State agency, and thus is not subject to local land use decisions.

C3. Existing Air Quality Environment

C3(a) Regional Air Quality

To identify ambient concentrations of the six criteria pollutants, the BAAQMD operates 31 air quality monitoring stations throughout the Basin. The nearest monitoring stations to the project site are the Mountain View Cuesta Drive station, which monitors levels of ozone, and the San Jose 4th Street station,

which monitors levels of ozone, PM_{10}, CO, and NO_2. Because the Mountain View monitoring station is closer to the campus, the ambient pollutant concentrations for ozone at that station are used to evaluate ambient concentrations of ozone in the vicinity of the project site. However, data for this monitoring station were available only through 1999. For 2000 and 2001, ambient pollutant concentrations for ozone from the San Jose 4th Street station are used to evaluate ambient concentrations of ozone in the vicinity of the project site.

Table 5.2-1, Ambient Pollutant Concentrations Registered at Mountain View/ San Jose Monitoring Stations, lists the concentrations registered and the violations of State and Federal standards that have occurred at the Mountain View and San Jose 4th Street monitoring stations from 1997 through 2001. In 1999, the BAAQMD expanded the Bay Area Air Pollution Summary to include measurements for a more complete set of Federal and State time-averaged pollutant standards. Most importantly, the BAAQMD added the EPA eight-hour average ozone standard proposed in 1997. However, the U.S. Supreme Court remanded this standard in April 2001, pending the development of a new ozone implementation policy by the EPA. (Data are provided on this standard in the table for informational purposes only.)

As shown, between 1997 and 1999, the Mountain View station registered as many as 7 days per year above the State standard for ozone, and no days above the Federal standard. Between 1997 and 2001, the San Jose station registered as many as 7 days per year above the State standard for PM_{10}. The specific dates and times of the PM_{10} violations are not known. However, elevated PM_{10} concentrations tend to occur on cold winter nights, and the residential combustion of wood for home heating and in home fireplaces is a often major contributor to such elevated concentrations.

Table 5.2-1
Ambient Pollutant Concentrations Registered at Mountain View/San Jose Monitoring Stations

		Year				
Pollutant	**Standards[1, 2]**	**1997**	**1998**	**1999**	**2000**	**2001**
OZONE (O_3)						
Maximum 1-hour concentration monitored (pphm)		10	10	11	7	9
Number of days exceeding Federal standard	>11 pphm	0	0	0	0	0
Number of days exceeding State standard	>9 pphm	1	2	7	0	0
Maximum 8-hour concentration monitored (pphm)		-	-	8	6	7
Number of day exceeding Federal standard	>8 pphm	-	-	0	0	0

SUSPENDED PARTICULATE MATTER (PM_{10})						
Annual Geometric Mean ($\mu g/m^3$)		23.7	22.5	25.4	23.7	25.5
State standards	>30 $\mu g/m^3$					
Maximum 24-hour concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)		-	-	114	76	77
Number of days exceeding Federal standards*	>150 $\mu g/m^3$	0	0	0	0	0
Number of days exceeding State standards*	>50 $\mu g/m^3$	3	3	5	7	2
CARBON MONOXIDE (CO)						
Maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)		-	-	8.8		-
Number of days exceeding Federal standard	>35 ppm	-	-	0	0	0
Maximum 8-hour concentration (ppm)		5.8	6.0	6.3	7	5.1
Number of days exceeding Federal standard	>9 ppm	0	0	0	0	0
NITROGEN DIOXIDE (NO_2)						
Maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)		12	8	13	11	8
Number of days exceeding State standard	>25pphm	0	0	0	0	0

Sources: BAAQMD, Bay Area Air Pollution Summary (for 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001).
[1] Parts by volume per hundred million of air (pphm), parts by volume per million of air (ppm), or micrograms per cubic meter of air ($\mu g/m^3$)
[2]Federal and State standards are for the same time period as the maximum concentration measurement unless otherwise indicated.
** Since PM_{10} is only sampled every sixth day, actual days over standard can be estimated to be six times the number shown.*
- Information is not available.

C3(b) Local Air Quality

The campus is in an urban setting, and is surrounded by a variety of land uses: commercial uses and Memorial Park to the north; single-family residences, a school/athletic field, and a church to the east; single/multi-family residences, college facilities, and two churches to the south; and State Route (SR) 85 to the west. Emissions sources include stationary activities such as space heating, cooking, and water heating, and mobile activities—primarily automotive traffic. Motor vehicles are the primary sources of pollutants within the area.

(i) Localized Carbon Monoxide Concentrations

Traffic-congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized high levels of CO. No exceedances of the State or Federal CO standard have been recorded at any of the BAAQMD monitoring stations since 1991. However, because elevated CO concentrations are generally localized, heavy traffic volumes and congestion at specific intersections or roadway segments can lead to high

levels of CO, or "hot spots," while concentrations at the nearest air quality monitoring station may be below State and Federal standards. For this reason, the BAAQMD recommends that CO modeling be conducted for projects for which traffic would affect intersections or roadway segments operating at level of service (LOS) D, E, or F, or would cause a decline to LOS D, E, or F. As discussed in **Section 5.1, Traffic and Circulation**, the proposed project would add trips to the following intersections and freeway segments, all of which currently operate at LOS D, E, or F or would decline to LOS D, E or F with project-related traffic. As a result, CO modeling was performed for the following roadway intersections and freeway segments.

Intersections

- Stevens Creek Boulevard/North De Anza Boulevard;
- Stevens Creek Boulevard/North Stelling Road;
- Stevens Creek Boulevard/SR-85 Northbound Ramps;
- Stevens Creek Boulevard/Bubb Road;
- North Stelling Road/Homestead Road;
- McClellan Road/Bubb Road; and
- McClellan Road/Rose Blossom Drive.

Freeway Segments

- SR-85 between Sunnyvale/Saratoga Road and Stevens Creek Boulevard;
- SR-85 between I-280 and Homestead Road;
- SR-85 between Homestead Road and Fremont Avenue;
- SR-85 between Stevens Creek Boulevard and I-280;
- I-280 between DeAnza Boulevard and SR-85; and
- I-280 between SR-85 and Foothill Boulevard.

The BAAQMD recommends the use of CALINE4, a dispersion model developed by Caltrans for predicting CO concentrations near roadways, as the preferred method of estimating pollutant

concentrations at various locations. CALINE4 adds roadway-specific CO emissions calculated from peak traffic volumes to ambient CO air concentrations. For this analysis, CO concentrations were calculated based on a simplified CALINE4 screening procedure developed by the BAAQMD. This methodology assumes worst-case conditions (i.e., wind direction is parallel to the primary roadway, 90° to the secondary road; wind speed of less than one meter per second; and extreme atmospheric stability) and provides a screening of maximum, worst-case, CO concentrations.

Maximum CO concentrations were calculated for peak hour traffic volumes at the intersections and on the freeway segments noted above. The results of these calculations are presented in **Table 5.2-2, Existing Carbon Monoxide Concentrations**, for representative receptors located 50, 100, and 300 feet from each roadway segment and freeway segment. In calculating the maximum CO for each of the freeway segments, the average speed for each direction of travel was combined to represent the speed for the freeway segment as a whole. For example, the average speed on SR-85 between I-280 and Homestead Road during the AM peak hour is 10 miles per hour (mph) northbound and 65 mph southbound; a combined average of 37.5 mph was used. Based on this analysis, CO hot spots do not currently exist near any of the roadway intersections or freeway segments examined.

C3(c) Site-Specific Emissions

The De Anza College campus includes academic buildings, a library, theatre, student union, child development center, athletic facilities, and associated parking totaling approximately 1,075,370 gross square feet of building space. Emissions are generated by stationary activities, such as space heating, cooking, and water heating, and mobile activities—primarily automotive traffic. There are currently no stationary uses on the campus that require permits from the BAAQMD.[1]

1 Suedkamp, Michael, Project Engineer, Gilbane Building Company, personal communication, February 14, 2001.

Table 5.2-2
Existing Carbon Monoxide Concentrations

	50 Feet		100 Feet		300 Feet	
Freeway Segments	**1-Hour[1]**	**8-Hour[2]**	**1-Hour[1]**	**8-Hour[2]**	**1-Hour[1]**	**8-Hour[2]**
Intersection						
Stevens Creek Boulevard/North De Anza Boulevard	9.6	6.5	9.4	6.3	9.1	6.1
Stevens Creek Boulevard /North Stelling Road	9.6	6.5	9.4	6.3	9.1	6.1
Stevens Creek Boulevard/SR-85 Northbound Ramps	10.1	6.8	9.7	6.6	9.3	6.2
Stevens Creek Boulevard/Bubb Road	9.8	6.6	9.5	6.4	9.2	6.1
North Stelling Road/Homestead Road	9.6	6.5	9.3	6.3	9.1	6.1
McClellan Road/Bubb Road	9.5	6.4	9.3	6.3	9.0	6.1
McClellan Road/Rose Blossom Road	9.3	6.2	9.1	6.1	9.0	6.0
Freeway Segments						
SR-85, between Sunnyvale/Saratoga Road and Stevens Creek Boulevard	10.5	7.1	10.0	6.7	9.3	6.3
SR 85, between I-280 and Homestead Road	11.2	7.5	10.5	7.1	9.5	6.4
SR 85, between Homestead Road and Fremont Road	11.5	7.8	10.7	7.2	9.6	6.5
SR 85, between Stevens Creek Boulevard and I-280	10.8	7.3	10.2	6.9	9.4	6.3
I-280, between DeAnza Boulevard and SR-85	12.1	8.2	11.1	7.5	9.9	6.6
I-280, between SR-85 and Foothill Boulevard	12.2	8.3	11.2	7.6	9.8	6.6

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc. Emissions calculations are provided in Appendix 5.2.
[1]*State standard is 20.0 parts per million. Federal standard is 35 parts per million.*
[2]*State and Federal standard is 9.0 parts per million.*

C3(d) Air Toxics

Regulation of toxic air contaminants (TACs), termed Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) under Federal regulations, is achieved through Federal and State controls on individual sources. Federal law defines HAPs as non-criteria air pollutants with short-term (acute) and/or long-term (chronic or carcinogenic) adverse human health effects. The 1990 Federal CAA Amendments offer a comprehensive plan for achieving significant reductions in both mobile and stationary source emissions of HAPs. A total of 189 air pollutants have been designated HAPs because of their adverse human health effects. Title III of the 1990 Federal CAA Amendments amends Section 112 of the CAA Amendments to replace the former program with an entirely new technology-based program. Under Title III, EPA must establish maximum achievable control technology emission standards for all new and existing "major" stationary sources.

Stationary sources of HAPs are required to obtain an operating permit from the BAAQMD pursuant to Title V of the 1990 CAA Amendments.

California State law defines TACs as air pollutants having carcinogenic effects. Assembly Bill (AB) 1807 (the Tanner Bill, passed in 1983) established the State Air Toxics Program and the methods for designating certain air toxics as TACs. A total of 191 substances have been designated TACs under California law; they include the 189 (Federal) HAPs adopted as TACs in accordance with AB 2728. The Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act of 1987 (AB 2588) seeks to identify and evaluate risk from air toxics sources; AB 2588 does not regulate air toxic emissions. Under AB 2588, sources emitting more than 10 tons per year of any criteria air pollutant must estimate and report their toxic air emissions to the local Air Districts. The local Air Districts then prioritize facilities on the basis of emissions, and "high priority" facilities are required to submit a health-risk assessment and communicate the results to the affected public. Depending on the risk levels, emitting facilities are required to implement varying levels of risk reduction measures. The BAAQMD is responsible for implementing AB 2588 in the Basin.

The District is currently working to control TAC impacts from local "hot spots" and from ambient background concentrations. The control strategy involves reviewing new sources to ensure compliance with required emission controls and limits, maintaining an inventory of existing sources to identify major TAC emissions, and developing measures to reduce TAC emissions. The BAAQMD publishes the results of the various control programs in an annual report, which provides information on the current TAC inventory, AB 2588 risk assessments, TAC monitoring programs, and TAC control measures and plans.

The major source of TACs contributing to ambient risk in the Bay Area is motor vehicles (45 percent of the risk associated with all sources). The California inventory of TAC sources identified the following sources in the City of Cupertino: dry cleaners, the Hanson Permanente Cement Company and the Stevens Creek Quarry, Inc. One dry cleaner (Dryclean Pro) is located within the vicinity of the campus along Stevens Creek Boulevard. Hanson Permanente Cement Company and the Stevens Creek Quarry are approximately 2.5 miles west of the campus on Stevens Creek Boulevard and Stevens Canyon Road, respectively. None of the TAC sources within the vicinity of the campus have been identified as priority sites and they are not required to prepare health risk assessments.

C4. Sensitive Receptors

Land uses such as schools, hospitals, and convalescent homes are considered to be relatively sensitive to poor air quality because infants, the elderly, and people with health afflictions, especially respiratory ailments, are more susceptible to respiratory infections and other air-quality-related health problems than the general public. Residential areas are also considered to be sensitive to air pollution because residents (including children and the elderly) tend to be at home for extended periods of time, resulting in sustained exposure to any pollutants present. In the vicinity of the project site, sensitive air quality receptors include Memorial Park to the north; single-family residential units, William Faria Elementary School, and Church of the Latter-Day Saints to the east; Saint Jude the Apostle Church to the southeast; and single and multi-family residential units and Kingdom Hall of Jehovah Witnesses to the south. The College itself is also considered a sensitive receptor.

D. PROJECT IMPACTS

D1. Significance Criteria

Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form), lists the following items to be considered when determining whether a project could have a significant effect on the environment:

- Whether the project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
- Whether the project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- Whether the project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors);
- Whether the project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
- Whether the project would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

In order to facilitate the intent and significance determinations of the CEQA *Guidelines*, the BAAQMD has issued criteria for determining the level of significance for project-specific impacts within its jurisdiction. The Foothill-DeAnza Community College District defers to these criteria when assessing project specific and cumulative air quality impacts for projects proposed within its jurisdiction. These thresholds are identified below.

D1(a) Construction Emissions

According to the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*, the determination of significance with respect to construction emissions should be based on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented. If all the applicable control measures for PM_{10} indicated in the BAAQMD *CEQA Guidelines* would be implemented, then air pollutant emissions from construction activities would be considered less than significant. If a project would not implement all applicable control measures, construction emissions would be considered a significant impact.

D1(b) Operational Emissions

The BAAQMD recommends that individual projects with direct and/or indirect operational emissions that exceed the following thresholds be considered significant:

- 80 pounds per day (ppd) of ROG
- 80 ppd of NO_x
- 80 ppd of PM_{10}

Direct emissions are emitted on site and include stationary sources and on-site mobile equipment. Examples of land uses and activities that generate direct emissions are industrial operations and sources subject to an operating permit by the BAAQMD. College uses are not significant sources of direct emissions. Indirect emissions come from mobile sources that access the project site but generally emit off site. The primary sources of long-term, indirect emissions associated with institutional projects such as schools are motor vehicles.

Indirect CO emissions are considered significant if they will contribute to a violation of the State standards for CO (9 ppm averaged over 8 hours and 20 ppm for one hour). CO emissions are localized, and typically analyzed in terms of their impacts to specific roadway segments or intersections. As discussed earlier, the BAAQMD requires CO modeling if the project would add trips to intersections currently operating at LOS D, E, or F, or cause a decline to LOS D, E, or F. As noted earlier in this section, some of the project study intersections and freeway segments currently operate at LOS D or lower or would deteriorate to LOS D or lower with the project, and thus require CO modeling. For the purposes of this EIR, a simplified CO modeling analysis will be used to determine impacts. If modeling demonstrates that the source would not cause a violation of the State standard at existing or reasonably foreseeable receptors, the project would not have a significant impact on local air quality.

Projects that have the potential to emit toxic air contaminants could also result in significant air quality impacts. In addition, projects that alter air movement, moisture, temperature, or climate either locally or regionally could have significant air quality impacts.

Projects that would emit pollutants associated with objectionable odors in substantial concentrations could result in significant impacts if odors would cause injury, nuisance, or annoyance to a considerable number of persons or would endanger the comfort, health, and safety of the public.

D1(c) Cumulative Impacts

Any project that would individually have a significant air quality impact would also be considered to have a significant cumulative air quality impact. For a project that does not individually have a significant air quality impact, the BAAQMD requires that a determination of cumulative impacts be based on an evaluation of the consistency of the proposed project with the local general plan and of the general plan with the regional air quality plan. The appropriate regional air quality plan for this analysis is the 2000 CAP. If a project is proposed in a city or county with a general plan that is consistent with the CAP, and the project is consistent with that general plan, the project would not have a significant cumulative impact.

D2. Impacts of Project

The proposed project would result in the generation of both construction-related impacts during project development and operational impacts associated primarily with project-generated trips. Discussions of construction-related and operational impacts associated with ultimate development of the proposed project are presented below.

D2(a) Construction Emissions

During the construction phase of development of individual Facilities Master Plan projects, emissions would be generated by on-site stationary sources, heavy-duty construction vehicles, construction worker vehicles, and energy use. In addition to construction vehicle emissions, fugitive dust would also be generated during grading and construction activities. Dust is generated when grading equipment breaks down surface materials. The resulting dust, which includes PM_{10}, is subsequently entrained into the air by wind and vehicle tires. Although much of this airborne dust would settle out on, or near, the project site, smaller particles would remain in the atmosphere, increasing existing particulate levels within the surrounding area. Sensitive receptors in proximity to the site that could be affected by construction

would include users of Memorial Park, William Faria Elementary School, Church of the Latter-Day Saints, Saint Jude The Apostle Church, and Kingdom Hall of Jehovah Witnesses, and the occupants of single- and multi-family residences. Students and employees on the College campus could also be affected by construction of individual projects within other parts of the campus.

Although the project's construction-related emissions would be temporary in duration, in the absence of control measures, they could be substantial. In addition, during some phases of the Facilities Master Plan, several projects could be under construction simultaneously, thus contributing to increased or combined construction emissions. Although the College District intends to require dust controls as part of its construction contracts, currently, the District does not have a formal or standard dust control program. Without implementation of all feasible measures for dust control, impacts related to construction emissions would be considered significant. The BAAQMD CEQA *Guidelines* note that quantification of construction emissions is not necessary provided that all feasible dust control measures for construction are implemented as mitigation. Feasible dust control measures are discussed under "Mitigation Measures," later in this section.

The proposed Facilities Master Plan would involve the demolition of the Faculty House and renovation of most existing campus buildings. The Faculty House was on the campus property when it was purchased in 1939; until the 1970s, many types of materials used in homes and commercial buildings contained asbestos. If asbestos is found in the Faculty House or the buildings proposed for renovation, the District would implement standard State and Federal procedures for asbestos containment and worker safety. For this reason, no impacts are anticipated with respect to asbestos.

D2(b) Operational Emissions

(i) Daily Emissions

Operational emissions associated with the ultimate development and operation of the proposed Facilities Master Plan would result primarily in mobile sources from increased vehicular trips to and from the campus. Other sources of emissions would include area source emissions, such as the use of natural gas for water heaters and cooking appliances. According to the BAAQMD's *CEQA Guidelines*, area sources are sources that individually emit fairly small quantities of air pollutants, but which cumulatively may represent significant quantities of emissions. The predicted mobile source emissions associated with project operation have been calculated utilizing the URBEMIS7G computer model distributed for use by the ARB and recommended for use by the BAAQMD.

The average daily indirect emissions associated with the proposed project are presented in **Table 5.2-3, Estimated Operational Emissions**, for the year 2010.

Table 5.2-3
Estimated Operational Emissions

Indirect Emissions Source	Applicable Emissions in Pounds per Day ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}
Mobile Sources	130.17	68.04	51.33
Recommended Thresholds:	80.0	80.0	80.0
Exceeds Threshold?	**Yes**	No	No

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc. Based on emission factors for the year 2010. Emissions calculations are provided in Appendix 5.2. Units are pounds per day.

The average emissions presented in **Table 5.2-3** are compared with the BAAQMD's project-specific recommended thresholds of significance for the sources of pollutants. As shown, the calculations indicate that the proposed project would generate average daily direct and indirect emissions that would exceed the BAAQMD-recommended ROG threshold for individual projects.

The estimates of project-related emissions presented in **Table 5.2-3** do not reflect the use of transportation demand management (TDM) programs. De Anza College has worked with Altrans to develop a Commute Alternative Program for students, involving multiple elements. Initially, a Student Transportation Survey and Transportation Needs Analysis were conducted to determine current and potential transportation usage, cost justification, and programs that would be most successful at De Anza. Following the survey, six alternative transportation programs were identified for students including:

- a Direct Transit Route Marketing Program and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) Trip Planning;
- a VTA ECO Pass Program;
- a College Shuttle Bus System;
- an interactive Carpool and Bicycle Matchlist Program;
- a Bicycle Safety and Encouragement Program; and

- a Distance Learning and Tele-Commute Program.

The Needs Analysis determined that all of these alternative transportation services could be provided to De Anza students at an estimated cost of $10.00 per student, per quarter.

An Alternative Transportation Center has been established at De Anza College to provide outreach and personal trip planning services. The Center is staffed 30 hours a week by a Transportation Coordinator and is used as a base for personal trip planning sessions, classroom presentations, fairs, development of an information packet and other outreach materials. Altrans has a track record of a 10 to15 percent effectiveness rate of placing a commuter in an alternative transit mode.

The Direct Transit Route Marketing Program, GIS Trip Planning, Associated Outreach and Marketing Planning, and Transit Route Identification System (including GIS-layered public transit routes, and GIS mapping for students within one quarter mile from a direct transit route to campus) are already being implemented at De Anza. An outside consultant provides GIS mapping for the College students and staff. Research shows that the average commute to De Anza College is 11 miles. According to a student survey, transit usage for students living within one quarter mile of a direct transit route has increased 10 percent as a result of the Transit Route Marketing Program.

The Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) ECO Pass Program is also being considered by the College. This program consists of a pre-paid pass that allows students to use all transit routes including Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) para-transit. The program cannot be implemented until the student body votes in favor of covering the additional cost for the program.

The College is also looking into a Shuttle Bus Program, targeting five neighborhoods for four shuttle bus routes to transport students directly to the College. The service could transport approximately 1,000 students per day. A Park and Ride Program with unlimited ridership would also be implemented to link De Anza with other community colleges in the area in order to be more cost effective. The College is looking into options for short-term options for next year and trying to get funding for Winter 2003. The College is currently in the process of identifying travel routes that are used frequently.

Th College is also looking into a Vanpool Program that may be subsidized by the District. This program would primarily target College staff and may be implemented by as early as next year.

The Interactive Carpool Program is currently running on campus. The program relies on enrollment data to create a pre-matching system to generate carpool match lists (according to commute patterns) to

be sent to student commuters each quarter. "Carpool Application Form" information was entered into a Web-based carpool program that incorporates commute needs and driving patterns.

The Bicycle Safety and Encouragement Program (targeting students living within three to five miles of campus) maps bicycle routes; establishes riding groups; and includes a number of other elements, such as bike and pedestrian trails, "Bicycle Buddy Program," bicycle safety training classes and maintenance classes, bicycle corrals, bicycle tours and bike-to-school events, and discounts at local bike shops. This program is moving forward, with planning occurring on a regional basis. A $60,000 grant has been secured for a bike trail. Construction of a bike corral is scheduled to begin in Spring 2002.

A Tele-Commute Program and Distance Learning Classes have also been expanded as part of the regular instruction program. The College is increasing hybrid-distance learning and is working on accommodating staff tele-commuting.

In addition, the College is considering designated parking lots on campus for carpooling and other incentives to encourage carpooling.

The programs already in place (the Alternative Transportation Center and the Direct Transit Route Marketing and associated programs, and the Interactive Carpool Program) could result in a reduction of about 2.6 percent of existing and future project trips, or about 13 percent of the increase in trips (based on estimates from the BAAQMD). In addition, the College campus already includes some features that are considered to reduce trips (such as availability of sidewalks, access to transit stops, and bicycle parking). However, these reductions would not be large enough to reduce future emissions of ROG to below the Air District thresholds. Other programs are planned for implementation but have not been implemented at this time, and the District's ability to move forward with several programs is uncertain. For those reasons, the project's operational emissions of ROG are considered significant.

(ii) Local Carbon Monoxide Concentrations

As was done to assess the existing CO concentrations, the simplified CALINE4 procedure was used to assess project buildout (year 2010) CO concentrations 50, 100, and 300 feet from the previously identified roadway intersections and freeway segments. The calculations are based on traffic generated by approved projects and the proposed project, as shown in **Section 5.1, Transportation and Circulation**. The results of this modeling are shown in **Table 5.2-4, Predicted Project Carbon Monoxide Concentrations**. Project impacts would be considered significant if the addition of project-generated

traffic caused a CO standard to be exceeded or if there is any measurable increase in a standard that is already exceeded.

As shown, the simplified CALINE4 procedure predicts that CO concentrations at all of the study roadway intersections and the freeway segments along SR-85 and I-280 would not exceed the State 1-hour or 8-hour CO standards under project (year 2010) conditions. Based on this analysis, CO hot spots are not predicted to exist near these study intersections and freeway segments. Therefore, project impacts related to CO emissions along all study roadway intersections and freeway segments of SR-85 and I-280 would not be significant.

Table 5.2-4
Predicted Project Carbon Monoxide Concentrations

	50 Feet		100 Feet		300 Feet	
Intersection	**1-Hour[1]**	**8-Hour[2]**	**1-Hour[1]**	**8-Hour[2]**	**1-Hour[1]**	**8-Hour[2]**
Intersection						
Stevens Creek Boulevard/North De Anza Boulevard	9.6	6.5	9.4	6.3	9.1	6.1
Stevens Creek Blvd/North Stelling Road	9.4	6.3	9.2	6.2	9.0	6.0
Stevens Creek Boulevard/SR-85 Northbound Ramps	10.2	6.9	9.8	6.6	9.3	6.3
Stevens Creek Boulevard/Bubb Road	9.8	6.6	9.5	6.4	9.2	6.2
North Stelling Road/Homestead Road	9.2	6.2	9.1	6.1	8.9	6.0
McClellan Road/Bubb Road	9.5	6.4	9.3	6.3	9.0	6.1
McClellan Road/Rose Blossom Road	9.1	6.1	9.0	6.0	8.9	6.0
SR-85, between Sunnyvale/Saratoga Road and Stevens Creek Boulevard	9.7	6.6	9.5	6.4	9.1	6.1
SR 85, between I-280 and Homestead Road	10.0	6.8	9.7	6.5	9.2	6.2
SR 85, between Homestead Road and Fremont Road	10.2	6.9	9.8	6.6	9.2	6.2
SR 85, between Stevens Creek Boulevard and I-280	9.9	6.6	9.6	6.4	9.1	6.1
I-280, between DeAnza Blvd and SR-85	10.9	7.4	10.3	6.9	9.4	6.3
I-280, between SR-85 and Foothill Boulevard	10.3	7.0	9.9	6.7	9.3	6.2

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc. Emissions calculations are provided in Appendix 5.2.
[1]*State standard is 20.0 parts per million. Federal standard is 35 parts per million.*
[2]*State and Federal standard is 9.0 parts per million.*

Buildout of the Master Plan includes construction of a one-story parking deck, and expansion of the existing parking lots: the proposed parking deck would be constructed in the area of Parking Lot C, and

all existing lots would be redesigned and reconfigured. Parking garages tend to concentrate vehicle CO emissions in a small area and may cause CO hotspots during the peak hour. For example, turbulence created by vehicle motion and wind entering the garage could cause CO emissions generated by vehicles in the parking garage to emanate from the openings in the walls. Although the proposed parking deck is not enclosed, it has the potential to cause CO hotspots during the peak hour and has been evaluated for levels of CO emissions. The proposed parking deck has been conceptually planned and therefore, the specific design features, including the number of parking spaces, of the deck are not known at this time.

As proposed, the parking deck would be one story high, and there is a potential for additional parking deck(s) at some future time over Parking Lots A and B. The existing berms could be removed to provide additional parking spaces. As mentioned above, the number of parking spaces provided by the proposed individual parking improvement projects is not known; however, it is anticipated that the parking improvements would add approximately 400 to 500 parking spaces in the short term and an additional 600 to 800 parking spaces in the long term. The nearest sensitive receptors would be Memorial Park to the north, across Stevens Creek Boulevard; and churches, a school, and single and multi-family residential units to the east across Stelling Road.

The closest intersection to the proposed parking improvements is Stevens Creek Boulevard and North Stelling Road. As mentioned above, based on the simplified CALINE4 analysis, CO exceedances are not predicted to exist near this intersection. The peak-hour traffic volumes at this intersection are substantially higher than the peak period volumes that would occur within the parking deck. Given these reasons, impacts related to local CO emissions for the parking improvements would be less than significant.

(iii) Toxic Air Pollutants

Toxic air pollutants are not expected to occur in large amounts in conjunction with the operations of the proposed Facilities Master Plan. The risk of accidental release of toxic air pollutants is minimal and is limited to the standard activities of science experiments. These science experiments are currently, and would continue to be, conducted under the supervision of an instructor. Only common forms of hazardous or toxic substances typically used, stored, or sold in conjunction with maintenance activities would be present in small quantities for the other uses on the campus (e.g., pesticides or fertilizers used at the horticultural facilities). Most uses of substance would occur indoors. Therefore, no significant impacts associated with toxic air pollutants would occur.

As mentioned previously, existing off-site sources of toxics, Dryclean Pro, Hanson Permanente Cement, and Stevens Creek Quarry, are located in the vicinity of the campus. However, the project site is and would continue to be buffered from these sources by existing roadways, landscaped areas and commercial structures. The dry cleaner, cement company, and quarry would continue to be required to comply with all permitting and reporting requirements per the State and Federal TAC legislation. Given these reasons, no impacts to new project students, faculty or staff related to off-site toxics would result.

E. MITIGATION MEASURES

E1. Measures Proposed as Part of the Project

No measures are included in the project that would reduce air quality impacts.

E2. Measures Identified in this EIR

E2(a) Construction Dust

1. In accordance with the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*, the College would require all construction contractors working on new construction projects for the Facilities Master Plan to implement a dust control plan. The dust control plan would include the following measures from Table 2 of the BAAQMD *CEQA Guidelines* as applicable and feasible and consistent with College Best Management Practices, in efforts to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. The program would be applied to all construction activities involving grading, excavation, use of unpaved areas for staging, extensive hauling of materials, or building demolition.

   Basic Control Measures (for all construction sites)

   - If necessary, water all active construction areas at least twice daily (with recycled water, if possible).
   - Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials.
   - Apply water two times daily to all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.
   - Sweep daily all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.

- Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

Enhanced Control Measures (for individual or combined construction sites of larger than four acres)

- Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- The College already enforces a traffic speed limit of 15 miles per hour; this limit would be consistent with the recommended measure in Table 2.
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

Optional Measures (to be implemented at the discretion of the District)

- Wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site.
- Install wind breaks, where necessary, at the windward side(s) of construction areas.
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when sustained winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

E2(b) Operational Emissions

2. The College would continue to implement its Commute Alternative Program, to the extent feasible (and consistent with State law), in order to reduce operational emissions related to vehicles traveling to and from the College. The individual program components are listed below with estimates of effectiveness, based on Altrans or the BAAQMD. (The estimates of effectiveness are noted following each measure.

   a. The Direct Transit Route Marketing Program and GIS Trip Planning (already being implemented) (0.5 to 2 percent trips);

   b. The VTA ECO Pass Program(estimated trip reduction has not been calculated);

   c. The College Shuttle Bus System (1,000 students per day, about 3 percent of total future student trips or about 17 percent of the increase in student trips);

d. Interactive Carpool Program (already being implemented) (1 to 4 percent trips);

e. The Bicycle Safety and Encouragement Program (0.5 to 2 percent trips); and

f. The Distance Learning and Tele-Commute Program (0.5 to 1.5 percent trips).

3. The College would monitor the effectiveness of the Commute Alternative Program at reducing student and employee trips. The monitoring activities would establish a baseline (pre-program level) for student and employee trips and trip characteristics, and would provide a quantitative measurement of future student and employee trips on at least a yearly basis. The monitoring activities may include, but would not be limited to, regular surveys and the use of trip counters at College entrances. If the measures are found to not be effective (that is, if they do not meet at least the minimum level of trip reduction estimated), the College would consider and implement corrective actions (to the extent feasible and consistent with State law).

4. The College would coordinate with the City to consider joint development of the area near Stevens Creek Boulevard and Stelling Road, in uses designed to reduce vehicle trips. Such uses could result in other environmental impacts, depending on the location and characteristics of the use. The impacts cannot be determined at this time, and would need to be addressed in a separate environmental review under CEQA. Also, it is not known to what extent the City is willing to participate in this measure.

Parking fees for single-occupancy vehicle commuters and parking cash-out programs, two measures recommended by the BAAQMD, are not identified as mitigation because they are not feasible for community colleges under State law.

In addition to the measures identified above, the College would implement the following to minimize emissions related to parking lots and garages:

5. The College would not expand its parking supply without the implementation of all feasible transportation demand management measures (see above) and an assessment of parking demand.

F. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

For purposes of this section, cumulative impacts include the impacts of buildout of the Facilities Master Plan, together with the impacts of pending projects (as defined by the City of Cupertino), plus a growth

factor applied to traffic in the area. The assumptions behind the cumulative analysis are discussed in **Section 5.1, Transportation and Circulation**.

According to the BAAQMD *CEQA Guidelines*, any proposed project that would individually have a significant air quality impact would also be considered to have a significant cumulative air quality impact. The proposed project, as identified in this EIR, would exceed the threshold of significance for the project's operational emissions of ROG. Therefore, the project's contribution toward cumulative impacts related to operational emissions would also be significant.

In order to determine whether the project would contribute toward a significant cumulative impact related to localized CO concentrations, the simplified CALINE4 procedure was used to assess project and cumulative (year 2010) traffic at Master Plan buildout, as shown in **Table 5.2-5, Predicted Cumulative Carbon Monoxide Concentrations**.

As shown, the simplified CALINE4 procedure predicts that, under cumulative conditions (which includes Master Plan buildout), CO concentrations at the study intersections and on the study freeway segments would not exceed the State 1-hour or 8-hour CO standards. Although traffic levels increase under the cumulative scenario, ambient concentrations of CO are expected to decline on average in future years; according to the BAAQMD *CEQA Guidelines*, this decline occurs because emission controls on new vehicles are expected to reduce CO emission rates faster than vehicle travel increases. Based on this analysis, CO hot spots are not predicted to exist near these intersections or freeway segments, and Master Plan buildout and cumulative CO impacts would not be significant.

Table 5.2-5
Predicted Cumulative Carbon Monoxide Concentrations

	50 Feet		100 Feet		300 Feet	
Intersection	**1-Hour[1]**	**8-Hour[2]**	**1-Hour[1]**	**8-Hour[2]**	**1-Hour[1]**	**8-Hour[2]**
Intersection						
Stevens Creek Boulevard/North De Anza Boulevard	9.7	6.6	9.5	6.4	9.2	6.2
Stevens Creek Boulevard/North Stelling Road	9.4	6.4	9.3	6.2	9.0	6.1
Stevens Creek Boulevard/SR-85 Northbound Ramps	10.3	7.0	9.9	6.7	9.3	6.3
Stevens Creek Boulevard/Bubb Road	10.0	6.7	9.6	6.5	9.2	6.2
North Stelling Road/Homestead Road	9.3	6.2	9.2	6.2	9.0	6.0
McClellan Road/Bubb Road	9.6	6.5	9.4	6.3	9.1	6.1
McClellan Road/Rose Blossom Road	9.1	6.1	9.0	6.1	8.9	6.0

Freeway Segments[3]						
SR-85, between Sunnyvale/Saratoga Road and Stevens Creek Boulevard	9.9	6.6	9.5	6.4	9.1	6.1
SR 85, between I-280 and Homestead Road	10.2	6.9	9.8	6.6	9.2	6.2
SR 85, between Homestead Road and Fremont Road	10.4	7.0	9.9	6.7	9.3	6.2
SR 85, between Stevens Creek Boulevard and I-280	10.0	6.8	9.7	6.5	9.2	6.2
I-280, between DeAnza Blvd and SR-85	11.2	7.6	10.5	7.1	9.5	6.4
I-280, between SR-85 and Foothill Boulevard	10.5	7.1	10.0	6.8	9.4	6.3

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc. Emissions calculations are provided in Appendix 5.2.

[1]*State standard is 20.0 parts per million. Federal standard is 35 parts per million.*

[2]*State and Federal standard is 9.0 parts per million.*

[3] Cumulative traffic volumes for the freeway segments were not available. A 15 percent increase to project-specific traffic volumes was used, and represents a conservative estimate of CO emissions. According to the Transportation Study, a growth rate of 1.2 percent per year is expected in the vicinity of the project area in addition to planned projects for the next nine years (2010).

As a separate project, the VTA will be building a new bus transit center in order to consolidate the various existing bus stops located around the perimeter of the campus. The new transit center will be designed to accommodate up to eight transit buses simultaneously and to function as a major gateway to the College. Bus stops along Stevens Creek Boulevard, Stelling Road, and McClellan Road will no longer be used once the transit center is in operation. The center will be located within the campus just west of Stelling Road, between Parking Lots B and C. VTA will start construction on the center in spring 2003, with opening planned for fall 2003. The center will accommodate five bus lines, and it is estimated that there would be 385 one-way bus trips per day through the center.

The transit center is not part of the Facilities Master Plan, and VTA found the transit center to be exempt from detailed CEQA review. The Facilities Master Plan would generate traffic that, together with the bus trips using the transit center, could contribute to air quality impacts at the intersection of Stelling Road and the College entrance. Therefore, an analysis of cumulative CO concentrations at the intersection was conducted, with the bus trips added to the cumulative totals. In the calculation, the conservative assumption was used that all of the daily bus trips would occur during the peak hour. The results showed that CO concentrations at the intersection segments would not exceed the State 1-hour or 8-hour CO standards. (The backup calculations are included in **Appendix 5.2**.) Therefore, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

The project would not result in any odors, toxics, or accidental release impacts, and thus would not contribute toward any cumulative impacts related to odors, toxics, or accidental releases.

G. CUMULATIVE MITIGATION MEASURES

Implementation of the measures previously specified to address operational emissions impacts would also serve to reduce the cumulative impacts related to vehicle-related emissions.

H. LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of the measures identified in this EIR (and recommended by the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines)* would reduce construction-related impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of all of the features of the College Commute Alternative Program would reduce operational emissions (that is, the increase in emissions over existing levels) by up to 81 percent at the high end of the effectiveness range provided. The potential effectiveness at reducing the impact is substantial because the measures would apply to existing as well as future trips. Assuming all of the measures implemented are maximally effective at reducing emissions, operational-related impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

There is no guarantee that the implementation of these measures would reduce the emissions to the maximum degree estimated.[2] Implementation of all of the features of the College Commute Alternative Program would reduce operational emissions by approximately 44 percent at the low end of the effectiveness range provided. If all of the measures are implemented, even at their minimum effectiveness, operational-related impacts would still be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

There is also no guarantee that the implementation of all of the measures would be feasible. For example, the ECO pass program requires a student vote; in addition, College staff have indicated that the shuttle program would probably not be implemented on an ongoing basis.[3] Without a shuttle program, the measures (at their minimum effectiveness) would reduce operational emissions by approximately 27 percent. Estimated emissions of ROG would still exceed the BAAQMD-recommended threshold by about 15 pounds per day, but the exceedance (compared to conditions without mitigation) would be reduced by about 70 percent. This reduction would be considered a substantial lessening of the impact, and therefore adequate mitigation, per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15092.

---

2 According to the BAAQMD *CEQA Guidelines*, the lower end of the range should be used unless local conditions warrant a higher figure; the list of supporting factors in Table 15 of the *Guidelines* should be consulted to see if a higher figure is justified.

3 Brandy, Mike, Foothill College, personal communication, March 15, 2002.

A. SUMMARY

The existing noise environment on the De Anza College site is typical of a college campus. Buildout of the proposed Facilities Master Plan would generate short-term construction noise that could affect campus facilities, nearby residences, churches, and a school; this would be a significant impact. Implementation of measures identified in this EIR would reduce impacts related to short-term construction noise to a less-than-significant level. On-site noise levels from project and cumulative traffic would not expose any new academic buildings 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 area roadways; therefore, impacts related to off-site noise would be less than significant. Increased activity on the campus associated with Facilities Master Plan buildout (e.g., more students talking, cars parking, increased use of athletic facilities) would result in noise of similar type and magnitude to existing noise, and would not result in any significant impacts to on-or off-site users.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS

B1. Introduction to Noise

Noise is usually defined as unwanted sound. It is an undesirable by-product of society's normal day-to-day activities. Sound becomes unwanted when it interferes with normal activities, when it causes actual physical harm, or when it has adverse effects on health. The definition of noise as unwanted sound implies that it has an adverse effect on people and their environment.

Noise is measured on a logarithmic scale of sound pressure level known as a decibel (dB). The human ear does not respond uniformly to sounds at all frequencies, being less sensitive to low and high frequencies than to medium frequencies, which correspond with human speech. In response to this, the A-weighted noise level (or scale) has been developed. It corresponds better with people's subjective judgment of sound levels. This A-weighted sound level is called the "noise level" referenced in units of dB(A). Since noise is measured on a logarithmic scale, a doubling of sound energy results in a three-dB(A) increase in noise levels. However, changes in a community noise level of less than three dB(A) are not typically noticed by the human ear.[1] Changes from three to five dB(A) may be noticed by some

1 *Highway Noise Fundamentals* (Springfield, Virginia: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, September 1980), p. 81.

individuals who are extremely sensitive to changes in noise. A 5.0-dB(A) increase is readily noticeable, and the human ear perceives a 10 dB(A) increase in sound level to be a doubling of sound.

Noise sources occur in two forms: (1) point sources, such as stationary equipment, loudspeakers, or individual motor vehicles; and (2) line sources, such as a roadway with a large number of point sources (motor vehicles). Sound generated by a point source typically diminishes (attenuates) at a rate of 6.0 dB(A) for each doubling of distance from the source to the receptor at acoustically "hard" sites and 7.5 dB(A) at acoustically "soft" sites.[2] For example, a 60-dB(A) noise level measured at 50 feet from a point source at an acoustically hard site would be 54 dB(A) at 100 feet from the source and 48 dB(A) at 200 feet from the source. Sound generated by a line source typically attenuates at a rate of 3.0 dB(A) and 4.5 dB(A) per doubling of distance from the source to the receptor for hard and soft sites, respectively.[3] Sound levels can also be attenuated by man-made or natural barriers, as illustrated in **Figure 5.3-1, Noise Attenuation by Barriers**.

Solid walls, berms, or elevation differences typically reduce noise levels by 5.0 to 10.0 dB(A).[4] Sound levels for a source may also be attenuated 3.0 to 5.0 dB(A) by a first row of houses and 1.5 dB(A) for each additional row of houses.[5] The noise attenuation provided by typical structures in California is provided in **Table 5.3-1, Typical Outside to Inside Noise Attenuation for Structures in California**.

When assessing community reaction to noise, there is an obvious need for a scale that averages varying noise exposure over time and quantifies the result in terms of a single number descriptor. Several scales have been developed that address community noise levels. Those that are applicable to this analysis are the Equivalent Noise Level (L_{eq}) and the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). L_{eq} is the average A-weighted sound level measured over a given time interval. L_{eq} can be measured over any time period, but is typically measured for 1-minute, 15-minute, 1-hour, or 24-hour periods. CNEL is another average A-weighted sound level measured over a 24-hour time period. However, this noise scale is adjusted to account for some individuals' increased sensitivity to noise levels during nighttime hours. A CNEL noise measurement is obtained after adding five decibels to sound levels occurring during

---

2 *Highway Noise Fundamentals*, p. 97. A "hard" or reflective site does not provide any excess ground-effect attenuation and is characteristic of asphalt, concrete, and very hard packed soils. An acoustically "soft" or absorptive site is characteristic of normal earth and most ground with vegetation.

3 Ibid., p. 97.

4 *Highway Noise Mitigation* (Springfield, Virginia: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, September 1980), p. 18.

5 T. M. Barry and J. A. Reagan, *FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Research, Office of Environmental Policy, December 1978), NTIS, FHWA-RD-77-108, p. 33.

FIGURE 5.3-1. NOISE ATTENUATION BY BARRIERS.

BACK OF PAGE

the evening from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., and ten decibels to sound levels occurring during the nighttime from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. For example, the logarithmic effect of these additions is that a 60 dB(A) 24-hour L_{eq} would result in a measurement of 66.7 dB(A) CNEL.

Table 5.3-1
Typical Outside to Inside Noise Attenuation for Structures in California

Building Type	Noise Reduction - dB(A) Open Windows	Noise Reduction - dB(A) Closed Windows
Residences	17	25
Schools	17	25
Churches	20	30
Hospitals/Convalescent Homes	17	25
Offices	17	25
Theaters	20	30
Hotels/Motels	17	25

Source: Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Highway Noise: A Design Guide for Highway Engineers, National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 117.

B2. Noise Analysis Methodology

The analysis of the existing and future noise environments presented in this EIR section is based on technical reports, noise level monitoring, and noise prediction modeling. Existing on-site noise levels were monitored by Impact Sciences, Inc. using a Brüel & Kjær model 2237 sound level meter. Future noise levels for some stationary activities and equipment were estimated based on available technical reports and literature, which are cited in this EIR section.

Noise modeling procedures involved the calculation of existing and future vehicular noise levels along individual roadway segments in the vicinity of the College campus. This task was accomplished using the Federal Highway Administration Highway Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108). The model calculates the average noise level at specific locations based on traffic volumes, average speeds, roadway geometry, and site environmental conditions. The average vehicle noise rates (energy rates) utilized in the FHWA Model have been modified to reflect average vehicle noise rates identified for California by

Caltrans.[6] The Caltrans data show that California automobile noise is 0.8 to 1.0 dB(A) higher than national levels and that medium and heavy truck noise is 0.3 to 3.0 dB(A) lower than national levels.[7] Traffic volumes utilized as data inputs into the noise prediction model were provided by DKS Associates and are consistent with the traffic and circulation analysis provided in **Section 5.1**, **Transportation and Circulation** of this EIR. The analysis in this section addresses the existing and future noise environments on and off the De Anza College campus.

B2(a) On-Site Methodology

The primary concern regarding on-site noise is the potential for proposed on-site land uses to be exposed to noise levels that exceed adopted or recommended thresholds (discussed later in this EIR section). In essence, the analysis of on-site noise levels assesses the compatibility of proposed on-site land uses with proposed on-site activities, adjacent off-site land uses and activities, and with roadway traffic noise that would occur proximal to the site.

B2(b) Off-Site Methodology

The assessment of off-site noise levels focuses on how on-site activities and increased traffic levels would affect existing land uses adjacent to, or near, the project site. This section specifically focuses on impacts to existing noise-sensitive uses, or those uses that would be most sensitive to an increase in noise levels. These uses are discussed later in this EIR section. Noise levels were modeled with and without project traffic to determine those locations at which the project (via increased traffic) may have an impact on existing noise sensitive uses.

B3. Plans and Policies for Noise Control

Plans and policies that pertain to the noise conditions affecting and affected by the proposed project include (1) the State of California, Department of Health Services, Environmental Health Division *Guidelines for Noise and Land Use Compatibility*, and (2) the City of Cupertino *General Plan*.

B3(a) California Department of Health Services

The State of California, Department of Health Services, Environmental Health Division published recommended guidelines for mobile source noise and land use compatibility in February 1976. These

---

6 Rudolf W. Hendriks, *California Vehicle Noise Emission Levels* (Sacramento, California: California Department of Transportation, January 1987), NTIS, FHWA/CA/TL-87/03.

guidelines are illustrated in **Figure 5.3-2, State Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Noise**. As shown, 60 dB(A) CNEL is the acceptable exterior noise level for single family, duplex, and mobile homes involving normal, conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements (normally acceptable noise levels). Exterior noise levels of up to 65 dB(A) CNEL are typically considered acceptable for multi-family units without any special noise insulation requirements. For noise-sensitive uses such as schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, day care centers, and nursing homes of conventional construction, an exterior noise level of 70 dB(A) CNEL is considered acceptable by the State.

Above the identified thresholds, exterior noise levels are typically considered acceptable only if the buildings are conditioned to include noise insulation features (conditionally acceptable noise levels). Conventional construction of the buildings with the inclusion of fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally ensure that interior noise levels are acceptable (reference **Table 5.3-1** for noise reduction provided by conventional construction techniques). However, detailed acoustical analyses must be conducted to identify all needed noise insulation features and confirm their effectiveness.

B3(b) The City of Cupertino General Plan

The California Government Code requires that a noise element be included in the general plan of each county and city in the State. Each local government's goals, objectives, and policies for noise control are established by the noise element of the general plan and the passage of specific noise ordinances. De Anza College is not within the jurisdiction of the City of Cupertino, and is therefore not subject to the noise compatibility guidelines of the City of Cupertino *General Plan*. The City's noise guidelines are discussed in this EIR section because the proposed Facilities Master Plan activities at the College could affect off-site uses that are located within the City's jurisdiction.

The City of Cupertino utilizes the State general noise guidelines; see **Figure 5.3-2.** Consistent with the State guidelines, the Public Health and Safety Element of the Cupertino *General Plan* specifies 60 dB(A) CNEL as the acceptable exterior noise level for single-family, duplex, and mobile homes, 65 dB(A) CNEL as the acceptable exterior noise level for multi-family units, and 70dB(A) CNEL as the acceptable exterior noise level for schools, parks and churches.

Policy 6-24 of the *General Plan* states that the City shall use the noise contours and noise guidelines from the *General Plan* and the City Municipal Code to evaluate land use decisions.

---

7 Ibid.

B3(c) The City of Cupertino Municipal Code

Section 10.48.040 of the Municipal Code limits the noise levels produced by stationary noise sources. Noise sources may not produce a daytime noise level exceeding 60 dB(A) CNEL on property zoned for residential uses, and 65 dB(A) CNEL on property zoned for nonresidential uses. In addition, the Cupertino Municipal Code specifies that the maximum permitted nighttime exterior noise level exposure for a single-family residential area is 50 dB(A), CNEL.[8]

Section 10.48.053 places limits on grading, construction and demolition activities. Grading, street construction, and underground utility work within 750 feet of a residential area are prohibited on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays and during the nighttime. During the daytime, the noise produced by construction-related activities may exceed the noise limits (in Section 10.48.040) if the equipment used has "high-quality noise muffler and abatement devices installed and in good condition," and if (1) no individual device produces a noise level of more than 87 dB(A) at a distance of 25 feet, or (2) the noise level on any nearby property does not exceed 80 dB(A).

B4. Existing Noise Environment

B4(a) On-Campus Noise Levels

Campus facilities currently include (among others) academic and administrative buildings, a library, campus center, child development center, athletic fields, and associated parking lots. Principal vehicular traffic routes near the campus include Stevens Creek Boulevard, Stelling Road, McClellan Road, and State Route (SR) 85, and vehicles are considered to be the dominant source of noise on, and in the vicinity of, the campus. The parking lots located throughout the campus and the Flint Center Parking Structure are the dominant point (stationary) sources of noise. Other sources of noise heard on the campus generally include normal student and staff activities.

Existing average noise contours prepared by Impact Sciences for the sections of roadways adjacent to the campus indicate that the 70 dB(A) CNEL contour is approximately 47 feet from the centerline of Stevens Creek Boulevard, 26 feet from the centerline of Stelling Road, and 21 feet from the centerline of McClellan Road. Based on these contours, no existing buildings or athletic facilities are exposed to noise levels above 70 dB(A).

---

8 Cupertino General Plan EIR, p. 6-7.

Figure 5.3-2, State Noise Compatibility Guidelines

BACK OF PAGE

Point sources of noise are generated by on-campus student and staff activities. Typical noise levels heard on the site are relatively low and consist of sources such as people talking, doors slamming, landscaping equipment operation, car/personal stereos, occasional auto alarms, etc.

Athletic facilities in the southern part of the campus are used by students and community members for team practices and recreational activities. Recreational facilities include the baseball field, softball/soccer field, football/track field, tennis courts, and swimming pool. Noise is generally limited to people talking and coaches' whistles and instructions.

Existing noise levels were monitored at six locations on the campus by Impact Sciences, Inc. on February 26, 2001. These locations are identified along with the average noise levels monitored at each location in **Figure 5.3-3, Noise Monitoring Locations**. On-site noise levels are characteristic of a campus environment. Average noise levels measured were as follows:

Location ID	Location	Noise Level (dB(A))
A	Parking Lot B	55.3
B	Campus Center	50.9
C	East of Reprographics	56.3
D	Parking Lot E	56.2
E	Tennis Courts	56.1

The dominant sources of noise heard during the noise monitoring included vehicles in parking areas, people talking, cellular phones, and maintenance equipment.

B4(b) Off-Campus Noise Levels

Vehicular traffic is the dominant source of noise affecting all noise-sensitive locations in the immediate vicinity of the campus. Project traffic would primarily affect land uses adjacent to Stevens Creek Boulevard, Stelling Road, and McClellan Road. Noise-sensitive receptors in proximity to these roadways include single- and multi-family residential units, Memorial Park, William Faria Elementary School, Church of the Latter-Day Saints, Saint Jude the Apostle Church, and Kingdom Hall of Jehovah Witnesses Church. Vehicular traffic noise levels were calculated in order to characterize the existing ambient noise environment at these locations. The calculated existing average noise levels are shown in **Table 5.3-2, Existing Exterior Off-Site Roadway Noise Levels at Noise-Sensitive Locations**. The noise levels shown for these locations are calculated for the nearest existing building to the center of the roadway.

Correspondingly, homes and structures located farther from these roadways would be exposed to lower noise levels.

Table 5.3-2
Existing Exterior Off-Site Roadway Noise Levels at Noise-Sensitive Locations

Roadway Segment	Noise-Sensitive Land Uses	dB(A) CNEL
Stevens Creek Boulevard		
• between Anton Way and May Avenue	Memorial Park	69.5
Stelling Road		
• between Pepper Tree Lane and Stevens Creek Boulevard	William Faria School	65.0
• between Pepper Tree Lane and Fairwoods Court	Church of the Latter-day Saints	63.9
• between Pepper Tree Land and McClellan Road	Single-family residences	64.7
McClellan Road		
• intersection of McClellan Road and Stelling Road	Saint Jude the Apostle Church	63.5
• between Hoo-Shang Court and Rose Blossom Drive	Kingdom Hall of Jehovah Witnesses	64.0
• between Hoo-Shang Court and Stelling Road	Single/multi-family residences	64.5

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc. Calculations are provided in Appendix 5.3. Noise levels are calculated for the nearest edge of the nearest existing building to the center of roadway.

As shown, based on noise modeling, the existing exterior noise levels at the nearby single-family residences exceed the City's daytime exterior noise standard (from the Municipal Code) of 60 dB(A), and the exterior noise threshold (from the *General Plan*) of 60 dB(A) CNEL. The existing noise levels at Memorial Park are close to the City's exterior noise threshold of 70 dB(A) CNEL. The exterior noise levels at the churches and school are within both the "normally acceptable" and "conditionally acceptable" land use compatibility ranges in the *General Plan*.

As noted above, these noise levels are based on the edge of the nearest existing building to the center of the roadway. These calculations do not account for any attenuation from barriers (i.e., walls or fences), or topography. Due to the variations in setbacks and designs for many of the buildings along project area roadways, this analysis does not attempt to precisely determine the ambient noise level at each noise-sensitive use. Rather, the noise levels noted above are intended to serve as a baseline to which the increase in noise from project traffic can be compared.

Figure 5.3-4, Noise Monitoring Locations

BACK OF PAGE

The single-family residences along McClellan Road face the street, and the single-family residences along Stelling Road are perpendicular to the street; therefore, the noise levels shown in **Table 5.3-2** reflect conditions in the front or side yards of these sensitive receptors. Attenuation from a solid barrier such as a building, wall or fence would be expected to reduce exterior noise levels by 5 to 10 dB(A). Given these factors, the noise levels obtained from the modeling probably overstate the actual ambient noise level within the primary outdoor use areas of the noise-sensitive uses.

C. PROJECT IMPACTS

C1. Significance Threshold Criteria

In order to assist in determining whether a project will have a significant effect on the environment, the CEQA *Guidelines* identify criteria that may be deemed to constitute a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in physical conditions. Specifically, Appendix G of the *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form) lists the following as criteria for determining that a project may have a significant impact:

- 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;
- Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels;
- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; or
- A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

The CEQA *Guidelines* do not define what a substantial increase in ambient noise is. Furthermore, the CEQA *Guidelines* do not provide an impact threshold for potential noise impacts. As such, the following thresholds of significance were developed for this noise analysis, based on the plans and policies discussed previously in this EIR section. These thresholds apply to both the project and cumulative impacts.

C1(a) On-Site Thresholds

According to the City of Cupertino *General Plan* and the State Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Noise (discussed above), school uses are "normally acceptable" with exterior noise levels up to 70 dB(A) CNEL. Given this, for purposes of this EIR, the project would result in a significant noise impact if on-site exterior locations around new campus academic buildings would be exposed to noise levels above 70 dB(A) CNEL.

C1(b) Off-Site Thresholds

Off-site noise thresholds consider the City's noise compatibility objectives, the State Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Noise (see **Figure 5.3-2**), and community response to changes in noise levels. As noted earlier, although the College itself is not within the jurisdiction of the City of Cupertino, the land uses surrounding the College are within the City's jurisdiction. As such, the City's noise compatibility guidelines are being utilized to evaluate impacts to off-site noise-sensitive uses, which include a park, a school, churches, and single and multi-family residences. The City *General Plan* considers 60 dB(A) CNEL to be the maximum acceptable exterior noise level for residential uses, and 70 dB(A) CNEL to be the maximum acceptable exterior noise level for schools, churches, and parks. Changes in a noise level of less than three dB(A) are typically not noticed by the human ear. Changes from three to five dB(A) may be noticed by some individuals who are extremely sensitive to changes in noise. A five dB(A) increase is readily noticeable. Based on this information, the following thresholds have been established for this analysis:

- An increase of five dB(A) or greater in noise level that occurs from project-related activities would be considered significant.
- An increase of three dB(A) or greater in noise level that occurs from project-related activities would be significant if the resulting noise levels exceed the City's exterior noise compatibility guidelines (as outlined in the *General Plan*) at noise-sensitive locations.
- An increase of less than three dB(A) in noise level that occurs from project-related activities would not be significant.

C2. Construction Noise Impacts

Development of individual Facilities Master Plan projects would require site preparation (i.e., grading) and construction (i.e., infrastructure, buildings and cleanup) of the proposed facilities and structures.

These activities typically involve the use of heavy equipment such as tractors, loaders, and concrete mixers. Trucks would be used to deliver equipment and building materials, and to haul away waste materials. Smaller equipment such as jackhammers, pneumatic tools, saws, and hammers would also be used throughout the project site(s) during the construction phases for individual projects. This equipment would generate both steady state and episodic noise that would be heard both on and off the project site(s). The use of pile driving is not proposed.[9]

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has compiled data regarding the noise-generating characteristics of specific types of construction equipment. These data are presented in **Figure 5.3-4, Noise Levels of Typical Construction Equipment**. As shown, noise levels generated by heavy equipment can range from approximately 68 dB(A) to noise levels in excess of 95 dB(A) when measured at 50 feet. However, these noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately six dB(A) per doubling of distance.

Noise levels generated during the construction phases would primarily affect existing uses on the campus and off-campus residences, Memorial Park, William Faria School, the Church of the Latter-Day Saints, Saint Jude the Apostle Church, and the Kingdom Hall of Jehovah Witnesses Church. Grading and construction activities, which involve the use of backhoes, tractors, scrapers, graders, and trucks, would be carried out at various locations throughout the campus. These activities could affect students, faculty, or staff utilizing classrooms, campus facilities (e.g., library), or administrative offices.

Proposed development activities would be distributed around the campus. Single-family residences, William Faria School, and the Church of the Latter-Day Saints are located on the east side of Stelling Road (the closest of these sensitive receptors is approximately 200 feet from the closest areas on campus where construction is proposed). Single/multi-family residences and the Kingdom Hall of Jehovah Witness Church are located on the south side of McClellan Road (the closest of these sensitive receptors is approximately 200 feet from the closest areas on campus where construction is proposed). Memorial Park is located on the north side of Stevens Creek Boulevard (approximately 400 feet from the closest areas on campus where construction is proposed). Due to the distance of sensitive receptors from proposed construction, and the noise attenuation provided by campus structures and the tree buffer, most construction noise would be masked by existing traffic. In addition, the proposed Future Facility, the Plant Services Maintenance Facility, the Science Center, and the E-1 expansion would be constructed on the west side of campus (in proximity to SR 85) and would not expose sensitive receptors to construction noise.

---

9 Farnham, Jennifer, Gilbane Building Company, Project Manager, personal communication, January 29, 2001.

The single-family residences closest to the campus could be exposed to construction-related exterior noise levels of up to 83 dB(A). In general, construction noise is typically of limited duration and restricted to daytime hours, and most residents would not be expected to be at home. In addition, the actual noise levels heard would depend on the distance between the noise source and receptor(s) and the type and number of pieces of equipment used (among other factors), and would usually be lower than 83 dB(A). However, the noise levels from construction could occasionally exceed the 80-dB(A) limit established by the Cupertino Municipal Code. For that reason, the impact to single-family residences would be significant without mitigation.

The College would be in session during the daytime, and construction could occur directly adjacent to classrooms, administrative offices, or other campus facilities. Similarly, it is possible that services or other activities could take place at the churches near the campus during the day while construction activities are occurring nearby. Construction noise levels of 95 dB(A) could expose churches within 800 feet of construction sites to unattenuated noise levels of 71 dB (A) or more, which exceeds the City's 70 dB(A) threshold. The actual noise levels heard would depend on the distance between the noise source and receptor(s) and the type and number of pieces of equipment used (among other factors), and would usually be lower than noted herein. In the absence of mitigation, however, construction noise impacts to uses within the campus and to churches within 800 feet of the campus could be potentially significant.

C3. Operational Noise Impacts

Noise impacts would result from increased use of the campus following Facilities Master Plan buildout. These impacts would primarily result from project-generated vehicular traffic and the increased student and community use of the campus. Each of these potential noise impacts is discussed separately below.

C3(a) Traffic Noise

As stated in the Traffic and Circulation section of this EIR, the proposed Facilities Master Plan is expected to generate approximately 3,393 vehicle trips per day when completed and fully operational.

(i) On-Campus Noise

The future noise levels on the campus at Facilities Master Plan buildout are identified in **Table 5.3-3, Predicted Future On-Campus Noise Levels**.

As shown in **Table 5.3-3**, the 70 dB(A) CNEL contour would be located approximately 52 feet from the centerline of Stevens Creek Boulevard, 30 feet from the centerline of Stelling Road, and 22 feet from the

centerline of McClellan Road. No new buildings are proposed within these noise contours. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Figure 5.3-4, Noise Levels of Typical Construction Equipment

BACK OF PAGE

Table 5.3-3
Predicted Future On-Campus Noise Levels

Roadway • Segment	Distance from Center of Roadway Noise Contour[1] 75 CNEL	70 CNEL	65 CNEL	60 CNEL
Stevens Creek Boulevard				
• State Route 85 to Stelling Road	-	52	137	425
Stelling Road				
• Stevens Creek Boulevard to McClellan Road	-	30	77	240
McClellan Road				
• State Route 85 to Stelling Road	-	22	42	120

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc. Calculations are provided in Appendix 5.3. Calculations are based on the original Facilities Master Plan forecast of 32,000 students. The actual distances to the noise contours would be greater than presented in this table.
[1]"-" = L_{dn} *noise contour is located within the roadway lanes or within 25 feet of the roadway centerline.*

(ii) Off-Campus Noise

The project's effects on off-campus noise levels are assessed using a methodology similar to that used in **Section 5.1, Transportation and Circulation**, in which the analysis is based on the difference between the existing traffic volumes and the existing plus (approved projects and) project traffic volumes. The noise levels that would be generated by these traffic volumes at various off-campus noise-sensitive locations are identified in **Table 5.3-4, Predicted Future Exterior Off-Campus Roadway Noise Levels at Noise-Sensitive Locations**.

As shown in **Table 5.3-4**, the noise levels at off-campus sensitive receptors would not increase by more than 0.3 dB(A). Changes in a noise level of less than 3 dB(A) are typically not noticed by the human ear. Therefore, project-generated traffic would not cause a significant noise impact.

Table 5.3-4
Predicted Future Exterior Off-Campus Roadway Noise Levels at Noise-Sensitive Locations

Roadway • Segment	Noise-Sensitive Land Uses	Exist. Noise	Future Noise	Increase	Impact
Stevens Creek Boulevard					
• between Anton Way and May Avenue	Memorial Park	69.5	69.7	0.2	not significant
Stelling Road					
• between Pepper Tree Lane and Stevens Creek Boulevard	William Faria School	65.0	65.1	0.1	not significant
• between Pepper Tree Lane and Fairwoods Court	Church of the Latter-day Saints	63.9	63.9	0.0	not significant
• between Pepper Tree Lane and McClellan Road	Single-family residents	64.7	64.7	0.0	not significant
McClellan Road					
• intersection of McClellan Road and Stelling Road	Saint Jude the Apostle Church	63.5	63.8	0.3	not significant
• between Hoo-Shang Court and Rose Blossom Drive	Kingdom Hall of Jehovah Witnesses	64.0	64.1	0.1	not significant
• between Hoo-Shang Court and Stelling Road	Single/multi-family residents	64.5	64.8	0.3	not significant

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc. Calculations are provided in Appendix 5.3. Noise levels are calculated for the nearest edge of the nearest existing building to the center of roadway. Calculations are based on original Facilities Master Plan forecast of 32,000 students. The actual noise increases would be lower than presented in this table.

C3(b) Operational Noise Impacts Other Than Traffic Noise

Noise impacts would also occur due to increased activity and new facilities on the campus. Some of these impacts would affect on-campus noise levels, and others would have a greater effect on off-campus locations. These impacts are discussed below.

(i) On-Campus Noise Levels

Students, faculty, staff, and community members utilizing the campus would generate, and be the recipients of, point source noise that would include people talking, doors slamming, auto alarms, landscaping equipment operation, car/personal stereos, etc. Noise levels generated by these sources would typically not exceed the 70 dB(A) State criteria for school or auditorium/theater uses. Therefore,

these noise impacts are typically not considered significant. These noise levels also contribute to the ambient noise levels that are experienced in all campus areas.

(ii) Off-Campus Noise Levels

Existing residential and other noise-sensitive uses that are near the proposed development areas on the campus would also experience a slight change in their ambient noise environment as a result of the proposed Facilities Master Plan. Some of the proposed facilities would be constructed within the interior of the campus or near SR-85; these facilities would be too far from off-campus receptors to affect them, and/or would be masked by traffic noise from the freeway. The proposed Kirsch Center for Environmental Studies would be constructed at about a 100-foot setback from McClellan Road; the slight changes in the ambient noise environment of this part of the campus (from students and staff entering and leaving the building) would not have a significant impact on the ambient noise environment of off-campus sensitive receptors.

Parking improvements proposed on the east side of campus include construction of a one-story parking deck, and reconfiguration of the existing parking lots. The proposed parking deck would be constructed in the area of Parking Lot C. All existing lots would be redesigned and reconfigured (berms could be removed to provide additional parking spaces). There is a potential for additional parking deck(s) at some future time over Parking Lots A and B. Although the size of, and number of parking spaces provided by, the proposed individual parking improvement projects are not known, it is anticipated that the parking improvements would add (in the short term) approximately 400 to 500 parking spaces, and (in the long term) an additional 600 to 800 parking spaces to the existing 4,438 spaces, for a total of 5,438 to 5,738 spaces.

The proposed parking deck and other parking improvements would contribute to noise levels generated on the east side of campus. Typical noises associated with a parking deck and parking lots include car doors closing, engines starting, car acceleration, parking lot cleaning and other maintenance activities, tire squeal noise (depending on the material used for ramps and parking surfaces) and car alarms. These noises would not be substantially different than the noises already occurring in the existing parking lots (A, B, and C); however, the frequency of the noise events would increase because an increased number of cars would park in this area of campus. Noise-generating activities from the parking deck and parking lots would be expected to be most intense during the limited times of the day when people are arriving or departing from campus; it is not expected that noise generated from the parking deck and lots on the weekends (when the campus is in limited use) would be substantial.

Given that additional parking deck(s) at some future time may cover Parking Lots A and B, the number of cars using this parking area could potentially double. Using the basic principle that a doubling of sound energy results in a 3 dB(A) increase in noise levels, the sound level in Parking Lot B could increase from 55.3 dB(A) (as monitored within the lot) to approximately 58.3 dB(A). (This approach is conservative, because it assumes that all of the noise measured within the parking lot is from cars within the lot. Noise heard within the lot is likely to be mainly from traffic along the nearby roadways.) The projected noise level generated by the parking area would be lower at residential uses across Stelling Road. Sensitive receptors adjacent to the east side of campus would not be exposed to noise levels exceeding the City daytime exterior noise level standard. Therefore, the off-site noise impacts related to the proposed parking improvements would be less than significant.

C3(c) Nighttime Noise

There is little regular activity on the De Anza campus after 10:00 P.M. A few classes at the College end at 11:00, but it is estimated that these classes are attended by only about 100 students. Therefore, these activities are not considered a substantial source of noise on the campus. The types of noise created by these students could include opening and closing of car doors in the parking lots, car engines starting, and cars leaving the campus. These noises would increase to some extent due to the Facilities Master Plan, in that there would be additional students leaving (existing and future new) evening classes. Based on the characteristics of the Facilities Master Plan, it is reasonable to assume that the increase would be proportional to the increase in students. Therefore, the increase in noise would not be large enough to be perceptible.

There are intermittent activities (such as events at the Flint Center) that occur after 10:00. The Facilities Master Plan does not include changes to the Flint Center, and activities at the Center would not increase as a result of the Facilities Master Plan. The Facilities Master Plan does envision eventual development of a Performance/Lecture space in the northeastern part of the campus, and there could be activities in that building after 10:00. However, these activities would not occur on a regular basis.

D. MITIGATION MEASURES

D1. Measures Identified in this EIR

D1(a) Construction Noise Impacts

1. For any exterior construction activity within 750 feet of off-campus residential uses and/or 800 feet of churches, the College would limit construction activity to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, and 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays.

2. For any exterior construction activity within 750 feet of off-campus residential uses and/or 800 feet of churches, construction contractors would implement appropriate additional noise reduction measures that may include using noise-reducing mufflers and other noise abatement devices, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, notifying adjacent residences and businesses in advance of construction work, and installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources. (Acoustic barriers would reduce the noise level by 5 to 10 dB(A).) In addition, the College District would require the posting of signs prior to construction activities with a phone number for residents to call with noise complaints. Depending on the type of equipment and type of control used, noise controls can also substantially reduce noise levels (by 1 dB(A) to 16 dB(A) at 50 feet).

3. In the event that construction activities would occur for an extended period of time adjacent to classrooms, or that construction noise could not be attenuated to an acceptable level inside classrooms, the College would temporarily relocate classes to a different location on campus.

4. Prior to construction activities anticipated to exceed 82 dB(A), the construction contractor would coordinate with churches within 800 feet of the construction site so that construction occurs outside of scheduled church activities.

D1(b) Other Noise Impacts

No additional measures are required.

E. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

A cumulative impact comparison is provided in **Table 5.3-5**, **Predicted Future Cumulative Exterior Off-Campus Roadway Noise Levels at Noise-Sensitive Locations**, for the future cumulative roadway scenario analyzed in **Section 5.1, Transportation and Circulation**.

Cumulative traffic-generated noise impacts have been assessed based on the difference between the existing traffic volumes and the cumulative traffic volumes (these volumes include traffic from buildout of the proposed Facilities Master Plan plus general traffic growth in the vicinity) provided in the traffic study. As shown in **Table 5.3-5**, the total increase in noise levels at off-campus sensitive receptors would not increase by more than 0.8 dB(A). Changes in a noise level of less than 3 dB(A) are typically not noticed by the human ear, and therefore cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Table 5.3-5
Predicted Future Cumulative Exterior Off-Campus Roadway Noise Levels at Noise-Sensitive Locations

Roadway • Segment	Noise-Sensitive Land Uses	Exist. Noise	Cum. Noise	Increase	Impact
Stevens Creek Boulevard					
• between Anton Way and May Avenue	Memorial Park	69.5	70.3	0.8	not significant
Stelling Avenue					
• between Pepper Tree Lane and Stevens Creek Boulevard	William Faria School	65.0	65.5	0.5	not significant
• between Pepper Tree Lane and Fairwoods Court	Church of the Latter-day Saints	63.9	64.4	0.5	not significant
• between Pepper Tree Lane and McClellan Road	Single-family residents	64.7	65.2	0.5	not significant
McClellan Road					
• intersection of McClellan Road and Stelling Road	Saint Jude the Apostle Church	63.5	64.1	0.6	not significant
• between Hoo-Shang Court and Rose Blossom Drive	Kingdom Hall of Jehovah Witnesses	64.0	64.6	0.6	not significant
• between Hoo-Shang Court and Stelling Road	Single/multi-family residents	64.5	65.2	0.7	not significant

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc. Calculations are provided in Appendix 5.3. Noise levels are calculated for the nearest edge of the nearest existing building to the center of roadway. Calculations are based on the original Facilities Master Plan forecast of 32,000 students. The actual increases in noise would be lower than shown in this table.

As a separate project, the VTA will be building a new bus transit center in order to consolidate the various existing bus stops located around the perimeter of the campus. The new transit center will be designed to accommodate up to eight transit buses simultaneously and to function as a major gateway to the College. Bus stops along Stevens Creek Boulevard, Stelling Road, and McClellan Road will no longer be used once the transit center is in operation. The center will be located within the campus just west of Stelling Road, between Parking Lots B and C. VTA will start construction on the center in spring 2003, with opening planned for fall 2003. The center will accommodate five bus lines, and it is estimated that there would be 385 one-way bus trips per day through the center.

The transit center is not part of the Facilities Master Plan, and VTA found the transit center to be exempt from detailed CEQA review. The Facilities Master Plan would generate traffic that, together with the bus

trips using the transit center, could contribute to noise impacts along Stelling Road between Stevens Creek Boulevard and McClellan Road. Therefore, an analysis of cumulative noise levels along Stelling Road was conducted, with the bus trips added to the cumulative totals. This approach is conservative, because several of the bus lines already travel along Stelling Road, and the trips to and from the transit center for those lines will not be new trips on the roadway. In the calculation, the assumption was used that all of the daily bus trips were comparable to medium-duty trucks in terms of noise level.

The results showed that the noise level between Stevens Creek Boulevard and Pepper Tree Lane would increase by an additional 0.6 dB(A), and the noise level between Pepper Tree Lane and McClellan Road would increase by an additional 0.3 dB(A). (The backup calculations are included in **Appendix 5.3**. The calculations were checked through use of the Federal Transit Administration General Noise Assessment Spreadsheet, which specifically addresses noise from buses.) The total increase in average noise levels would be 1.1 dB(A) or less, and still would not be perceptible. In addition, the project contribution to the increase would be 0.1 dB(A) or less. For these reasons, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

The VTA transit center will generate single-event noise levels as buses enter and leave the transit center, as well as noise from buses idling at the center. Single-event noise levels from moving buses are estimated to be about 88 dB(A) at close range, and single-event noise levels from a bus transit center can be about 101 dB(A) at close range. As noted previously, the transit center is not part of the Facilities Master Plan, and will be built regardless of whether the Facilities Master Plan is implemented.

F. LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

The mitigation measures identified in this EIR would reduce the identified construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

5.4 PUBLIC SERVICES

A. SUMMARY

The increase in students and employees associated with buildout of the Facilities Master Plan would increase the demand for police services from the College District Police Department, possibly requiring the need for additional staff and/or equipment. Given that an annual needs assessment process would address this issue, impacts related to additional demand on police services would be less than significant. Impacts related to response times would not be significant given the location of the on-site Police station and that the proposed roadway improvements would facilitate access into and around the campus and reduce congestion and confusion. The increase in student population and building square footage could result in a demand for additional security and safety features. Several improvements are currently being considered by the District Police Department to increase campus safety, including implementation of a new telecommunication system that would direct after hour emergency calls to the Santa Clara Sheriff's Department, an increase in security cameras and the establishment of an emergency center located on campus. These improvements would reduce the impact related to campus safety to a less-than-significant level.

The Cupertino, Monta Vista, and Seven Springs fire stations are closest to the campus, and are mainly the stations that respond to campus fire- and rescue-related emergencies. The Santa Clara County Fire Department estimates that the Facilities Master Plan would result in an increase in service calls from the campus. This increase is not expected to result in a need for more staff or equipment. The College District would comply with the California Fire Code, Title 19 of the Code of Regulations and the Santa Clara County Fire Department's access road standards. For these reasons, impacts to fire service would be less than significant. Cumulative impacts of the Facilities Master Plan would also be less than significant.

B. INTRODUCTION

This section discusses potential project impacts to police services and fire protection services. In the Initial Study, the project was found to have no impacts related to schools and parks; therefore, those topics are not analyzed in this section (see **Chapter 10.0, Impacts Found Not to be Significant** for a brief discussion).

The information in this section was obtained through the following personal communications:

- Rodriguez, Ben, Director of Safety and Security Department, De Anza College Community College Safety and Security Department, personal communication, February 13, 2001.

- Rock, Michael, Director of Business Services, Santa Clara County Fire Department, personal communication, February 26, 2001 and March 6, 2001.

C. POLICE SERVICES

C1. Existing Conditions

Police protection services are provided to De Anza College by the Foothill-De Anza Community College District Police Department (which also serves Foothill College). The Police Department has the primary authority for providing security services, including the investigation of criminal activities on campus.

The District Police Department and the Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department have implemented a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in compliance with California law (the Kristen Smart Act). The MOU establishes service responsibilities assigned to the College and the Sheriff's Department. The primary responsibilities outlined in the MOU are that District Police will be responsible for the day-to-day affairs of the campus and the Sheriff's Department will be responsible for serious felonies, such as homicides, rape and robbery.

The De Anza College Police office is on the northeast side of the Campus Center (CC2 building) on the lower floor. The office is open seven days a week from 7:00 A.M to midnight. It is staffed, at minimum, by a radio dispatcher and one peace officer who patrols the campus. The Sheriff's Department responds to emergencies on the campus when the College Police office is closed.

The District Police Department promotes preventive enforcement. The Department offers several awareness workshops, and escorts to vehicles when requested. In addition, emergency phones that directly contact the dispatcher are available throughout the campus.

The College District Police Department is currently authorized for ten Officers, one Chief, one Community Services Officer, and one Support Services Coordinator. The Police Department currently has seven vacancies (including six full-time sworn police officers and one Community Services Officer) and supplements its staff with non-permanent part-time police officers. According to the Police Chief, the staff level does not negatively affect the Police Department's response times because part-time police officers are used to fill the vacancies.

Equipment at the College Police station includes a radio dispatch, computers and two patrol bicycles. The District Police Department is currently budgeting the need for expanding security cameras for the campus, specifically for the Child Development Center and the entrances into the College to monitor

traffic. The Department is also considering the installation of a new phone system that would automatically transfer emergency calls to the Sheriff's Department during non-operational hours.

Through an annual needs assessment process, the Police Chief determines the level of service at the campus and its future needs. The needs assessment process includes a statistical analysis of number of calls, number of officers, response time, as well as input from staff, student and the general public. Determinations of future needs are finalized by the Police Chief and the Vice-President of Educational Resources and Instruction of the College District. The Police Department does not have a formal response time goal or utilize other criteria to determine service impacts associated with new development. A number of variables are used to determine staff and equipment needs, including level of service. The Police Department does not use quantifiable measures for evaluating the level of service. At a minimum, the Department has determined that there should be one police officer per College site per day and evening shift during the weekdays, and one police officer servicing both colleges on the weekend.

Response times at the De Anza College vary, and depend on the situation and proximity of the peace officer. Response times also vary because there is only one peace officer patrolling the entire campus. However, response times are minimal due to the on-site location of the Police station, the relatively small area of the campus, and the use of patrol vehicles. Current response times on the campus are usually three to five minutes for emergency calls and five to ten minutes for non-emergency calls.

C2. Policy and Regulatory Framework

As mentioned previously, the Cupertino 1993 *General Plan* does not have jurisdictional authority over the College campus. The following policies are included for informational purposes only.

Public Health and Safety, Crime, Non-Residential Design for Defensible Space

> **Policy 6-39: Crime Prevention in Building Design.** Consider the relationship between building design and crime prevention in reviewing all developments. Develop criteria with help from Sheriff's Office to determine the degree to which crime prevention standards should override aesthetic concerns.
>
> **Policy 6-41: Pre-hearing Review.** Continue to request County Sheriff review and comment on development applications for security measures.

C3. Project Impacts

C3(a) Significance Criteria

Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form) states that a project could have a significant effect on the environment if it would result in "substantial adverse" physical impacts associated with the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards.

Section 15131 of the CEQA *Guidelines* (discussion) notes that "effects on facilities or services are not automatically regarded as significant effects of a project. The changes must be related to or caused by physical changes." In this case, demand for additional personnel or equipment or unacceptable response times would be significant because a lowered level of police protection services could lead to property damage and human injury. The need for additional personnel might also require the construction of additional facilities, which in itself could lead to additional environmental impacts.

Based on this criterion, buildout of the proposed Facilities Master Plan would result in a significant impact if it would allow new development without increases in staffing and equipment needed to maintain acceptable levels of police service, or would result in a substantial need for new, altered, or expanded police service not met by the College District.

C3(b) Impacts of Facilities Master Plan

The increase in student population accommodated by the Facilities Master Plan, as well as the increase in the number of facilities on campus under the Plan, would increase the demands on security/police services at the De Anza College campus, and could result in a request for staff and equipment increases. The District Police Department would increase staffing and equipment levels as needed to continue to provide the same levels of service at the De Anza College. At this time, the Police Department does not have projections for staffing or equipment increases that would result from the Facilities Master Plan. As discussed, evaluations of the level of service to determine additional staff and/or equipment needs are made during the Police Department's annual needs assessment process. Given the above, the Police Department does not expect buildout of the Facilities Master Plan to result in a reduction in level of police protection services to the De Anza College campus. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

The increase in student population and building square footage could result in a demand for additional security and safety features. The Police Department is currently budgeting the need for the expansion of

safety equipment, including security cameras, and installation of a new phone system that would automatically transfer emergency calls to the Sheriff's Department when the Police office is closed. In addition, the Department anticipates utilizing the Emergency Operations Center/Lecture Hall, which would be located in the proposed Student Services building. This area would be used as an emergency center, and would have communication devices and video and computer equipment

Accessibility of the campus to peace officers on bicycles or emergency vehicles may improve as a result of the Facilities Master Plan. The Facilities Master Plan includes revisions to the existing campus entries along Stevens Creek Boulevard, modifications to the Stelling entry, and the re-alignment of the internal Loop Road on the west side of campus. These roadway improvements are intended to facilitate access into and around the campus and correct some of the current congestion and confusion.

For these reasons, impacts related to campus security and safety are considered to be less than significant.

C4. Mitigation Measures

C4(a) Measures Proposed as Part of the Project

No mitigation measures are proposed.

C4(b) Measures Identified in this EIR

No mitigation is required.

C5. Cumulative Impacts

As previously mentioned, the Police Department serves both the Foothill and De Anza sites. The District is developing a proposed Facilities Master Plan for Foothill Community College to accommodate an increase in enrollment from 16,000 to approximately 18,000 students. Buildout under the Foothill Community College Facilities Master Plan and the De Anza College Facilities Master Plan would increase the overall demand for District police services. Through the annual needs assessment process, staff and equipment levels would be increased as needed. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the project would be less than significant.

C6. Cumulative Mitigation Measures

No additional measures are required.

C7. Level of Significance After Mitigation

No significant impacts were identified.

D. FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

D1. Existing Conditions

The Santa Clara County Central Fire Protection District (County Fire Department) provides 24-hour fire protection services to the City of Cupertino. The following fire stations are closest to the campus, and are usually the stations that respond to campus fire- and rescue-related emergencies: Cupertino station (20215 Stevens Creek Boulevard), Monta Vista station (22620 Stevens Creek Boulevard), and Seven Springs station (21000 Seven Springs Parkway). De Anza College is within the one- to one-half-mile service area for the Cupertino and Seven Springs fire stations and within the two-mile service area for the Monta Vista fire station.

The County Fire Department currently has 265 full-time employees and operates 16 fire stations and 1 fire prevention bureau with 3 satellite offices. The Cupertino, Monta Vista, and Seven Springs fire stations each have one 3-person engine truck. In addition, the Cupertino station has one 4-person truck and the Seven Springs station has one 3-person hazardous materials/support vehicle. The Department administers its programs from the administrative headquarters located in Los Gatos.

The County Fire Department receives 65 percent of its funding for staffing and equipment through property taxes and 30 percent through contracts (the remaining 5 percent of funding is funded from "other sources").

In calendar year 2000, the County Fire Department had a total of 13,531 calls for service. Of the total, 6,985 calls were medical, 638 calls were fire-related and 5,908 calls were other types of calls (such as search and rescue). All calls for service are received at the County Communications Department and than routed to the nearest emergency unit without regard to station assignment. De Anza College generated 56 calls for service in calendar year 2000.

The County Fire Department has a response time goal of five minutes (travel time) or less for emergency calls. The County Fire Department tracks its average response time each month and as to date has attained its targeted goals every month.

D2. Policy and Regulatory Framework

As mentioned previously, the City of Cupertino *General Plan* does not have jurisdictional authority over the College campus. The following policies are included for informational purposes only.

Public Health and Safety

Policy 6-9: Early Project Review. Involve the Central Fire Protection District in the early design stage of all projects requiring public review to assure fire department input and plan modifications as needed.

Policy 6-12: Roadway Design. Attempt to involve the Central Fire District in the design of public roadways for review and comment. Attempt to ensure that roadways have frequent median breaks for timely access to properties.

Policy 6-14: Multi-Story Building Fire Risks. Recognize that multi-story buildings of any land use type increase risks of fire. Ensure that adequate fire protection is built into the design and require on-site fire suppression materials and equipment to ensure safety of the community.

D3. Project Impacts

D3(a) Significance Criteria

Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form) states that a project could have a significant effect on the environment if it would result in "substantial adverse" physical impacts associated with the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards.

Section 15131 of the CEQA *Guidelines* (discussion) notes that "effects on facilities or services are not automatically regarded as significant effects of a project. The changes must be related to or caused by physical changes." In this case, demand for additional personnel or equipment, unacceptable response times, or development in a fire hazard area would be significant because a lowered level of fire protection services could lead to additional fire damage to undeveloped and developed properties and injuries to humans and animals. The need for additional personnel might also require the construction of additional facilities, which in itself could lead to additional environmental impacts. Based on this criterion, buildout of the proposed Facilities Master Plan would result in a significant impact if it would

allow new development without increases in staffing and equipment needed to maintain acceptable levels of fire services, or would result in a substantial need for new, altered, or expanded fire services not met by the Facilities Master Plan.

The Initial Study for the Facilities Master Plan found that the proposed project would not expose people or structures to hazards related to wildland fires. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed further in this section.

D3(b) Impacts of Facilities Master Plan

Buildout of the proposed Facilities Master Plan would result in a net increase of existing building space by approximately 147,260 square feet, to accommodate about 30,850 students at buildout in the year 2010. The increase in building square footage and student population could result in an increased demand for County Fire Department services to De Anza College. Although the average number of calls for service varies from year to year, it is expected that there would be a general increase in the number of calls for service. This increase in service calls would increase the probability of simultaneous calls for service, thereby causing the average response time per call to increase. The increase in calls would not require an increase in staff or equipment levels at the stations serving the campus. However, the potential increase in response time is likely to occur due to increased traffic and denser buildout.

Proposed changes to the main entries and exits on the campus could improve emergency vehicle access. The detailed architect plans for each building project would be reviewed by the County Fire Department for emergency access. The College District would comply with Title 19, Sections 3.05 & 3.16 of the California Code of Regulations and State Appendices III-AA and III-BB, Part 9, Title 24 of the California Fire Code relative to site access and water supply for any development associated with the proposed Facilities Master Plan. In addition, the College District would comply with Fire Department Access Road Standard A-1 relative to circulation radius, roadway width, turn-around dimensions and overhead clearance. Given that the College District would implement these measures as part of the proposed Facilities Master Plan, impacts related to the potential increase in response times would be less than significant.

D4. Mitigation Measures

D4(a) Measures Proposed as Part of Project

1. The College District would comply with applicable fire and life safety standards and code requirements such as fire hydrant flows and hydrant spacing. Service roads would be maintained throughout the campus to allow access to all portions of the buildings located within 150 feet of foot travel from where the fire department apparatus are stopped or staged. A fire department apparatus turn-around is required whenever travel in one direction only exceeds 150 feet. If an apparatus turn-around does not currently exist on all service roads within the campus, the College District would provide them during future development. Compliance with Fire Department Access Road Standard A-1 would be followed relative to circulation radius, roadway width, turn-around dimensions and overhead clearances.

2. Any new parking structures would comply with the current edition of the California Building and Fire Codes. Regardless of construction type, an approved automatic fire sprinkler system throughout with a 2.5 inch hose valve connections would be installed and made available for fire department use.

3. The College District would comply with Title 19, Sections 3.05 & 3.16 and State Appendices III-AA and III-BB, Part 9, Title 24 relative to site access and water supply for any development associated with the proposed Facilities Master Plan.

4. The College District would comply with California Fire Code Appendix III-AA in the assessment of fire flow. The assumption of 1,500 gallons per minute at 20 psi residual pressure would be the minimum required flow per building. The minimum flow would increase incrementally with building size and may be reduced accordingly with the inclusion of fire sprinklers. The College District would consider the installation of automatic fire sprinklers where appropriate.

5. The College District would continue to implement its Emergency Management Response Plan that includes a plan for responding to fires.

6. The detailed architect plans would be reviewed by the County Fire Department for emergency access.

D4(b) Measures Identified in This EIR

No additional measures are required.

D5. Cumulative Impacts

According to the County Fire Department, buildout of the De Anza College Facilities Master Plan, combined with ongoing and proposed development in the vicinity, would have a collective detrimental effect on the level of service provided to the College and to the surrounding areas. The County Fire Department anticipates the need to improve and expand existing facilities, increase personnel levels, and obtain new equipment to serve this cumulative development. The City of Cupertino *General Plan* states that the District will compensate for increased fire service by adjusting/or expanding staff and equipment in high areas of service demand and will continue its program of placing emergency traffic preemption controls on key traffic signals. In addition, the College would implement measures (noted previously) to help ensure fire safety for new campus facilities. For these reasons, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

D6. Cumulative Mitigation Measures

No additional measures are required.

D7. Level of Significance After Mitigation

All impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant.

5.5 PUBLIC UTILITIES

A. SUMMARY

This section discusses project impacts to water supply, wastewater treatment and collection, solid waste collection and disposal and storm drainage.

The increase in students, employees, building square footage, and landscaped area associated with buildout of the Facilities Master Plan would result in an increased demand for potable water. The additional students and employees on the campus would result in an increase in demand of about 23 percent. The San Jose Water Company does not expect a shortage in the Mercedes Pressure Zone in the near future, and the College would employ water conservation measures in the new buildings and would upgrade existing buildings and the irrigation system to use less water. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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. The upgrades would address any potential impacts related to fire flow requirements and water line condition.

Buildout of the Master Plan would generate an estimated 0.102 million gallons of wastewater per day. New on-site wastewater collection lines would be installed on an as-needed basis. The San Jose/ Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) and the City of Cupertino collection pipes have sufficient capacity to accommodate this increase in wastewater. Therefore, the impact to wastewater collection and treatment is less than significant.

Buildout of the Master Plan would generate additional solid waste at the campus. The Los Altos Garbage Company services the collection and disposal needs of the campus. Solid waste and recycled materials collected from the campus is hauled to the Newby Island Landfill located in Milpitas. The landfill currently has a remaining life of 17 years and has sufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in solid waste and recycled items. In addition, buildout of the Master Plan would not effect the collection and disposal service provided by the Los Altos Garbage Company. Therefore, impacts to solid waste collection and services and landfill capacity are less than significant.

The existing campus is connected to the City of Cupertino underground storm drainage system along Stevens Creek Boulevard and McClellan Road. According to the City of Cupertino, both storm drainage systems are currently operating at capacity and during peak storm conditions exceed their capacity. Buildout of the Facilities Master Plan would increase impervious surfaces on the campus by about three percent. The City requires a no net increase in surface water runoff based on a 10-year storm event upon project completion. Therefore, the potential increase in peak flow from the Facilities Master Plan would be significant. Mitigation in this section would require the project

to include features that would mitigate peak flows during the 10-year storm to the existing conditions. In addition, the District would be required to consult with the City of Cupertino Department of Public Works regarding the drainage techniques required for the project. Implementation of the above measures would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

B. WATER SUPPLY

B1. Existing Conditions

The City of Cupertino has two major water suppliers: California Water Service and San Jose Water Company. The San Jose Water Company provides potable water to the De Anza College campus. Water comes from three sources: wells fed by groundwater, the Santa Clara Valley Water District (Water District), and two surface water treatment plants.[1] The De Anza College campus is located in the Mercedes Pressure Zone. According to the Water Company, existing water supplies in the Mercedes Pressure Zone are sufficient for the existing demand.[2]

The De Anza campus has one meter that records the entire water demand for the campus, including domestic, landscape irrigation, and fire systems. The water demand for fiscal year 1999-2000 for the entire campus was approximately 175,737 gallons per day (gpd). There were no fires recorded that year, and thus the demand reflects domestic and irrigation uses only.

Water conservation measures utilized by the campus include low-flow toilets and urinals and self-closing faucets in all restrooms.[3]

The San Jose Water Company provides water to the campus through underground pipes in the surrounding streets. The San Jose Water Company's pipes (10 to 12 inches in diameter) connect to the campus water pipes at Stevens Creek Boulevard.

B2. Policy and Regulatory Framework

As mentioned previously, the Cupertino 1993 *General Plan* does not have jurisdictional authority over the College campus. The following policies are included for informational purposes only.

---

1 Craig Giordano, Director of Engineering, San Jose Water Company, personal communication, February 15, 2001.

2 Asahina, Michael, Planning Supervisor, San Jose Water Company, personal communication, January 12, 2001.

3 John Saulter, Lead Plumber, Foothill-DeAnza College District, personal communication, February 26, 2001.

Environmental Resources, Water Resources, Urban Water Conservation

Urban Water Conservation Policy 5– 31: Local Conservation Policies Similar to Regionwide Policies. Continue to keep citywide efforts of water conservation similar to those being conducted on a regional scale. Many of these conservation efforts are outlined in the Santa Clara Valley Water District Drought Plan and Countywide Water Use Reduction program.

Urban Water Conservation Policy 5– 33: Prohibit Excessive Water Use. Prohibit excessive water uses throughout the City, such as irrigation of existing landscaping during the daylight, and require large water users to perform water audits. These and other policies shall be enforced until such time as an official declaration has been made by Santa Clara Valley Water District that the drought conditions may no longer exist.

B3. Project Impacts

B3(a) Significance Criteria

Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form) states that a project could have a significant effect on the environment if it were to result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, or require new or expanded entitlements to serve the project. Based on this criterion, buildout of the proposed Facilities Master Plan would result in a significant impact if it would result in a substantial need for new, altered, or expanded water systems, or new or expanded water entitlements.

B3(b) Impacts of Master Plan

Buildout of the Facilities Master Plan would result in an increased demand for potable water. Water use would increase due to the increase in building square footage and in students and faculty. It is assumed that the increase in total potable water use would be directly related to the increase in the number of students and employees. Based on these assumptions, total potable water demand at the De Anza College campus would increase by about 23 percent. As part of the Facilities Masters Plan, the existing landscaped areas would decrease by about 3.8 acres to accommodate new facilities and thus, the water demand for irrigation would decrease as a result of the buildout of the Facilities Master Plan.

As stated previously, existing water supply to the Mercedes Pressure Zone is adequate. In addition, the San Jose Water Company does not anticipate a water shortage in the Mercedes Pressure Zone in the near future. As part of the Facilities Master Plan improvements, the College District would implement water conservation measures in the new buildings, including low-flow showers, toilets and faucets. In addition, the existing buildings would be upgraded to accommodate these water conservation devices.

The irrigation watering system would be altered to provide more efficient water conservation irrigation. For these reasons, the project impact to water supply would be less than significant.

The Facilities Master Plan would result in a new layout of campus facilities on the De Anza College campus. According to College District staff, new pipelines would be installed within the campus boundaries to service the campus facilities. At the start of each individual Facilities Master Plan project, the College District Engineer would consult with San Jose Water Company to determine the required pipe capacity and the need to upgrade the pipe size to meet fire flow requirements and water demand. In addition, the Santa Clara County Fire Department would determine the fire flow requirement as a result of the increase in construction type and building size and consult with the San Jose Water Company regarding pipe size and capacity. Given the above, this impact is less than significant.

B4. Mitigation Measures

B4(a) Measures Proposed as Part of the Project

1. The College District would implement water conservation measures in the new buildings, including low-flow showers, toilets and faucets, and would upgrade existing buildings with these conservation devices.

2. The Santa Clara County Fire Department would determine the fire flow requirement as a result of the increase in construction type and building size and consult with the San Jose Water Company regarding pipe size and capacity.

3. The irrigation watering system would be upgraded to allow the College to regulate and conserve irrigation water.

4. At the start of each individual Facilities Master Plan project, the College District Engineer would communicate with the San Jose Water Company to determine the necessary pipe capacity and upgrades to meet fire flow requirements and water demand.

B4(b) Measures Identified in this EIR

No additional measures are required.

B5. Cumulative Impacts

The Water District indicates it has the ability to meet the long-term water needs of Cupertino water retailers. The Water District Water Supply Master Plan has planned for growth, based upon the maximum growth potential of all municipalities in the Water District, which does not exceed ABAG projections.[4]

The San Jose Water Company expects that it will be able to accommodate future water demand. Given the above and that the College would implement water-conserving measures as part of the project, the Facilities Master Plan would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact on water service.

B6. Cumulative Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

B7. Significance after Mitigation

Because the Water Company does not expect any supply problems, the impact would be less than significant after mitigation.

C. WASTEWATER SERVICE

C1. Existing Conditions

Wastewater collection and treatment in the City of Cupertino is provided by the Cupertino Sanitary District (District) and the City of Sunnyvale. The Sanitary District serves the majority of Cupertino. The Sanitary District collects and transports wastewater to the San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP). The Sanitary District purchases water treatment capacity from the plant, and approximately 25 years ago purchased 8.6 million gallons per day (mgd) of capacity from the San Jose/Santa Clara WPCP. The Sanitary District currently has about 4.5 mgd of capacity remaining at the San Jose/Santa Clara WPCP.

The wastewater is treated at the WPCP, located in Alviso. The San Jose/ Santa Clara WPCP provides tertiary treatment, and the treated effluent is ultimately discharged into the southern end of the San Francisco Bay. The existing design capacity of the San Jose/ Santa Clara WPCP is approximately

4 The City of Cupertino General Plan, 1993.

167 mgd. The San Jose/ Santa Clara WPCP currently processes an estimated 134 mgd of effluent (dry weather peak).

The San Jose/ Santa Clara WPCP is currently operating under a 120 mgd average dry weather effluent flow (ADWEF) constraint. This constraint was established in response to concerns over the effects of freshwater discharges from the WPCP on the saltwater marsh habitat, and pollutant loading to the Bay from the San Jose/ Santa Clara WPCP. In response to this constraint, the City of San Jose prepared a Clean Bay Strategy and the South Bay Action Plan, which describe the strategy for reducing the wastewater flow from the San Jose/ Santa Clara WPCP to the South Bay.

Existing wastewater generation on the De Anza campus is approximately 0.029 mgd.[5] Wastewater generated on the campus is collected into eight-to ten-inch pipes and flows into the City's eight- to ten-inch pipes at Stelling Road.[6]

C2. Policy and Regulatory Framework

As mentioned previously, the 1993 Cupertino *General Plan* does not have jurisdictional authority over the College campus. The following policies are included for informational purposes only.

> **Environmental Resources, Water Resources, Government Action**
>
> **Government Action Policy 5–37: Development on Septic Systems.** Do not permit urban development to occur in areas not served by a sanitary sewer system, except the previously approved Regnart Canyon Development.

C3. Project Impacts

C3(a) Significance Criteria

Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form) states that a project could have a significant effect on the environment if it would exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, or have inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Based on this criterion, buildout

---

5 Paulsen, Dave, Fire, Life and Safety, Hazard Materials, Foothill-De Anza College District, personal communication, March 9, 2001.

6 Beckam, Carl, General Manager, Cupertino Sanitary District, personal communication, March 5, 2001.

of the proposed Master Plan would result in a significant impact if it would result in a substantial need for new, altered, or expanded wastewater systems.

C3(b) Impacts of Facilities Master Plan

Buildout of the proposed Facilities Master Plan would increase the demand for wastewater treatment and collection services. It is assumed that the increase in total wastewater generation would be directly related to the increase in the number of students and employees (23 percent increase at Facilities Master Plan buildout). Based on this assumption, total wastewater generation demand at the De Anza College campus would be 0.036 mgd, an increase of 0.007 mgd over the current wastewater generation of about 0.029 mgd. However, based on wastewater generation factors developed by the Sanitary District, the project would generate approximately 0.102 mgd.[7]

The Sanitary District plans to conduct a survey in the vicinity of the campus to determine constraints to sewer pipe capacity and maintenance issues. It appears that the main sewer lines along Stevens Creek Boulevard need repair. As previously mentioned, the campus sewer pipes connect to the City's sewer pipes at Stelling Road. According to Sanitary District staff, the sewer pipes at Stelling Road do not require upgrading or maintenance. Wastewater collected at the Stelling sewer pipelines travels north and does not connect to the main sewer lines on Stevens Creek Boulevard. At this point, the Sanitary District has determined that the City's wastewater treatment and collection system has sufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in wastewater generated at project buildout (based on the District's projected generation of 0.102 mgd).[8] In addition, it is expected that new lines would be installed within the campus to collect wastewater for treatment by the City system. Given the above, the impact of the Facilities Master Plan on sewer service is less than significant.

C4. Mitigation Measures

C4(a) Measures Proposed as Part of the Project

No mitigation measures are proposed.

---

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid.

C4(b) Measures Identified in this EIR

No mitigation measures are required.

C5. Cumulative Impacts

As stated above, the City of Cupertino has a remaining capacity of 4.5 mgd at the WPCP. The remaining capacity would be expected to sustain the wastewater requires of the City for the next several years. According to the Sanitary District, no significant cumulative impacts are anticipated.[9]

C6. Cumulative Mitigation Measures

No measures are identified for cumulative impacts.

C7. Significance after Mitigation

All impacts related to wastewater services would be less than significant.

D. SOLID WASTE

D1. Existing Conditions

In recent years, regional concerns have been expressed regarding existing landfill capacity and the lack of potential landfill sites to meet future needs. To assure adequate capacity, the City of Cupertino has entered into a Joint Powers Agreement with five other cities in northwest Santa Clara County to provide solutions to common solid waste management concerns. In 1989, the City of Cupertino finalized a contract for landfill at Newby Island, located in Milpitas. The term of the agreement is 30 years (2019) or depletion of the tonnage allocated (2,050,000 tons), whichever comes first.

The Newby Island Landfill has a design capacity of 42 million cubic yards. According to the General Manager of the landfill, the landfill has a remaining capacity of 13 million tons or a lifetime of 17 years (if not more). There are no current expansion plans for the landfill.

The Los Altos Garbage Company provides collection and disposal services to the De Anza College campus. The Los Altos Garbage Company collects waste and recycled items, including paper, glass,

9 Ibid.

plastic, aluminum, and cardboard, and hauls the materials to the Newby Island landfill facility. De Anza College generated 1,179.13 tons of solid waste in the year 2000.[10]

D2. Policy and Regulatory Framework

D2(a) California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939)

The City of Cupertino is responsible for implementing the State Assembly Bill AB 939 as well as waste diversion programs that have been developed in response to this act. Additionally, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991 mandates cities and counties to divert 50 percent of all solid waste by January 1, 2000, through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities. Each of these categories has short-, medium- and long-term goals and implementation programs. The City of Cupertino is currently trying to meet this goal by implementation of various types of recycling programs including residential, commercial/industrial, construction debris, and cardboard recycling.[11] The College District has confirmed that it is complying with relevant AB 939 requirements.

D3. Project Impacts

D3(a) Significance Criteria

Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form) states that a project could have a significant effect on the environment if available landfill capacity would be exceed by implementation of the project or the project would breach federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Based on this criterion, buildout of the proposed Master Plan would result in a significant impact if it would interfere with the achievement of the waste diversion level mandated by AB 939, or result in a need for expanded solid waste services.

D3(b) Impacts of Master Plan

Buildout of the proposed Facilities Master Plan would increase the demand for solid waste collection services and disposal services. Assuming a direct relationship between the campus population and waste generated, the project would likely generate a 23 percent increase in waste. This increase would

---

10 The Los Altos Garbage Company, Elizabeth Ayoubi, personal communication, February 21, 2001.

11 Millar, Lavenia, City of Cupertino, Environmental Program Manager, personal communication, February 21, 2001.

not affect the collection and disposal service provided by Los Altos Garbage Company. In addition, the Newby Island Landfill has a remaining life capacity of 17 years (or 13 million tons) and thus, has sufficient capacity to accommodate this increase in solid waste. Given the above, the impact of the Facilities Master Plan to solid waste collection services and landfill capacity is less than significant.

D4. Mitigation Measures

D4(a) Measures Proposed as Part of the Project

No mitigation measures are proposed.

D4(b) Measures Identified in this EIR

No mitigation measures are required.

D5. Cumulative Impacts

There are no future projections for the Newby Island Landfill. However, total waste generation of 900,000 tons per year is expected. Under this assumption, the landfill has a remaining capacity of 17 years and thus, no significant cumulative impacts are anticipated.

D6. Cumulative Mitigation Measures

No measures are identified for cumulative impacts.

D7. Significance after Mitigation

All impacts related to solid waste services would be less than significant.

E. STORM DRAINAGE

E1. Existing Conditions

Cupertino is located within three watersheds: Calabazas, Stevens Creek and Permanente Creek. Some of the major streams that traverse the City include Calabazas Creek, Regnart Creek, Stevens Creek and Permanente Creek. These streams, among others, collect the surface runoff from storms and convey it

into the Bay. When these stream courses cannot convey the storm flow, overflow of the stream banks occurs with potential flooding of nearby structures and property.

The DeAnza campus is connected to the City's subsurface drainage systems along Stevens Creek Boulevard and McClellan Road. Surface water runoff collected at Stevens Creek Boulevard flows approximately 1.5 miles down Stevens Creek Boulevard to Finch Avenue, where it drains into Calabazas Creek. Surface water runoff collected on McClellan Road flows to an outfall located about three-fourths of a mile west of the campus, on the other side of Whitney Way, and then drains into Regnart Creek. According to the City of Cupertino, Department of Public Works, both drainage systems are currently operating at capacity and during peak storm conditions exceed their capacity.

Surface water runoff on campus is captured through a series of catch basins, curve drains, and roof drains directed to an underground drainage system, which connects to the City drainage system at 11 different locations. Approximately 90 percent of the campus's surface water runoff drains to the City's pipes along Stevens Creek Boulevard. The remaining 10 percent drains to the rear of the campus at McClellan Road.[12]

E2. Policy and Regulatory Framework

As mentioned previously, the 1993 Cupertino *General Plan* does not have jurisdictional authority over the College campus. The following policies are included for informational purposes only.

Water Resources, Government Action

Government Action Policy 5-36: Storm Water Runoff. Encourage the reduction of impervious surface areas and investigate opportunities to retain or detain storm runoff on new development.

E3. Project Impacts

E3(a) Significance Criteria

Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form) states that a project could have a significant effect on the environment if it would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. For the purposes of this EIR, an increase in the runoff magnitude of a 10-year storm is considered to be

12 John Saulter, Lead Plumber, Foothill-DeAnza College District, personal communication, June 4, 2001.

significant. This criterion is based on the City requirement that the project not increase runoff generated by a 10-year event.

Development of the Facilities Master Plan could result in declining quality of stormwater runoff due to non-point source urban pollutants (from increased traffic on area 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, which is required under NPDES for any development over five acres. The District would implement standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce non-point source pollution during project operation. These BMPs are listed at the back of the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project. Therefore, potential impacts related to polluted runoff are not discussed further in this document.

E3(b) Impacts of Facilities Master Plan

Development of the Facilities Master Plan would increase the amount of impervious area on the project site, thereby potentially increasing runoff quantities. An increase of approximately three percent in impervious surfaces would occur with the construction of new buildings and other facilities.

As mentioned above, the City drainage system in the project vicinity is currently operating above capacity. Therefore, the City requires that projects in its jurisdiction result in no net increase of peak flow during a 10-year storm event. Without mitigation, the proposed Facilities Master Plan could result in a net increase in peak flow; this potential impact on the City drainage system would be significant.

E4. Mitigation Measures

E4(a) Measures Proposed as Part of the Project

No measures are proposed.

E4(b) Measures Identified in This EIR

5. As individual Facilities Master Plan projects are designed, the College District would incorporate features into the projects or elsewhere on the campus to maintain peak flows during a 10-year storm event at the existing level. These features may include, but are not limited to, the following: offsetting increase in permeable surfaces elsewhere on the campus, permeable pavements, bio-swales or infiltration ponds, storm-drain rehabilitation and/or sump drains. The District would provide a

drainage analysis, or other comparable information, to demonstrate that there is no net increase in peak runoff leaving the campus during the 10-year storm. This measure would be implemented prior to any project that results in an increase in peak runoff leaving the De Anza campus.

6. The District would consult with the City of Cupertino Department of Public Works regarding the drainage techniques to be used for individual Facilities Master Plan projects.

E5. Cumulative Impacts

The increase in peak runoff that could result from the proposed project, together with other projects within the City, could contribute to cumulative increases in peak flows in the area drainage system. This cumulative impact would be significant.

E6. Cumulative Mitigation Measures

The measures identified above for the project-specific impact would also address the project contribution to the cumulative impact. In addition, the City of Cupertino would condition projects within its jurisdiction to meet the requirements for no net increase in peak flow during the 10-year storm event.

E7. Significance after Mitigation

All impacts related to drainage would be less than significant after mitigation.

5.6 VISUAL QUALITY

A. SUMMARY

This section discusses visual impacts related to the potential removal of trees on the campus. In the Initial Study, the Facilities Master Plan was found to have no impacts related to scenic vistas, views from an identified scenic roadway corridor or other publicly-accessible location, or the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The Initial Study also found that the campus does not include any rock outcroppings or historic buildings (see ***Chapter 10.0, Effects Not Found to be Significant*** *for a brief discussion). The Initial Study specifies measures proposed by the College District to address impacts from new sources of light and glare (see* ***Appendix 1.0****). Therefore, these topics are not analyzed in this section.*

The Facilities Master Plan would result in the loss of some existing mature trees and trees meeting the definition of "specimen trees" in the City of Cupertino Code. The loss of such trees would be a significant impact, but would be mitigated by preservation of as many trees as feasible on a project-specific basis, and relocation or replacement of removed trees.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS

B1. Project Site Setting

Trees are located throughout the De Anza Community College campus. The most prevalent trees on campus are native redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), Douglas Fir (*Pseudotsuga Meinzeisii*), non-native Atlas Cedars (*Cedrus atlantica*), and Eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.). Other tree species on campus include American Sweetgum (*Liquiddambar styraciflua*), Fir (*Abies* sp.), Chinese Elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*), Coast Live Oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), Coast Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), Deodar Cedar (*Cedrus Deodara*), and Chinese Pistache (*Pistacia chinensis*).

Other trees on the De Anza campus include Blackwood Acacia (*Acacia melanoxylon*), Blue Atlas Cedar (*Cedrus atlanitca* 'Glauca'), Blue Gum (*Eucalytptus globulus*), Sycamore (*Populus* sp.), California Pepper (*Schinus molle*), Cork Oak (*Quercus suber*), Glossy Privet (*Ligustrum lucidum*), Holly Oak (*Quercus ilex*), Maidenhair *(Ginkgo biloba*), Olive (*Olea Europaea*), Manna gum (*Eucalyptus viminalis*), Pink Ironbark (*Eucalyptus sideroxylon*), Purple Leaf Plum (*Prunus ceresifera*'Krauter vesuvias'), and Tulip (*Liriodendron tulipifera*).

An evergreen tree buffer surrounds the perimeter of the campus, screening views of the campus from locations along Stelling Road, and to a lesser extent, from locations along Stevens Creek Boulevard and McClellan Road. Trees surround the parking lots on campus and are located along pedestrian paths, near a number of campus buildings, along the approaches to the campus and parking areas, and along the bike path that traces the campus perimeter. Trees in the central campus area and along pedestrian paths provide a landscaping and shading function, and enhance the visual character of the campus. Trees located throughout the parking lots provide a landscaping and shading function; trees surrounding the lots provide a shading function and serve as a buffer between structures.

An analysis of the health and structure of several trees on campus was conducted by a certified arborist on April 18, 2001. Specific trees were selected for evaluation due to their apparent poor health. According to the report, five trees are recommended for removal due to unsafe conditions. DeAnza College requested an additional arborist report to be conducted in September 2001 as a follow-up to the April 2001 report. The September 2001 report concurs with the April 2001 report, and recommends the removal of an additional (sixth) tree. (The arborist reports are on file and available for review at the College District.)

The trees recommended for removal include three coast live oak trees and three pink-flowered ironbark trees. The trees are scattered within the campus. The tallest tree recommended for removal is 70 feet tall and has a trunk diameter of 36 inches.

C. POLICY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

C1. City of Cupertino General Plan

The City of Cupertino 1993*General Plan* does not have jurisdictional authority over the College campus. The following policies are included for informational purposes only.

Urban Design

Public Open Space Development Policy – 2-26 Maximize tree landscaping along arterial street frontages between buildings and/or parking lots and their adjacent street curb lines consistent with land use visibility requirements.

C2. Cupertino Heritage and Specimen Tree Ordinance

The Cupertino Heritage and Specimen Tree Ordinance (Section 14.18 of the City Municipal Code) requires that a Tree Removal Permit be obtained for the removal for specimen trees, defined as Oak trees with a 10″ diameter (31″ circumference), California Buckeye with a 10″ diameter (31″ circumference), Big Leaf Maple with a 12″ diameter (38″ circumference), Deodar Cedar with a 12″ diameter (38″ circumference), and Blue Atlas Cedar with a 12″ diameter (38″ circumference), or heritage trees. Although this ordinance does not specifically apply to the College, it is mentioned here because it identifies trees as a valuable asset to the community. Based on a limited survey of campus trees by Sandis Humber Jones, there are trees on the De Anza College campus that meet the definition of "specimen trees."[1]

C3. Cupertino Heritage Tree List

No trees on the campus are identified as Heritage Trees in the City of Cupertino Heritage Trees List.

D. PROJECT IMPACTS

D1. Significance Threshold Criteria

Appendix G (Environmental Checklist Form) of the CEQA *Guidelines*, lists the following items to be considered when determining whether a project could have a significant effect on the environment:

- Whether the project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- Whether the project would substantially damage scenic resources including trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;
- Whether the project would substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings; or
- Whether the project would create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

As noted in the Initial Study prepared by the College District in November 2000, there are no scenic vistas that include the campus as a major part of the view. The project would also not result in

substantial obstruction or impairment of views from an identified scenic roadway corridor or other publicly-accessible location. The Initial Study also found that the campus does not include any rock outcroppings or historic buildings that would be affected. In addition, the campus topography is relatively flat, and therefore, the campus does not contain any ridgelines or other topographic forms that could be affected by development. Therefore, these topics are not discussed further in this EIR section.

The proposed new buildings would shift some light sources within the campus and may increase light in portions of the campus. To potential address adverse impacts from new sources of light and glare, the District would prepare a lighting plan prior to installation of any additional lighting features. (This measure is identified in the Initial Study, which is included in **Appendix 1.0** and incorporated into this section by reference.) The plan would include measures to minimize off-site spillover and glare. Therefore, potential impacts with respect to light and glare are not discussed further in this EIR section.

Trees are referred to as a potential scenic resource in the CEQA *Guidelines*. As noted previously, the College is not subject to the City of Cupertino Heritage and Specimen Tree Ordinance, and the College District does not have its own standards for what constitutes a "heritage" or significant tree from a visual standpoint. A review of other tree protection regulations in the area indicates that what constitutes a heritage tree (in terms of size and tree species) can vary widely.[2] (For example, the regulations define heritage trees as ranging from 4 inches to 24 inches in diameter.) Based on this review, the City of Cupertino definitions will be used to indicate visually significant trees on the De Anza College campus.

As evaluated in this EIR, therefore, the project would have a significant impact if it results in substantial damage to or removal of trees that are considered a scenic resource, and/or if the trees damaged/removed are considered "specimen trees" as defined by the City of Cupertino Tree Ordinance.

D2. Impacts of the Proposed Project

D2(a) Tree Removal

Based on a limited tree survey of the campus provided by Sandis Humber Jones and comparison of the Facilities Master Plan with an aerial photograph of the site, it was determined that the following trees would be removed because they are within the footprint of a proposed new structure or expansion area:

---

1 Sandis Humber Jones, Topographic Survey of De Anza College, March 2001.

2 A review of tree ordinances, for the cities of Menlo Park, San Mateo, Atherton, Palo Alto, Mountain View, and Los Altos.

- The parking deck would be constructed in the area of Parking Lot C, in the northeast part of the campus. Construction of this facility would require the removal of approximately 82 scattered ornamental trees, throughout the parking lot. The trees located to the north and east of the parking lot, forming a landscape buffer along the campus perimeter, would not be affected. Among the trees to be removed are 17 oak trees and 4 Deodar Cedar trees that are considered "specimen trees" by the City of Cupertino Tree Ordinance. The potential removal of these trees would be considered a significant impact.

  The non-specimen trees to be removed are scattered and too small to provide an important landscaping function within the parking lot. The trees do provide a shading function for a small portion of the parking lot. Although these trees visually enhance the parking lot, they do not substantially enhance the visual character of the college campus as a whole. In addition, the trees adjacent to the lot along the campus perimeter would remain. Therefore, the visual impact of tree removal at this location would be less than significant.

- There is potential for additional parking deck(s) at some future time over Parking Lots A and B. There are currently about 14 trees located in Parking Lot A and no trees in Parking Lot B. The proposed parking structure in Parking Lot B would therefore not involve the removal of any trees. The trees located in Parking Lot A are small and scattered throughout the lot. The trees to be removed are too scattered and too few to provide a landscaping or shading function within the parking lot. Trees surrounding the parking lot would not be affected by the proposed structure and the visual character of the college campus as a whole would not be affected. Therefore, the visual impacts of tree removal at this location would be less than significant.

- The Kirsch Center for Environmental Studies would be constructed near the southeast corner of the campus. The proposed building site is used for tennis courts; construction of this facility could involve removal of a few trees along the periphery of the project area. Trees in this area are include Redwoods and Sycamore trees. The trees are generally small and do not provide a screening or shading function. The evergreen tree line would not be altered and will continue to provide screening from McClellan Road. Given that the area is currently used for tennis courts, the removal of ornamental/landscaping trees within this area would not degrade the existing visual character of the area. Therefore the visual impact of tree removal at this location would be less than significant.

- The Student and Community Services building would be constructed in the northeast part of campus, occupying the south part of the existing Staff Lot A. The facility would be located in an

existing parking lot with a few ornamental trees, none of which are ordinance sized. Most of the trees are eucalyptus with a few olive and fir trees. The trees are scattered and do not provide a screening or shading function. The dense tree cover to the west bordering the campus entry would remain. Given that the trees do not meet the definition of "specimen trees" under the City of Cupertino Code, do not provide a screening function, or do not substantially enhance the visual character of the site, the resulting impact would be less than significant.

- The Science Center would be located northwest of the football field/track and east of the Automotive Technology Building, in an existing parking lot with a few ornamental trees, including several oaks, six of which meet the definition of "specimen trees" in the City of Cupertino Code. The six oak trees, several sycamore trees, and several redwood trees would be removed for construction. These trees provide a landscaping and shading function for a small portion of the parking lot. Given the number of landscaping trees on campus (and in proximity to the project site), the removal of several trees at this location would not constitute a significant loss of visual character. In addition, the tree line to the north, which provides screening between structures, would remain. Therefore, the visual impact of tree removal at this location would be less than significant.

- The existing Child Development Center would be expanded to the north of the existing facility. This component of the Facilities Master Plan would not involve the removal of any trees.

- The Plant Services/Warehouse would be constructed on the west side of campus (south of the Flint Parking Structure). The facility would be located in an area that is currently paved and contains a small concentration of three to five fir trees and several small ornamental trees. The trees are small and do not provide a landscaping or shading function. The removal of several trees in this area would not substantially degrade the visual character of the area or affect the evergreen trees that provide a screening function around the borders of the campus. Therefore, the visual impact of tree removal at this location would be less than significant.

- A 1,000 gross-square-foot classroom addition to the E-1 building would be built to provide additional instructional space. The exact footprint for development has not yet been decided. However, based on an aerial photograph of the site, 1,000 square feet from the building in any direction could result in the removal of only a few trees at most. Therefore, the visual impact of tree removal at this location would be less than significant.

In addition to the above-mentioned trees, the College plans to remove five trees for health reasons. All five of these trees would be removed separately from the proposed project.

Although the removal of groups of trees (as described above) would not result in a significant visual impact, the proposed project would result in significant impacts to individual trees. Approximately 27 trees meeting the definition of "specimen trees" under the City of Cupertino Code could be removed.

E. MITIGATION MEASURES

E1. Measures Proposed as Part of the Project

No measures are proposed. (The College may plant trees within the reconfigured surface parking lots, but the locations and numbers are not known at this time.)

E2. Measures Identified in This EIR

E2(a) Tree Removal

1. Prior to the final design of each project, a landscape architect would review the construction footprint of the project. All feasible measures, such as changes to the building footprint, shall be used to preserve and protect healthy trees meeting the definition of "specimen trees" in the City of Cupertino Code.

2. Based on recommendations from a qualified arborist, the District would relocate healthy trees meeting the definition of "specimen trees." The trees would be moved to locations consistent with the College landscape plan.

3. Specimen trees that cannot be saved (as the result of Measures 1 or 2 above) would be replaced with new trees of the same species at a ratio of 1 to 1. The 1to 1 planting ratio would include replacing each existing tree with a 24-inch box oak tree. As an option for replacing larger trees, a grove of five 15-gallon sized oak trees could be planted instead of the 24-inch box tree, to create a small tree grove. The locations of the replacement trees would be selected by the College landscape architect to be consistent with the landscape plan, but the visibility of the existing trees would be considered. All trees would be monitored for at least 5 years to ensure the success of the new tree plantings. If a tree dies during this period, the tree would be replaced at a ratio of 1 to 1.

F. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Potential visual impacts of the proposed project relate only to impacts to the immediate vicinity of the campus. Cumulative impacts are not relevant in this case because the area is already generally developed, and because the Facilities Master Plan does not involve major changes in the type or scale of development on the campus. Therefore, there would be no cumulative visual impacts.

G. CUMULATIVE MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

H. SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

The proposed project could result in removal of approximately six trees meeting the definition of "specimen trees." Mitigation in this EIR would require the preservation of as many trees as feasible, and relocation or replacement of trees removed. Therefore, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

6.0 UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

A. PURPOSE

Section 15126(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to describe any significant impacts which cannot be avoided if the proposal is implemented. The discussion is to include the identification of any significant impacts that can be mitigated, but not to less-than-significant levels.

B. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

B1. Transportation and Circulation

Assuming all of the features of the College Commute Alternative Program are maximally effective at reducing emissions (and accounting for the current enrollment forecast), the project impact to the freeway segment (SR 85 southbound between I-280 and Stevens Creek Boulevard) would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. At their maximum effectiveness, the measures could completely offset the long-term parking deficit, and offset about 75 percent of the short-term parking deficit. At their maximum effectiveness, then, the measures would substantially reduce the parking impacts, and therefore adequately mitigate them, per Sections 15091 and 15092 of the CEQA *Guidelines*.

There is no guarantee that the implementation of these measures would reduce the emissions to the maximum degree estimated. At their minimum effectiveness, the measures would not reduce the project impact to SR 85 to below the one-percent threshold, but could reduce the project contribution to the impact substantially (the contribution could be reduced from about 6.0 percent to about 3.4 percent). The measures could completely offset the long-term parking deficit, and could offset about 40 percent of the short-term parking deficit. Assuming all of the measures are implemented, at their minimum effectiveness, the measures would substantially reduce the freeway and parking impacts, and therefore adequately mitigate them, per Sections 15091 and 15092 of the CEQA *Guidelines*.

There is also no guarantee that the implementation of all of the measures would be feasible. For example, the ECO pass program requires a student vote; in addition, College staff have indicated that the shuttle program would probably not be implemented on an ongoing basis.[1] Without a shuttle program, the measures (at their minimum effectiveness) would not reduce the project impact to SR 85 to below the

1 Brandy, Mike, Foothill College, personal communication, March 15, 2002.

one-percent threshold, and would not reduce the project contribution to the impact substantially (the contribution could be reduced from about 6.0 percent to about 4.4 percent). The long-term parking deficit could be reduced substantially (to about 130 spaces), but the short-term parking deficit would not be reduced substantially (it could still be about 930 spaces). Without the shuttle program, then, the measures might not adequately mitigate the freeway and short-term parking impacts.

B2. Air Quality

Implementation of all of the features of the College Commute Alternative Program would reduce operational emissions (that is, the increase in emissions over existing levels) by up to 81 percent at the high end of the effectiveness range provided. The potential effectiveness at reducing the impact is substantial because the measures would apply to existing as well as future trips. Assuming all of the measures implemented are maximally effective at reducing emissions, operational-related impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

There is no guarantee that the implementation of these measures would reduce the emissions to the maximum degree estimated. Implementation of all of the features of the College Commute Alternative Program would reduce operational emissions by approximately 44 percent at the low end of the effectiveness range provided. If all of the measures are implemented, even at their minimum effectiveness, operational-related impacts would still be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

There is also no guarantee that the implementation of all of the measures would be feasible. For example, the ECO pass program requires a student vote; in addition, College staff have indicated that the shuttle program would probably not be implemented on an ongoing basis. Without a shuttle program, the measures (at their minimum effectiveness) would reduce operational emissions by approximately 27 percent. Estimated emissions of ROG would still exceed the BAAQMD-recommended threshold by about 15 pounds per day, but the exceedance (compared to conditions without mitigation) would be reduced by about 70 percent. This reduction would be considered a substantial lessening of the impact, and therefore adequate mitigation, per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15092.

B3. Noise

There would be no unavoidable significant impacts.

B4. Public Services

There would be no unavoidable significant impacts.

B5. Public Utilities

There would be no unavoidable significant impacts.

B6. Visual Quality

There would be no unavoidable significant impacts.

7.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

A. SUMMARY

Three alternatives to the proposed Facilities Master Plan were considered, and two were evaluated, based on the potential to reduce identified significant impacts of the project. Based on a comparison of impacts, the Leased Facilities Alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives to the project.

B. PURPOSE

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines ("Consideration and Discussion of Alternatives to the Proposed Project") states: "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed 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." Section 15126.6(b) states, "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 those alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly." CEQA also states that "the EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project." Generally, significant effects of an alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the proposed project, and should provide decision-makers perspective as well as a reasoned choice. However, the *Guidelines* state that the selection of alternatives should be governed by a "rule of reason."

C. ALTERNATIVES TO THE FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

To develop alternatives to the project, the EIR preparers reviewed the significant impacts in **Chapters 5.0** and **6.0** of this EIR, identified those impacts that could be substantially avoided or reduced through an alternative, and determined the modifications that would be needed to the Facilities Master Plan. The following factors influenced the consideration of project alternatives:

- In general, potential significant impacts to relating to construction air pollutant emissions and construction noise would be mitigated through standard practices or are impacts that would apply to any similar project.

- The proposed project has already been designed to site buildings within paved areas, so potential impacts to trees and drainage would not likely be reduced through an on-site alternative.

- The significant impacts related to traffic and circulation (increased freeway congestion and lack of parking capacity) and air quality (increased air pollutant emissions from automobile traffic) are already being addressed to some extent through the District's implementation of the Alternative Commute Program.

Based on these factors, two alternatives were evaluated: an alternative Facilities Master Plan prepared by the District to accommodate increased enrollment (Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative) and dispersing the expected growth by leasing sites to house additional programs and services (Alternative 2, the Leased Facilities Alternative). A potential third alternative, involving construction of new facilities at an off-site location, was rejected, as explained later in this section.

C1. Alternative 1: No Project Alternative (Alternative Facilities Master Plan)

C1(a) Description

As noted in Section 15126.6 (e)(3)(B) of the CEQA *Guidelines*, an EIR on projects other than a land use or regulatory plan ("for example a development project on identifiable property") typically analyzes a No Project alternative that is "the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this 'no project' consequence should be discussed."

In this case, disapproval of the proposed project would mean that the College Educational Master Plan (which is required by the State for College funding) would no longer be supported by a Facilities Master Plan. The practical result of this situation would be that an alternative Facilities Master Plan would be developed to support the Educational Master Plan, address existing conditions, and accommodate the expected increase in enrollment at the College. Although this alternative Facilities Master Plan would likely involve the construction of new buildings, it would be speculative to state what buildings would be proposed or their locations.

The College District projects an increase in enrollment at De Anza from 25,000 to 30,850 total students (not including distance learning or off-site students) by 2010. The proposed Facilities Master Plan is intended to accommodate the projected increase. Under an alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario, this increase in enrollment would still occur.

C1(b) Discussion of Impacts

Transportation and Circulation

Under the alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario, the projected increase in enrollment would still occur. Therefore, the project-specific impacts at the unsignalized intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive would still occur. As noted in **Section 5.1,** this impact can be easily mitigated through the installation of yield signs.

The project-related traffic increase on the segment of SR 85 between I-280 and Stevens Creek Boulevard during the PM peak hour would also still occur, and would still be significant. As noted in **Section 5.1**, the College is implementing a Commute Alternative Program that will help to reduce existing and future trips to the campus, and continuation of that program is identified in this EIR as a mitigation measure. At its maximum effectiveness, the Program would reduce the freeway impact to a less-than-significant level, and at its minimum effectiveness, the Program would reduce the freeway impact substantially. There is no guarantee that all Program components will be feasible to implement, and without a shuttle program, the Commute Alternative Program might not reduce the freeway impact substantially.

Impacts related to on-site circulation, pedestrians, parking and construction activities would depend on the characteristics of the alternative Facilities Master Plan; it is reasonable to assume, however, that they would be similar in scope, kind and degree to those of the proposed project.

Air Quality

Under the alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario, it is likely that new facilities similar to the project facilities would be constructed. Therefore, there could still be significant impacts related to construction dust. These impacts would be adequately mitigated with the dust control program in **Section 5.2**.

The proposed project would result in significant operational air quality impacts related to emissions of ozone precursors. This alternative scenario would involve a similar increase in auto traffic, and thus would also result in any significant operational impacts. As noted in **Section 5.2**, the College is implementing a Commute Alternative Program that will help to reduce existing and future trips to the campus, and continuation of that program is identified in this EIR as a mitigation measure for the air

quality impact. If all Program components are implemented, the Program would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. However, there is no guarantee that all Program components will be feasible to implement; without a shuttle program, the Commute Alternative Program would still reduce the emissions impact substantially.

Noise

Under the alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario, it is likely that new facilities similar to those of the project would be constructed. Therefore, there could still be significant impacts related to construction noise. These impacts would be adequately mitigated with the standard control measures in **Section 5.3**.

The proposed project would not result in any significant operational noise impacts. This alternative scenario would involve a similar increase in auto traffic, and thus would also not result in any significant operational noise impacts.

Public Services

The proposed Facilities Master Plan would not result in any impacts related to public services. The alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario would likely involve a similar type and extent of construction on the campus, and the increase in enrollment would be the similar to that under the proposed project. Therefore, the alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario would not result in any significant impacts with respect to public services.

Public Utilities

The proposed Facilities Master Plan would not result in any impacts related to water supply, wastewater collection or treatment, or solid waste disposal. The alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario would likely involve a similar type and extent of construction on the campus, and the increase in enrollment would be the similar to that under the proposed project. Therefore, the alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario would not result in any significant impacts with respect to these services.

Under the Alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario, there could be a greater or smaller increase in impervious surfaces than under the proposed project. The mitigation identified in **Section 5.5** would still apply to this impact, and would reduce it to a less-than-significant level.

Visual Quality

Under the alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario, it is likely that new facilities would be constructed, and given the constraints related to the limited area available for building on the campus, it is also likely

that the facilities would be built in locations similar to those proposed for the project. Therefore, this scenario would probably result in similar impacts to trees meeting the definition of "specimen trees." These impacts would be adequately mitigated with the measures in **Section 5.6**.

Other Impacts

The project would not result in any significant impacts related to agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, seismicity and soils, hydrology or water quality, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation or hazardous materials (these topics were "scoped out" of detailed study in the EIR or found to be less than significant in the EIR). The alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario would result in a similar level and type of construction on the campus, and the increase in enrollment would be the similar to that under the Facilities Master Plan. Therefore, the No Project Alternative also would not result in any significant impacts with respect to any of those resources.

C1(c) Relationship to Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative could meet project objectives because the alternative plan would likely be similar to the proposed project (given the limited area available for building, and the projected increase in enrollment). However, the need to develop an alternative Facilities Master Plan could require a substantial delay in project implementation.

C2. Alternative 2: Leased Facilities Alternative

C2(a) Description

This alternative would attempt to avoid or reduce significant impacts to traffic and air quality by dispersing future growth at De Anza College to leased off-site locations. Under this alternative, only limited renovation, expansion and infrastructure projects would be completed on site. The proposed new facilities (Science Center, Student and Community Services Building, Kirsch Center, Plant Services, and Future Facility) would not be built. For this alternative, it is assumed that the College District would address the increase in enrollment by housing new programs within leased facilities off site. The locations of these facilities are not known. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that there would be an increase in enrollment at the De Anza College campus, but that most of the additional growth would occur off site.

C2(b) Discussion of Impacts

Transportation and Circulation

Under the Leased Facilities Alternative, there could still be an increase in students at the De Anza College site. Depending on the number of additional students, there could still be an impact at the unsignalized intersection of McClellan Road and Rose Blossom Drive. As noted in **Section 5.1**, this impact can be easily mitigated with the installation of yield signs.

Depending on the increase of students, the project would contribute to a significant impact on the segment of SR 85 between I-280 and Stevens Creek Boulevard. The project would increase the traffic on SR-85 between I-280 and Stevens Creek Boulevard by more than 6 percent of the freeway capacity; even a 1,000-student increase would result in a significant impact on that freeway segment. As noted previously, implementation of the Commute Alternative Program could reduce substantially reduce the impact, but the feasibility of some Program components is uncertain.

There could also be impacts relating to a parking deficit and spill-over into neighboring streets because the number of parking spaces on the campus would not accommodate additional students. Under the Leased Facilities Alternative, there could be an increase in students but the College District would not provide additional parking. This increased deficit could lead to congestion within the campus and parking spillover in the nearby neighborhood.

The use of leased sites for additional programs would result in vehicle trips to and from those sites. Depending on the location of the leased sites, the additional traffic could result in significant impacts related to traffic congestion at local intersections and on nearby freeway segments.

Air Quality

The Leased Facilities Alternative could result in construction dust impacts related to the renovation and infrastructure projects; these impacts would be less than those of the project, and would be addressed through standard construction control measures.

The air quality impacts due to the increase in auto traffic could be lower under this alternative, but may still be significant because the emissions of ROG under the project substantially exceeded the BAAQMD threshold. As noted in **Section 5.2**, implementation of the Commute Alternative Program could substantially reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. However, the feasibility of some Program components is uncertain.

The use of leased sites for additional programs would result in vehicle trips to and from those sites, with associated air pollutant emissions. This approach could negate some of the benefits of the Commute Alternative Program, as the College facilities would be more decentralized.

Noise

The Facilities Master Plan would result in significant intermittent short-term noise impacts related to construction; this alternative could still result in short-term noise impacts because there would still be limited construction on the campus. This potential impact would be mitigated by the use of standard construction controls. The Facilities Master Plan would not result in any other significant noise impacts; this alternative would involve less development and lower student enrollment at the De Anza campus.

The use of leased sites for additional programs would result in vehicle trips to and from those sites; depending on the size and location of the facilities, the additional trips could cause discernible increases in noise along the roadways near those sites. It is not known whether such increases would be significant.

Public Services

The proposed Facilities Master Plan would not result in any impacts related to public services. This alternative would result in only limited construction on the campus, and the increase in enrollment would be less than that under the Facilities Master Plan. Therefore, this alternative would not result in any significant impacts with respect to public services to the De Anza campus. The use of leased sites for additional programs could raise issues with respect to security at the leased locations. It is assumed that leased facilities would also meet current fire standards.

Public Utilities

The proposed Facilities Master Plan would not result in any impacts related to water supply, wastewater collection or treatment, or solid waste disposal. This alternative would result in only limited construction on the campus, and the increase in enrollment would be less than that under the Facilities Master Plan. Therefore, the alternative would not result in any significant impacts with respect to these services. In addition, the alternative would not change the impervious surfaces on the campus, and there would be no impacts to the downstream storm drainage system.

The use of leased facilities could result in an increase in water demand and wastewater treatment demand from the service providers where the leased facilities are located. However, the leased facilities would be within established buildings that have already been included in the service districts' planning.

Visual Quality

This alternative would result in only limited construction on the campus, and the visual character of the campus would remain the same. The use of leased facilities would not result in any tree removal. Therefore, there would be no impacts relating to tree removal.

Other Impacts

The project would not result in any significant impacts related to agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, seismicity and soils, hydrology or water quality, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation or hazardous materials (these topics were "scoped out" of detailed study in the EIR or found to be less than significant in the EIR). This alternative would result in only limited construction on the campus, and the increase in enrollment would be less than that under the Facilities Master Plan. Therefore, the alternative would not result in any significant impacts with respect to any of those resources.

C2(c) Relationship to Project Objectives

Providing instructional space and support space off campus is problematic. The support services such as counseling, student government, disabled student services, library, bookstore, food services, and others are all limiting factors to student success when programs are moved off campus. The College goals of academic synergies, convenience, and quality student experience (among others), which comprise project objectives, all would be compromised by off-site facilities.

The Educational Master Plan goals of the College, as well as the partnership for excellence goals of the State, all measure student access and success. If student access to De Anza College programs is limited through the use of leased facilities, the College cannot achieve these goals. Currently, the College has programs in two high schools and one middle school. College staff know from instructor and student feedback that the educational experience at these sites is not optimum for student success. In virtually every case, both the students and faculty believe that the leased space is inferior to being on the main De Anza campus.

The College also knows that it cannot deliver the same student services support programs to off-site locations. These services range from the library, bookstore and food services to the more direct student support programs like counseling, tutorial, disabled student programs, and others. Additionally, the College cannot provide the "life" of De Anza off campus. The student government, student newspaper, student clubs, musical performances, physical education facilities, etc. all require on-campus attendance

for student participation. It is through these extra-curricular activities that the fullness of the educational experience of the student is achieved. Student success increases when the student has access to support services to assist them in course completion and success, transfer goals and occupational guidance. These support programs are particularly crucial in addressing the needs of the under-prepared students. Without these opportunities, the College cannot fulfill its State mandate.

C3. Off-Site Alternative

Construction of the proposed facilities at an alternative location was not included because of the likely infeasibility of such an alternative, and the lack of evidence that such an alternative would avoid or substantially reduce the significant impacts of the proposed project. The College District has plans to explore a third campus at the NASA Ames Research Center. However, it would take at least 10 years to obtain funding for and develop the campus. This time frame would not meet the objectives of the College District with respect to De Anza College.

An off-site alternative has been examined for many years, dating back to the early history of the College District. While it has long been a goal to try to serve populations better in some segments of the District, the cost of land acquisition in this real estate market has been prohibitive. The real estate prices for property are even higher now as the area has generally reached buildout, so land acquisition would require purchasing of buildings as well. The cost to retrofit buildings and sites to accommodate a college campus is far beyond the available resources of the District, even with the available bond money. The College also knows from the experience of other college districts that the feasibility of small off-campus centers is costly in terms of overhead, difficult to provide needed support services, and lacking in student life and synergy that are evident on the main campus. The College does not believe that acquiring a new location to build a campus is financially feasible under any current or projected funding scenario.

D. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis presented in this section, the following general conclusions can be made regarding the impacts of the alternatives.

The No Project Alternative (alternative Facilities Master Plan) would likely result in impacts similar to those of the project, given the limited area available on the campus for construction, and the similar increase in enrollment that would occur.

The Leased Facilities Alternative would result in a reduction in some impacts at the De Anza College campus, but would shift some of the impacts of the project to the off-site leased facilities, the areas around those facilities, and (possibly) the areas between leased facilities and the De Anza campus. As noted above, the Leased Facilities Alternative would raise a number of inconsistencies with project and College objectives.

Based on the analysis in this section, there would be tradeoffs involved with the adoption of any of the alternatives. As required by CEQA (*Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(e)(2)), the "environmentally superior" alternative must be selected from one of the other alternatives to the project. Therefore, the Leased Facilities alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative (of the No Project Alternative and Leased Facilities Alternative) under CEQA.

8.0 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

A. PURPOSE

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of a proposed project may be irreversible if a large commitment of these resources makes their restoration thereafter unlikely. According to Section 15126(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, irretrievable commitments of such resources are to be evaluated to assure that their consumption by a proposed project is justified. In addition, this section must also identify any irreversible damage that can result from environmental accidents associated with the proposed project.

B. DISCUSSION

The De Anza College campus is developed. However, implementation of the Facilities Master Plan (in particular, the construction of new building and parking) would represent a long-term commitment to a more intensive land use than currently occurs on the property, in that the campus would accommodate more students and faculty. The Facilities Master Plan would, therefore, involve an irreversible commitment to the use of non-renewable resources during the construction and operation phases in the form of refined petroleum-based fuels, natural gas for space and water heating, and mineral resources used in construction materials. The College already uses substantial amounts of these resources. Mitigation measures are identified in **Chapter 5.0** of this EIR to try to minimize the increase in automobile trips; such measures would also address some of the increase in fuels usage.

The College does not use or transport large amounts of hazardous materials. In addition, the College District would follow all applicable requirements to ensure safe use, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials or wastes on campus. For these reasons, the project would not result in any significant hazards to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, or through upset or accident conditions.

9.0 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

A. PURPOSE

Section 15126(g) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, as amended, requires a discussion of the ways in which a project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Such a discussion should also include projects that would remove obstacles to population growth, and the characteristics of a project that may encourage and/or facilitate other activities that, either individually or cumulatively, could significantly affect the environment. CEQA emphasizes that growth in an area should not be considered beneficial, detrimental or of little significance. The purpose of this section is to evaluate the growth-inducing potential and impact of this project.

B. INTRODUCTION

In general terms, a project may foster spatial, economic, or population growth in a geographic area if it meets any one of the criteria that are identified below.

- The project removes an impediment to growth (through e.g., the establishment of an essential public service, the provision of new access to an area, or a change in zoning or general plan designation).
- Economic expansion, population growth, or the construction of additional housing occurs in the surrounding environment in response to the project, either directly or indirectly (e.g., changes in revenue base, employment expansion, etc.).
- Establishment of a precedent-setting action (e.g., an innovation, a change in zoning, or general plan amendment approval).
- Development or encroachment in an isolated or adjacent area of open space (being distinct from an "infill" type of project).

Should a project meet any one of these criteria, it can be considered growth-inducing. An evaluation of the Facilities Master Plan vis-à-vis these growth-inducing criteria is provided in **Subsection C**, below.

The CEQA *Guidelines* also require that consideration also be given to potential impacts on community service facilities resulting from increases in population. **Chapter 5.0** of this EIR addresses potential impacts on community service facilities (e.g., police, fire, water, wastewater, etc.) resulting from the expected increases in students and faculty on the De Anza College campus (the campus itself does not house any students or employees).

It must be emphasized that the CEQA *Guidelines* require an EIR to "discuss the *ways*"[emphasis added] a project could be growth inducing and to "discuss the *characteristics* of some projects that *may* encourage…activities that could significantly affect the environment" [emphasis added]. However, the CEQA *Guidelines* do not require that an EIR predict (or speculate), specifically where such growth would occur, in what form it would occur, or when it would occur. The answers to such questions require speculation, which CEQA discourages (see CEQA *Guidelines* §15145).

C. GROWTH INDUCEMENT POTENTIAL

C1. Removal of an Impediment to Growth

Growth in an area may result from the removal of physical impediments or restrictions to growth, as well as the removal of planning impediments resulting from land use plans and policies. In this context, physical growth impediments may include nonexistent or inadequate access to an area or the lack of essential public services (e.g., water service), and planning impediments may include restrictive zoning and/or general plan designations.

The De Anza College campus is currently accessible from State Route 85, Stevens Creek Boulevard, Stelling Road and McClellan Road. No off-site roadway extensions would be required to support the proposed project. Consequently, the project would not induce growth due to the extension of transportation infrastructure.

The campus is currently served by the San Jose Water Company. The project would connect to existing water lines in City streets. At the start of each individual Facilities Master Plan project, the College District would consult with San Jose Water Company to determine the required pipe capacity and the need to upgrade to meet fire flow requirements and water demand. In addition, the Santa Clara County Fire Department would determine the fire flow requirements as a result of the increase in construction type and building size and consult with the San Jose Water Company regarding pipe size and capacity. A new fire main pipe will be connected to the San Jose Water Company's system at McClellan Road.

The pipeline improvements would occur within the campus boundaries, and thus would not result in additional water capacity in lines within the City. Given the above, the Facilities Master Plan would not induce growth due to the extension of water infrastructure. The campus is currently served by the City of Cupertino Sanitary District sewer collection system. No extension or increase in the size of off-site City sewer lines would be required; therefore, the project would not induce growth due to the extension of sewer infrastructure.

In addition to the physical impediments discussed above, development impediments and regulatory legislation, such as land use plans and policies, may also restrict or deter localized growth and can be considered an impediment to growth. Approval of this project would not require an amendment to the City's *General Plan*. No text amendments or general changes are proposed that could foster growth on other properties within the City.

C2. Economic Growth

The proposed project includes the construction of about 184,200 square feet in net new building space and is intended to help the campus accommodate 32,000 students by 2010. As a community college, De Anza College does not house any residents; therefore, the project would not result in any direct population increase that could lead to economic growth nearby. The increase in students could lead to increased use of local businesses that serve the campus (e.g., restaurants), thus leading to indirect economic growth. The projected increase in full-time faculty and classified staff (338 positions) could help induce people to move into the area, and lead to associated economic growth in the region. The number of people that move to the College vicinity would depend in part on the affordability of area housing relative to faculty and staff salaries.

As a community college, De Anza's mission involves vocational education. Therefore, the College indirectly influences economic growth by providing students with work-related skills. The facilities proposed as part of the Facilities Master Plan are also related to job training, and thus the project could have an indirect effect on economic growth. The extent and location of this growth cannot be determined at this time.

The proposed project could also induce growth by introducing additional short-term employment opportunities during construction of the Facilities Master Plan projects. The temporary employment opportunities provided by this project could help induce a small number of people to move into the area, and some indirect economic growth, such as an increased demand for goods and services and housing, could likely result from project implementation. Therefore, the proposed project could be considered growth-inducing based on this criterion.

C3. Precedent-Setting Action

Since the College is not under the jurisdiction of the Cupertino 1993 *General Plan*, the Facilities Master Plan would not require an amendment to the *General Plan* or *General Plan* Land Use Map. The proposed Master Plan also would not require a zoning amendment. The project continues an existing use. Therefore, the proposed project is not considered growth-inducing based on this criterion.

C4. Development of Open Space

The project site and the surrounding area are developed. The Facilities Master Plan would involve development within the existing campus boundaries. Therefore, development of the Master Plan would not involve the development of open space or of land adjacent to open space, and thus is not considered growth-inducing based on this criterion.

10.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

A. PURPOSE

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines requires a brief statement of the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project have been determined not to be significant and are therefore not evaluated in the EIR. This section provides such a statement for the proposed Facilities Master Plan.

B. EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

This section covers topics in Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form) that are considered to be less-than-significant-effects of the proposed Facilities Master Plan, and therefore are not discussed in **Chapter 5.0** of this EIR. The following discussion is primarily based on the College District's November 2000 Initial Study. Information regarding the features of the proposed project comes from the draft De Anza College Facilities Master Plan.

B1. Aesthetics

Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The campus is located in central Cupertino, an urban setting. The topography of the campus is relatively flat, and the campus is completely developed. Based on a site visit and a review of the City of Cupertino *General Plan*, there are no scenic vistas that include the campus as a major part of the view. In addition, the evergreen tree buffer around the perimeter of campus partially obstructs existing views of the hillsides to the west. Due to the presence of the evergreen tree buffer, from Stelling Road there are filtered views of the hillsides to the west.

New buildings would be constructed within the existing campus boundaries and would be mostly one to two stories high, similar to existing buildings, which are also one to three stories high.

The proposed parking deck would be one story high (the existing parking structure is four stories). The proposed parking deck would be constructed in the area of Parking Lot C. There is potential for additional parking deck(s) at some future time over Parking Lots A and B. Views from Stelling Road of the proposed parking structure locations are currently screened by the evergreen tree buffer surrounding the campus. The proposed structures would not exceed the height of the evergreen tree buffer and would therefore not result in a substantial adverse effect on an existing view.

Project would not have a substantial adverse impact to rock outcroppings or historic resources within a historic state highway. The City of Cupertino *General Plan* does not designate State Route (SR) 85 as a state scenic highway. In addition, the section of SR 85 that runs along the west edge of campus is depressed below grade, and offers no views of the campus.

As the campus is flat and completely developed, there are no rock outcroppings on the site. Buildings of historic significance on the campus would not be affected by proposed development.

Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The proposed facilities would be similar in type and scale to the existing college facilities and would be built within the existing campus boundaries. With the exception of the Kirsch Center for Environmental Studies, all proposed buildings would be near existing buildings and would be of similar, or smaller scale, than neighboring buildings. The Kirsch Center for Environmental Studies would be located in the south portion of campus, bordered by the soccer field to the north and the environmental studies area to the east. This proposed building site is paved and currently contains tennis courts and provides storage space for dumpsters and field maintenance equipment.

The City of Cupertino *General Plan* includes policy 2-19: Neighborhood Protection, which states, "Protect residential neighborhoods from noise, traffic, light and visually intrusive effects from more intense developments with adequate buffering setbacks, landscaping, walls, activity limitations, site design and other appropriate measures." The proposed building would be two stories high, similar to or less than the heights of existing buildings on campus, and would be set back about 100 feet from McClellan Road. Therefore, the proposed building would not degrade the existing visual quality of the site or visually intrude upon the nearby residential neighborhood.

Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Existing lighting on the campus includes light standards in the parking lots, lighting along pedestrian pathways, and lighting on the outsides of buildings. Most areas of the campus currently have at least one of these kinds of lighting. The existing campus buildings are also a source of glare, and cars that use the campus may be a source of light (at night) and glare. The proposed new buildings would shift some light sources within the campus, and may increase light in portions of the campus. These changes would not represent a new source of substantial light or glare, given the developed nature of the campus and surrounding residential/commercial areas. The proposed lighting fixtures would be designed to minimize glare and off-site impacts. This measure would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. (See **Appendix 1.0, Initial Study, Notice of Preparation, and Responses**.)

The proposed Kirsch Center for Environmental Studies would be an additional source of light in the southeast portion of campus. However, this area has existing tennis court and pathway lighting, and is shielded from both Stelling and McClellan Road by the evergreen tree boundary around the campus perimeter. Due to these factors, and the developed nature of the surrounding area, the proposed facility would not represent a new source of substantial light or glare.

The visual impact of tree removal is discussed in the EIR.

B2. Agricultural Resources

Project would not convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to non-agricultural use, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract or involve other changes in the existing environment which could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. De Anza College is completely developed and is surrounded by urban uses. Therefore, there would be no impacts to farmlands due to the proposed project.

B3. Air Quality

Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The campus is completely developed and the proposed facilities would be similar in function to the existing facilities.

All other topics are discussed in the EIR.

B4. Biological Resources

Project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The campus is completely developed and is within an urban area. The campus has no natural areas and no natural plant communities, and the existing landscaping does not provide suitable habitat for special-status species. The campus contains vegetation in the form of landscaping trees, lawns, landscaped environmental studies area, and athletic fields. The trees on campus consist mainly of native redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), and non-native Atlas cedars (*Cedrus atlantica*) and eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus sp*.) and the areas with trees do not contain any natural understory plants. Although the environmental studies area contains native plants, it is a landscaped area used for educational purposes.

No special-status wildlife species were observed on campus and none are expected to occur except, perhaps, briefly during the migration of bird species. The California Natural Diversity Data Base did not document any special-status species occurring within the project area and those found in the surrounding area are not expected to occur on the site. Therefore, the Facilities Master Plan would not have any impacts on species of concern.

Common wildlife species associated with urban environments such as striped *skunk (Mephitis mephitis*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), American robin (*Turdus migratorius*), and northern mocking bird (*Mimus polyglottos*) would likely occur on the site. Although the project could result in adverse effects on habitat for these and other common species, it is not expected to diminish or result in the permanent loss of these species or adversely impact the local population as a whole, due to the already developed nature of the site. The site contains suitable nesting habitat for a number of bird species, including raptors. Construction-related activities and tree removal could result in the direct loss of active nests or the abandonment of active nests by breeding birds. Bird nests with eggs or young are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code. The College District would implement standard mitigation to avoid impacts to existing bird nests (See **Appendix 1.0, Initial Study, Notice of Preparation, and Responses**). This measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The De Anza College campus is completely developed, does not contain any riparian habitat, and is not identified in any adopted plan as having sensitive natural communities. Therefore, the Facilities Master Plan would not have any impacts on sensitive communities.

Project would not 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. The De Anza College campus is completely developed, and there are no wetlands on the campus. Therefore, the Facilities Master Plan would not result in any impacts to wetlands.

Project would not 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. The campus is completely developed, is bounded by State Route (SR) 85 and major roadways, and is within an urban area. Therefore, the campus does not provide any

wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites, and the Facilities Master Plan would not have any impacts on such resources.

Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Because of the urbanized nature of the campus and surrounding area, there are no impacts with respect to biological resources protected by local policies except for the trees that would be removed for construction reasons. The City of Cupertino has a tree ordinance that requires protection and maintenance of Heritage Trees. This ordinance would not apply to the campus, as the College District is under the jurisdiction of the State of California. However, the proposed Landscape Master Plan states that mature *Quercus agrifolia* trees would serve as landmarks throughout campus and should be preserved and protected. (Impacts related to the potential removal of mature oaks are discussed in the EIR.)

Implementation of the Facilities Master Plan would result in the removal of existing trees. The campus is completely developed, extensively landscaped, and lacks any natural habitat. Therefore, existing trees provide more of a visual than biological function on campus.

Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, or the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans that apply to the campus. Therefore, there would be no related impact.

B5. Cultural Resources

Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. The campus is completely developed, and all proposed facilities would be constructed within the campus boundaries. The City of Cupertino *General Plan* does not mention paleontological resources as an area of concern to the City. The campus is underlain by alluvial fan deposits, and exploratory borings drilled at the south and northwest parts of campus did not encounter bedrock. These conditions suggest that the presence of unique paleontological resources underlying the campus is unlikely. The campus is completely developed and flat; thus, the campus has no unique geologic features. Therefore, this issue will not be evaluated in the EIR.

Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. The campus is generally developed, and all proposed facilities would be constructed within the campus boundaries. A cultural resource evaluation conducted in September 2000 by the Northwest Information Center (Sonoma State University) for this Initial Study found that the project area contains no recorded

Native American cultural resources. However, the Santa Clara Valley is known for having buried archaeological resources, and several archaeological sites have been recorded in proximity to the campus. In the event that areas are excavated that contain unidentified cultural resources, such impacts could be addressed with standard mitigation measures (see **Appendix 1.0, Initial Study, Notice of Preparation, and Responses**).

Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. A cultural resource evaluation conducted in July 2000 by the Northwest Information Center (Sonoma State University) for this Initial Study found that the project area contains one historic resource (La Petit Trianon), a mansion built in 1892. However, proposed development would not affect this structure.

The proposed project includes the demolition of the Staff House. This structure is greater than 50 years old, and therefore could have historic significance. To determine the historic significance of this structure, Archaeological Resource Management conducted a historical evaluation in April 2001. The Staff House is not currently listed in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). According to Archaeological Resource Management, the Staff House does not appear to be eligible for inclusion in either of these registers. The setting of the structure does not appear to be significant, and the structure is not made of unusual or unique materials. Although the structure is an example of ranch style architecture, the workmanship and feeling of the home are not particularly noteworthy. Historic research has identified the Euphrats (the former owners of the structure) as a socially and financially prominent family in the North Bay area, but their importance is not sufficiently significant as criteria for inclusion of the house in either the CRHR or the NRHP. Therefore, the Facilities Master Plan would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

Project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The Santa Clara Valley is known for having buried archaeological resources, and several archaeological sites have been recorded in proximity to the campus. In the event that areas are excavated that contain unidentified cultural resources, such impacts could be addressed with standard mitigation measures (see **Appendix 1.0, Initial Study, Notice of Preparation, and Responses**).

B6. Geology and Soils

Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or

based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. According the maps provided in the City of Cupertino *General Plan* there are no known active faults within the campus. Therefore, the Facilities Master Plan would not expose people or structures to impacts involving fault rupture (and the EIR will not evaluate this issue).

Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking. The campus would be subjected to ground shaking in the event of a major earthquake on any of the faults in the region. The Facilities Master Plan would allow the campus to accommodate an increased number of students and faculty. However, the State of California will require that all construction on the campus comply with the latest version of the Uniform Building Code, and specifically with the requirements for public school facilities (which are more stringent than those for general structures). These features would reduce potential impacts due to seismic shaking to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the EIR will not evaluate this issue.

Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Geotechnical investigations conducted at the northwest and southeast parts of the De Anza campus found that these sites are underlain by predominately non-saturated, medium dense to very dense gravelly clayey to silty sands to a depth of at least 20 feet. Based on this evidence, and the uniform topography of the campus, the likelihood of soil liquefaction during strong ground shaking at the campus is low.

Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. The campus topography is flat; therefore, there would be no impacts related to landslides.

Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The campus is completely developed, and relatively flat. Although some earth movement would be required for construction of Facilities Master Plan projects, it is not anticipated that substantial grading would be required. Therefore, it is not expected that construction related erosion would be substantial (given the characteristics of the site). Erosion-related impacts would be addressed with standard mitigation measures (see **Appendix 1.0, Initial Study, Notice of Preparation, and Responses**).

Project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Geotechnical investigations conducted in the northwest and

southeast parts of the De Anza campus concluded that because of the flat topography and the predominantly dense condition of the subsurface soils, soil densification, lateral spreading, and ground cracking are considered unlikely.

Project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property. The geotechnical investigation conducted in the northwest part of campus found that the near surface clayey sand to sandy clay materials have a moderate expansion potential.[1] The geotechnical investigation conducted in the southeast part of campus found that the near surface clayey to silty sand materials have a low expansion potential.[2] By implementing consultant recommendations for each proposed building site, the related impact would be less than significant.

Project would have no impact relating to the use of septic tanks where the soils are inadequate or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water. The proposed project does not include the use of alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, there would be no related impact.

B7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The campus is already completely developed; existing campus uses involve activities that use small amounts of hazardous materials. The proposed Science Center would involve activities that use hazardous materials and result in the generation of small amounts of hazardous waste. The College District would follow all City, County, State and federal requirements to prevent employee or student exposure and ensure safe use, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials or wastes. For these reasons, the Facilities Master Plan would 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.

Project would not 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. See above response. The Staff House is proposed for demolition and could contain

---

1 Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Instructional Facility 'A', De Anza Community College, Cupertino, California, prepared by Cleary Consultants, August 2000.

2 Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Instructional Facility 'C', De Anza Community College, Cupertino, California, prepared by Cleary Consultants, August 2000.

asbestos; if asbestos is found, the District would implement standard (required) safety procedures to prevent worker exposure. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The campus is already completely developed; existing and proposed campus uses involve activities that use small amounts of hazardous materials. The College District would follow all City, County, State and federal requirements to prevent employee or student exposure and ensure safe use, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials or wastes.

Project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The City of Cupertino Planning Department has indicated that the campus is not located on a Hazardous Waste Site and is not in close proximity to a known site. Therefore, there would be no impact relative to construction on a designated hazardous materials site.

For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. A review of an area map shows that the campus is not located within two miles of a public airport. The closest airport is the San Jose International Airport, about 8 miles northeast of the campus. In addition, the project site is not within the Airport Land Use Plan boundaries. Therefore, there would be no related impacts.

For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. A review of an area map shows that there are no private airstrips within two miles of the campus. Therefore, there would be no related impact.

Project would not 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 site is located in an urbanized area, and does not involve the placement of structures in areas containing flammable brush. Therefore, there would be no related impact.

Issues regarding interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan are discussed in the Transportation and Circulation section of the EIR.

B8. Hydrology and Water Quality

Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The uses anticipated within the campus would not create effluent discharges from point sources, and thus would not violate any waste discharge requirements.

Project would not 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. The existing campus is already developed, and the proposed land uses would be similar to existing uses; therefore, there would be no impacts related to groundwater recharge. According to the San Jose Water Company (the campus water provider), water supplied to the campus is imported from other water providers. Therefore, campus water consumption would have no effect on local groundwater supplies.

Project would not 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. The existing campus is developed and drains to the City storm drain system; there are no natural surface watercourses on campus. The development built as part of the Facilities Master Plan would result in similar uses to those now present. Therefore, the proposed projects do not involve the alteration of the course of streams or rivers.

Project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The proposed drainage system would connect to the City drainage system. Because the campus is already developed, impervious surfaces are not expected to increase substantially; therefore, there would not be a substantial increase in storm drainage from the project. However, impacts related to changes in runoff quantities are discussed in **Section 5.5, Public Utilities**, of the EIR.

Development of the Facilities Master Plan could result in declining quality of stormwater runoff due to non-point source urban pollutants (from increased traffic on area 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, which is required under NPDES for any development over five acres. The District would implement standard Best Management Practices (see **Appendix 1.0, Initial Study, Notice of Preparation, and Responses**) to reduce non-point source pollution during project operation.

Project would not 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 or place within

a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. Maps in the City of Cupertino *General Plan* indicate that the campus is not within a 100-year flood plain or dam inundation area. In addition, the project does not propose construction of any housing. Therefore, there would be no flood-related impacts.

Project would not expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Seiches are waves in an enclosed body of water. A review of area maps shows that the nearest enclosed body of water, Stevens Creek Reservoir, is approximately 2 miles up-drainage from the campus. The campus is located about 9 miles south of the San Francisco Bay. The Pacific Ocean is approximately 20 miles to the west. Based upon this information, there would be no significant impact as a result of seiches or tsunamis.

The campus is completely developed and is within an urban area. The City of Cupertino *General Plan* does not mention mudflows as a hazard. Therefore, there would not be a related impact.

The impact of the project on the capacity of the stormwater drainage system is evaluated in the public Services section of the EIR.

B9. Land Use and Planning

Project would not physically divide an established community. The changes proposed in the Master Plan are a re-organization of the campus buildings and circulation patterns within the existing campus boundaries. Therefore there would not be a related impact.

Project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans that apply to the campus.

A discussion of policies of the *General Plan* as they pertain to adjacent land uses is included in the EIR.

B10. Mineral Resources

Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource 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. The campus is already developed, and thus is not available as a mineral resource. The City of Cupertino *General Plan* designates the campus as an area containing mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data. Therefore, there would be no impact on loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State.

B11. Noise

Project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The types of uses anticipated as part of the Facilities Master Plan include classrooms, student facilities, and other support facilities; these uses would not create excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels.

For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. A review of an area map shows that the campus is not located within two miles of a public airport. The closest airport is the San Jose International Airport, about 8 miles northeast of the campus. In addition, the project site is not within the Airport Land Use Plan boundaries. Therefore, there would be no related impacts.

For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. A review of an area map showed that the campus is not located within two miles of a private airstrip.

All other topics are discussed in the EIR.

B12. Population and Housing

Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There is no housing on the campus. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the displacement of existing housing or a need to build replacement housing.

All other topics are discussed in the EIR.

B13. Public Services

With respect to schools and parks, project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. The proposed project would not result in any direct increase in the residential population of the area. The project would have a beneficial impact on community college capacity by allowing the campus to accommodate additional students.

All other topics are discussed in the EIR.

B14. Recreation

Project would not 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. The proposed project would not result in any direct increase in the residential population of the area; therefore, there would be no increase in park usage by area residents. The project would bring additional students, employees and visitors to the campus. Although Memorial Park is across the street from the northern boundary of campus, it is unlikely that students would use this park because of the facilities available for recreation on campus (and because of the campus' function as a community college). The Cupertino Planning Department does not anticipate any issues regarding increased use of Memorial Park.[3] Therefore, this issue will not be evaluated in the EIR.

Project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment. The tennis courts would be relocated to the west of their current location. The new courts would be located in an area currently used as a parking lot. Due to the current use of this area, and the proximity of the proposed site to the existing recreational facilities, there would not be a significant adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, this issue will not be evaluated in the EIR.

B15. Transportation and Circulation

Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. The campus is about 10 miles from the San Jose International Airport and the project site is not within the Airport Land Use Plan boundaries. Therefore, the campus is not within the safety area for the airport. In addition, the Master Plan is not expected to result in increased air traffic because the campus is used by area residents. Therefore, there would be no related impacts.

All other topics are discussed in the EIR.

---

3 Gilli, Peter, Planner, Cupertino Planning Department, personal communication, September 18, 2000.

B16. Utilities and Service Systems

Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. The campus is already developed and generates wastewater; the Master Plan would result in similar types of uses as those on the campus currently. No uses are proposed (e.g., industrial uses) that might generate wastewater that exceeds the RWQCB treatment requirements. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The types of uses proposed raise no specific issues related to compliance with solid waste laws and regulations. Therefore, there would be no related impact.

All other topics are discussed in the EIR.

11.0 LIST OF EIR PREPARERS AND ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

A. LIST OF EIR PREPARERS

The following persons/organizations were involved in the preparation of this EIR.

Impact Sciences, Inc.
Arlyn Purcell, Managing Principal
Josh Phillips, Staff Analyst
Audrey Darnell, Staff Analyst
Dorney Burgdorf, Staff Analyst

DKS Associates
Mark Spencer
Patty Camacho

Sixth Street Studio
Valerie Reichert

B. ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

B1. Transportation and Circulation

- DKS Associates

  Mark Spencer, Project Manager

- De Anza College

  Mike Brandy, Vice President, Finance and College Services

- City of Cupertino

  Ray Chong, Traffic Engineer

B2. Air Quality

- Foothill-De Anza Community College District

  Jennifer Farnham, Project Manager, Gilbane

- De Anza College

  Mike Brandy, Vice President, Finance and College Services

B3. Noise

- Foothill-De Anza Community College District

  Jennifer Farnham, Project Manager, Gilbane

B4. Public Services

- De Anza College

  Ben Rodriguez, Director of Safety and Security Department

- Santa Clara County Fire Department

  Michael Rock, Director of Business Services

B5. Public Utilities

- City of Cupertino

  Lavenia Millar, Environmental Program Manager

- Cupertino Sanitary District

  Carl Beckam, General Manager

- Foothill-DeAnza Community College District

  John Saulter, Lead Plumber

  Dave Paulsen, Fire, Life and Safety, Hazard Materials

- San Jose Water Company

  Craig Giordano, Director of Engineering

  Michael Asahina, Planning Supervisor

  Tommy Rodriquez, Civil Engineer

- The Los Altos Garbage Company

Elizabeth Ayoubi, Recycling Coordinator

12.0 REFERENCES

ALL SECTIONS

The following documents are excerpted or summarized in parts of the EIR, and are incorporated by reference.

TBP/ Architecture, *Draft De Anza College Facilities Master Plan*, prepared for the Foothill-De Anza Community College District.

CHAPTER 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Brandy, Mike, Vice President, Finance & College Services, De Anza College, letter, January 17, 2002.

CHAPTER 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SETTING

Association of Bay Area Governments, *Projections 2000*.

City of Cupertino *General Plan,* 1993, as amended.

City of Cupertino Zoning Map.

City of Cupertino, Status of Development Activity, December 2000. Development Activity Highlights. Updated based on communication with the City of Cupertino Planning Department.

Santa Clara County *Congestion Management Program*, 2001.

CHAPTER 5.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS, PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Transportation and Circulation

De Anza College EIR, Draft Transportation and Circulation Study, DKS Associates, March, 2002.

Air Quality

BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, dated April, 1996.

Brandy, Mike, Foothill College, personal communication, March 15, 2002.

Suedkamp, Michael, Project Engineer, Gilbane Building Company, personal communication, February 14, 2001.

Noise

Barry, M. and J. A. Reagan, *FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Research, Office of Environmental Policy, December 1978), NTIS, FHWA-RD-77-108, p. 33.

Hendriks, Rudolf W., *California Vehicle Noise Emission Levels* (Sacramento, California: California Department of Transportation, January 1987), NTIS, FHWA/CA/TL-87/03.

Highway Noise Fundamentals (Springfield, Virginia: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, September 1980, pages 81 and 97.

Highway Noise Mitigation (Springfield, Virginia: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, September 1980), p. 18.

Public Services

Rodriguez, Ben, Director of Safety and Security Department, De Anza College Community College Safety and Security Department, personal communication, February 13, 2001.

Rock, Michael, Director of Business Services, Santa Clara County Fire Department, personal communication, February 26, 2001 and March 6, 2001.

Public Utilities

Asahina, Michael, Planning Supervisor, San Jose Water Company, personal communication, January 12, 2000.

Beckam, Carl, General Manager, Cupertino Sanitary District, personal communication, March 5, 2001.

The City of Cupertino General Plan, 1993.

The Los Altos Garbage Company, Elizabeth Ayoubi, personal communication, February 21, 2001.

Giordano, Craig, Director of Engineering, San Jose Water Company, personal communication, February 15, 2001.

Millar, Lavenia, City of Cupertino, Environmental Program Manager, personal communication, February 21, 2001.

Paulsen, Dave, Fire, Life and Safety, Hazard Materials, Foothill-De Anza College District, personal communication, March 9, 2001.

Saulter, John, Lead Plumber, Foothill-DeAnza College District, personal communication, February 26, 2000.

Visual Quality

Sandis Humber Jones, Topographic Survey of De Anza College, March 2001.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1.0

Notice of Preparation, Initial Study and Responses

APPENDIX 5.1
Transportation and Circulation

APPENDIX 5.2
Air Quality

APPENDIX 5.3
Noise