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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE OF THE FINAL EIR

This document, together with the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR or Draft EIR), is the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR or Final EIR) for the Bond Spending Implementation Plan for the Kentfield campus of the Marin Community College District. The DEIR identifies the likely environmental consequences of the project and recommends mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate significant impacts. This FEIR document responds to public comments on the DEIR, revises the DEIR as necessary, and provides a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project.

According to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (as amended January 1, 2007), lead agencies are required to consult with public agencies having jurisdiction over a proposed project and to provide the general public with an opportunity to comment on the DEIR. For this project, the Marin Community College District is the lead agency. This FEIR has been prepared to respond to comments received on the DEIR and to clarify any errors, omissions, or misinterpretations of the analysis or findings in the DEIR.

This document, together with the DEIR, will constitute the Final EIR if the Marin Community College District certifies the Final EIR as complete and adequate under CEQA.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The DEIR was made available for public review from July 24 to September 6, 2007. The general public was advised of the availability of the DEIR through notification on the campus website and property owners within 300 feet of the project site were notified by mail. Public agencies and interest groups were also notified by mail.

During the public review period on the DEIR, written comments were made on the DEIR. A copy of written comments and responses to the comments can be found in Chapter II of this FEIR.

This FEIR will be presented to the Marin Community College District Board at their meeting scheduled for November 7, 2007 at the Staff Lounge of the Deedy Student Services Building on the Kentfield Campus. Before acting on the project (i.e., adoption of the Bond Spending Implementation Plan), the Board must certify the Final EIR and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (see Chapter IV of this FEIR). In addition, the Board must make the necessary Findings for the adoption of mitigation measures and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the significant, unavoidable impacts associated with the project. The Findings will be part of the overall Resolution to be adopted by the Board at the November 2007 meeting.
C. REPORT ORGANIZATION

This FEIR consists of the following chapters:

- **Chapter I: Introduction.** This chapter includes a discussion of the purpose and organization of the Final EIR.

- **Chapter II: Comment Letters and Responses.** This chapter contains the names of individuals and agencies commenting on the DEIR and reproductions of letters and emails received on the DEIR. The comments are numbered in the margins of the comment letters and responses are keyed to the comment numbers. Where revisions to the DEIR are appropriate, these are summarized and the actual text changes are shown in Chapter III.

- **Chapter III: Draft Text Changes and Errata.** Corrections or clarifications based on comments received on the DEIR are contained in this chapter, including language that has been added to or deleted from the DEIR. Underlined text represents language that has been added to the DEIR; text in strikeout has been deleted from the DEIR. Errata are also shown in this chapter.

- **Chapter IV: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** This chapter identifies mitigation measures referenced in the DEIR as necessary to avoid or reduce the project's potentially significant impacts and provides a program for implementation and monitoring of these measures. The timing and entity responsible for monitoring are identified.
# Chapter II

**COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES**

---

This chapter includes a reproduction of each letter (including emails) that addressed the DEIR and was received during the public review period. Each letter is followed by responses to comments made in the letter.

## A. State, Regional and Local Agency Comments

1. City of Larkspur ..............................................................A1-1 to A1-18
2. California Department of Toxic Substances Control .............................................................A2-1 to A2-3
3. Marin Municipal Water District ................................................................. A3-1
4. Marin County Department of Public Works (Jack Curley) .........................................................A4-1 to A4-5
5. Marin County Community Development Agency ................................................................. A5-1
6. California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research ......................................................... A6-1
7. California Department of Fish and Game .............................................................................. A7-1
8. County of Marin Department of Parks and Open Space ..........................................................A8-1
9. Marin County Department of Public Works (Eric Steger and Amanuel Haile) .........................A9-1 to A9-5

## B. Public and Special Interest Group Comments

1. Granton Park Neighbors. ..........................................................B1-1 to B1-3
2. Patricia Russo ........................................................................ B2-1
3. Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed ................................................................. B3-1 to B3-19
4. Marin Conservation League .............................................................................. B4-1 to B4-2
5. Kentfield Planning Advisory Board .............................................................................. B5-1 to B5-2
6. Marin County Bicycle Coalition .............................................................................. B6-1 to B6-5
7. Transportation Alternatives for Marin .............................................................................. B7-1 to B7-8
8. Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria .............................................................................. B8-1 to B8-7
A. STATE, REGIONAL AND LOCAL AGENCY COMMENTS

NOTE: No federal agencies commented on the Draft EIR.
August 22, 2007

Ms. Debra Mathau  
Construction Manager  
Swinerton Management and Consulting, Inc.  
P.O. Box 144003  
Kentfield, CA  94914

RE: Kentfield Campus Draft EIR, Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin (2007-2013)

Dear Ms. Mathau:

Thank-you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Kentfield Campus, Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin (2007-2013). This letter focuses on the impacts of the project plans as they relate to lands within the City of Larkspur, i.e., Larkspur Annex. Unfortunately, the Draft EIR for the Kentfield Campus is wholly inadequate relative to the College of Marin lands referred to as the Larkspur Annex.

Larkspur Annex

On page 3-4, in paragraph 3 under Section 3.3 Project Site Characteristics, the Draft EIR states, “The Larkspur Annex includes the Marin Brain Injury Network Building (leased from the District) and a paved area that is proposed to be used for construction staging.)” In addition, the use of the Larkspur Annex area in relation to the proposed project is further described on page 3-23, under Site Grading and Construction Staging, which states, “Construction trailers are proposed to be located at the Larkspur Annex (see Figure 3-2) to house offices for contractors. Additional items that may be located at the Larkspur Annex include contractor staff parking and materials storage. This area was recently paved and fenced, in anticipation of future campus construction.” A similar description is included in Chapter 4.8 Transportation, but other than that there is little to no mention of the Larkspur Annex area and its proposed development (i.e., paving, fencing, installation of construction trailers, etc.) and use throughout the remainder of the Draft EIR.

As the Larkspur Annex is not included in most of the figures, it is clear that the potential impacts on and from storm water runoff/drainage, lighting, noise, traffic and visual caused by the paving of the site, the parking of vehicles and heavy equipment, and materials storage have not been...
considered in the analysis of the project. Further, there is no mention of how the site will be used once the project construction is completed. The City of Larkspur is very concerned about the use and development of the Larkspur Annex property as it is next to a residential, adjacent to healthy wetlands, and highly visible from Magnolia Avenue,

In March of 2006, representatives of the project met with City staff to discuss the project and informed the City, at that time, that the Larkspur Annex was to be used for construction staging. The lot was not completely paved or fenced at that time. Section 15378 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a "Project" as "...the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment." This definition clearly includes any construction staging areas. However, the paving and fencing of the site was done prior to the completion of the environmental review, which is clearly in violation of the California Environmental Quality Act. At a minimum, a supplement to the Draft EIR needs to be prepared that analyzes the development and use of the Larkspur Annex both as a construction staging area and relative to its future uses, and circulated for public review.

Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided below:

1. Page 2-4, Areas of Potential Controversy, refers to the comments on the Notice of Preparation from the City of Larkspur, however, the City’s concerns are not addressed in the Draft EIR. Also, Appendix A only lists concerns from the public scooping meeting and does not include any reference to the City’s letter and the concerns that the City raised.

2. Page 3-23, Site Grading and Construction Staging, refers to materials storage at the Larkspur Annex location but does not describe or explain what materials are to be stored nor is this described elsewhere in the document. The types of concerns relating to materials storage include whether the materials will be hazardous, dust generating, require large contractor trucks, or create an eyesore.

3. Page 4.1-15, Conflict with Applicable Plans or Regulations (topic also included in Appendix B), states, “The project would not conflict with Larkspur General Plan policies,” and that “…the project is anticipated to be consistent with Marin County and City of Larkspur zoning regulations. The lands uses proposed by the project are allowed by the zoning of the site (Public Facility and Planned Commercial for the unincorporated portions of the campus; Educational/Environmental Resource for the portion of the campus located in the City of Larkspur).” However, nowhere is there a discussion of how a paved construction-staging yard located in the vicinity of wetlands for six years is consistent with the land use designation of the site, or what the anticipated long term use of the site will be and whether it also is consistent with the local General Plan and Zoning.

4. Chapter 4.4, Hydrology and Water Quality. The Larkspur Annex is not mentioned in the analysis or shown on any of the figures within the Chapter including Figure 4.4-4, Site
Drainage at Kentfield Campus. What are the plans for addressing storm water runoff from the site? How will the nearby wetlands be protected? Though the mitigations are general in nature, they do not appear to apply to the Larkspur Annex as it is not discussed in the text or shown on the figures. Further, parking lot 13 is currently a gravel lot and shown in terms of parking occupancy for the Campus and the project, how is contaminated runoff from the parking of vehicles in this area controlled and prevented from entering the wetlands?

5. Chapter 4.5, Hazardous Materials. What are the materials to be stored on the Larkspur Annex site and will there be any hazardous materials?

6. Chapter 4.6, Visual Resources. Where are the visual impacts from the construction staging and materials storage on the Larkspur Annex site analyzed? The site is a paved area with cyclone fencing and no landscaping. There appear to be no proposals for or mitigations relating to landscape screening or control of glare from security lighting. The City considers the visual impacts of the construction staging significant; the site is located along a major thoroughfare in the vicinity of a thriving commercial area.

7. Chapter 4.7-1, Cultural Resources. Pages 4.7-13 and –14 describe Larkspur’s regulations relating to archaeological resources, but it is not clear how they are related to the Larkspur Annex site and whether the archaeological mitigation measures will apply to the site.

8. Chapter 4.8, Transportation. The analysis does not include transportation impacts or mitigation relative to the construction staging plans or the future use of the Larkspur Annex area. As the project traffic impacts major regional routes, intersections further from the site need to be analyzed. The Magnolia Avenue intersections at College Court and Estelle and Francis Avenues also need to be analyzed.

9. Chapter 4.8, Transportation, Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-1. This mitigation measure requires the development of a Construction Management Plan. The Construction Mitigation Plan must be coordinated with the Public Works Departments of the City of Larkspur and the County of Marin.

10. Chapter 4.9, Air Quality. Also, what are the materials to be stored on at this location and will they have the potential to generate dust?

11. Chapter 4.10, Noise. The analysis does not include impacts or mitigation relative to the construction staging plans or future use of the Larkspur Annex area. What construction materials will be hauled to the site and what will be the hours of hauling? Page 4.10-15 states that the hauling of excavated material and construction materials would generate truck trips on local roadways, it is unclear whether Magnolia Avenue has been considered as one of these local roadways.
12. Chapter 4.11. Public Services. The analysis makes no reference to the Larkspur Fire and the Twin Cities Police Departments or any mutual aid agreements with these two agencies, even though a portion of the project site is within the City of Larkspur and the remainder is in close vicinity. Construction staging areas and contractor buildings are often the targets of vandalism. What will be the security for this area?

13. Pages 3-26 and 4.10-19 state that construction hours would be from Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Page 4-8-21 states that construction hours would be from Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Which is correct? Will construction occur on holidays?

As noted earlier, the Draft EIR for the Kentfield Campus is inadequate and the paving and fencing of the Larkspur Annex site has been done in violation of the California Environmental Quality Act. At a minimum, a supplement to the Draft EIR that includes an analysis of the impacts of the construction staging and future use of the Larkspur Annex site needs to be prepared and circulated for public comment.

PE Complex Parking Lot

It is further noted that the PE Complex was given a categorical exemption, which also is contrary to CEQA’s requirement to consider the project as a whole. The City of Larkspur has concerns about what is planned for the improved and unimproved parking area adjacent to the College Court neighborhood. Will construction staging occur in these areas and was either of these parking areas considered as an alternative to the Larkspur Annex site for construction staging? The areas of concern are the same as listed above for the Larkspur Annex.

Thank-you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Nancy Kaufman
Planning Director

C: Dr. Francis White, Superintendent/President, College of Marin
Jean Bonander, City Manager
City Council
Letter A1
City of Larkspur

A1-1 The description found on page 3-4 of the Draft EIR (DEIR) is brief because it is part of the description of the overall site characteristics. As described on page 3-23, no major development is proposed to occur at the Larkspur Annex at this time or as part of the Bond Spending Implementation Plan. The paving of the site was done as preparation for use of the site to store temporary construction trailers. In the Categorical Exemption that was filed in 2006, the site paving was addressed because it was part of the overall demolition of the non-code-compliant buildings existing at the site. If the site had remained unpaved, problems related to dust creation, runoff and other problems could have arisen.

The improvements undertaken at the Larkspur Annex were not part of the Bond Spending Implementation Plan because the plan does not propose long-term improvements at this site. The site’s use for construction trailers would be temporary. Thus, the District has not avoided addressing the “whole” of the action (refer to Response to Comment A1-3 below). The paving, demolition of old buildings, and site improvements such as lighting and utilities were found to be categorically exempt under Section 15301 (l) (3 and 4) and 15304 (e and f) as shown in the Notice of Exemption filed in 2006.

A1-2 The comment mentions storm water runoff/drainage, lighting, noise, traffic and visual issues related to use of the Larkspur Annex. The Larkspur Annex is not included in many of the EIR graphics because no new development is proposed at this site. Runoff from the existing parking area has been accommodated by the existing biofiltration areas at the north end of the parking area. Lighting has already been installed and was addressed as part of the Categorical Exemption. Noise generated at the Larkspur Annex would not be significant because no major construction activities would occur at this site. No heavy equipment would operate at the site. The use of construction trailers by workers and the parking of construction worker vehicles would not result in significant noise impacts. The site would provide parking for no more than approximately 25 vehicles, with access from the Magnolia Avenue driveway. Traffic impacts related to on-site parking and use of this driveway would not be significant. In terms of visual impacts, the removal of the older structures was intended to improve the overall visual quality of the site. While the site is now more visible due to the removal of vegetation, new fencing has been installed and dilapidated structures have been removed.

A1-3 It is true that CEQA requires that the whole of an action be reviewed. However, the buildings at the Larkspur Annex were in a dangerous state of disrepair (non-compliant electrical wiring, etc.) prior to their removal and required removal prior to completion of the Draft EIR on the Bond Spending Implementation Plan. For this reason, a Notice of Exemption was filed in 2006. The work undertaken at the Larkspur Annex site was merely to clean up the site and the paving was done to reduce the potential for dust generation and increased soil runoff/sedimentation into the nearby wetland area. As part of the paving, biofiltration systems have been installed. No major development is proposed at this site as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the EIR has not avoided looking at the true whole of the action.
Construction staging areas are described on page 3-23 of the Draft EIR and are shown in Figure 1 that follows Response to Comment B1-3. As stated on page 3-23, the Larkspur Annex may house construction trailers, contractor staff parking and materials storage. The types of materials stored at the Larkspur Annex are likely to include boxed materials in steel shipping containers such as light fixtures.

Other construction staging areas would be closer to the locations of actual construction, such as near the new Math/Science Building or the new Fine Arts Building as described on page 3-23. (See also Figure 1, as mentioned above.) Thus, a significant amount of traffic is not anticipated to be generated at the Larkspur Annex.

A Supplemental EIR is not considered necessary. The DEIR clearly identified the Larkspur Annex site as a site for construction trailers (see page 4.8-21 of the DEIR) and the need for a Construction Management Plan to address construction-related traffic associated with all campus construction. Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-1 on page 4.8-21 addresses how such a plan would identify traffic control measures such as lane closure procedures, signs, cones, warning devices for drivers, and designation of construction access routes. No additional mitigation measures are considered necessary.

A1-4 The City's comments on the Notice of Prepar ation (NOP) are summarized on page 2-4 of the Draft EIR and thus were not found necessary to repeat in Appendix A (which only includes public scoping meeting comments). As noted on page 2-4, the City's comments on the NOP related to lands within the City's jurisdiction, traffic construction impacts, and construction staging. City of Larkspur zoning is addressed clearly in Figure 4.1-4 and on page 4.1-11 of the DEIR. The DEIR could not identify all construction hauling and delivery routes because the exact timing and overlap of projects could not be determined. In a Program EIR, this level of detail is not necessary. For this reason, the DEIR included Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-1 that addressed the need for a Construction Management Plan prior to commencement of any construction activities. The DEIR does identify the likely routes on page 4.8-21 (Kent Avenue and Laurel Avenue). Access to both of these streets would come from Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue. Few trucks would be likely to use Magnolia Avenue as this road does not allow a direct connection to Highway 101. No further clarification regarding City of Larkspur lands is considered necessary because the DEIR explains any changes proposed for lands within the City of Larkspur. No additional parking area or building improvements are proposed at this time. Refer to Responses to Comments A1-2 and A1-3 regarding construction traffic and staging.

A1-5 Refer to Response to Comment A1-3. No dust-generating or hazardous materials would be stored at the Larkspur Annex.

A1-6 As stated on page 4.1-1 of the DEIR, paragraph two, "The Marin Community College District is constitutionally exempt from local land use regulations when using District property in furtherance of the District’s educational purposes. However, this Draft EIR evaluates the project’s consistency with local land use regulations and policies for the purpose of CEQA compliance and also because it is the District’s goal that local land use controls be acknowledged and adhered to as much as feasible."

The use of the Larkspur Annex site for construction trailers is not a permanent use. While six years is a long construction period as compared to standard residential projects, this is not a
permanent use. Therefore, the project’s compatibility with the City’s policies, as addressed in Appendix B, does not require revision.

It should be noted that the DEIR does point out the City’s zoning does not allow improved parking areas for the “Educational/Environmental Resource” zoning district, of which the Larkspur Annex site is a part. However, this area has historically been used for buildings and impervious surface areas and also the District is exempt from this restriction as mentioned above. With the recent biofiltration system constructed at the site, any runoff from the site would be filtered prior to disposal to the nearby wetland to reduce water quality impacts from oils and other pollutants associated with use of the paved surface area.

A1-7 The Larkspur Annex site is in many of the regional-scale graphics shown in Section 4.4 of the DEIR. The impacts from drainage at the Larkspur Annex, and the inclusion of this portion of the campus in Figure 4.4-4, were not considered necessary in the DEIR because this element is not formally a part of the Bond Spending Implementation Plan. As mentioned in Response to Comment A1-2, a biofiltration system has been put in place at the Larkspur Annex to protect water quality and nearby wetlands. No changes to Parking Lot 13 are proposed as part of the project.

A1-8 Asbestos-containing materials were removed from the site when buildings were removed. No hazardous materials are proposed to be stored at the Larkspur Annex.

A1-9 Visual impacts from construction staging and materials storage at any locations of the campus were not evaluated in the EIR based on the identified CEQA significance criteria and the fact that any construction activities would be temporary.

A1-10 The City of Larkspur regulations regarding cultural resources are provided for informational purposes. The Marin Community College District is exempt from the City’s codes. However, the District would follow very similar, if not identical, procedures, should unknown resources be uncovered during construction, as addressed under Mitigation Measures CULTURAL-2 through 4. These mitigation measures would apply to any area of the Kentfield campus. However, no ground-disturbing activities are proposed at the Larkspur Annex.

A1-11 The comment refers to the potential effects of construction activity, and future land uses at the Larkspur Annex on the City of Larkspur transportation system. Actual construction would not occur at the Larkspur Annex, and the project does not include future uses of the Annex following construction. The Annex would be used to provide motor vehicle parking for approximately 25 contractor vehicles (personal vehicles driven to and from the job site by construction employees) during periods of construction. Since the contractors are anticipated to conduct work from 7:00 AM until approximately 3:00 PM each working day, few peak hour trips are anticipated to result from the temporary use of the Annex for contractor parking. Furthermore, the majority of daily vehicle trips are anticipated to use Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue for access to the site. No significant impacts to the City of Larkspur transportation system are anticipated.
A1-12 In response to this comment, the following text change is made to Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-1 on page 4.8-21 of the DEIR:

"...prior to commencement of any construction activities and shall coordinate this plan with the Public Works Departments of the City of Larkspur and the County of Marin. The Construction Management Plan shall...."

A1-13 The only types of materials that would be stored would be items in steel shipping containers, such as light fixtures and other similar construction items; no loose soils would be stored at the Larkspur Annex. The materials stored at the Larkspur Annex would not have a significant potential to generate dust.

A1-14 No significant noise impacts along Magnolia Avenue would occur because this would not be a construction haul route for the project. See Response to Comment A1-13 above regarding types of materials to be stored. Contractor work hours would be 7:00 AM to approximately 3:00 PM at the Annex.

A1-15 In response to this comment, Section 4.11 (Public Services) of the DEIR has been revised to include reference to the Larkspur Fire Department and Twin Cities Police Authority and discussion of their jurisdiction over the proposed contractor staging area at the Larkspur Annex. This information is summarized below.

**Impacts on Larkspur Fire and Police Services.** The Larkspur Annex is within the City of Larkspur and is therefore within the jurisdiction of the Larkspur Fire Department and Twin Cities Police Authority. The Larkspur Fire Department has a mutual aid agreement with the Kentfield Fire Protection District, which has jurisdiction over the rest of the Kentfield campus. Similarly, the Twin Cities Police Authority assists the Marin Community College Police Department in responding to calls for service in the areas of campus that adjoin the City of Larkspur.

As part of the proposed project, the Marin Community College District would use the Larkspur Annex for "staging" during building demolition, renovation, and construction under the Implementation Plan. The area may house construction office trailers, contractor staff parking, and materials storage. The only types of materials that would be stored would be items in steel shipping containers, such as light fixtures and other similar construction items; no loose soils would be stored at the Larkspur Annex. Security measures would include locked gates and the chain-link fencing that is currently in place. The site would provide parking for approximately 25 cars (with five on-site trailers), separate from the 15 spaces provided on the site for the Marin Brain Injury Network (MBIN) building and the nine public spaces at the front of the site. Main access is expected to be from the MBIN driveway, where there is a locked gate and a driveway into the proposed construction trailer area. At the existing driveway leading directly onto Magnolia Avenue from the construction trailer area, only right turns onto Magnolia would be allowed. Existing lighting at the site mainly serves the MBIN driveway, not the proposed trailer area. Some lights were recently replaced to minimize glare for nearby residents; the new lights face downward and are shielded.

The proposed staging use would not have any significant impacts on public services, since it would not result in a need for new or altered police or fire facilities or interference with emergency response or evacuation (the two criteria for determining whether service impacts are significant...
under CEQA). The main issues of concern to the Larkspur Fire Department and Twin Cities Police Authority are security and access in the Larkspur Annex area during the construction process. Both agencies have requested review of the District’s final plans for the staging area. A Twin Cities Police Authority representative has indicated that additional patrols may be necessary while the area is used for contractor staging, and has recommended that no staging activity occur within the public right-of-way. Neither agency foresees the need for new or altered facilities or any problems with emergency access or evacuation as a result of the temporary use of Larkspur Annex for contractor staging. Therefore, impacts on public services provided by these agencies would not be significant.

Revisions to DEIR. To reflect the findings described above, the DEIR is revised as follows.

On DEIR page 4.11-2, the following paragraph is added as the last paragraph under “Environmental Setting, Fire Protection Services”:

“Larkspur Fire Department Jurisdiction (Larkspur Annex Area)
The Larkspur Annex portion of the project site is within the City of Larkspur and is therefore within the jurisdiction of the Larkspur Fire Department. The Larkspur Fire Department has a mutual aid agreement with the Kentfield Fire Protection District, which has jurisdiction over the rest of the Kentfield campus (Sinnott, 2007).”

On DEIR page 4.11-3, the following paragraph is added as the last paragraph under “Environmental Setting, Police Services”:

“Twin Cities Police Authority Jurisdiction (Larkspur Annex Area)
The Larkspur Annex portion of the project site is within the City of Larkspur and is therefore within the jurisdiction of the Twin Cities Police Authority. The Twin Cities Police Authority assists the Marin Community College Police Department in responding to calls for service in the areas of campus that adjoin the City of Larkspur (Cusimano, 2007).”

On DEIR page 4.11-5, the following paragraph is added as the last paragraph under “Less-than-Significant Impacts, Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services, Need for New or Altered Facilities or Equipment”:

“The proposed temporary use of the Larkspur Annex area for contractor staging would not result in a need for new or altered Larkspur Fire Department facilities (Sinnott, 2007). (The Larkspur Fire Department representative also indicated that the contractor staging use would not have any significant impacts on emergency access or evacuation but requested review of the District’s final plans for the staging area. This issue is addressed under Impact SERVICES-1 and Mitigation Measure SERVICES-1 below.)”

1 Personal communications with Robert Sinnott, Chief, Larkspur Fire Department, September 10, 2007; and Todd Cusimano, Captain, Twin Cities Police Authority, September 11, 2007.
Also on DEIR page 4.11-5, the following paragraph is added as the last paragraph under “Less-than-Significant Impacts, Police Services”:

“The proposed temporary use of the Larkspur Annex area for contractor staging would not result in a need for new or altered Twin Cities Police Authority facilities. A Twin Cities Police Authority representative indicated that additional patrols may be necessary while the area is used for contractor staging but no significant service problems are anticipated (Cusimano, 2007). (The Twin Cities Police Authority representative also indicated that the contractor staging use would not have any significant impacts on emergency access or evacuation but requested review of the District’s final plans for the staging area. This issue is addressed under Impact SERVICES-1 and Mitigation Measure SERVICES-1 below.)”

On DEIR page 4.11-6, the following paragraph is added as the last paragraph under the discussion of Impact SERVICES-1:

“According to Larkspur Fire Department and Twin Cities Police Authority representatives, the proposed temporary use of the Larkspur Annex area for contractor staging is not expected to interfere with emergency access or evacuation. Nevertheless, both agencies have requested review of the District’s final plans for the staging area, and the Twin Cities Police Authority representative has recommended that no staging activity occur within the public right-of-way (Sinnott, 2007; Cusimano, 2007).”

On DEIR pages 2-32 and 4.11-6, Mitigation Measure SERVICES-1 is revised as follows:

“Mitigation Measure SERVICES-1: The Marin Community College District shall coordinate construction plans with the Kentfield Fire Protection District and Marin Community College Police Department (as well as the Larkspur Fire Department and Twin Cities Police Authority, for plans for contractor staging in the Larkspur Annex area) to ensure that emergency access is adequate during project construction. (LTS)”

On DEIR pages 4.11-7 through 4.11-8, the following items are added under “References”:

“Cusimano, 2007. Personal communication with Todd Cusimano, Captain, Twin Cities Police Authority, September 11.”


A1-16 Refer to Response to Comment A1-14. The bulk of the traffic would come in at 7:00 AM and leave at 3:00 PM, with contractor office staff staying until 5:00 PM. No holiday work is planned without prior approval of costs and budgets. The text on page 4.8-21, third paragraph of the DEIR, is changed as follows:

“… construction would occur between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM, Mondays through Fridays.”

A1-18 The improvements to the PE Complex were renovations that did not entail a change in the building's footprint or height or add any student/faculty/staff capacity to the campus. The only improvements proposed for the parking area adjacent to the College Court residential neighborhood would be the installation of mounted solar panels, which are addressed on page 4.6-9 of the DEIR. The staging of the PE Complex renovations would occur in Parking Lot 10, away from the College Court residential area.
August 13, 2007

Ms. V-Anne Chernock  
Marin Community College District  
c/o Swinerton Management and Consulting  
PO Box 144003  
Kentfield, California 94949

Dear Ms. Chernock:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin Kentfield Campus (SCH #2007032098). As you may be aware, pursuant to the California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.8, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) oversees cleanup of sites where hazardous substances have been released. As a potential Resource Agency, DTSC is submitting comments to help ensure environmental documentation prepared for this project under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) adequately addresses any remediation activities pertaining to releases of hazardous substances.

According to the draft, this EIR is intended to address the adoption and implementation of the proposed plan project, which consists of various remodeling projects, the construction of 5 new buildings, and the demolition of 15 buildings.

The draft report does not include a thorough description of the property’s historical uses, without which we are unable to determine whether hazardous substances may have been released to soil at the Site. The draft states that the main part of the campus was purchased in 1924 from the Butler Estate and that additional land was purchased in 1927 and 1931. Without additional information regarding the specific previous use of the purchased land, DTSC will be unable to determine whether hazardous substances may have been released at the Site. We strongly suggest that the Marin Community College District thoroughly assess all historical activities at the property. Based on that information, samples should be collected to determine whether additional issues need to be addressed in the CEQA compliance document.

Assessments described in the draft focus on the state of existing buildings, noting the presence of lead-containing paint and asbestos-containing pipes and other materials in buildings slated for demolition. DTSC strongly suggests that the Marin Community College District collect environmental samples after building demolition to determine
whether these hazardous substances have been released to the soil, ground water, or surface water. Any contamination will need to be addressed as part of the project.

For example, if the proposed project includes soil excavation and remediation, the CEQA document should include: (1) an assessment of air impacts and health impacts associated with soil excavation activities; (2) identification of applicable local standards, which may be exceeded by the excavation activities, including dust levels and noise; (3) transportation impacts from the removal or remedial activities; and (4) risk of upset if an accident occurs at the Site.

DTSC and the Regional Board signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), March 1, 2005 aimed at preventing duplication of efforts among the agencies in the regulatory oversight of investigation and cleanup activities at brownfield sites. Under the MOA, anyone requesting oversight from DTSC or the Regional Board must submit an application to initiate the process to assign the appropriate oversight agency. The completed application and site information may be submitted to either DTSC or Regional Board office in your geographic area.

Please contact Amy E. DeMasi at (510) 540-3812 if you have any questions or would like to schedule a meeting. Thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Denise M. Tsuji, Unit Chief
Northern California
Coastal Cleanup Operations Branch

cc: Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
PO Box 3044
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

Guenther Moskat
CEQA Tracking Center
Department of Toxic Substances Control
PO Box 806
Sacramento, California 95812-0806
Letter A2
California Department of Toxic Substances Control

A2-1 The property’s historical uses included mainly cattle ranching. Thus, hazardous waste releases would be limited to those associated with cattle ranching transportation and maintenance needs (i.e., diesel trucks and equipment). Since the site was not used for agriculture, sampling for pesticide- or herbicide-related hazardous waste is not necessary.

A2-2 The required National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would mitigate any hazardous waste releases into soils or water from construction (see Mitigation Measure HYDROLOGY-1a in the DEIR). No additional mitigation measures would be necessary.

A2-3 Comment noted.
Amy,

Here is a copy of the response to the COM Draft EIR:

>>> Joseph Eischens 5/14/2007 8:07 AM >>>

Natalie,

In response to your preliminary draft of the EIR section addressing water service, I have reviewed Marin Municipal Water District records for the College of Marin. Based on the data provided by you, the Bond Improvement Plan will not have a significant impact on water service. In regards to water facilities, meters etc., current District code does not require the College to install additional services as a result of the proposed construction. Furthermore, existing MMWD infrastructure in the area can support new service installations should the College choose to do so. In the matter of water use, MMWD estimates consumption for schools using a formula based on the number of students enrolled. The College of Marin expects an increase of 369 students over the next six years. Therefore, the District does estimate an increase in water use. However, District consumption records indicate the College of Marin's water usage in steady decline over the past three years and in fact, is equal to approximately one half of their annual water entitlement of 111.67 acre-feet. Thus, the College can easily absorb the estimated increase in water use with little impact. If you have further questions please let me know.

Joseph Eischens
Engineering Technician
MMWD
415-945-1531
Letter A3
Marin Municipal Water District

A3-1 Comment noted.
September 6, 2007

Ms. Debra Mathau, Construction Manager
Swinerton Management and Consulting
P.O. Box 144003
835 College Ave. MS-3
Kentfield, CA 94904

Dear Ms. Mathau,

Below are comments on the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the DEIR.

1. RE: Table 4.4-1 on page 4.4-4: A study just completed by Stetson Engineers (August 2007) utilizing an updated hydrologic and hydraulic model gives higher flows for peak discharges for the recurrence intervals shown. The new data gives these flows as:

- 5 year (20%) - 3660 cfs
- 10 year (10%) - 4580 cfs
- 100 year (1%) - 6820 cfs

Most severe flow on record: 1982 flood - 7200 cfs
December 2005 flood: 6757 cfs

2. With respect to the discussion on "Flooding" beginning on page 4.4-4, current conceptual plans for Unit 4 will increase the flow at the entry to the concrete channel in Ross to approximately 5400 cfs. The accepted capacity of the concrete channel that flows through the Kentfield campus is 3300 cfs. An integral part of increasing capacity in Unit 4 will be increasing the capacity of the concrete channel (Units 2 and 3). This will require the raising of walls between 1 and 3 feet along the concrete channel at some locations. The exact location of the wall sections to be raised will be determined during the design (PS&E) phase of the Unit 4 project which is presently in the early EIR/EIS phase. PS&E is expected to begin by the end of 2008.
General Comments:

- The hydrologic & hydraulic model developed by Stetson Engineers is available to aid engineers in predicting the water surface elevation and flood extents of expected, low probability events. We urge the technical designers to coordinate with Marin County Flood Control District in this regard.
- During the December 31, 2005 storm and flood, water was observed re-entering the concrete channel from the flows on Kent Ave.

General Concerns:

- It is not clear if new construction will reduce the storage capacity of the floodplain
- Increase parking areas provide opportunities for the use of impervious surfaces to allow for rainwater to penetrate the ground

We look forward to continued cooperation with the planning and development of the Kentfield campus.

Sincerely,

Jack Curley
Assistant Engineer
Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Letter A4
Marin County Department of Public Works

A4-1 The following text change is made to the last paragraph on page 4.4-2 of the DEIR.

"Between 1951 and 1993, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) maintained a stream gauge just upstream of the Lagunitas Road Bridge in Ross. Since 1993, the Marin County Department of Public Works has gathered data at the gauge. Between 1951 and 1993, the lowest flows occurred July through September 1977 when the stream was dry. The highest flows occurred in early January 1982, when the peak flow within the channel was 6,000-7,200 cubic feet per second (cfs). The December 2005 flood recorded a peak flow of 6,757 cfs."

The following text change is made to Table 4.4-1 on page 4.4-4 of the DEIR:

Table 4.4-1 Summary Peak Discharges for Corte Madera Creek at Ross, California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chance of Occurrence (Percent)</th>
<th>Peak Discharge (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Channel Capacity at Ross</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Year Flow</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-Year Flood</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Project Flood</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cfs = cubic feet per second.
*Source: Corte Madera Creek General Re-Evaluation Report, Hydrology and Hydraulics Appendix.
**Source: Stetson Engineers, August 2007.

The following text change is made to the last paragraph on page 4.4-4 of the DEIR:

"...downstream of the Lagunitas Road bridge in Ross. The accepted capacity of the concrete channel that flows through the Kentfield campus is 3,300 cfs. Unit Four, which was never built, was to extend from the Lagunitas Road Bridge in Ross to the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard bridge."

The following text change is made to the fourth paragraph on page 4.4-6 of the DEIR:

"Construction of Unit Four was to have begun in 1972 but was postponed due to environmental concerns. The Corps was asked to redesign Unit Four to preserve the natural character of the creek. Completing the project required the Corps to redesign Unit..."
Four and to correct the already-constructed concrete channel in Units Two and Three so that it could carry a greater flow (Figure 4.4-2). Current conceptual plans for Unit 4 will increase the flow at the entry to the concrete channel in Ross to approximately 5,400 cfs (County of Marin, Department of Public Works, 2007).

In 1996, the County passed a resolution recommending that the Corps proceed with a smaller design level of protection to minimize impacts. The project was required to adhere to certain specific design considerations, including minimizing the use of concrete, retaining adjacent recreational facilities such as the creekside multi-use pathway, using native plants, enhancing riparian and fish spawning habitat, and maximizing the channel capacity while retaining the Lagunitas Road Bridge as is. This project was to provide 40-year flood protection. The Town of Ross currently has plans to replace the Lagunitas Road Bridge with a new structure that will convey the maximum flows that can be accommodated at the entrance to the concrete channel, approximately 5,400 cfs.

A4-2 Comment noted. To accommodate future potential flood control improvements in the creek corridor, a 5-foot rise in elevation to the north side of Corte Madera Creek is expected to be achieved through a series of landscaped walls located along the channel.

A4-3 Comment noted.

A4-4 Comment noted.

A4-5 The new buildings are not expected to result in significant new fill. Impervious surface area would not significantly change in the proposed plan, so the net change in storage capacity should remain the same or increase with the addition of a grass-lined swale. Additional parking is proposed at the location of the existing Science Center. The proposed plan incorporates permeable paving and bioswales where appropriate within the new parking design. The issues raised by the commentor do not involve any significant impacts not addressed in the DEIR.
September 6, 2007

Debra Mathau
Swinerton Management & Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 14403
Kentfield CA 94941

RE: College of Marin Draft EIR Measure C Bond Measure Kentfield Campus
SCH 2007032098

Dear Ms. Mathau:

The Community Development Agency staff reviewed the draft EIR for the Kentfield Campus. The project scope does not include restoring the culverted blue-line stream (Tamalpais Creek) to a natural condition. It should be noted that The 2007 Countywide Plan Update, which is anticipated to be adopted in October 2007, includes Policy BIO-4.9 that states:

"Replace storm drains and culverts in Streamside Conservation Areas with natural drainage and flood control channels wherever feasible. Reopening and restoring culverted reaches of natural drainages should be considered part of review of development applications on parcels containing historic natural drainages where sufficient land area is available to accommodate both the reopened drainage and project objectives. Detailed hydrologic analysis may be required to address possible erosion and flooding implications of reopening the culverted reach and to make appropriate design recommendations. Incentives should be provided to landowners in restoring culverted, channelized or degraded stream segments. Where culverts interfere with fish migration but replacement is not possible, modify culverts to allow unobstructed fish passage."

The daylighted (restored) Tamalpais Creek and tidal marsh which could replace the culvert consistent with this policy would improve habitat value, flood control, and provide an example of creek restoration for environmental education programs at the College of Marin, Kent Middle School, Bacich School, etc. Tamalpais Creek supports Steelhead Trout that are listed as threatened species pursuant to the federal and state Endangered Species Acts.

Sincerely,

Ben Berto
Principal Planner
Letter A5
Marin County Community Development Agency

A5-1 While restoring Tamalpais Creek to a natural condition may be favored by the Countywide Plan Update policies, no impact associated with the proposed project would require such action as a mitigation measure. Therefore, no change to the DEIR is considered necessary. At some future date, the College District is not precluded from pursuing funding to undertake such restoration if the restoration is compatible with overall campus uses.
September 6, 2007

Ms. V-Anne Chernock
Marin Community College District
o/o Swinerton Mgmt. & Consulting
P.O. Box 144003
Kentfield, CA 94941

Subject: Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin (2007-2013) Kentfield Campus
SCH#: 2007032098

Dear Ms. V-Anne Chernock:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on September 5, 2007, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project’s ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

“A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation.”

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures:

cc: Resources Agency

1400 10th Street  P.O. Box 3844  Sacramento, California  95812-3044  
(916) 445-0613  FAX (916) 323-3018  www.opr.ca.gov

407.19.07
Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH#</th>
<th>2007032098</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin (2007-2013) Kentfield Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Marin Community College District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type**  
EIR  Draft EIR

**Description**  
The Implementation Plan for the Kentfield Campus would be constructed over a six-year period. At completion, the Kentfield campus is expected to have an enrollment of about 6,402 students, which is about a 6% increase (1% per year) over the 2006-2007 enrollment. This enrollment includes both full time equivalent students and students taking limited classes. The campus would decrease in overall square footage by 40,000 gross square feet (gsf) to 45,000 gsf.

**Lead Agency Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ms. V-Ann Chernock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Marin Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>(415) 457-9343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>c/o Swinerton Mgmt. &amp; Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box</td>
<td>144003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Kentfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>94914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Marin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Streets</td>
<td>Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No.</td>
<td>Multiple: 074-022-10 to 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proximity to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways</td>
<td>Corte Madera Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Kent MS, Ross ES, Redwood HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Site is now a college campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Public Facilities and Education/Environmental Resource District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>Public Facilities and Education/Environmental Resource</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Issues**

- Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeological-Historic; Biological Resources; Cumulative Effects; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Noise; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife

**Reviewing Agencies**

- Resources Agency; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 2; Department of Parks and Recreation; Native American Heritage Commission; Integrated Waste Management Board; Department of Fish and Game, Region 3; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 4; Department of Toxic Substances Control

**Date Received**  
07/23/2007

**Start of Review**  
07/23/2007

**End of Review**  
09/05/2007

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
Letter A6
California Governor's Office of Planning and Research

A6-1  Comment noted.
July 31, 2007

Ms. V-Anne Chernock
Director of Modernization
Marin Community College District
c/o Swinerton Management and Consulting
Post Office Box 144003
Kentfield, CA 94914

Dear Ms. Chernock:

Subject: Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin

Kentfield Campus, SCH # 2007032098, City of Kentfield, Marin County

The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) has reviewed the documents provided for the subject project, and we have the following comments.

For any activity that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (which may include associated riparian resources) of a river or stream, or use material from a streambed, DFG may require a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA), pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code, with the applicant. Issuance of SAAs is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). DFG, as a responsible agency under CEQA, will consider the CEQA document for the project. The CEQA document should fully identify the potential impacts to the stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and reporting commitments for completion of the agreement. To obtain information about the SAA notification process, please access our website at www.dfg.ca.gov/1600; or to request a notification package, contact the Streambed Alteration Program at (707) 944-5520.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Jeremy Sarrow, Environmental Scientist, at (707) 944-5573 or Mr. Greg Martinelli, Water Conservation Supervisor, at (707) 944-5570.

Sincerely,

Charles Armor
Regional Manager
Bay Delta Region

cc: State Clearinghouse
Letter A7
California Department of Fish and Game

A7-1 Comment noted. The response simply states that potential impacts to streams or riparian resources should be fully identified in the EIR, that adequate mitigation should be provided, and that a Streambed Alteration Agreement may be required by the California Department of Fish and Game. A discussion of the potential riparian impacts of the proposed Implementation Plan is provided under the Less than Significant Impacts assessment on page 4.3-11 and under Impact BIOLOGY-2 on page 4.3-14 of the DEIR. Mitigation Measure BIOLOGY-2 requires that any disturbance to jurisdictional wetlands and other waters be avoided and minimized, that required authorizations be secured from jurisdictional agencies including the California Department of Fish and Game, and that a detailed mitigation plan be prepared where required by jurisdictional agencies with any replacement provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. No additional assessment or mitigation is considered necessary in response to the comment.
September 14, 2007

Ms. Debra Mathau
Swinerton Management & Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 144003
Kentfield, CA 94914

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan, College of Marin, Kentfield Campus

Dear Ms. Mathau:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced draft EIR. This document evaluates a project that includes the following activities: 1) construction of five new buildings; 2) demolition of 15 existing buildings; 3) implementation of new landscaping, pathways, lighting, and utility plans; 4) construction of a new pedestrian/emergency access bridge across Corte Madera Creek; and 5) implementation of a new geothermal system.

The Marin County Department of Parks and Open Space (POS) manages the multiple-use path along Corte Madera Creek on both the east and west sides of the campus. The Department also works with the College District and the Marin County Flood Control District to manage the portion of the path that crosses the campus. The EIR addresses potential impacts to this pathway with mitigation measures that require the development of three plans: 1) a construction management plan; 2) a plan for accommodating multiple users of the Corte Madera Creek pathway; and 3) a bicycle circulation plan. POS strongly supports these mitigation measures and recommends that the College District implement them as part of the project.

In addition, POS requests that the College District consult with both the Marin County Flood Control District and POS in the development and implementation of these plans. In addition, the multiple-use plan should address cross traffic impacts from the existing and proposed new bridges over Corte Madera Creek. Finally, POS recommends that the multiple-use plan for the Corte Madera Creek pathway address the following issues: trash removal, pavement repair, and vegetation management.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please call me at (415) 499-3745.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James R. Raves
Senior Open Space Planner

c. Sharon McNamee, Director, Marin County Department of Parks and Open Space
   Ed Hulme, Parks Superintendent
   David Hansen, Planning and Acquisition Manager
   Steve Petterle, Principal Park Planner
   Marin County Flood Control District
Letter A8
County of Marin Department of Parks and Open Space

A8-1: Comment noted. These elements can be addressed in the multi-use plan recommended under Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-2 on page 4.8-22 of the DEIR.
September 17, 2007

Ms. Debra Mathau, Construction Manager
Swinerton Management and Consulting
P.O. Box 144003
Kentfield, CA 94904

Re: Additional Marin County DPW Comments
Draft Environmental Impact Report, Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan, Kentfield Campus

Dear Ms. Mathau:

The Marin County Department of Public Works (DPW) has completed additional review of the subject DEIR and provides the following additional comments below. Jack Curley from our office had previously provided comments in a letter dated September 6, 2007. We realize that the DEIR deadline has recently expired, but please accept these additional comments in the record and for your consideration.

1) Page 4.4-21, Mitigation Measure Hydrology-4: Reference to “finished lowest floor” should be replace with the “lowest floor” to conform to FEMA definitions. FEMA and County floodplain regulations (Marin County Code Chapter 23.09) apply to the lowest floor regardless whether it is considered finished. Reference to the defined FEMA 100 year flood elevation should be changed as FEMA has mapped the campus as an ‘A’ zone with a base flood elevation and flood hazard factor not determined. Our suggestion is to reference US Army Corps of Engineers "Report on the Floods of 4-6 January 1982 in the San Francisco Bay Areas" as the base flood elevation (BFE). Revise Hydrology -4 on page 2-14 accordingly.

2) Page 4.8-23, Mitigation Measure Transportation-3: DPW would like an opportunity to review and comment on a draft of the proposed bicycle circulation plan.
3) Page 4.8-22, Impact Transportation-2: The DEIR does not address the project contribution to the existing campus pedestrians and vehicular traffic conflicts along and across Sir Francis Drake Blvd. and Circle Drive. Campus pedestrians use Circle Drive as campus access, crossing Sir Francis Drake Blvd. mid block to use the bus stops or access the parking lot on the north side of Sir Francis Drake Blvd. Figure 4.8-1 does not show the pedestrian node as it is exists in the vicinity of the bus stop between Elm and Maple.

In addition, limited pedestrian visibility to vehicle traffic because of road geometry and vegetation along Sir Francis Drake Blvd. at Circle Drive should be addressed in the DEIR. Mitigation measures such as physical barriers that restrict pedestrians from crossing the street other than at intersections should be designed and implemented as part of this project.

4) Beginning on page 4.8-12, the DEIR discusses impacts to the transportation system. The campus is expected to increase student and faculty enrolment by 371 by 2013 with 56 trips in the AM peak hour and 45 trips in the PM peak hour. On page 4.8-14 the DEIR states that the level of service at of College Ave/Woodland Rd/Kent Ave would remain at an acceptable level.

By 2013 the County projects that the level of service will deteriorate significantly and likely warrant a higher level of traffic control such as signalization or construction of a roundabout at that intersection. The project trips are significant and will impact significantly the LOS of the existing stop controlled intersection of College Ave/Woodland Rd/Kent Ave. This intersection level of service will continue to deteriorate below acceptable LOS unless mitigated. The DEIR should add a mitigation measure for the District to pay a fair share of transportation facility improvements to mitigate the impact.

5) The DEIR did not address parking facility traffic ingress/egress on Kent Ave. Kent Avenue is a narrow residential street with parking on both sides of the street and a relatively high volume of bicycle and vehicular traffic. CHP collision reports indicate that there is a high number of collisions between bicyclists and vehicular traffic along Kent Ave. next to the campus. The campus should consider limiting the use of Kent Avenue as parking lot access during peak hours or other measures.

Please contact either Amanuel Haile or Eric Steger at (415) 499-6528 should you have any questions or require further clarification.

Very truly yours,

Eric Steger
Senior Civil Engineer

Amanuel Haile
Assistant Traffic Engineer

C: Farhad Mansourian
Craig Tackabery
Tim Haddad, CDA
Letter A9-1
Marin County Department of Public Works (Eric Steger & Amanuel Haile)

A9-1 The following text change is made to Mitigation Measure HYDROLOGY-4 on page 4.4-21 (and page 2-14) of the DEIR:

“Mitigation Measure HYDROLOGY-4: The District shall ensure that all lowest floor elevations for new buildings shall be at least 1 foot above the defined Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year flood elevation base flood elevation at time of construction, as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers “Report on the Floods of 4-6 January 1982 in the San Francisco Bay Areas,” and that the new West Bridge complies with plans for Corte Madera Creek in terms of the height of the channel walls. (LTS)

A9-2 The commentor has requested an opportunity to review and comment on a draft of the proposed bicycle circulation plan. The comment has been noted for the record. The DEIR contains a map showing recommended bicycle facilities (Figure 4.8-7).

A9-3 The comment refers to potential impacts resulting from the project contribution to pedestrian trip generation near the campus, and potential pedestrian/vehicle conflicts on adjacent streets such as Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and Circle Drive. In particular, the commentor recommends that physical barriers be installed to restrict pedestrian crossings at locations other than intersections (such as mid-block locations) on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. However, such measures cannot be recommended by the EIR since increased pedestrian travel resulting from the project has not been found to result in significant impacts, nor would the project create transportation safety hazards requiring mitigation. Key reasons supporting these findings are described below.

First of all, the project has not been found to result in a significant increase in trips to and from campus. Enrollment is anticipated to increase by 6 percent with the project, and the resulting amount of college-generated traffic (including pedestrian traffic) is anticipated to increase by a proportional amount. Impacts resulting from a 6-percent increase in the number of pedestrians crossing adjacent streets would be less than significant.

Secondly, although the commentor suggested that pedestrian crossings near campus result in conflicts with motorists, no specific documentation was provided to support this assertion (such as collision records or other data demonstrating that significant impacts would result from an increase in campus-generated pedestrian trips).

Thirdly, the commentor’s assertion that campus pedestrians tend to cross Sir Francis Drake Boulevard at “mid-block” locations near two adjacent bus stops (rather than crossing at intersection locations) is not consistent with observations conducted by the EIR transportation consultant. Although there is a potential mid-block crossing location on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (with access from Circle Drive via a stone pathway), there is little incentive for pedestrians to cross at that location. The north side of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard is developed with a campus parking lot (Parking Lot 2) that is several feet above the grade of the street and not conveniently accessible at the mid-block location; instead, a ramp provides access from Parking Lot 2 to the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard intersection with Elm Street. Thus, it is not surprising that pedestrians walking to
campus via the stone pathway were generally seen traveling on the south side of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, rather than crossing at the mid-block location. Even if mid-block crossings were frequent at this location, there is no indication that the prevalence of such crossings would increase significantly as a result of the project, since project development would occur south of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard.

Rather than crossing at mid-block locations, pedestrians traveling between campus and the westbound bus stop on the north side of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard have been observed to cross at the intersection with Maple Street. Pedestrian crossings of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard are prohibited at this intersection, despite the close proximity to two bus stops and the central part of campus. Pedestrians are expected to cross Sir Francis Drake Boulevard at either the College Avenue crosswalk (approximately 280 feet to the east, via the southeast leg of the intersection) or at the Elm Street crosswalk (approximately 290 feet to the west). As a result, pedestrians crossing between the westbound bus stop and the campus are required to travel nearly 600 feet out of their way in order to legally cross a road that is approximately 80 feet wide. Thus, it is not surprising that some pedestrians instead choose to travel the shortest path (a straight line) and cross illegally at the intersection with Maple Street, during gaps in the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard traffic flow. Pedestrians crossing at this location were frequently observed to cross the two halves of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in two separate movements (using the center median to provide refuge between movements).

Rather than restricting pedestrian movements through the installation of barriers that would limit pedestrian crossings, it may be prudent for the County at some time to consider measures to facilitate pedestrian crossings. Such measures could include a formal pedestrian refuge and/or signalized pedestrian crossing at the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard/Maple Street intersection (coordinated with the traffic signal at Sir Francis Drake Boulevard/College Avenue). As discussed above, pedestrian crossings on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard are determined by existing site conditions not resulting from the project. The design of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, and location of crosswalks and bus stops, are outside the jurisdiction of the College of Marin. Furthermore, as stated above, impacts resulting from the project are less than significant given the relatively small amount of enrollment growth (just 6 percent) that is forecasted to occur with the project.

The commentor also states that limited pedestrian visibility to vehicle traffic on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard should be addressed in the EIR, due to roadway geometry and vegetation. College Avenue would continue to provide the primary access points to campus. As with the pedestrian crossing issues discussed above, any concerns about site visibility on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard reflect an existing condition not resulting from the project. Site visibility would not be worsened as a result of the project, and no new direct access routes to Sir Francis Drake Boulevard are proposed. Parking Lot 2 would only be used for contractor trailers and construction worker vehicles. No materials would be stored on this lot. There are no plans to improve or increase the Parking Lot 2 capacity.

A9-4 The comment refers to the level of service at the intersection of College Avenue with Woodland Road and Kent Avenue, and states that the Marin County Public Works Department anticipates that unacceptable traffic operations requiring mitigation will occur by 2013. Installation of a roundabout or traffic signal is identified by the commentor as a potential mitigation measure. The commentor also states that the College of Marin should contribute to the cost of the mitigation.
The commentor indicated that their assessment of traffic conditions at the intersection was derived from a 1973 traffic study\(^2\) that addressed “sluggish” operations at the five-legged intersection in a more qualitative manner than would be typical today. For instance, there were no level of service calculations contained in the 1973 study, and even if such calculations were provided, they would not be consistent with the current state of the practice in transportation planning and traffic operations.

Intersection traffic operations are now evaluated based on the average delay (in seconds) experienced by motorists traveling through an intersection during the AM and PM peak hours; the average delay determines the intersection level of service (LOS). In recent years, sophisticated computer modeling and traffic analysis software has been developed that allows for a more accurate assessment of operational characteristics and average delay. Such tools were not available when the County’s 1973 study of operations at the College/Kent/Woodland intersection was prepared.

Furthermore, operational characteristics of the intersection have changed since 1973. For example, the fifth leg of the intersection is a driveway that provides access to college parking. In 1973, 14 percent of peak hour traffic through the intersection consisted of vehicles entering or exiting the College driveway; by 2005, the College driveway accounted for just nine percent of intersection traffic. This is largely due to the fact that from 1973 to 2005, the overall volume of traffic through the intersection increased by 34 percent during the AM peak hour and 27 percent during the peak hour, while the volume of College-generated traffic remained the same and/or declined in some cases.

For the reasons cited above, the commentor’s assessment of Year 2013 traffic conditions differs from the analysis described in the EIR, which is based on current traffic data and analysis methodology and found that traffic operations at the intersection would remain at acceptable levels without mitigation measures. The traffic modeling methodology used to forecast future traffic growth is also described in the EIR.

The EIR found that addition of project trips would not result in an increase in average delay at the intersection. Since the project would include a 6-percent increase in enrollment, the increase in campus-generated traffic would be relatively minor, and most campus-generated traffic would travel to campus from the north via College Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. Therefore, just 5 to 6 new peak hour trips (resulting from the project) are anticipated to travel through this intersection, which currently accommodates over 1,200 peak hour trips.

Since the project would not result in increased delay at the College Avenue/Woodland Road/Kent Avenue intersection, impacts on the intersection level of service (LOS) resulting from the project would be less than significant.

\(^{A9-5}\) The comment refers to parking ingress and egress on Kent Avenue. No major changes to the Kent Avenue driveway access would occur with the project. College Avenue would continue to provide primary access to and from campus parking lots, with secondary access from Kent Avenue. Any increase in parking demand or use of Kent Avenue for access by the college population would be

\(^2\) The 1973 study report was provided by County of Marin staff to Fehr & Peers on September 27, 2007.
relatively modest, since enrollment would increase by just 6 percent with the project. Impacts on circulation on Kent Avenue would be less than significant.
B. PUBLIC AND SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP COMMENTS
8/20/07

To: Ms. Debra Mathau  
Construction Manager  
Swinerton Management  
P.O. Box 144003  
835 College Ave., MS-3  
Kentfield, CA 94904

Dear Ms. Mathau,

The undersigned neighbors from Granton Park (Laurel, Cedar and Locust Aves) are very concerned about three impacts of the proposed college construction project as described in the draft EIR:

1. **Drainage.** Our neighborhood is a low spot and runoff from both the college and surrounding hill areas that drain through Laurel Avenue, which has been historically inadequate. We want to be certain that the college will reduce runoff to our neighborhood by channeling drainage away from the neighborhood, where possible, and increase the storm drain system capacity through the college so that our system does not get overwhelmed.

2. **Noise from the proposed “plant” facility to be located next to Laurel Ave.** We’re not sure why they did not pick a location more removed from proximity to residences as requested at the scoping meetings. However, we expect the college to fully mitigate the noise level from any machinery or power plants located nearby.

3. **Construction equipment and contractor parking along Laurel Ave.** What steps will be taken to keep major construction activity away from Laurel Ave, which does not have a stoplight at the congested corner of Sir Francis Drake, is a narrow street, and does not have the ability to handle influx of cars parked by workers?

For further discussion of the above please contact Ms. Pat Russo at 415-456-1789.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

[Handwritten signatures from other neighbors]
Suzan M. Conk
12 Cedar Ave.

J. Doe
12 Cedar Ave.

taylor Stites
4 Cedar Ave

Maria Stokes
1 Cedar Ave

Danae L. Rooney
14 Cedar Ave

Patricia & Tom Hall
16 Laurel Ave.

Barbara Hall
Tom Hall

Joe Passanisi
12 Laurel Ave

Bobbie Thrasher
8 Laurel Ave

Susan Ferrell
14 Laurel Ave
Kentfield CA 94904

Ken Gamble, Ken Hendy
18 Laurel Ave
Kentfield, CA

Benjamin Gamble
18 Laurel Ave
Kentfield, CA

Eileen Gamble
18 Laurel Ave
Kentfield CA 94904

Bridget Mulrooney
2045 S F D B}

Tom McDonald
7 Locust Ave
Kentfield CA 94904

Tracy K. McDonald
7 Locust Ave
Kentfield, CA 94904

She Fenton
3 Cedar Ave
Kentfield, CA 94904

Marilyn Fenton
3 Cedar Ave
Kentfield, CA 94904
Richard G. Kramer
100 First Ave
Kentfield CA 94904
415-220-9921

Leslie Lincoln
246-4697
1 Locust Ave

Richard and Ellen Gumbiner
11 Cedar Ave
Kentfield CA 94904
415-456-5015

Raymond Beers
Donald Sandline
9 Locust Ave
Kentfield, 94904
415-457-4625

Vera Henri
22 Cedar Ave
Kentfield, 94904

Ralph H. Alexander
1 Cedar Ave,
Kentfield, CA 94904

Ruth Alexander
Letter B1
Granton Park Neighbors

B1-1 To accommodate future potential flood control improvements in the creek corridor, a 5-foot rise in elevation to the north side of Corte Madera Creek would likely be achieved through a series of landscaped walls located along the channel. No other specific drainage improvements are proposed in the current plan. Minor site grading and drainage improvements may be designed during the final design phase. New parking lot improvements may incorporate bioretention systems that would increase the infiltration of stormwater and decrease runoff from the campus. See discussion in Section 4.4, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the DEIR.

B1-2 The Draft EIR (Section 4.10, Noise) assesses noise from the proposed Central Plant and mitigation is included to reduce noise levels at residences.

B1-3 The comment includes a request for information as to what steps would be taken to keep construction activity away from Laurel Avenue. Staging areas for construction activity have been identified and are shown on Figure 1. For construction of the new Math/Science Building near Laurel Avenue, construction staging would be conducted within Parking Lots 4 and 9. The primary access route to these two staging areas would be provided by the new West Bridge to be constructed over Corte Madera Creek, thus limiting the number of vehicles anticipated to use Laurel Avenue during periods of construction. Parking would not be allowed on Laurel Avenue and construction vehicles would be allowed to use Laurel Avenue on a limited basis only. Contractor parking would be accommodated within the Larkspur Annex and Parking Lots 13 (with access from College Avenue) and 15 (with access from Kent Avenue). As a result of these measures, traffic and construction vehicle activity on Laurel Avenue would be minimized.
KENTFIELD CAMPUS CONSTRUCTION STAGING AREAS
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SOURCE: CSW, J. Skaer and A.Skewes-Cox

AMY SKEWES-COX
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
Debra Mathews  
Construction Manager  
Avinorton Management and Consulting  
Kentfield, Ca 94904

Re: Draft EIR College of Marin, Kentfield

My concern regarding construction of Science-Math building on Lot 4 is that all drainage off this lot (plus drainage off Sir Francis Drake) flows into the storm drain on Laurel.

Lot 4 was created by landfill of 3 1/2-4 feet and this created increased flooding in Granton Park.

I hope that the above information will be taken into consideration when planning for run-off from this project.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
Letter B2
Patricia Russo

B2-1 Please see Response to Comment B1-1.
September 5, 2007

Ms. Debra Mathau
Swinerton Management & Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 14403
Kentfield CA 94914

RE: Comments on Draft EIR
COM Kentfield – Measure C
SCH 2007032098

Dear Ms. Mathau:

Friends of Corte Madera Creek watershed appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR for Measure C Bond spending. Our comments are focused on biological resources and hydrology, the areas most directly related to Friends’ main interests.

Specific Comments
First, we have some specific comments on the document. Our general concerns are addressed after these.

4.1 LAND USE AND PLANNING
This section refers three times to the confluence of Corte Madera Creek and Tamalpais Creek. Although the USGS map labels as Tamalpais Creek a small creek the drains College Court, Lot 13 and part of Marin Brain Injury Network, Tamalpais Creek actually enters a culvert on the west side of Kent Avenue and is completely underground through the campus. The confluence of Corte Madera Creek and Tamalpais Creek is located where a large double culvert flows into the stilling basin, just downstream of the concrete flood control channel. One bore of the culvert is Tamalpais Creek; the other, Murphy Creek.

4.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

INTRODUCTION (page 4.3-1)
This section states: “No detailed surveys for special-status animal species were conducted as part of the Background Assessment Report because of the marginal habitat conditions on the Kentfield campus where new development was proposed.” This seems to have been a false economy, given the fact that clapper rails have been observed on numerous occasions and suitable habitat for salt marsh harvest mice is found on the campus. Without protocol surveys for the special-status species of concern conducted in advance of the initiation of the construction project, there is no basis for finding that there are no significant impacts to those species.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING
Please add a section on riparian vegetation. The Ecology Study Area (ESA) and Murphy Creek both have riparian vegetation. The ESA is not a developed or landscaped area and should not be included in the discussion of developed areas. Also, please include a brief description of the habitat restoration efforts there. Here is a description, lightly edited, from Friends’ website:

College of Marin Ecology Study Area: This woodland site covers 2 acres adjacent to the multi-use path that links the college and Creekside Park. It is bounded by Corte Madera Creek and a tidal slough, the former main channel before construction of the flood control project. Friends of
Corte Madera Creek Watershed initiated a habitat enhancement project in 1998 by pulling broom and installing a small number of coyote brush plants and oaks. It has developed into a cooperative effort with the College of Marin. The goal is to create a diverse woodland of native species, accomplished by replacing eucalyptuses and acacias with oaks, buckeyes, willows, and other native trees and shrubs. A large area was cleared and replanted with nearly 400 plants in early 2005. A survey of bird use of the site was conducted to ensure that roosting herons and egrets will be disturbed as little as is possible (Lenarz 2005).

In the document as it now stands, Murphy Creek is not named or acknowledged. It is a short, but significant, tributary to Corte Madera Creek that flows into the campus at Parking Lot 15 and then enters a culvert at Kent Avenue. It parallels Kent Avenue until it meets the culvert containing Tamalpais Creek; both then travel under the athletic fields until they reach Corte Madera Creek in the stilling basin. Furthermore, even though Tamalpais Creek is culverted, it is a significant drainage that traverses the campus.

Aquatic Habitat
Add Murphy Creek and the channels draining the wetland near Lot 13 to this discussion. Murphy Creek is tidal in some of the reach on COM property; the channel from Lot 13 is fully tidal and connects to a tidal marsh located between Lot 13 and the Marin Brain Injury Network.

In the last line of page 4.3-2, please replace “movement” with “fish passage.” Also, the work to improve fish passage in Unit 3 does not involve Caltrans. The Marin County Flood Control District and the US Army Corps of Engineers are key players and should be added to the list.

SPECIAL-STATUS ANIMAL SPECIES
On page 4.3-5, the first paragraph provides a species list: the northwestern pond turtle is Clemmys marmorata marmorata. Clemmys marmorata is the western pond turtle. Northwestern pond turtles have been reported on the campus at the Ecology Study Area.

Fish Species (page 4.3-6).
Replace the phrase “remnant tidal marshes” with “estuary” in the first paragraph describing fish.

Table 4.3-1 (page 4.3-7).
Murphy Creek could provide habitat for California red-legged frogs and northwestern pond turtles, although we agree it is unlikely they are found there.

The Invasive Spartina Project hired Jules Evens to conduct protocol surveys for California clapper rails (Evens 2007). Unfortunately, his surveys did not include the tidal marsh at Lot 13; however, he considers the marshes around Lot 13 to be potential breeding habitat. Board members of Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed have seen clapper rails in that marsh on more than one occasion and a mother and 5 chicks were observed along the channel that connects Lot 13 to Corte Madera Creek.

Bird Species (page 4.3-9). Note that egrets and other herons are heavy users of the Ecology Study Area (Lenarz 2005).

JURISDICTIONAL WATERS
On page 4.3-10, the last sentence on refers to an unnamed ephemeral drainage near Lot 15. That is Murphy Creek. Replace the phrase “an open channel segment of an unnamed ephemeral drainage” with “Murphy Creek.” Most of that reach of Murphy Creek is tidal, not ephemeral.
LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS (page 4.3-11)
In the absence of protocol surveys for special-status animal species, it is difficult to justify the conclusion that: “The proposed Implementation Plan would not substantially interfere with wildlife movement opportunities or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.” As the DEIR warns, any impact on migratory bird species would be a violation of state, federal and international law (e.g., the Migratory Bird Treaty Act).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact BIOLOGY-1 (page 4.3-12)
This should include California clapper rails in the list of birds, and account for the 700-foot avoidance area around their nests and the breeding season of Feb 1 – Aug 31. That will require changes throughout the section.

Mitigation Measure BIOLOGY-2 (page 4.3-15)
The ratio should be a minimum of 3:1 replacement for permanently impacted wetlands and 1.1:1 for disturbed wetlands.

On page 4.3-15, the reference to the ephemeral drainage should be changed to Murphy Creek.

Impact BIOLOGY-3 (page 4.3-16)
We support planting valley oaks and other native trees along the concrete channel, however, the ultimate goal for restoration of Corte Madera Creek is removal of the concrete channel, so no buildings or facilities should be located within 50 feet of the concrete channel.

4.4 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY
Page 4.4-6 says that flooding is largely due to insufficient channel capacity in the vicinity of the Lagunitas Road Bridge. That statement is probably taken from a report prepared for or by the USACE, looking only at its project area. It would be more accurate to replace the phrase “in the vicinity of the Lagunitas Road Bridge, which is located approximately 600 feet upstream of the end of the existing concrete channel,” with “in San Anselmo, Ross, and Kentfield.” In the following sentence, replace “right (westerly) bank” with “banks” and delete “for a distance of over 1 mile”; then insert “San Anselmo Avenue, Shady Lane, and” before “Poplar and Kent avenues”.

In the penultimate paragraph, replace “This project was to provide 40-year flood protection.” With “The Town of Ross now has plans to replace the Lagunitas Road Bridge with a new structure that will convey the maximum flows that can be accommodated at the entrance to the concrete channel, approximately 5400 cfs.”

Page 4.4-14, discussion of Flood Zone 9. The replacement of the Lagunitas Road Bridge is strictly a Town of Ross project. The County is coordinating with the Town of Ross so that the bridge will have adequate capacity, but it has no other role in the bridge project.

Impact HYDROLOGY-4
Page 4.4-21 states that the flood control project aims to provide 40-year flood protection. The USACE was under the impression in 1996 that 5400 cfs was the 40-year event. However, the updated rating curve for the gage at Ross suggests that it has a recurrence interval of a few years less.
It would be better to remove all references to the flood control project providing protection for any particular recurrence interval, but to simply say that the goal is to convey as much flow as feasible into the concrete channel in Ross. At the present time, that is approximately 5400 cfs.

4.10 NOISE
Additional assessments of the impacts of the noise on wildlife over the 6-year construction period are needed. Noise during work at the PE Complex is likely to be heard in the tidal wetland near Lot 13, along the unnamed drainage feeding that marsh, and along the main channel downstream of the concrete channel. These natural areas are used by clapper rails. No protocol surveys for California clapper rails or saltmarsh harvest mice have been conducted in the tidal marsh; therefore it is unknown whether that area is used by either species for breeding.

General Concerns
The stated desire to have a sustainable, environmentally successful project is admirable, and a number of features to this end have been incorporated into the Measure C-funded components. We also feel that this is an appropriate time to acknowledge a broader goal for the campus as a whole, particularly with respect to the aquatic and riparian resources on the campus, and the role the campus played in the Corte Madera Creek Flood Control Project.

Restoration of Wetland Habitat: A very large amount of usable land was added to the campus when tidal marshes were filled, Corte Madera Creek was confined in a concrete channel, and Tamalpais and Murphy creeks were buried in culverts under the campus. Most of the athletic facilities occupy this reclaimed land. Now is time to develop long-term goals to address a portion of the resulting environmental damage. Specific actions that we recommend are:

1. Designating existing environmentally sensitive areas of College Property as Open Space to be protected in perpetuity for the benefit of fish, wildlife, and watershed functions. This designation could also include existing developed areas that could be restored to natural conditions, such as Parking Lot 13, Tamalpais Creek, etc. (see below).
2. Removing Lot 13 and restoring it to a tidal wetland. This would be the most easily accomplished project. It would be necessary to obtain funding for the planning, permitting, and implementation, but a number of state and federal agencies could be expected to support this effort. The DEIR states on page 4.8-20) that Lot 13 could be removed without causing a shortage of parking spaces.
3. Daylighting Tamalpais Creek. It could be recrouted to its historic channel or through the new wetland on Lot 13 to connect to the existing tidal channel. Planning for this effort could begin immediately, so that the new wetland could be designed to accommodate the flows.
4. Enhancing the riparian habitat along Murphy Creek upstream of Kent Avenue. This could be done immediately, with relatively modest financial support from grants.
5. Daylighting Murphy Creek downstream of Kent Avenue to the extent feasible. At the present time, it is in a culvert parallel to Kent Avenue until it joins the culvert containing Tamalpais Creek. At that point, it could be daylighted, along with Tamalpais Creek.
6. Removing the concrete channel confining Corte Madera Creek. This is a very long-term goal, but one that is worth keeping in mind. We request that no Measure C facilities be constructed in areas that in the future would be required to provide adequate capacity for the creek.
Friends would be very happy to work with the College on obtaining funding for these projects. Funders are more inclined to support projects that have multiple objectives and that are proposed by multiple stakeholders. I am sure we can engage the Marin County Flood Control District, Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (MCSTOPPP), and Town of Larkspur in collaborative efforts to enhance habitat and provide flood management on the campus by careful design of these projects.

Educational Opportunities: Faculty and students at the College of Marin have shown interest and ability to engage in environmental issues. We see the Measure C construction and the broader environmental view we advocate as providing an important educational opportunity for classroom learning in a variety of disciplines.

Involving students and faculty in planning and implementation of the five projects listed above would not only demonstrate COM’s commitment to a green bond project but would also provide opportunities for project-based learning in environmental remediation and restoration that would give unique hands-on experience both to its faculty and students. A number of COM faculty from diverse disciplines are likely to be interested in participating in such a project. Furthermore, employment in environmental restoration is growing rapidly and COM support for environmental restoration would identify it as a leader in the field, thereby attracting students who wish to study in this field.

We are eager to be engaged with the College as implementation of Measure C proceeds.

Sincerely,

Sandra Guldman
President
Letter B3  
Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed

B3-1  Refer to Response to Comment B3-4.

B3-2  As discussed on page 4.3-1 of the DEIR, protocol surveys for special-status animal species were not considered necessary because no development or habitat modifications are proposed in locations where suitable habitat for these species remains on the Kentfield campus. A habitat suitability analysis was conducted as part of the field survey work summarized in the Background Report, which determined the extent of any suitable habitat for special-status animal species on the Kentfield site. Most of the Kentfield campus is already developed and does not provide suitable habitat for special-status species. Areas with some potential to support special-status animal species will continue to remain undeveloped as part of the proposed Bond Spending Implementation Plan, which is why protocol surveys were not considered necessary. Additional information on special-status animal species known or suspected to occur on the remaining undeveloped portions of the Kentfield campus is provided under the discussion of Special-Status Animal Species beginning on page 4.3-5 of the DEIR, including Table 4.3-1 which summarizes information on each species of concern.

B3-3  The DEIR does acknowledge the presence of native woodlands on the hillside above Parking Lot 15 and the “Biological Preserve” in the eastern portion of the Kentfield site, as described on page 4.3-2. As requested by the commentor, this discussion on page 4.3-2 of the DEIR has been revised to highlight these remaining natural areas and to provide a summary of restoration activities in the “Biological Preserve,” as indicated below.

“Developed Areas/Ornamental Landscaping/Remaining Natural Areas
Buildings, roadways, parking lots, other impervious surfaces, turf, and ornamental landscaping occupy most of the Kentfield site. Existing landscaping consists primarily of non-native trees, shrubs, and groundcovers. The main campus is generally improved with structures and ornamental landscaping, but contains a number of mature specimen trees from the former Butler Estate in the northwestern portion of the property. A few native tree species occur as mature specimens, and native species commonly used in landscaping such as coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) and coast redwood (Sequoia sempervirens) are scattered throughout the main campus.

In addition to the undeveloped marshlands and grasslands in the southeastern portion of the site, remaining natural areas on the Kentfield site include a “Biological Preserve” in the eastern portion of the site and native woodlands on the hillside above Parking Lot 15. Native woodlands dominated by California bay, valley oak, and California buckeye (Aesculus californica) occur on the hillside above Parking Lot 15. Dense stands of the invasive non-native green wattle (Acacia decurrens) occupy much of the undeveloped area informally recognized as a “Biological Preserve” in the eastern portion of the site between the remnant segment of the original Corte Madera Creek alignment and the dredged channel. Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed initiated a habitat enhancement project in 1996 by removing broom and installing a small number of coyote brush plants and oaks in the Biological Preserve as part of cooperative effort with the College of Marin. The goal is to create a
diverse woodland of native species, accomplished by replacing eucalyptus and acacia trees with oaks, buckeye, willows, and other native trees and shrubs. A large area was cleared and replanted with nearly 400 plants in early 2005.”

B3-4 The unnamed ephemeral drainage referred to by the commentor as “Murphy Creek” is acknowledged on page 4.3-10 of the DEIR under the discussion of Jurisdictional Waters. This creek is primarily culverted, as shown in a new Figure 4.3-1.

B3-5 The commentor is correct that a number of tributaries to the main channel of Corte Madera Creek provide additional aquatic habitat on the campus. These are acknowledged under the discussion of marshlands on page 4.3-3 of the DEIR, and the discussion of Jurisdictional Waters on page 4.3-10 of the DEIR. As requested by the commentor, the discussion of Aquatic Habitat on page 4.3-2 of the DEIR has been revised to indicate other segments of open drainages which continue to provide aquatic habitat on the Kentfield site. These revisions are indicated below for page 4.3-2 of the DEIR:

“Aquatic Habitat
Although Corte Madera Creek has been channelized across the site, it continues to provide an important link for fish and other aquatic species. The creek corridor once supported a dense canopy of mature native riparian trees such as coast live oak, California bay, California buckeye, valley oak, and willows (Salix sp.), transitioning to the open marshlands in the southeastern portion of the Kentfield site. Efforts are underway to improve opportunities for movement of fish passage by anadromous species and other fish during periods when storm runoff levels contribute to high flow velocities in the concrete-lined channel and limit upstream migration. This includes an assessment of existing and proposed improved channel conditions for the Unit 3 Corps flood control channel that crosses the site, currently being conducted as part of a collaborative effort involving the non-profit Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries), the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and Caltrans. Tributaries to Corte Madera Creek that continue to provide aquatic habitat include the slough and drainage channels that border Parking Lot 13, and an ephemeral drainage that passes through the undeveloped area adjacent to Parking Lot 15, known locally as Murphy Creek. Murphy Creek enters a culvert downstream of this open reach, with the culvert following the alignment of Kent Avenue to the point where it joins with a culvert that contains flows from Tamalpais Creek. Tamalpais Creek has been completely culverted across the Kentfield site, but resurfaces as a perennial stream just off-site above Kent Avenue (see Figure 4.3-1).”

B3-6 The commentor is correct that the subspecies of western pond turtle known or suspected from the site is most likely northwestern pond turtle (Clemmys marmorata marmorata). However, this has not been confirmed, although the remnant segment of Corte Madera Creek in the “Biological Preserve” is in the northeastern portion of the Kentfield site. In response to the comment, the reference to northwestern pond turtle on page 4.3-5 of the DEIR has been revised to indicate the full scientific name of the subspecies. This revision is indicated below for page 4.3-5, last paragraph:

“. . . California clapper rail, northwestern pond turtle (Clemmys marmorata marmorata), California red-legged frog (Rana aurora draytonii), . . ."
Figure 4.3-1

MURPHY CREEK AND TAMALPAIS CREEK ON KENTFIELD CAMPUS
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Note: Easement locations are approximate and are shown for planning purposes only.

40-foot drainage and flood control easement (Murphy and Tamalpais Creeks) (Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District)
B3-7 The reference to “remnant tidal marsh” on page 4.3-6 (third paragraph) of the DEIR was used to describe the connection Corte Madera Creek currently provides anadromous fish because the segment of the creek has been extensively altered and very little tidal marsh remains along the existing drainage. Using the term “estuary” as suggested by the commentor does not provide any clarification, and no text change is considered necessary.

B3-8 As stated in the discussion of special-status bird species on page 4.3-9 of the DEIR, there is a high likelihood that California clapper rail and California black rail may forage and possibly nest in the remnant salt marsh in the southeastern portion of the site. However, as discussed under Impact BIOLOGY-1 on page 4.3-12 of the DEIR, no improvements are proposed that would affect the aquatic habitat along Corte Madera Creek, or the remnant salt and brackish marsh in the southeastern portion of the site. Thus, no impact would occur on potential suitable habitat for listed fish species, salt marsh harvest mouse, and other species associated with the marshlands on the site, including California clapper rail.

As indicated in the summary of habitat characteristics in Table 4.3-1, the presence of California red-legged frog and northwestern pond turtle on the Kentfield site was considered unlikely. California red-legged frog are known from the lower Corte Madera Creek and tributary watersheds. Suitable retreat habitat necessary for survival of northwestern pond turtle is absent on the Murphy Creek segment which crosses the Kentfield site.

B3-9 As indicated in the discussion under Impact BIOLOGY-1 on page 4.3-12 of the DEIR, no improvements are proposed along the Corte Madera Creek channel, which would include the “Biological Preserve.” No adverse impacts on known or possible future roosting areas are anticipated, and no mitigation is considered necessary.

B3-10 Please refer to Response to Comment B3-5, which provides a reference to the unnamed tributary on page 4.3-2 of the DEIR. The open segment of the unnamed tributary is not tidal where it passes through Parking Lot 15, and no additional revision to the DEIR is considered necessary.

B3-11 Please refer to Response to Comment B3-2. Mitigation Measure BIOLOGY-1b would ensure that either vegetation removal is scheduled outside the nesting season or that preconstruction surveys are conducted and adequate setbacks are provided if any active raptor or loggerhead shrike nests are encountered. No improvements are proposed in the vicinity of potential nesting habitat for salt and brackish marsh-dependent species, and preconstruction surveys for these species are therefore not necessary.

B3-12 Please refer to Response to Comments B3-2, B3-8, and B3-11 regarding the possible occurrence of clapper rails on the Kentfield site and fact that no improvements are proposed in the vicinity as part of the proposed Bond Spending Implementation Plan. No additional mitigation such as a 700-foot setback from clapper rail nests is considered necessary.

B3-13 The commentor suggests increasing the minimum wetland mitigation ratios specified in Mitigation Measure BIOLOGY-2, which currently identifies a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1. Specific mitigation ratios are set by the jurisdictional agencies depending on the value and functions of the affected wetland habitat. Establishing a minimum ratio of 3:1 replacement for permanently affected wetlands would exceed typical ratios required by jurisdictional agencies. Preferably, jurisdictional wetlands would be avoided, as called for in Mitigation Measure BIOLOGY-2. Please refer to
Response to Comment B3-5, which provides a reference to the unnamed tributary on page 4.3-2 of the DEIR.

B3-14 Restoration of the channelized segment of Corte Madera Creek is not identified as a goal of the proposed Bond Spending Implementation Plan. The channel includes a 50-foot easement and the Implementation Plan does not propose any development other than the new West Bridge within this easement area. Generally, new buildings and facilities would be set back more than 50 feet, as shown in Figure 3-4 of the DEIR.

B3-15 The following text change is made to the second paragraph on page 4.4-6 of the DEIR:

"The flood of January 3-5, 1982, was the largest on record and caused considerable damage in San Anselmo, Ross, Kentfield, and Larkspur. Another flood on December 31, 2005 reached levels only slightly below that of the 1982 flood. Flooding from Corte Madera Creek under existing conditions is largely due to insufficient channel capacity in San Anselmo, Ross, and Kentfield the vicinity of the Lagunitas Road Bridge, which is located approximately 600 feet upstream of the end of the existing concrete channel. Flows greater than about 3,300 cfs, which can be expected to occur once in five years, overtop the right (westerly) banks and flow downstream for a distance of over 1 mile along San Anselmo Avenue, Shady Lane, Poplar and Kent avenues through densely populated areas north of the Kentfield campus. While some flows can re-enter the channel upstream of College Avenue, the majority of flows re-enter the main channel downstream of the concrete section."

The following text change is made to the last paragraph on page 4.4-14 of the DEIR:

"Zone 9 is currently participating in the new planning efforts for the unbuilt Unit Four. This unit extends upstream of Unit Three and includes the channel through Ross and proposed retrofits of the Lagunitas Road bridge."

B3-16 The following text change is made to the second paragraph under Impact HYDROLOGY-4 on page 4.4-21 of the DEIR:

"Though the current plan for Corte Madera Creek flood control has not been finalized, the project's objective is to provide 40-year flood protection convey as much flow as feasible into the concrete channel in Ross, which at the present time is 3,300 but will be increased to 5,400 cfs. The flood control project involves improving . . . ."

Figure 4.4-3, Dam Failure Inundation Areas: Kentfield Campus, on page 4.4-3, is amended as shown below and the figure is shown in Chapter 3 of this FEIR:

"Source: ABAG, 1995 need year ****"

B3-17 The State CEQA Guidelines and the Marin Countywide Plan contain policies that are designed to limit human exposure to noise at noise-sensitive land uses. Assessment of project noise impacts on wildlife is not part of the CEQA process and no standards for noise impacts on wildlife have been adopted. See Response to Comments B3-2, B3-8 and B3-11 for discussion of wildlife surveys.
B3-18 The identified actions and goals relate to the Plan rather than any specific impacts that require analysis in the EIR, and as such do not require any changes to the EIR. These comments are noted. Future actions for habitat restoration could be undertaken at a future date if funds were obtained, but are not part of the current Measure C program. Refer to Response to Comment B4-2.

B3-19 Comments noted. See Response to Comment B3-18.
September 6, 2007

Ms. Debra Mathau, Construction Manager
Swinerton Management and Consulting
P.O. Box 144003
835 College Avenue, MS-3
Kentfield, CA 94904

Re: Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin Draft Environmental Impact Reports

Dear Ms. Mathau:

The Marin Conservation League is an organization dedicated to preserve, protect and enhance the natural assets of Marin County since 1934. In reviewing the EIR’s for the Indian Valley campus and the Kentfield campus we focused our attention on the impacts to the natural assets of each campus.

Indian Valley Campus

Description of the project does not identify the setback of the new campus building from the bank of the creek, but it appears to be at least fifty feet as recommended by county and Novato setback standards. It is not clear from the description whether the paved walk along the creek at the new building would require removal of any riparian vegetation. Riparian vegetation should be preserved and enhanced whenever possible.

Outdoor lighting, as mentioned on page 3-12, is to be designed to maximize public safety while minimizing intrusion on adjacent residential areas. It should also take into consideration the impact on wildlife and minimize that impact also.

The green building goal of achieving LEED silver is laudable for new buildings. Remodeled buildings should also attain LEED certification. The geothermal heat exchange system may impact archeological resources well below the surface so some test borings should be made before finalizing that element of the plan.

Page 4.3-4 downplays the value of the riparian corridor that runs through the campus. Wherever possible it should be enhanced. No fish were observed during field reconnaissance, however the document acknowledges that structures on the campus, as well as downstream prevent migration of anadromous fish. The problem structures on campus should be removed as part of this project. The riparian vegetation should be restored wherever possible, but especially next to the new building. Riparian

Marin County’s Environmental Watchdog
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Marin Conservation League – September 6, 2007

vegetation should be native to the area. Whenever possible invasive plants should be replaced with native or non-invasive species.

The mitigation measure on page 4.4-13 includes straw mulching, erosion matting and hydro-seeding which are effective, but could introduce invasive species. Care should be taken to prevent that. The bioswales are a good means to reduce pollutants in the creek. It would have been helpful to be able to review the maintenance plan, which will be critical to their success.

The reduction of parking capacity due to the changes in the existing parking lots appears to remain adequate for the projected college uses. The discussion did not take into consideration the joint use with the City of Novato of the western lots and the athletic fields developed by the city. What is the demand for that use?

Kentfield Campus

The intent to achieve LEED certification of new structures is a good objective. It should pay off in the long run and should be instructive for the students at the college.

The Kentfield campus is a more urban setting than IVC, but it has the potential to provide increased habitat value throughout the campus. Since Corte Madera Creek is a major feature on the campus and the focus of years of controversy, effort should be made to either help with the restoration of a natural channel or to keep building setbacks at least 50 feet from the creek bank to allow for the eventual restoration.

Other opportunities for restoring habitat include: (a) restoring the tidal wetlands where parking lot 13 exists (page 4.8-20 states that this lot is excess of the need), (b) daylighting Tamalpais Creek, as well as Murphy Creek, where possible, but certainly through a wetland restored at lot 13, (c) restoring riparian habitat along Murphy Creek.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these documents. We would appreciate receiving notice when the Board of Trustees schedules their meeting to discuss them.

Yours truly,

Roger Roberts
President
Letter B4
Marin Conservation League

B4-1 This comment addresses plans for the Indian Valley campus, which is addressed in a separate Final EIR.

B4-2 Comment noted. There are currently no long-term goals or specific programs defined as part of the proposed Bond Spending Implementation Plan addressing the habitat restoration and enhancement opportunities suggested by the commentor. Mitigation Measure BIOLOGY-3a on page 4.3-16 of the DEIR includes a recommendation that the proposed geothermal field be located at least 50 feet from the Corte Madera Creek to allow for establishment of native tree plantings along the channelized reach across the main campus. Refer to Response to Comment B3-14.

A number of opportunities exist on the Kentfield campus for the restoration of habitat. However, the College has no control over the channel, which is a right-of-way that is within the County’s jurisdiction.
September 6, 2007

Ms. Debra Mathau
Swinerton Management & Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 14403
Kentfield, CA 94914

RE: Comments on Draft EIR

Dear Ms. Mathau:

Thank you for giving us an opportunity to comment on the Environmental Impact Report.

There are a couple of areas we would like to see expanded:

- **Visuals as you look down College Avenue from the Sir Francis Drake intersection.**

  The two new Gateway buildings could have a profound impact on this corner. I didn’t see much in the way of visuals for these two buildings as seen from College Avenue. It would be important to our community to have wider sidewalks in this area and a true interface with the street to draw people into the college campus which is such an important part of our Kentfield Community. Unfortunately, the current campus Learning Center appears from College Avenue to be a loading dock and does nothing to invite the community.

- **Analysis of the current pedestrian bridge in the middle of the campus and possible replacement.**

  The current pedestrian bridge is known to be one of the first impediments to water flow when the Corte Madera Creek is reaching flood stage. Since there will significant construction and re-routing of utilities going on during this period, it would be good time to replace this bridge.

We would appreciate your consideration of providing more information in these areas.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Anne Peterson
Chairman, Kentfield Planning Advisory Board
Letter B5
Kentfield Planning Advisory Board

B5-1 Visuals for the Gateway buildings are not available at this time because no detailed drawings have yet been prepared. As explained on page 1-1 of the Draft EIR, this EIR is a “Program EIR” and, as such, looks at the entire set of actions associated with the Bond Spending Implementation Plan. Detailed drawings were only available for a select number of projects at the time of preparation of the Draft EIR. Comments about sidewalk widths are noted.

B5-2 No plans for replacement of the existing pedestrian bridge are included in the current Bond Spending Implementation Plan. Water flow impediments from the bridge have not been noted by the County’s Department of Public Works or others, and replacement has not been found to be necessary.
September 6, 2007

Ms. Debra Mathau, Construction Manager
Swinerton Management and Consulting
P.O. Box 144003
835 College Avenue, MS-3
Kentfield, CA 94904

Subject: Comments on the Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin (2007-2013), Kentfield Campus, Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Mathau:

Thank you for the opportunity for the Marin County Bicycle Coalition (MCBC) to provide comments for the College of Marin Measure C Bond Spending Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

Our non-profit organization promotes safe bicycling for everyday transportation and recreation. It is within this context that we submit these comments to the College of Marin.

Summary of Comments

The Marin County Bicycle Coalition is pleased that the College of Marin’s DEIR is taking bicycle and pedestrian access into consideration as part of the Kentfield Campus infrastructure upgrade project. As the County of Marin’s off-campus bicycle route system continues to be enhanced, we believe that even more students, staff, and visitors will choose to bicycle to campus. Additionally, we are pleased to see that bicycle parking has been proposed next to nearly all buildings on campus, but more specificity is needed about the type and quantity of this bicycle parking. At the same time, however, we feel that there are many opportunities to improve bicycle and pedestrian access to and at the campus which we hope you will take into account for the FEIR and final implementation plan.

Suggestions for Improvements on the Existing Plan

Bicycle Traffic Counts

We believe that the traffic counts taken along the Corte Madera Creek Trail through the Kentfield Campus during peak morning and afternoon periods on October 12, 2005 do not show the true “peak” numbers of bicyclists and pedestrians who utilize the existing facilities. October is a fairly wet month in Marin County, and as such, a greater number of bicyclists will choose not to ride to campus due to the wet weather. In addition, many bicyclists (and pedestrians) use routes other than the Corte Madera Creek Trail to access the campus, so the counts are incomplete in that these other routes have not been taken into account.
We suggest that additional counts for both bicyclists and pedestrians be taken during the
upcoming late spring months when weather is more conducive to bicycling. On Friday,
August 31, 2007 casual observation along the roads leading to the campus (Kent and
College) showed more than 20 cyclists entering the campus directly off of the street; this is
due-in part to the fact that the Corte Madera Creek Trail is not of standard width, and the
pavement condition is extremely poor in some areas. Transit also serves the campus; a
number of bikes were observed being unloaded during the peak morning hours; this was not
considered as part of the initial analysis and should be taken into account.

**Bicycle Parking**

Section 4.8-4 notes, “Bicycle parking is currently underused in many locations on campus, in
part because the current supply of bicycle parking includes locations that may not be
convenient for secure bicycle storage.” We agree that bicycle parking is currently
underutilized, based on our observations on August 31, 2007. However, we could find no
additional information in the DEIR that would help us to understand if the observation that
the lack of secure bicycle storage would be addressed as part of the campus infrastructure
upgrade. We believe that additional bicycle parking should be addressed, as studies show
that people will not ride their bicycle to a destination if there is not secure bicycle parking.

We offer the following suggestions for improving the bicycle planning component of the
DEIR:

- All recommended bicycle parking should placed near the main entrances of each
  building. For personal safety reasons and to reduce vandalism to and theft of bikes,
  cyclists will not use racks that are out of sight, are not in well lighted locations, and
do not have an immovable structure to lock their bike frame to.
- Note the proposed number of bicycle parking spaces at each location. We
  recommend storage for at least 20 bicycles at each building. It’s noteworthy that
  eight bicycles can fit in the space of one automobile, so this is a good use of space.
- MCBC suggests the use of “Coro”-type or “inverted-U” bicycle racks. Proper
  placement of each rack is critical, because if a rack has inadequate room provided
  around it to position bike frames to be locked directly to it, they will not be used.
- We additionally recommend installation of bicycle lockers (which can be rented on a
  per-term basis) at each building designated for bike parking; these will be very
effective to deter theft of bicycles and will provide bikes with protection from
inclement weather. (Most thefts on campus occur at night when fewer people are
around).

**Routes to Access the Campus**

One of the main issues that College of Marin must deal with is ensuring that campus
upgrades will not lead to increases in automobile traffic in the surrounding areas. As many
College of Marin students live within bicycling and walking distance to the campus, we
recommend that College of Marin actively partner with the County of Marin, and
surrounding jurisdictions, to improve the bicycle and pedestrian routes to access the campus.
The College of Marin should provide funding for this effort, as safer bicycle and pedestrian
access (combined with promotion of these modes) could lead to a substantial mode shift, and
a reduction in negative traffic impacts. Routes should be improved as called for in the County
of Marin’s 2001 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan which is currently being updated. In
addition, special attention should be given to street crossings that lead to the campus to
ensure that they safe. Many times, cars do not stop when people are trying to cross College
Avenue, even when there is a crosswalk.
Supporting Bicycle Facilities

Finally, the Marin County Bicycle Coalition suggests installation of several alternative-transportation-related kiosks around campus. We suggest that these kiosks include information on local bus schedules, area bicycle maps, a campus map, and bike shop locations and resources. We feel that these kiosks would help to send the message that bicycling and walking are healthy, environmentally responsible, and realistic modes for commuting to and from campus.

The Marin County Bicycle Coalition looks forward to working with the College of Marin in the future. We hope that you will find our suggestions both reasonable and appropriate, and we look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

David Hoffman
Director of Planning
Marin County Bicycle Coalition
PO Box 1115
Fairfax, CA 94978
415.456.3469 x4#

Cc: College of Marin Board of Directors
   Marin County Board of Supervisors
   Craig Tackabery, Marin County Department of Public Works
   Deb Hubsmith, Kim Baenisch, Marin County Bicycle Coalition
   Patrick Seidler, Transportation Alternatives for Marin
Letter B6
Marin County Bicycle Coalition

B6-1 The comment expresses support for the bicycle and pedestrian access measures included in the Bond Spending Implementation Plan and recommended in the DEIR, and states that additional measures (beyond those already identified) would also be beneficial. The comment is noted for the record. However, additional measures at not necessary to mitigate impacts identified in the DEIR.

B6-2 The comment addresses data collection conducted during preparation of the DEIR that included counts of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling on the Corte Madera Creek Trail during morning and afternoon periods on October 12, 2005. The commentor states that the counts do not reflect the “peak” number of bicyclists and pedestrians who travel to the campus, since other routes are used by cyclists, in part due to the substandard nature of the Creek Trail (due to narrow width and substandard pavement). The comment is noted for the record.

The bicycle and pedestrian counts conducted on the Corte Madera Trail for the DEIR were not intended to reflect the total number of bicyclists and pedestrians traveling to the campus; instead, the intent was to measure existing usage of the Creek Trail (which likely includes users from outside the college who frequently use the path). Given the multiple access routes into campus, accurately counting each pedestrian and bicyclist entering and exiting campus during peak periods would be a difficult and labor-intensive endeavor.

The commentor also states that wet weather during the month of October limits the number of bicyclists traveling to campus during that time of the year, thus constraining the number of cyclists counted. Given the significantly higher rates of bicycling in such wet locations as Eugene, Oregon and Amsterdam, Holland, the amount of rain typically experienced in Marin County during the month of October seems unlikely to significantly limit bicycle travel by active cyclists. However, the comment is noted for the record.

B6-3 The commentor states that the DEIR does not indicate whether the project will address the lack of bicycle parking in convenient locations. The DEIR noted that the project includes the provision of bicycle parking as new buildings are constructed on campus. Preparation of a bicycle circulation plan (that will show recommended shower and locker facilities) is recommended as an EIR mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-3 on page 4.8-23).

B6-4 The comment notes that many students live within bicycling and walking distance of campus and recommends that the College actively partner with the County of Marin and other jurisdictions to improve and fund bicycle and pedestrian facilities routes to the campus. The comment is noted for the record. The DEIR recommends preparation of a bicycle circulation plan (Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-3), which is adequate mitigation for the project’s bicycle-related impacts.

B6-5 The commentor suggests installation of several kiosks around campus to provide information on local bus schedules, bicycle maps and other resources. The comment is noted for the record and could easily be part of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program identified in Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-4 on page 4.8-23 of the DEIR.
August 24 2007

Via US Mail and E-mail

Ms. Debra Mathau
Swinerton Management & Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 144003
Kentfield, CA 94914
Debra.Mathau@marin.edu

Dear Ms. Mathau,

In reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) for the Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan (“Measure C Plan”) for College of Marin’s (“COM”) Indian Valley (“IVC”) and Kentfield (“KC”) Campuses, I was pleased to note that the DEIR was responsive to our prior correspondence and suggestions. However, even with the extensive measures to be taken per the DEIR, a number of issues remain unresolved, and a few new issues have arisen.

As an experienced advocate of bicycle transportation, TAM is an organization with a working knowledge of what is effective and what is not. Accordingly, I have a series of comments and suggestions that will help facilitate sustainable non-motorized access to the COM campuses.

Below, I have outlined the changes that we would like made to both better define the goals of the DEIR and to address new issues that the DEIR have raised.

1. First and foremost, the Corte Madera Creek Bicycle Path should be improved to a Class I bicycle path. The proposed mitigation measure number two (2) for the KC DEIR (see KC DEIR 4.8-22) will improve the path, but TAM believes that the EIR should require the path to be elevated to a Class I bicycle path to facilitate bicycle access to the campus.

2. Second, TAM would like the EIR to include not just recommended, but mandatory bicycle stations and lockers. It is important that a minimum number of new facilities be required by the EIR to mitigate the environmental impacts outlined.
   a. Bicycle parking facilities should be located at each building, and those facilities should be of high quality, so as to ensure their use.
   b. To that end, the bicycle parking facilities must be covered, secure, and located in the front of each building.
c. There should also be one (1) or more secured indoor bicycle parking facilities per campus, preferably located adjacent to the proposed shower/locker facilities.

d. Finally, there should be one small, secured bicycle parking facility located inside each building for the exclusive use of the COM faculty, staff, and administration.

3. Third, as noted, “since parking is plentiful and cheap, there is little incentive for drivers to use other travel modes to and from the Kentfield campus.” (see KC DEIR pg 4.8-10). It is important to provide incentives for students to use non-motorized and/or public transportation to mitigate the environmental impact of automotive transportation. To that end, TAM would like the EIR to require two items:

a. First, an increase in parking fees to at least $6 per day, so that the $4 roundtrip cost of public transit or the free bicycle parking facilities will be a significant discount to the cost of driving. In addition, this $2 increase in parking fees could be used as an additional funding mechanism for improvements to the Corte Madera Creek path, and would bring the cost of parking at COM closer to parity with other locations in Marin.

b. Second, the free parking facilities at Lot 13 should be removed, and free parking eliminated at COM, as suggested in the DEIR. (see KC DEIR 4.8-20). This would have a “less than significant” impact on parking, but would provide further incentive for alternative methods of transportation.

4. Fourth, the proposed bicycle circulation plans should be revised to include the following recommendations, pursuant to the figures in Exhibit 1, attached hereto:

a. First, as shown in the attached revision to figure 4.7-8, three additional bicycle parking facilities should be constructed at IVC to ensure that bicyclists can access and securely park their bicycles at all buildings on campus.

b. Second, as illustrated in the revision to figure 4.7-1, the highlighted part of the “unpaved hiking” path should be surface treated to allow bicycle access, and the highlighted roads on campus should be upgraded to Class I bicycle lanes.

c. Third, as noted in the revision to figure 4.8-1 and the revision to figure 4.8-2, the bicycle paths leading to the Kentfield campus should be greatly improved, including the construction of a new Class I bicycle path on the South side of Corte Madera Creek. This construction should also include Class I path leading from Magnolia Avenue to the South side path. The rest of the highlighted area should likewise be improved to a Class I bicycle path to ensure bicycle access to the Kentfield campus.

d. Fourth, as illustrated in the revision to figure 4.8-2, the highlighted section of Sir Francis Drake Blvd and all of College Ave should be upgraded to include a cycle track, separated by a median from the main road. A picture of a cycle track from Boulder, CO is included as Exhibit 2.
5. Finally, the alternatives to the proposed plan, including the no action alternative, should be revised to reflect all improvements suggested to bicycle infrastructure at both campuses. This would ensure that, even if an alternative plan is adopted, the bicycle infrastructure will be greatly improved at both campuses.

These suggested improvements will help to ensure sustainable, non-motorized access to the Kentfield and Indian Valley campuses for the foreseeable future. This will not only lessen the environmental impact of the proposed projects, but will help to establish the College of Marin system as a model transportation solution for the nation.

Transportation Alternatives for Marin (“TAM”) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission is to promote pedestrian and bicycle transportation, in the United States and globally, by making Marin County, California the national model for pedestrian and bicycle transportation. TAM also works to demonstrate that investment in integrated bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, combined with education, is the optimal transportation solution and an integral part of an effective multi-modal transportation system.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick M. Seidler
President

cc: Marin County Board of Supervisors
    City of Larkspur
    City of Novato
    Marin County Bicycle Coalition
Exhibit 1
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- Existing Bike Path
- Proposed Bike Path
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- Proposed Bike Lanes/Shoulders
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Figure 4.7-2
EXISTING AND PLANNED BICYCLE ROUTES
INDIAN VALLEY CAMPUS

SOURCE: Fehr and Peers, 2007
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Upgrade to Class 1 bicycle path
Proposed Class I bicycle path
Exhibit 2
Cycle Track – Boulder, Colorado
Letter B7
Transportation Alternatives for Marin

B7-1 The commentor recommends that the Corte Madera Creek Trail be improved to Class I bicycle path standards. The College does not own or maintain the bike path along Corte Madera Creek. This area is maintained by the County’s Open Space District. The only improvements that would occur would be adjacent to the planned West Bridge to be constructed over the creek.

The EIR includes a mitigation that requires preparation of a plan for accommodating multiple users of the pathway through campus, with specific emphasis on reducing potential conflicts that might arise between multiple path users, or at locations where the pathway intersects other circulation routes (such as parking aisles and campus paths) and/or minimal separation between the path and adjacent motor vehicle parking spaces. Refer to Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-2 on page 4.8-22 of the DEIR.

B7-2 The commentor recommends that the bicycle stations and lockers that were “recommended” in the EIR be mandatory. The provision of bicycle parking and support facilities would increase the likelihood that the campus would obtain a desired LEED standard for sustainable building practices, which is a key goal of the project. Thus, while bicycle parking is not strictly required by the DEIR, the provision of such facilities is anticipated in order to help achieve this goal. In order to require the provision of specific mitigations as part of an EIR, significant impacts must be identified. In this case, impacts to bicycle parking resulting from the project are less than significant, since the project is not anticipated to result in a shortage of bicycle parking. Therefore, bicycle parking is not required as a mitigation measure.

B7-3 The commentor suggests that parking fees be increased to $6 at the Kentfield campus in order to discourage driving and to allow the $4 cost of a round-trip bus ticket to compare more favorably with private vehicular use. The comment is noted for the record but no additional mitigation measures are necessary.

The fee amount that California junior colleges may charge for parking is limited by State law, with some exceptions: colleges are allowed to increase parking fees to fund transportation demand management (TDM) programs or the construction of new parking facilities. Increasing the cost of parking has been found to be effective in reducing vehicles trips at some colleges and universities, with traffic reductions of approximately 15 percent noted at several universities.

B7-4 The comment refers to the Indian Valley campus (IVC) and is addressed in the Final EIR for that campus.

B7-5 The comment refers to the Indian Valley campus (IVC) and is addressed in the Final EIR for that campus.

B7-6 The comment recommends that a Class I path be provided on the south side of Corte Madera Creek and other locations. Ultimately, consideration of this recommendation will need to be balanced with funding constraints, as well as potential effects on adjacent wetlands. Refer to
Response to Comment B7-1. The comment is noted for the record, but no additional mitigation measures are necessary to mitigate bicycle-related impacts identified in the DEIR.

B7-7 The commentor recommends that a type of bicycle path known as a “cycle track” be installed on College Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. The cycle track would be separated from motor vehicle travel lanes by a median. Although cycle tracks are common in some European countries, their application in the United States has been limited primarily to university towns with significant numbers of cyclists. While cycle tracks may ultimately become more common in the United States, their initial installation in Marin County should be carefully considered to avoid challenging locations. If not properly located and designed, cycle tracks can cause conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians (as is frequently the case on multi-use trails), as well as conflicts with motorists if driveways and intersection locations are too closely spaced. Given these concerns, College Avenue does not appear to be an appropriate location for installation of the first cycle track in Marin County, given the large number of closely spaced driveways and narrow sidewalks. Furthermore, since College Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard are County roads, the Marin Community College District does not have jurisdiction to install such a treatment.

B7-8 The commentor recommends that alternatives to the proposed plan, including the no action alternative, include the bicycle improvements suggested for the campus. This recommendation is noted for the record, although inclusion of these elements in the no action (“No Project”) alternative is not possible (since this would require “action”). It should be noted that many, if not all, of the recommended mitigation measures for the proposed project would also apply to the alternatives (other than the “No Project” alternative). Mitigation measures that would be applicable to each alternative are not described in detail in DEIR Chapter 5, since the California Environmental Quality Act does not require detailed mitigation descriptions for alternatives. It is assumed that many of the same mitigation measures would apply to any of the alternatives, should one be selected rather than the proposed project.
Sept. 4, 2007

Ms. Debra Mathau
Construction Manager
Swinerton Management and Consulting
P.O. Box 144003
835 College Ave, MS-3
Kentfield, CA 94904

RE: College of Marin Draft Environmental Impact Report Comments

Dear Ms. Mathau:

The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR) has reviewed the College of Marin’s Draft Environmental Impact Report and provides the following comments.

Research by several archaeologists have confirmed our Tribal knowledge of the many cultural resources, long term habitation areas, including burial areas containing human remains. Over the years, these resources have been disturbed and spread to other campus sites due to construction by the college. The cultural resources have been moved with the soil, placed in other locations or removed from the site. While the legal definition would declare these campus archaeological sites as “not significant” by CEQA standards, FIGR requests the College of Marin understand these areas and soils are culturally significant and important to FIGR. We believe these materials may contain human remains and other articles of cultural significance and only a Tribal member can accurately determine their importance and significance. In this framework, the following comments are made.

1. The DEIR document does not address the possibility of avoidance of cultural resources, but only addresses mitigation. Mitigation and monitoring are not the equivalent.

2. In several of the mitigation plans, it requires the presence of an archaeologist, not a FIGR monitor. If circumstances are sensitive enough to require an archaeologist, a FIGR monitor should always be present to insure the resources are properly treated with respect to Tribal policies.

3. The extent of soil disturbance in prehistoric and historic times may have buried several sites below the current grade of the soil. Presence/absence testing may not have been deep enough to locate the midden soils. A FIGR monitor should be present for the initial excavation of these areas.
4. All excavation within 50 feet of a current or former streams should be monitored by a FIGR monitor due to the probability cultural resources are present. These areas are most likely to contain cultural resources.

5. A “Treatment Plan” should be written by the Tribe, in consultation with LSA and College of Marin or its agents. This document will specify when Tribal monitoring is required, how artifacts and other cultural resources are treated and their disposition, conditions for leaving human remains ‘in situ’ or the development of reburial plans. This document, jointly developed, would then constitute the details of the mitigation plan for both campuses.

6. Part of your mitigation is to instruct construction workers on identifying resources and their duties. They are not fully trained to identify cultural resources and despite a lecture on the legal requirements of reporting, must be focused on their work. Therefore, all soil disturbance and excavation within 100 feet of midden soil should be monitored by a FIGR monitor.

FIGR believes it should be an equal party to how our cultural resources are to be treated and how soil disturbance is monitored. All references in the proposed mitigation measures should reflect that consultation with the Tribe is the first priority. We believe a comprehensive “Treatment Plan” is the proper method, not mitigation measures developed by non Tribal personnel. The scope and importance of the Treatment Plan should be reflected and referenced in the mitigation measures.

The preservation of our cultural resources is not a matter of science, but of our beliefs. We hope you will respect them.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Nick Tipon
Chairman: Sacred Sites Protection Committee

(707) 538-1424
ntipon@comcast.net
Letter B8  
Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria

B8-1  In response to this comment, Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2a is revised to include avoidance of project impacts to prehistoric archaeological deposits as a possible course of action in the event that such deposits are identified during ground-disturbing activities. The second paragraph of Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2a on DEIR page 4.7-23, last paragraph, now reads:

"Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2a: . . . Archaeological deposits identified during preconstruction archaeological testing or project implementation shall be avoided by project activities. If avoidance is not feasible, the archaeological deposits shall be evaluated to determine if they qualify as historical resources or unique archaeological resources as defined in CEQA. . . ."

B8-2  This commentor states that ground-disturbing activities occurring in archaeologically sensitive areas should be monitored by an archaeologist and a tribal monitor. Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2a (paragraph 3) states that a consultant with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR) shall monitor preconstruction archaeological testing. Specific areas that would require monitoring are not known at this time, however, since the EIR is being prepared at a program level. The Treatment Plan, as described in Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2a, would identify appropriate treatments for cultural resources based on a review of final development plans for the campus. Such treatments may include, but are not necessarily limited to, preconstruction archaeological testing to determine the presence/absence of archaeological deposits at a given location; recovery, analysis, and curation of significant archaeological deposits; and monitoring of ground-disturbing project activities by a qualified archaeologist and FIGR consultant.

B8-3  Comment noted. See Response to Comment B8-2 above.

B8-4  The commentor states that ground-disturbing activities occurring within 50 feet of a current or former stream should be monitored by a FIGR consultant due to the high likelihood of encountering archaeological deposits and human remains in these areas. The Treatment Plan recommended in Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2a would identify those areas where monitoring for cultural resources would occur.

B8-5  The Treatment Plan should be written in consultation with FIGR. The first paragraph of Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2a on page 4.7-23 of the DEIR is amended as follows:

"Mitigation Measure CULTURAL -2a: . . . Once specific development plans are finalized, a qualified archaeologist shall review such plans and prepare a Treatment Plan (Plan) that provides specific treatments for areas where ground disturbance would occur on campus. The Plan shall be written in consultation with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR), which will identify treatments for Native American cultural resources, skeletal, and cremated remains. The Plan shall take into account locations where . . . "

10/12/08
B8-6 None of the mitigation measures include instructing “construction workers on identifying resources and their duties.” The areas, circumstances, and procedures under which monitoring of ground-disturbing activities would occur would be addressed in the Treatment Plan.

B8-7 Comment noted.
Chapter III
DEIR TEXT CHANGES AND ERRATA

Section 4.3, Biological Resources

Page 4.3-2 is amended as follows:

Developed Areas/Ornamental Landscaping/Remaining Natural Areas
Buildings, roadways, parking lots, other impervious surfaces, turf, and ornamental landscaping occupy most of the Kentfield site. Existing landscaping consists primarily of non-native trees, shrubs, and groundcovers. The main campus is generally improved with structures and ornamental landscaping, but contains a number of mature specimen trees from the former Butler Estate in the northwestern portion of the property. A few native tree species occur as mature specimens, and native species commonly used in landscaping such as coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) and coast redwood (Sequoia sempervirens) are scattered throughout the main campus.

In addition to the undeveloped marshlands and grasslands in the southeastern portion of the site, remaining natural areas on the Kentfield site include a “Biological Preserve” in the eastern portion of the site and native woodlands on the hillside above Parking Lot 15. Native woodlands dominated by California bay, valley oak, and California buckeye (Aesculus californica) occur on the hillside above Parking Lot 15. Dense stands of the invasive non-native green wattle (Acacia decurrens) occupy much of the undeveloped area informally recognized as a “Biological Preserve” in the eastern portion of the site between the remnant segment of the original Corte Madera Creek alignment and the dredged channel. Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed initiated a habitat enhancement project in 1996 by removing broom and installing a small number of coyote brush plants and oaks in the Biological Preserve as part of cooperative effort with the College of Marin. The goal is to create a diverse woodland of native species, accomplished by replacing eucalyptus and acacia trees with oaks, buckeye, willows, and other native trees and shrubs. A large area was cleared and replanted with nearly 400 plants in early 2005.

Aquatic Habitat
Although Corte Madera Creek has been channelized across the site, it continues to provide an important link for fish and other aquatic species. The creek corridor once supported a dense canopy of mature native riparian trees such as coast live oak, California bay, California buckeye, valley oak, and willows (Salix sp.), transitioning to the open marshlands in the southeastern portion of the Kentfield site. Efforts are underway to improve opportunities for movement fish passage by anadromous species and other fish during periods when storm runoff levels contribute to high flow velocities in the concrete-lined channel and limit upstream migration. This includes an assessment of existing and proposed improved channel conditions for the Unit 3 Corps flood control channel that crosses the site, currently being conducted as part of a collaborative effort involving the non-profit Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries), the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and Caltrans. Tributaries to Corte Madera Creek that continue to provide aquatic habitat include the slough and drainage
channels that border Parking Lot 13, and an ephemeral drainage that passes through the undeveloped area adjacent to Parking Lot 15, known locally as Murphy Creek. Murphy Creek enters a culvert downstream of this open reach, with the culvert following the alignment of Kent Avenue to the point where it joins with a culvert that contains flows from Tamalpais Creek. Tamalpais Creek has been completely culverted across the Kentfield site, but resurfaces as a perennial stream just off-site above Kent Avenue (see Figure 4.3-1).

Page 4.3-5, last paragraph, is amended as follows:

. . . California clapper rail, northwestern pond turtle \( (Clemmys marmorata marmorata) \), California red-legged frog \( (Rana aurora draytonii) \), . . .

Section 4.4, Hydrology and Water Quality

Page 4.4-2, last paragraph, is amended as follows:

Between 1951 and 1993, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) maintained a stream gauge just upstream of the Lagunitas Road Bridge in Ross. Since 1993, the Marin County Department of Public Works has gathered data at the gauge. Between 1951 and 1993, the lowest flows occurred July through September 1977 when the stream was dry. The highest flows occurred in early January 1982, when the peak flow within the channel was 6,000-7,200 cubic feet per second (cfs). The December 2005 flood recorded a peak flow of 6,757 cfs.

Page 4.4-4, Table 4.4-1, is amended as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.4-1</th>
<th>Summary Peak Discharges for Corte Madera Creek at Ross, California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chance of Occurrence (Percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Channel Capacity at Ross</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Year Flow</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-Year Flood</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Project Flood</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cfs = cubic feet per second.

*Source: Corte Madera Creek General Re-Evaluation Report, Hydrology and Hydraulics Appendix.

**Source: Stetson Engineers, August 2007.
Page 4.4-4, last full paragraph, is amended as follows:

... downstream of the Lagunitas Road bridge in Ross. The accepted capacity of the concrete channel that flows through the Kentfield campus is 3,300 cfs. Unit Four, which was never built, was to extend from the Lagunitas Road Bridge in Ross to the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard bridge.

Page 4.4-6, second paragraph, is amended as follows:

The flood of January 3-5, 1982, was the largest on record and caused considerable damage in San Anselmo, Ross, Kentfield, and Larkspur. Another flood on December 31, 2005 reached levels only slightly below those of the 1982 flood. Flooding from Corte Madera Creek under existing conditions is largely due to insufficient channel capacity in San Anselmo, Ross, and Kentfield. The vicinity of the Lagunitas Road Bridge, which is located approximately 600 feet upstream of the end of the existing concrete channel. Flows greater than about 3,300 cfs, which can be expected to occur once in five years, overtop the right (westerly) banks and flow downstream for a distance of over 1 mile along San Anselmo Avenue, Shady Lane, Poplar and Kent avenues through densely populated areas north of the Kentfield campus. While some flows can re-enter the channel upstream of College Avenue, the majority of flows re-enter the main channel downstream of the concrete section.

Page 4.4-6, fourth and fifth paragraphs, are amended as follows:

Construction of Unit Four was to have begun in 1972 but was postponed due to environmental concerns. The Corps was asked to redesign Unit Four to preserve the natural character of the creek. Completing the project required the Corps to redesign Unit Four and to correct the already-constructed concrete channel in Units Two and Three so that it could carry a greater flow (Figure 4.4-2). Current conceptual plans for Unit 4 will increase the flow at the entry to the concrete channel in Ross to approximately 5,400 cfs (County of Marin, Department of Public Works, 2007).

In 1996, the County passed a resolution recommending that the Corps proceed with a smaller design level of protection to minimize impacts. The project was required to adhere to certain specific design considerations, including minimizing the use of concrete, retaining adjacent recreational facilities such as the creekside multi-use pathway, using native plants, enhancing riparian and fish spawning habitat, and maximizing the channel capacity while retaining the Lagunitas Road Bridge as is. This project was to provide 40-year flood protection. The Town of Ross currently has plans to replace the Lagunitas Road Bridge with a new structure that will convey the maximum flows that can be accommodated at the entrance to the concrete channel, approximately 5,400 cfs.

Page 4.4-14 is amended as follows:

Zone 9 is currently participating in the new planning efforts for the unbuilt Unit Four. This unit extends upstream of Unit Three and includes the channel through Ross and proposed retrofits of the Lagunitas Road bridge.
Page 4.4-21 (and page 2-14) is amended as follows:

Though the current plan for Corte Madera Creek flood control has not been finalized, the project’s objective is to provide 40-year flood protection convey as much flow as feasible into the concrete channel in Ross, which at the present time is 3,300 cfs but will be increased to 5,400 cfs. The flood control project involves improving . . .

Page 4.4-21, Mitigation Measure HYDROLOGY-4 is amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure HYDROLOGY-4: The District shall ensure that all lowest floor elevations for new buildings shall be at least 1 foot above the defined Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year flood elevation base flood elevation at time of construction, as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers “Report on the Floods of 4-6 January 1982 in the San Francisco Bay Areas,” and that the new West Bridge complies with plans for Corte Madera Creek in terms of the height of the channel walls. (LTS)

Section 4.7, Cultural Resources

Page 4.7-23 (and page 2-21), Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2a, is amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2a: . . . Once specific development plans are finalized, a qualified archaeologist shall review such plans and prepare a Treatment Plan (Plan) that provides specific treatments for areas where ground disturbance would occur on campus. The Plan shall be written in consultation with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR), which will identify treatments for Native American cultural resources, skeletal, and cremated remains. The Plan shall take into account locations where archaeological deposits have been identified on campus relative to where ground-disturbing activities would occur. The Plan shall outline the appropriate courses of action, which may include, but are not necessarily limited to, preconstruction archaeological testing—necessary to determine the presence/absence of archaeological deposits and to evaluate whether such deposits qualify as historical or unique archaeological resources—and monitoring of ground-disturbing activities. The Plan shall provide appropriate courses of action should archaeological deposits be identified during preconstruction archaeological testing or during project implementation.

Archaeological deposits identified during preconstruction archaeological testing or project implementation shall be avoided by project activities. If avoidance is not feasible, the archaeological deposits shall be evaluated to determine if they qualify as historical resources or unique archaeological resources as defined in CEQA. If archaeological deposits are determined to be historical resources or unique archaeological resources, and adverse effects on such resources are anticipated, mitigation of project impacts on the resource shall occur. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, thorough recording on Department of Parks and Recreation form 523 records (DPR 523), data recovery excavation, and public outreach. . . .
Section 4.8, Transportation

Page 4.8-21 (and page 2-24), Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-1 is amended as follows:

...prior to commencement of any construction activities and shall coordinate this plan with the Public Works Departments of the City of Larkspur and the County of Marin. The Construction Management Plan shall....

Page 4.8-21, third paragraph, has been changed as follows:

... construction would occur between 8:00 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM, Mondays through Fridays.

Section 4.11, Public Services

Page 4.11-2, the following paragraph is added as the last paragraph under “Environmental Setting, Fire Protection Services”:

Larkspur Fire Department Jurisdiction (Larkspur Annex Area)
The Larkspur Annex portion of the project site is within the City of Larkspur and is therefore within the jurisdiction of the Larkspur Fire Department. The Larkspur Fire Department has a mutual aid agreement with the Kentfield Fire Protection District, which has jurisdiction over the rest of the Kentfield campus (Sinnott, 2007).

Page 4.11-3, the following paragraph is added as the last paragraph under “Environmental Setting, Police Services”:

Twin Cities Police Authority Jurisdiction (Larkspur Annex Area)
The Larkspur Annex portion of the project site is within the City of Larkspur and is therefore within the jurisdiction of the Twin Cities Police Authority. The Twin Cities Police Authority assists the Marin Community College Police Department in responding to calls for service in the areas of campus that adjoin the City of Larkspur (Cusimano, 2007).

Page 4.11-5, the following paragraph is added as the last paragraph under “Less-than-Significant Impacts, Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services, Need for New or Altered Facilities or Equipment”:

The proposed temporary use of the Larkspur Annex area for contractor staging would not result in a need for new or altered Larkspur Fire Department facilities (Sinnott, 2007). (The Larkspur Fire Department representative also indicated that the contractor staging use would not have any significant impacts on emergency access or evacuation but requested review of the District’s final plans for the staging area. This issue is addressed under Impact SERVICES-1 and Mitigation Measure SERVICES-1 below.)
Page 4.11-5, the following paragraph is added as the last paragraph under “Less-than-Significant Impacts, Police Services”:

The proposed temporary use of the Larkspur Annex area for contractor staging would not result in a need for new or altered Twin Cities Police Authority facilities. A Twin Cities Police Authority representative indicated that additional patrols may be necessary while the area is used for contractor staging but no significant service problems are anticipated (Cusimano, 2007). (The Twin Cities Police Authority representative also indicated that the contractor staging use would not have any significant impacts on emergency access or evacuation but requested review of the District’s final plans for the staging area. This issue is addressed under Impact SERVICES-1 and Mitigation Measure SERVICES-1 below.)

Page 4.11-6, the following paragraph is added as the last paragraph under the discussion of Impact SERVICES-1:

According to Larkspur Fire Department and Twin Cities Police Authority representatives, the proposed temporary use of the Larkspur Annex area for contractor staging is not expected to interfere with emergency access or evacuation. Nevertheless, both agencies have requested review of the District’s final plans for the staging area, and the Twin Cities Police Authority representative has recommended that no staging activity occur within the public right-of-way (Sinnott, 2007; Cusimano, 2007).

Page 4.11-6 (and page 2-32), Mitigation Measure SERVICES-1 is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure SERVICES-1: The Marin Community College District shall coordinate construction plans with the Kentfield Fire Protection District and Marin Community College Police Department (as well as the Larkspur Fire Department and Twin Cities Police Authority, for plans for contractor staging in the Larkspur Annex area) to ensure that emergency access is adequate during project construction. (LTS)

Pages 4.11-7 through 4.11-8, the following items are added under “References”:

Cusimano, 2007. Personal communication with Todd Cusimano, Captain, Twin Cities Police Authority, September 11.


New Figure 1 is shown on the following page.

New Figure 4.3-1 is shown on the following page:
Figure 1 Kentfield Campus Construction Staging Area
Figure 4.3-1    Murphy Creek and Tamalpais Creek on Kentfield Campus
Figure 4.4-3  Dam Failure Inundation Areas: Kentfield Campus

Insert updated figure
ERRATA

Page 4.4-8, Figure 4.4-3, Dam Failure Inundation Areas: Kentfield Campus, is amended and shown on the following page. The only change to Figure 4.4-8 was a correction for the year of the figure. Also, a printer error occurred in the DEIR, making the image difficult to read.
Chapter IV
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (see Table 1) has been prepared to comply with the requirements of State law (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6). State law requires the adoption of a mitigation monitoring program when mitigation measures are required to avoid significant impacts. The monitoring program is intended to ensure compliance during implementation of the project.

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been formulated based upon the findings of the DEIR and the comments received on the DEIR and addressed herein. This Mitigation Monitoring Program identifies mitigation measures recommended in the EIR to avoid or reduce identified impacts, and specifies the agencies/party responsible for implementation and monitoring.

The first column identifies the mitigation measure. The second column entitled "Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation" refers to the person(s) who will undertake the mitigation measures. The third column entitled "Party Responsible for Monitoring" refers to the person/agency responsible for ensuring that the mitigation measure has been implemented and recorded. The fourth column entitled "Monitoring Timing" identifies when and/or for how long the monitoring shall occur.

For the College of Marin, many of the mitigation measures will be overseen by the District Construction Managers working under the Director of Modernization. The Construction Managers will work with independent consultants on specific tasks for specialized mitigation measures, as identified in Table 1.
### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND-1:</strong> Refer to Mitigation Measures VISUAL-1, TRANSPORTATION-1, AIR-1a, AIR-1b, AIR-2, NOISE-2, NOISE-3, and NOISE-4.</td>
<td>See referenced mitigation measures.</td>
<td>See referenced mitigation measures.</td>
<td>See referenced mitigation measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geology, Soils and Seismicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOLOGY-1a:</strong> The District shall complete a design-level Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by a Registered Geotechnical Engineer and Structural Design Plans as prepared by a Registered Structural Engineer for all new campus construction. Proper foundation and structural engineering and construction shall be performed in accordance with the recommendations of a Registered Geotechnical Engineer and a Registered Structural Engineer.</td>
<td>District Construction Manager (DCM)</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to design with verification at time of construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOLOGY-1b:</strong> All new buildings and structures shall comply with the California Building Code and Uniform Building Code and compliance shall be verified by the California Division of the State Architect (DSA) in the review of building plans. Incorporation of seismic construction standards would reduce the potential for catastrophic effects of ground shaking such as complete structural failure to an acceptable standard, but would not entirely eliminate the hazard of seismically induced ground shaking.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>During construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOLOGY-1c:</strong> The District shall implement design-level geotechnical hazards study recommendations for all new construction over alluvial or unstable soils, such as the proposed Science Center in Parking Lot 4, pursuant to the California Building Code. Implementation of the above measures would reduce impacts from strong seismic ground shaking to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>During construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOLOGY-2:</strong> The District shall prepare an Erosion Control and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prior to the onset of demolition, site grading, or construction. Please see Section 4.4, Hydrology and Water Quality, for impacts and mitigation measures for construction-related storm runoff. With implementation of the standard control measures therein, impacts from substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.</td>
<td>DCM with Consultant (Hydrologist)</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to demolition site grading or construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY-3: The District shall conduct a design-level geotechnical study and comply with the California Building Code as recommended under Mitigation Measure GEOLOGY-1a, to address unstable soils, lateral spreading, subsidence, or liquefaction for each new on-campus development project.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY-4: The District shall design and construct all new structures in accordance with geotechnical investigation recommendations (see Mitigation Measure GEOLOGY-1a), including recommended mitigation measures for expansive clay soils. Potential measures for control of expansive clay soils include the following: (a) Use of deeper foundations than normal. (b) Use of non-expansive layer under floor slabs and pavements. (c) Treating site soils with lime to reduce the expansion potential and increase the strength. (d) Additional reinforcing for slabs and walkways. (e) Grading around structures to assure positive drainage away from structures. The District’s compliance with the above mitigation measure would reduce the impact of potentially expansive soils to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biological Resources**

| BIOLOGY-1a: Construction restrictions shall be implemented for activities within or over Corte Madera Creek to avoid possible inadvertent take of steelhead, coho salmon, and tidewater goby. If any in-channel modifications are required, measures shall be taken to minimize disturbance and degradation of aquatic habitat. Authorizations shall be obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and appropriate construction restrictions shall be implemented through informal consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) to ensure no inadvertent take of listed anadromous fish species. | DCM with Consultant (Biologist) | DCM (working with CDFG and NOAA) | As needed, prior to construction. |  |

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGY-1b: Any active raptor or loggerhead shrike nests in the vicinity of proposed grading, demolition, renovation, and new construction shall be avoided until young birds are able to leave the nest (i.e., fledged) and forage on their own. This measure shall not apply to ongoing maintenance and building repair, to which raptors are already acclimated. Avoidance may be accomplished either by scheduling vegetation removal and building demolition, renovation, and construction during the non-nesting period (September through February), or if this is not feasible, by conducting a pre-construction survey for active nests. A pre-construction survey report verifying that no active nests are present shall be submitted to the Marin Community College District Director of Modernization for review and approval prior to initiation of vegetation removal or building demolition, renovation, and construction during the nesting season. Alternatively, the survey shall document that nesting has been completed as detailed below. Provisions of the pre-construction survey and nest avoidance measures, if necessary, shall include the following: (1) If vegetation removal and building demolition, renovation, and construction are scheduled during the active nesting period (March through August), a qualified wildlife biologist shall be retained to conduct a pre-construction nesting survey no more than 15 days prior to initiation of these activities to provide confirmation on presence or absence of active nests in the vicinity. (2) If active nests are encountered, species-specific measures shall be prepared by a qualified biologist through informal consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and implemented to prevent nest abandonment. At a minimum, vegetation removal and building demolition, renovation, and construction in the vicinity of the nest shall be deferred until the young birds have fledged. A nest-setback zone of at least 300 feet shall be established for raptors and 100 feet for loggerhead shrike and passerine birds within which all vegetation removal and construction-related disturbances shall be prohibited. The perimeter of the nest-setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated and construction personnel restricted from the area.</td>
<td>DCM, District Director of Modernization, and Consultant (Wildlife Biologist)</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to construction and at time of scheduling. Also, possibly during construction.</td>
<td>Initial Date Project/ Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) If permanent avoidance of the nest is not feasible, impacts shall be minimized by prohibiting disturbance within the nest-setback zone until a qualified biologist verifies that either a) birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation, or b) the juveniles from the nest are foraging independently and capable of independent survival at an earlier date than usual.</td>
<td>DCM and Consultant (Wetland Specialist)</td>
<td>DCM working with Corps, RWQCB and CDFG, if necessary</td>
<td>Prior to disturbance to jurisdictional wetlands and waters, and following disturbance, as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) A survey report of findings verifying that any young have fledged shall be submitted for review and approval by the Marin Community College District Director of Modernization prior to initiation of grading or building demolition, renovation, or construction in the nest-setback zone. Following approval by the Director of Modernization, vegetation removal and building demolition, renovation, and construction in the nest-setback zone may proceed as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The combination of the above mitigation measures, as appropriate, would reduce the impact to less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGY-2: Disturbance to jurisdictional wetlands and waters shall be avoided and minimized to the extent feasible, with the exception of the proposed Corte Madera Creek crossing. Appropriate authorizations shall be obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) where avoidance is determined to be infeasible, and required conditions implemented to protect and mitigate any adverse impacts on existing habitat and water quality. Where required by jurisdictional agencies, a detailed mitigation plan shall be prepared by a qualified wetland consultant for any wetlands or waters affected by proposed improvements, with replacement provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. The plan shall clearly identify the total jurisdictional areas affected by proposed improvements, as well as habitat to be created, restored, or enhanced as part of the required mitigation. Any replacement mitigation shall be consolidated to the degree possible to improve existing habitat values. The plan shall specify performance criteria, maintenance, and long-term management responsibilities, monitoring requirements, and contingency measures. Monitoring shall be conducted by the consulting wetland specialist until the success criteria are met.</td>
<td>DCM and Consultant (Wetland Specialist)</td>
<td>DCM working with Corps, RWQCB and CDFG, if necessary</td>
<td>Prior to disturbance to jurisdictional wetlands and waters, and following disturbance, as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGY-3a</strong>: Improvement design and construction restrictions shall be implemented to protect mature specimen trees in the vicinity of proposed improvements. Restrictions shall consist of the following:</td>
<td>DCM working with Certified Arborist</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>At time of construction.</td>
<td>Initial Date Project/Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Restrict the General Area for the Geothermal Field (shown in Figure 3-11) to avoid the mature elm trees along the College Avenue frontage, the mature valley oaks in the northwestern corner along the Corte Madera Creek channel, and opportunities for future enhancement native tree plantings along the Corte Madera Creek channel. Any excavation and pipeline installation associated with the geothermal field shall be restricted to the area outside the dripline of the existing trees. This activity shall preferably occur no fewer than 50 feet from the southwest bank of Corte Madera Creek to allow for future tree root establishment along this feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Design new structures, parking and driveway modifications, bioswales and other stormwater improvements, and new landscaping to avoid mature, healthy specimen trees. As necessary, a certified arborist shall be retained to evaluate tree health and make recommendations for construction restrictions where trees suitable for preservation could be adversely affected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGY-3b</strong>: Enhancement plantings with native tree species shall be provided as part of landscape improvements along the Corte Madera Creek corridor through the main campus. Suitable native tree plantings along the creek corridor include valley oak, coast live oak, California bay, and California buckeye. Although this reach of Corte Madera Creek remains channelized, establishing a mature overstory of native trees would provide important shade along the creek. Tree canopy would help minimize the warming of creek water temperatures along the concrete creek bottom and would improve the aquatic habitat for migrating fish.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Following construction; at time of landscaping and prior to Year 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HYDROLOGY-1a</td>
<td>DCM working with Hydrology Consultant</td>
<td>DCM and District personnel</td>
<td>Prior to grading or construction for SWPPP; monitoring for compliance with SWPPP during and following construction; long-term maintenance may be monitored at least once a year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydrology and Water Quality

HYDROLOGY-1a: The District shall prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to the onset of site grading or construction. The District shall be required to comply with all Phase I National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit requirements for the construction period because the construction site is larger than 5 acres in size. Under the Phase I program, the District is required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) Division of Water Quality. The NOI includes general information on the types of construction activities that would occur on the site.

The project SWPPP shall include the following mitigation measures for the construction period:

1. The Erosion Control Plan shall include erosion control/soil stabilization techniques such as straw mulching, erosion control blankets, erosion control matting, and hydro-seeding. Silt fences used in combination with fiber rolls shall be installed downslope of all graded slopes. Fiber rolls shall be installed in the flow path of graded areas receiving concentrated flows and silt fences and other proven sediment retention structures shall be placed around all soil stockpiles. The construction entrances shall be stabilized to prevent tracking of dirt onto roads next to the site through the use of a gravel base, erosion control blankets, or other approved elements.

2. After construction is completed, all drainage facilities shall be inspected for accumulated sediment, and these drainage structures shall be cleared of debris and sediment.

Long-term mitigation measures to be included in the project SWPPP shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Description of potential sources of erosion and sediment at the project site, and any hazardous or potentially hazardous materials and chemicals. This description shall include a thorough assessment of existing and potential pollutant sources.

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
### Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Development of a monitoring and implementation plan. Maintenance requirements</td>
<td>DCM and District personnel</td>
<td>DCM and District personnel</td>
<td>Long-term BMPs to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and frequency, including vector control, clearing of clogged or obstructed inlet or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be monitored as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outlet structures, and vegetation/landscape maintenance, shall be carefully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>part of College's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Monitoring and maintenance program conducted at the frequency agreed upon by the</td>
<td>DCM and District personnel</td>
<td>DCM and District personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and/or the District. The SWPPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall be adjusted, as necessary, to address any inadequacies of the best management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices (BMPs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDROLOGY-1h: The District shall implement “best management practices” (BMPs) for</td>
<td>DCM and District personnel</td>
<td>DCM and District personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventing the discharge of other construction-related NPDES pollutants beside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sediment (i.e. paint, concrete, etc.) to downstream waters, including the following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Parking lots and other paved areas shall be swept regularly to eliminate the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority of litter and debris washing into storm drains and thus entering local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waterways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The combination of the above measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDROLOGY-2a: The District shall incorporate, where feasible within design</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>During design stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constraints, grassed swales (bioswales) into the project bio-retention system for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and during</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>runoff conveyance and filtering of pollutants. Rather than have concrete drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swales to transport the runoff to roadside ditches, these swales shall be lined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with grass or appropriate vegetation to encourage the biofiltration of sediment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phosphorus, trace metals, and petroleum from runoff prior to discharge into the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal drainage network. General design guidelines relevant to optimizing the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pollutant removal mechanisms of grassed swales are (1) a dense, uniform growth of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine-stemmed herbaceous plants for optimal filtering of pollutants; (2) vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is tolerant to the water, climatological, and soil conditions of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site; (3) grassed swales that maximize water contact with the vegetation and soil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surfaces that have the potential to substantially improve removal rates, particularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of soluble pollutants; and (4) pollutant removal efficiency increased as the flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>path length is increased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Grassed/vegetated swales treat concentrated flow and must be sized wide enough to maintain low-flow velocities and maximize surface area. A minimum of 1,200 square feet of swale per impermeable acre is recommended. Entrances to swales shall be equipped with flow spreaders to dissipate energy and avoid erosion and have a maximum longitudinal slope of 5 percent.

**HYDROLOGY-2b:** The District shall include the following in the regular maintenance operations for bioswale areas: (1) regular mowing to promote growth and increase density and pollutant uptake (vegetative height should be no more than 8 inches; cuttings must be promptly removed and properly disposed of); (2) removal of sediments during summer months when they build up to 6 inches at any spot, cover bioswale vegetation, or otherwise interfere with bioswale operation; and (3) reseeding of bioswale as necessary, whenever maintenance or natural processes create bare spots.

The combination of the above mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

**HYDROLOGY-3:** The District shall ensure that all stormwater drainage shall be released in such a manner as to prevent erosion within Corte Madera Creek. All storm drain outfalls to the creek shall be equipped with energy dissipators to avoid erosion of the creek channel in areas where the creek is in a natural channel (i.e., not the concrete culvert). The energy dissipators shall be used in conjunction with any erosion-protection materials that are to be used along the creek bank.

**HYDROLOGY-4:** The District shall ensure that all finished lowest floor elevations for new buildings shall be at least 1 foot above the defined Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year flood elevation at time of construction, and that the new West Bridge complies with plans for Corte Madera Creek in terms of the height of the channel walls.

**Hazardous Materials**

**HAZARDS-1a:** A Demolition and Disposal Plan shall be developed to reduce hazards related to the demolition, staging, and removal of construction-related and hazardous materials. The plan shall include measures for handling the spill of liquids such as fuels or hydraulic fluids as well as abatement of hazardous materials and airborne dust.

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS-1b: The Demolition and Disposal Plan for safe demolition of existing structures shall include asbestos dust control. The Demolition and Disposal Plan shall address both on-site worker protection and off-site resident protection from both chemical and physical hazards.</td>
<td>DCM with Hazardous Waste Consultant</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to demolition of campus buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS-1c: All contaminated building materials shall be tested for contaminant concentrations and shall be disposed of to appropriate licensed landfill facilities. Asbestos National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulations must be followed for demolitions of facilities with minimum quantities listed by the NESHAP of regulated asbestos-containing materials. All demolitions must include notification of the appropriate regulatory agency, even if no asbestos is present at the site, and all demolitions and renovations are “subject” to the Asbestos NESHAP insofar as owners and operators must determine if and how much asbestos is present at the site (EPA, 2006). Prior to obtaining a demolition permit from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), an asbestos demolition survey shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements of BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2.</td>
<td>DCM with Abatement Specialist</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to demolition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS-1d: Prior to building demolition, hazardous building materials such as peeling, chipping and friable lead-based paint and asbestos-containing building materials shall be removed in accordance with all applicable guidelines, laws, and ordinances. The Demolition and Disposal Plan shall include a program of air monitoring for dust particulates and attached contaminants. Dust control and suspension of work during dry windy days shall be addressed in the Demolition and Disposal Plan.</td>
<td>DCM with Abatement Specialist</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to demolition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS-1e: For the impact of flaking and peeling lead-based paint, the requirements of Title 8, California Code of Regulations, Section 1532.1 (T8 CCR 1532.1) shall be followed. These requirements include but are not limited to the following: (1) Loose and peeling lead-containing paint shall be removed prior to building demolition. Workers conducting removal of lead paint must receive training in accordance with T8 CCR 1532.1. (2) The lead paint removal project shall be designed by a California Department of Health Services (DHS)-certified lead project designer, project monitor or supervisor. (3) Workers conducting removal of lead paint must be certified by DHS in accordance with T8 CCR 1532.1.</td>
<td>DCM with Abatement Specialist and/or DHS-certified lead project designer, project monitor or supervisor.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>During demolition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Date</td>
<td>Project/Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HAZARDS-1f: The District shall apply all Existing Facilities Assessment Hazardous Material Report recommendations for asbestos-containing materials, lead-containing materials, and other hazardous materials. Building-specific recommendations shall be followed prior to demolition, during construction, and during future facility operations. These recommendations include:

1. **Label any unidentified hazardous waste.**
2. **Store hazardous materials in code-compliant cabinets.**
3. **Maintain quantities within limits of fire codes.**
4. **Update the Hazardous Materials Report on a regular basis to reflect the actual chemical inventories.**
5. **For laboratory sinks, evaluate requirements for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works for acid waste line pre-treatment, such as dilution tanks, and associated permitting.**
6. **Test fume ventilation hoods and exhaust systems annually.**
7. **Create “chain of responsibility” for hazardous materials/wastes.**
8. **Provide a complete set of Materials Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) where materials are stored and used.**
9. **Inventory and remove fixtures and structural elements that may contain hazardous materials prior to renovation or demolition.**

### HAZARDS-1g: Building spaces shall be designed to handle the intended use, with sprinklers, alarms, vents, and secondary containment structures, where applicable. These systems must pass plan review through the Division of the State Architect.

**Notes:** DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZARDS-1h</strong>: During construction, the utilities (including sprinkler systems) shall pass pressure and flush tests to make sure they perform as designed. At the end of construction, occupancy shall not be allowed until a final inspection is made by the Kentfield Fire Protection District for conformance of all building systems with the Fire Code and National Fire Protection Agency Requirements. The inspection shall include testing of sprinklers systems, alarm systems, ventilation and airflow systems, and secondary containment systems. The inspection shall include a review of the emergency evacuation plans. These plans shall be modified as deemed necessary.</td>
<td>DCM working with Kentfield Fire Protection District</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>At completion of construction.</td>
<td>Initial Date Project/ Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZARDS-1i</strong>: All transportation of hazardous materials and hazardous waste to and from the site shall be in accordance with Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, US Department of Transportation (DOT), State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and local laws, ordinances and procedures including placards, signs, and other identifying information. Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce the impact of routine transportation, use, or disposal of hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>DCM working with haulers</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>During construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZARDS-2a</strong>: The District shall check the State and federal lists of regulated substances for chemicals that pose a major threat to public health and safety or the environment because they are highly toxic, flammable, or explosive. This list is available from the Marin County Department of Public Works Waste Management Division. Should the campus qualify for the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) program, as determined in consultation with Marin County Department of Public Works Waste Management Division, the District shall complete a CalARP registration form and submit it to the Environmental Health Department. Following registration, the District shall submit a Risk Management Plan (RMP). Risk Management Plans are designed to handle accidental releases and ensure that businesses have the proper information to provide emergency response teams if an accidental release occurs. The storage or handling of more than a threshold quantity (TQ) of a regulated substance requires the development and implementation of a Risk Management Plan.</td>
<td>Campus Police Dept. working with County Department of Public Works and specialist in Risk Management Plans (as needed)</td>
<td>Campus Police Dept.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Plans (RMPs) describe impacts to public health and the environment if a regulated substance is released near schools, residential areas, hospitals, and child care facilities. RMPs must include procedures for keeping employees and customers safe, handling regulated substances, training staff, maintaining equipment, storing materials safely, and responding to an accidental release.</td>
<td>District personnel in the Campus Police Dept.</td>
<td>Campus Police Dept.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS-2b: Employee training shall include spill prevention, clean-up, and notification procedures in accordance with the federal and State Occupational Safety and Health Administrations (OSHA and CAL-OSHA). This includes having sufficient clean-up materials such as spill kits, absorbent rags, and sand available to staff for containing and cleaning up spills and leaks, as well as procedures for proper disposal of contaminated materials. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of accidental releases of hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISUAL-1: The District shall complete an environmental review of specific projects when the designs have been completed. At that time, the issue of light and glare shall be evaluated to ensure that the designs comply with recommendations of the Design Guidelines. This review shall also occur as part of the overall design review process by the District. Refer to Mitigation Measure ENERGY-4 regarding outdoor lighting.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>At time of specific building design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISUAL-2a: In the design of the new Math/Science Building, the District shall investigate opportunities to build part of the “non-laboratory” four-story structure into the existing hillside to reduce overall building mass and bulk.</td>
<td>DCM and Architects</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>At time of design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISUAL-2b: New landscaping shall be considered for the northwest edges of the Math/Science Building to soften the overall mass of the buildings. This landscaping shall be in scale with the building. For example, new redwood or other similar scale of evergreen tree should be considered.</td>
<td>DCM and Landscape Architects</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>At time of landscape design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISUAL-2c:</strong> The building shall be “stepped” so that the overall mass of the building is reduced. For example, the top story should be set back from the lower stories, allowing new roof angles and a reduced building mass. Alternatively, the upper two stories may be set back, especially as viewed from Laurel Avenue where the ground level is lower than the campus area to the southeast, and where the building mass would be more visible. The combination of the above mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>DCM and Architects</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>At time of design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL-1a:</strong> Rather than being demolished, Dickson Hall and the Administrative Center shall be rehabilitated for campus needs according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Historic Structures published by the U.S. Department of the Interior (1992). The buildings shall be retained in their historic location. As part of the rehabilitation of Dickson Hall, the non-historic addition and landscape fencing and adjunct structures shall be removed and the south façade of the building shall be restored. Pathways, landscaping, and grading shall be reintroduced in order to integrate Dickson Hall into the campus pedestrian systems and connect it to the new Math/Science Center. The same shall occur for the Administrative Center as these features relate to their surroundings. This mitigation measure alone would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>At time of site planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL-1b:</strong> If Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-1a above is not implemented, the following measures shall be implemented: (1) The buildings shall be documented according to the outline format described in the outline for the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) published by the Western Regional Office of the National Park Service. This documentation shall include the required quality of photographic documentation. In addition, original floor plans, Sanborn maps, and sketch plans of the existing buildings shall be included as part of the HABS documentation. A copy of the documentation shall be donated, with original photographs and prints, to an historical archive accessible to the public, such as the Adeline Kent History Room of the Marin County Free Library and the College of Marin Library Historical Archives or other suitable local history collection.</td>
<td>DCM working with Architectural Historian and local landmarks preservation organization</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to demolition of Administrative Center or Dickson Hall; during design of Gateway buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) The preservation of architecturally distinguished or historically significant features of Dickson Hall (e.g., cupola, rainwater scuppers and downspouts, steel frame windows) and the incorporation of these features into the design of a new building or landscaping proposed on the site would reduce project impacts. If the building is to be demolished, salvaging these features and incorporating them into a display on campus in a prominent location would also reduce impacts. If the building is to be demolished, representatives of a local landmarks preservation organization or commission and other interested parties shall be contacted and given the opportunity to examine the building and to provide suggestions for salvaging these elements. The same shall apply to the Administrative Center. If the Administrative Center is to be demolished, the preservation of architecturally distinguished or historically significant features of the building (columns and column capitals, medallions, exterior porch entrance facing the courtyard, access from the street and the courtyard, tile roofs, stucco cladding, triple wood windows and proportions) and the incorporation of these features into the design of new buildings or landscaping proposed on the site would reduce project impacts. (3) If the Administrative Center is to be demolished, the architecture and landscape teams shall include consultants who meet the criteria of the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for historic architecture and landscape architecture on the team for the design of the new Gateway buildings. (4) The local preservation committee or commission and other interested parties shall be contacted and given the opportunity to appoint a member at large with professional training in architecture, planning, and landscape architecture to review the building documents at each phase of the project and provide suggestions for salvaging elements of the historic buildings if they cannot be retained. If Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-1a cannot be implemented or can only partially be implemented, the combination of mitigation measures in Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-1b would reduce the impact. However, the demolition of either of the identified buildings would result in a significant, unavoidable impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CULTURAL-2a: Once specific development plans are finalized, a qualified archaeologist shall review such plans and prepare a Treatment Plan (Plan) that provides specific treatments for areas where ground disturbance would occur on campus. The Plan shall be written in consultation with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR), which will identify treatments for Native American cultural resources, skeletal, and cremated remains. The Plan shall take into account locations where archaeological deposits have been identified on campus relative to where ground-disturbing activities would occur. The Plan shall outline the appropriate courses of action, which may include, but are not necessarily limited to, preconstruction archaeological testing—necessary to determine the presence/absence of archaeological deposits and to evaluate whether such deposits qualify as historical or unique archaeological resources—and monitoring of ground-disturbing activities. The Plan shall provide appropriate courses of action should archaeological deposits be identified during preconstruction archaeological testing or during project implementation.

Archaeological deposits identified during preconstruction archaeological testing or project implementation shall be avoided by project activities. If avoidance is not feasible, the archaeological deposits shall be evaluated to determine if they qualify as historical resources or unique archaeological resources as defined in CEQA. If archaeological deposits are determined to be historical resources or unique archaeological resources, and adverse effects on such resources are anticipated, mitigation of project impacts on the resource shall occur. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, thorough recording on Department of Parks and Recreation form 523 records (DPR 523), data recovery excavation, and public outreach.

A consultant with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria shall be retained to monitor preconstruction archaeological testing to ensure Native American artifacts, skeletal remains, and cremated remains are treated with appropriate respect and that appropriate regulatory procedures for the treatment of human remains are followed (see Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-4). |

DCM working with qualified Archaeologist and consultant with Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria | DCM | Prior to construction and following completion of finals site planning; during construction as needed. | |

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL-2b: Marin Community College District Policy 8.0025 (last revised on April 9, 1985) shall be updated to address current site conditions, archaeological sensitivity, and legislation. The combination of the mitigation measures above would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to onset of construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL-3: If historic-period deposits are encountered during preconstruction testing (in areas identified by the Treatment Plan—see Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2a) a qualified archaeologist shall evaluate such deposits to determine if they qualify as historical or unique archaeological resources as defined in PRC Section 21084.1 and Section 21083.2(g). If such deposits qualify as neither an historical or a unique archaeological resource (i.e., they are not significant), no further protection of the deposits is necessary. If the deposits are determined to be significant, project impacts on such deposits shall be avoided or impacts must be mitigated. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, thorough recording on Department of Parks and Recreation form 523 records (DPR 523), data recovery excavation, and public outreach. If historic-period archaeological deposits are encountered during project implementation, all work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and a qualified archaeologist contacted (if an archaeological monitor is not present) to assess the finds and make recommendations. Project personnel shall not collect or move any archaeological materials. It is recommended that such deposits be avoided by project activities. If such deposits cannot be avoided, they shall be evaluated to determine if they qualify as historical or unique archaeological resources. If the deposits are not significant, avoidance is not necessary. If the deposits are significant, they would need to be avoided or adverse effects must be mitigated. Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results, and provide recommendations for the treatment of the archaeological materials discovered. The report shall be submitted to the Director of Modernization and the Northwest Information Center of Sonoma State University.</td>
<td>DCM working with qualified Archaeologist, and with Director of Modernization and Northwest Information Center of Sonoma State University, as needed</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction, as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
### Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL-4:</strong> If human remains are encountered during project implementation or preconstruction archaeological testing, work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the County Coroner notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist shall be contacted (if an archaeologist is not on-site) to assess the situation. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results, and provide recommendations for the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report shall be submitted to the Director of Modernization and the Northwest Information Center.</td>
<td>DCM, working with County Coroner and Archaeologist if needed; submission of report to Director of Modernization and Northwest Information Center of Sonoma State University, if needed</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>During preconstruction testing or during construction.</td>
<td>Initial Date Project/ Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Transportation** | **TRANSPORTATION-1:** The District shall develop a Construction Management Plan prior to commencement of any construction activities and shall coordinate this plan with the Public Works Departments of the City of Larkspur and the County of Marin. The Construction Management Plan shall include:  
(a) Location of construction staging and a description of the level and type of construction-related traffic;  
(b) Identification of all construction hauling and delivery routes;  
(c) Recommendations for comprehensive traffic control measures, including scheduling of major truck trips and deliveries to avoid peak hours; lane closure procedures; signs, cones, and other warning devices for drivers; and designation of construction access routes;  
(d) Description of the maximum number of construction employees during any single phase of project construction, and a forecast of the number of AM and PM peak hour trips to be generated by those employees; | DCM working with Transportation Consultant, City of Larkspur, and County of Marin | DCM | Prior to construction. | Initial Date Project/ Comments |

**Notes:** DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) Provision of dedicated parking for all construction employees, site visitors, and inspectors;</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to completion of construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Provisions to remove construction-related debris;</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to completion of construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Designation of pedestrian and bicycle facilities around the construction and staging areas; and</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to completion of construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Description of measures to avoid impacts to adjoining streets and transit facilities (including bus stop locations) near campus.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to completion of construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combination of the above elements in a Construction Management Plan would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

TRANSPORTATION-2: The District shall develop a plan for accommodating multiple users of the Corte Madera Creek pathway where the path travels through campus. The plan shall include potential measures to (1) reduce potential conflicts between multiple path users (i.e., bicyclists and pedestrians); (2) reduce conflicts that arise where the path intersects other circulation routes (such as parking aisles and campus paths); (3) reduce potential conflicts where there is minimal separation between the path and adjacent motor vehicle parking spaces; and (4) identify potential funding mechanisms (such as State or local bicycle program grants) for implementation of the plan.

TRANSPORTATION-3: The District shall prepare and adopt a bicycle circulation plan for the Kentfield campus as part of the project. The bicycle circulation plan at buildout should show planned bicycle paths, lanes, and routes and the recommended location of bicycle parking and shower facilities.

TRANSPORTATION-4: The District shall develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. The TDM program should include some or all of the following:

(a) Establish a transportation kiosk or office on campus to distribute information on traveling to and from campus via multiple travel modes, with an emphasis on alternatives to automobile trips.

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Collaborate with the Marin County Transit District and Golden Gate Transit to investigate the provision of subsidized or reduced-cost transit passes for students, faculty, and staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Continue to offer internet courses to reduce the need to drive to and from campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Explore options for vanpool or shuttle bus service between the Kentfield and Indian Valley campuses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Encourage carpooling by providing preferential parking and reduced parking fees for carpoolers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Support the provision of services (restaurants, banks, etc.) nearby on College Avenue to reduce the need for off-campus trips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Explore options for encouraging use of neighborhood electric vehicles (NEV) and other low-emission options (including shuttles and/or van-pools), including on-campus maintenance vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Provide one or more &quot;bicycle stations&quot; on campus, to include shower and locker facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Air Quality

AIR-1a: Consistent with guidance from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the following measures shall be required of construction contracts and specifications:

(1) Use water to control dust generation during demolition of structures and break-up of pavement.
(2) Cover all trucks hauling demolition debris from the site.
(3) Use dust-proof chutes to load debris into trucks whenever feasible. Watering shall be used to control dust generation during transport and handling of recycled materials.
(4) Ensure that all crushing or screening equipment used on site for the recycling of materials is permitted by the BAAQMD or the State’s portable equipment statewide registration program, and use Best Available Control Technology for that type of equipment.

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When "consultant" is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
### Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods; active areas adjacent to existing land uses shall be kept damp at all times, or shall be treated with non-toxic stabilizers or dust palliatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites; water sweepers shall vacuum up excess water to avoid runoff-related impacts on water quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Sweep streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AIR-1b:** All neighboring properties located within 500 feet of a construction site boundary shall be provided with the name and phone number of the Campus Construction Manager who can respond to complaints by suspending dust-producing activities or providing additional personnel or equipment for dust control. Residents shall also be provided with the phone number of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Project/ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to onset of construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
The above measures include all feasible measures for construction emissions identified by the BAAQMD for large sites near sensitive receptors and additional measures beyond those recommended by the BAAQMD. According to the BAAQMD threshold of significance for construction impacts, implementation of the combination of the above measures would reduce construction impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR-2: The following measures shall be required of construction contracts and specifications for construction of the geothermal field: (a) Minimize idling time for diesel equipment and diesel trucks (five minutes maximum). (b) Maintain properly tuned equipment. (c) Use on-road trucks and non-road diesel-powered equipment that are certified as meeting Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 2 standards. Such equipment is the cleanest currently available.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>At time of development of specifications and prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE-1: Buildings located within the 60 dBA L_{dn} contour shall be designed to orient noise-sensitive uses (such as offices, classrooms, study rooms, library uses, and noise-sensitive laboratory areas) away from noise sources to the extent possible. Interior noise levels in buildings located within the 60 dBA L_{dn} shall include forced-air mechanical ventilation to allow occupants the option of keeping windows closed to control noise.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>At time of building design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE-2: The following combination of measures shall be implemented by the District to reduce noise: (a) Locate, select, and design the Central Plant so that noise levels resulting from the operation of the equipment at the Central Plant do not exceed 55 dBA L_{eq} during the daytime or 45 dBA L_{eq} during the nighttime outside at any residential receptor in the project vicinity. Adopt a noise performance standard of 55 dBA L_{eq} in sensitive outdoor campus areas and 35 dBA L_{eq} inside for Central Plant equipment noise intrusion into any noise-sensitive campus areas.</td>
<td>DCM working with Acoustical Consultant</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>At time of design; verify during project operations by noise monitoring two times in first year of operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Consider equipment noise levels in the selection of the cooling tower(s) and other equipment for the Central Plant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) As the design for the Central Plant proceeds, analyze expected noise levels and incorporate equipment noise control treatments, as necessary, to meet the noise performance standards. Consider community noise and on-campus noise impacts during the siting of the Central Plant and orientation of plant equipment by keeping the equipment as far as possible from off-campus and on-campus sensitive receivers, and locating equipment such that intervening buildings can attenuate noise. The combination of the above measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE-3: Construction equipment shall be well-maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical. Contract specifications shall incorporate the following measures, as appropriate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Limit demolition and construction activities to daytime hours between 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to construction at time of development of specifications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) To the extent feasible, route construction truck traffic to campus construction sites via Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue, avoiding Laurel Avenue and Kent Avenue and other residential streets as much as possible. This would require that construction routes internal to the campus be identified prior to the onset of construction, specific to each major project, and provided to contractors. (See also Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-1.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Use “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Locate all staging areas and stationary noise-generating equipment, such as air compressors and portable power generators, as far away as possible from residences or noise-sensitive campus areas and buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Prohibit all unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(g) Notify all adjacent residents and campus staff and students of the construction schedule in writing or by posting signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Erect a temporary noise control blanket barrier on the geothermal drill rig on the side facing adjacent residences or noise-sensitive campus areas or buildings. Noise control blanket barriers can be rented or purchased and quickly erected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Designate the Campus Construction Manager as the campus noise disturbance coordinator, responsible for responding to complaints about construction noise. The name and telephone number of the Campus Construction Manager shall be posted at the construction site and made available to adjacent residents prior to the onset of construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Provide a written schedule of “noisy” construction activities (e.g. pile driving, geothermal drilling) to nearby residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Prohibit construction worker radios from being audible beyond the limits of the construction site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combination of the above measures would reduce construction noise but not to a less-than-significant level. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable during the construction phase.

NOISE-4: Project construction shall comply with the following measures, in addition to the best practices specified in Mitigation Measure NOISE-3, to reduce vibration impacts:

(a) Impact pile-driving shall be avoided where possible. Drilled piles or slab mats cause lower vibration levels where geological conditions permit their use.

(b) For impact pile-driving within 50 feet of a building, a construction vibration monitoring plan shall be implemented to document conditions prior to, during, and after vibration-generating construction activities. All plan tasks shall be undertaken under the direction of a Professional Structural Engineer licensed in the State of California and be in accordance with industry-accepted standard methods. The construction vibration-monitoring plan shall include the following:

DCM working with Acoustical Consultant and Professional Structural Engineer

DCM; all reports to be kept on file at District Maintenance Department

At time of construction, as needed; following construction for follow-up survey and repairs, if needed.

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
### Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Identification of the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. Vibration limits shall be applied to all vibration-sensitive structures located within 50 feet of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Performance of a photo survey, elevation survey, and crack monitoring survey for each sensitive structure within 50 feet of pile-driving activities. Surveys shall be performed prior to any construction activity, in regular intervals during construction and after project completion. The surveys shall include internal and external crack monitoring in structures, settlement, and distress and shall document the condition of foundations, walls, and other structural elements in the interior and exterior of said structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Development of a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted; establishment of a vibration monitoring schedule; definition of structure-specific vibration limits; and documentation of the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions. Construction contingencies shall be identified for times when vibration levels approach the established vibration limits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) If vibration levels approach limits, suspension of construction and implementation of contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Designation of a person responsible for registering and investigating claims of excessive vibration. The contact information of this person shall be clearly posted on the construction site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Performance of a post-construction survey on structures where either monitoring has indicated high vibration levels or complaints of damage have been made. Appropriate repairs or compensation shall be made where damage has occurred as a result of construction activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) The results of all vibration monitoring shall be summarized and submitted in a report shortly after substantial completion of each phase identified in the project schedule. The report shall include a description of measurement methods, equipment used, calibration certificates, and graphics as required to clearly identify vibration-monitoring locations. An explanation of all events that exceeded vibration limits shall be included together with proper documentation supporting any such claims. The combination of the above measures would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>DCM working with Kentfield Fire Protection District, and Marin Community College Police Dept., Larkspur Fire Dept., and Twin Cities Police Authority</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES-1: The Marin Community College District shall coordinate construction plans with the Kentfield Fire Protection District and Marin Community College Police Department (as well as the Larkspur Fire Department and Twin Cities Police Authority, for plans for contractor staging in the Larkspur Annex area) to ensure that emergency access is adequate during project construction.</td>
<td>DCM with College Police Dept.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to demolition of police headquarters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES-2: The Marin Community College District shall coordinate final site and building plans with the Kentfield Fire Protection District and Marin Community College Police Department to ensure that long-term emergency access to structures and fire hydrants is adequate.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES-3: The Marin Community College District shall coordinate building demolition and construction plans to ensure that the Marin Community College Police Department has adequate space until the Learning Resource Center is ready for occupancy by the Police Department.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No potentially significant impacts on water, wastewater, or solid waste disposal services have been identified.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
### Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy and Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY-1: The District shall develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program as described in Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-4. Refer to Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-4 related to potential ways to reduce reliance on the private automobile for access to and from the campus.</td>
<td>DCM working with Transportation Consultant</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to Year 3 of Bond Spending Implementation Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENERGY-2a</strong>: Measures to increase recycling of construction and demolition material from implementation of the Bond Spending Implementation Plan shall include the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Preparation of a “Materials Management Plan” prior to the onset of building demolition, renovation, or new construction that identifies (a) types of materials to be recycled or reused, (b) contractor specifications, (c) required record-keeping), (d) storage areas for materials, (e) recycling goals by types of material, and (f) coordination with hazardous materials disposal requirements. The Materials Management Plan shall ensure that at least 50 percent of non-hazardous construction waste from building demolition, renovation and new construction is recycled, in accordance with the Bond Spending Implementation Plan Design Guidelines.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to demolition; at time of development of specifications; and ongoing during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Inclusion of specific Materials and Resources LEED requirements in the specifications, including but not limited to the following as applicable to individual projects: Materials and Resources (MR) Prerequisite 1, Storage and Collection of Recyclables; Building Reuse MR credit 1.1 or 1.2; Recycled Content MR credit 4.1 or 4.2; and Certified Wood MR credit 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Record-keeping on the campus of amounts and types of waste sent to recyclers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Documentation of “recyclable” materials from demolition and renovation that could possibly be incorporated into new buildings to reduce District costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Provision of a list of local recycling operators to contact for any construction and demolition debris.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Provision of adequate on-campus storage areas where recyclable materials can be separated and stored temporarily after demolition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.
### Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Ensuring Implementation</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENERGY-2b:</strong> The District shall ensure that all contractors comply with federal, State, and local regulations related to disposal of hazardous material contained in construction and demolition debris. The combination of the above measures would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. The measures would also help the District meet LEED requirements for construction waste management, which include (1) developing and implementing a construction waste management plan, and (2) diverting 50 percent of construction and demolition wastes from landfills, or recycling or reusing 25 percent of these wastes on-site (U.S. Green Building Council, 2005b).</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>During construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENERGY-3:</strong> The District shall consider ensuring that rooftop structural systems of new and renovated buildings are designed to allow future solar systems. New landscaping plans shall be reviewed prior to implementation to ensure that new trees would not block solar access to rooftops that could be used for solar systems.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>During design of rooftops and landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENERGY-4:</strong> The District shall incorporate the use of solar lighting for outdoor areas and pathways, assuming that adequate lumen levels to ensure safety can be provided by such systems.</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Prior to installation of exterior lighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DCM: District Construction Manager. When “consultant” is mentioned, the District Construction Manager may need to retain a specialist such as a biologist or hydrologist for the specific mitigation measure.