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INTRODUCTION

1. **Project Title:** Measure C Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin (2007-2013) Kentfield Campus

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**

   Marin Community College District  
   c/o Swinerton Management and Consulting  
   P.O. Box 144003  
   835 College Avenue, Building MS-3  
   Kentfield, CA 94904

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** V-Anne Chernock, Director of Modernization  
   (415.485.9343)

4. **Project Location:** Kentfield Campus of College of Marin; College Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, Kentfield, California (see Figure 1).

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

   Marin Community College District  
   c/o Swinerton Management and Consulting  
   835 College Avenue, MS-3  
   Kentfield, CA 94904

6. **General Plan Designation:** Public Facilities (Marin County) and Education/Environmental Resource (City of Larkspur for Larkspur Annex portion of campus)

7. **Zoning:** Public Facilities/Combining District (Marin County) and Education/Environmental Resource District (City of Larkspur for Larkspur Annex portion of campus)

8. **Description of Project:**

   **INTRODUCTION**

   The Marin Community College District Board of Trustees, hereinafter referred to as the Trustees, will serve as the lead agency for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document for the proposed Bond Spending Implementation Plans (hereinafter also referred to as the Implementation Plans). The Implementation Plans are the outcome and the guiding documents for the Measure C Bond Program that was passed by the Marin County voters in 2004. This Bond Program provided $249.5 million to be used for modernization and new construction at the District’s three campuses: the Kentfield campus, the Indian Valley campus, and the Bolinas Marine Biology Laboratory facility.
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At this time, there are no planned changes for the Bolinas campus. Thus, the focus of the Implementation Plans is on renovations at the Kentfield and Indian Valley campuses. Two separate Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) are being prepared—one for each campus. These will both be Program EIRs that will address the overall growth identified in the Implementation Plans. The Trustees will be responsible for certifying each EIR to ensure that the documents meet all the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. After the certification of the EIRs, the Implementation Plans for each campus can be approved.

**PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

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-percent increase (1 percent per year) over the 2006-2007 enrollment. This enrollment includes both fulltime equivalent students and students taking limited classes. Table 1 presents the student enrollment, staffing and current (gsf) occupancy and maximum projections to 2013. Figure 2 illustrates the Bond Spending Implementation Plan. As shown in Table 1, the campus would decrease in overall square footage by 40,000 to 45,000 gross square feet (gsf).

### Table 1  Project Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment (Headcount)</th>
<th>Total at Completion of Bond Spending Implementation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Square Feet</td>
<td>402,291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demolition**

A number of buildings on the Kentfield campus would be demolished because the cost of repairing these buildings and bringing them up to current building standards would be far greater than replacing the buildings altogether. Detailed assessments were done by a team of engineers, architects, and specialists in hazards, ventilation, and other disciplines during 2006 (Marin Community College District, 2006b). These recent assessments augmented the work done by 3D/I in 2003 (3D/I, 2003). Full copies of these assessments can be viewed at the offices of Swinerton Management and Consulting located on the Kentfield campus, Building MS-3. The assessment reports are also available on the College website at www.marin.edu (Measure C Updates page).

The main buildings proposed for demolition are the following (see Figure 2):

- Science Center
- Harlan Center
- Olney Hall
- Business Center
- Dickson Hall
- Taqueria Restaurant
- Administration Center/Children’s Center
- Dance/Landscape Building
- Disabled Students Program and Services (DSPS) Building
- MS-2, TB1 and MS-3 Temporary Buildings
• Fine Arts wing of the Performing Arts Building
• 1950s Extension on Fusselman Hall

The demolition of the above buildings would occur in phases as new buildings are constructed and as existing buildings are no longer needed as “swing space” (i.e., space that can be used temporarily during the construction period).

Modernization and Construction of New Buildings
Some buildings, such as the PE Complex and the remainder of the Performing Arts Building would undergo modernization without any demolition. New buildings and structures are proposed to include the following (see Figure 2):

• New Gateway 1 and 2 Buildings and Plaza that would be used for administration, general classrooms, and an auditorium.
• A new Math/Science/Central Plant/Data Center that would include science classrooms and the main plant equipment for the campus such as electrical/mechanical equipment.
• New Maintenance Building adjacent to Kent Avenue to house trades such as electrical, plumbing, and painting.
• New bridge across Corte Madera Creek to the west of the existing bridge, to provide pedestrian and emergency vehicle access to the new Math/Science Center/Central Plant area.
• New Fine Arts Building.

Site Improvements: Landscaping, Pathways, Lighting, Parking, and Utilities
In addition, overall site improvements would occur such as new landscaping, new pathways, reconfiguration of parking lots, and new utility lines (water, wastewater, gas, electricity, and telecommunications).

Landscaping. The main areas proposed for new landscape improvements include the existing Science Center Parking Lot, the Oak Quad adjacent to new Gateway 1 and 2 Buildings, the area between the new Fine Arts Building and the existing Performing Arts Building, and the Central Green near Fusselman Hall. No specific landscape plans for individual buildings have yet been developed but generalized landscape plans have been proposed. The Design Guidelines for the Kentfield Campus address the goal of new plantings that are native, drought-tolerant and low maintenance. These same Guidelines address paving materials, irrigation, seatwalls and stairs, lighting, site furnishings and a number of other elements in the design of the new improvements (College of Marin, 2006).

Outdoor lighting would be designed to maximize public safety and security while minimizing visual intrusion to adjacent residential areas. Outdoor light fixtures would include shrouds and other shielding as appropriate. Lighting along pedestrian corridors would be low-level lights. To
Figure 2
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the extent practicable, area lighting and security lighting would be controlled by the use of timed switches and/or motion detector activation to reduce energy consumption.

Pathways and Bridges. New pedestrian pathways would be created throughout the campus, with improvements for compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). A new clear span bridge across Corte Madera Creek would be developed to the west of the existing bridge (see Figure 2). This bridge would be for pedestrians and bicyclists, but would also allow access for service and emergency vehicles. 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 be achieved through a series of landscaped and terraced levels located along the channel. A new retaining wall and ramped access would be built to provide access into the campus via this new west bridge. The existing bike path along the south side of Corte Madera Creek would be reshaped to incorporate the new ramp and bridge. Disabled access would be improved, and new gateways would be created. The Corte Madera Creek Promenade is proposed to enhance the creekside experience, connecting College Avenue with the new Math/Science Center. A portion of this promenade now exists but would be extended near the new Math/Science Center. Streetscape improvements along College Avenue, with a widening of the sidewalk, are also proposed.

Parking Lots. The main parking area that would undergo improvements would be the parking area around the existing Science Center (Parking Lots 6 and 7). After the demolition of the Science Center, additional parking in this area may be provided and new landscaping would be planted. Also, a new geothermal field is proposed in Parking Lot 9 to the north of the existing Science Center (see discussion under “Utilities” below). New trees would be planted, bioswales would be provided where appropriate to reduce runoff and water quality impacts from surface parking areas.

Utilities. A number of utility improvements would be made on the campus for water, natural gas, wastewater, telecommunications (phone, fiber optics, and other signal systems), and storm drainage. The District is proposing to develop a geothermal field in Parking Lot 9. This field would allow the College to reduce the energy needs of future buildings by taking advantage of the temperature underground. A geothermal system circulates water through a buried closed loop system to take advantage of the constant temperatures underground. The system is then connected to the cooling/heating system for the campus buildings to minimize the heating/cooling necessary by the use of traditional non-renewable energy sources (i.e., natural gas and electricity generated by non-renewable sources).

Existing water supply to the campus is from the Marin Municipal Water District. Existing piping and fire hydrants would be replaced in a phased manner as construction proceeds. Sanitary sewer service is provided by Ross Valley Sanitary District. Existing on-site sewer lines would be replaced. The entire sewer system in the area of Fusselman Hall and Dickson Hall would be relocated.

A new gas main would be installed from College Avenue along a path parallel to and north of Corte Madera Creek. This gas service would supply the new Math/Science/Central Plant Building.

---

1 A clear span bridge would eliminate the need to disturb the existing Corte Madera Creek channel.
All of the telecommunication services would be installed at the new Data Center in the Math/Science/Central Plant/Data Center Building and routed in a joint trench to the new and modernized buildings. This trench would also include all services required in each of the new buildings, including electric, fiber optics, and cooling/heating water.

**Phasing of Facilities.** A summary of the projects in their projected order is shown in Table 2. A total of approximately 140,000 gsf of new building area would be developed, while a total of about 184,000 gsf of building area is expected to be demolished to make room for the new development. The overall construction is expected to be completed by 2013. The EIR will address a reduction of approximately 40,000 to 45,000 gsf at program completion because the exact square footage of new construction may vary, depending on the final designs of new buildings. No final designs have yet been prepared.

**Hazardous Materials.** Hazardous material storage in the science labs would be minimal and would be limited to quantities allowed by the Uniform Building Code for Group B Occupancies as set forth by Table 7902.5A of the California Fire Code. Asbestos removal would occur during the modernization and replacement of buildings.

**Building Height and Design.** Campus buildings would be one to four stories in height and would be designed to comply with the College of Marin Master Plan Design Guidelines (Marin Community College District, 2006). A copy of the Guidelines is available on the web (http://www.marin.edu, Measure C Updates page) and at the Swinerton office (Building MS-3 on the Kentfield campus). No specific designs had been completed as of the printing of the Initial Study.

**Vehicle Access, Parking and Bicycle Facilities**

Few changes to the existing vehicle access and circulation patterns on the Kentfield campus are proposed. The main changes would entail restriping of parking spaces in Lots 6, 7 and 9 after the demolition of the existing Science Center. New landscaping would be provided in this parking area. Vehicular access to the new Math/Science/Central Plant Building would be from Laurel Avenue. The total number of spaces in the parking lot in this area (Lot 4) would be reduced.

New bicycle parking facilities would be provided throughout the campus and minor changes to the bike path that follows Corte Madera Creek may occur with the construction of the new west bridge across Corte Madera Creek. This new bridge would be for both pedestrians and service/emergency vehicles.

**Site Grading**

Site development would require moderate grading to regrade areas of demolished buildings and to prepare sites for new buildings. Grading would be balanced as much as possible and would not require the import of fill. The areas of the campus that have the most slope are the Gateway area at the intersection of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue, and the area just north of Corte Madera Creek where the new Math/Science Building would be located. Other areas of the campus are generally level.
### Table 2: Phased New/Modernized Projects and Demolition at Kentfield Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Project</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Existing GSF</th>
<th>Proposed New GSF</th>
<th>GSF to be Demolished</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PE Complex</td>
<td>47,335</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Modernization of facilities and minor site improvements. This project has been the subject of a Categorical Exemption but is addressed herein to look at cumulative campus changes and a proposal to include photovoltaic cells for energy generation on structures in the adjacent parking lot. The square footage removed is circulation area spanning the east and west wings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Geothermal Field</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>This project would entail development of a geothermal field in Parking Lot 9. New underground pipes would be routed to the new Math/Science/Central Plant/Data Center Building to reduce overall heating and cooling load for the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>New Maintenance Bldg.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>A new Maintenance Building near Kent Avenue at the west side of campus would be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Demolish MS-2</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>This temporary building (near Parking Lot 9 and the proposed new pedestrian bridge) would be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>New West Bridge</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>A new pedestrian bridge would be constructed across Corte Madera Creek at the west end of the campus near the new Math/Science/Central Plant/Data Center Building. Access would also be available for maintenance and emergency vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Demolish DSPS, Dance/Landscape</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>10,840</td>
<td>These buildings would be demolished to make room for the new Math/Science/Central Plant/Data Center Building (near Parking Lot 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>New Math/Science/ Central Plant/Data Center Building (3 – 4 stories)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>See 4A above and 4C below</td>
<td>This new building would require the removal of the Dance/Landscape complex, the Disabled Student Program and Services (DSPS) Building and Dickson Hall. A new 77,000-gsf building would be constructed, with a footprint of approximately 24,000 gsf. New utilities would be constructed within 5 feet of the building footprint and old utilities would be capped within this 5-foot area. The new building would be 3 to 4 stories in height. A new pedestrian/service vehicle road would be constructed on the south side of this new building, adjacent to Corte Madera Creek.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Phased New/Modernized Projects and Demolition at Kentfield Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Project</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Existing GSF</th>
<th>Proposed New GSF</th>
<th>GSF to be Demolished</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Dickson Hall</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>Dickson Hall is proposed for removal but may be used during construction as “swing” space to house relocated programs. Its status is dependent on the construction of 4B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Campus Utilities</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>New campus utilities would be located throughout the central campus to serve new and modernized buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>New Fine Arts Building (3 story)</td>
<td>33,089</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>33,089</td>
<td>This new 30,000-gsf building to be adjacent to the existing 83,089-gsf Fine Arts/Performing Arts Building. A total of 33,089 gsf would be removed, for a net loss of about 3,000 gsf. Building footprint would be approximately 13,500 gsf. This building would be 3 stories in height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Modernize Performing Arts Building</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Includes modernization and minor repairs, with some site work/landscaping. The existing building that houses Performing Arts and Fine Arts would be reduced in size by 33,089 gsf (see 5A text above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C/D</td>
<td>Demolish Existing Fine Arts Building</td>
<td>See 5A and 5B above.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>See 5A and 5B above</td>
<td>The existing building and foundations would be removed. Utilities within 5 feet of new building footprint would be removed. Remaining utilities would be capped. Site improvements would include lighting, ADA improvements, and landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A/B</td>
<td>Fusselman Demolition and Modernization and Central Green Improvements</td>
<td>16,382</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>A total of 4,500 gsf would be removed from Fusselman Hall at the south end where a new addition to the building was made many years after the original design. Repairs to be made in area of demolition and modernization would include roof replacement, abatement of asbestos materials around pipes, and some utility improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Taqueria, Olney Hall, Admin. Center and Children’s Center Demolition</td>
<td>2,000 for Taqueria 12,227 7,836</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22,063</td>
<td>These buildings would be demolished to make room for the proposed Gateway 1 Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Phased New/Modernized Projects and Demolition at Kentfield Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Project</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Existing GSF</th>
<th>Proposed New GSF</th>
<th>GSF to be Demolished</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>Gateway 1 and Gateway Plaza (1 story)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>See 8A</td>
<td>A new Gateway Complex at the Kentfield campus would include Gateway 1 and Gateway 2 Buildings. These would be located at the prominent intersection of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue. Gateway 1 would house administrative services and student services, general classrooms, and the campus AV/TV services. The building would be 1 to 2 stories. The sidewalk would be widened in front of this building and street trees would be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Demolish Harlan Center and Business Management</td>
<td>26,302</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>These two buildings would be demolished to make room for Gateway 2 Building and new Oak Quad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>Gateway 2 and Oak Quad (1 story)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>See 8A above</td>
<td>The Gateway 2 Building would be 1 to 2 stories. General lecture classrooms and faculty offices would be provided in this building. Three heritage oaks would be preserved between the Gateway Complex and the Learning Resource Center and a landscaped courtyard would be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8C</td>
<td>Oak Quad</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>In the area of the Gateway 1 and 2 Buildings, the Oak Quad would be improved for an outdoor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Modernize Learning Resource Center</td>
<td>66,855</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Modernization would include roof replacement, seismic upgrades, repair of interior/exterior finishes, replacements of flooring and ceilings, ADA upgrades and site work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A, B, and C</td>
<td>Demolish Old Science Center, TB1 and MS-3; Site Improvements for Parking</td>
<td>51,236</td>
<td>7,125</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>These buildings in the vicinity of Parking Lot 6 on the south side of Corte Madera Creek would be removed to take buildings out of the 100-year floodplain. After demolition, Parking Lot 6 would be reconfigured. Site Landscaping improvements would occur for Parking Lot 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST-3 Storage</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>This storage space would be removed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL            | 354,658<sup>a</sup>           | 140,000       | 183,586          |                                                                  | A net final gross square footage at the campus of approximately 364,000 would result as compared with the existing gsf of 402,291. The EIR will evaluate a net decrease of 40,000 to 45,000 gsf because it will be a Program EIR that will address a general program that may have changes in overall square footage as projects are designed. |

<sup>a</sup> Does not include entire campus, which contains 402,291 gsf.
Energy-Efficient Design

Facilities would be designed with efficient heating and cooling systems beginning with the orientation of the buildings on the site and the placement of the windows on the buildings to maximize natural winter heat gain and minimal summer heat gain. Furthermore, the structures would be constructed of building systems that provide appropriate levels of thermal protection. Skylights and clerestory windows would assist in providing required lighting. A geothermal system is proposed to minimize the heating and cooling equipment loads for campus buildings. This system is tentatively planned for construction in Parking Lot 9 near the existing Science Center. For all modernization and new construction projects, The District is committed to obtaining Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification, which allots points for various energy-saving features.

Hours of Operation

Hours of operation at the Kentfield campus would be 8 AM to 10 PM, Monday through Friday. Some classes are also offered on weekends.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting (briefly describe the project surroundings):

The Kentfield campus of the College of Marin is surrounded by the following land uses: residential uses to the north, northwest and southwest of the main campus; office and medical buildings to the north along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard; a community grocery store to the south of the main campus; commercial (offices, restaurants, and retail businesses) and institutional uses (Kent Middle School) to the east of the main campus along College Avenue; residential and commercial uses to the south and west of the Larkspur Annex portion of the campus near Magnolia Avenue; and the Corte Madera Creek channel to the north of the Larkspur Annex portion of the campus.

10. Other Agencies whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, or participation agreement):

Approvals from a number of agencies would be necessary to permit future development of the Kentfield campus. The Division of the State Architect would review all designs to ensure compliance with the California Building Code and other relevant requirements. The Regional Water Quality Control Board may require a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for the project and would ensure that the project complies with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The Marin County Department of Public Works, working with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, may need to grant a permit for the proposed bridge crossing of Corte Madera Creek.
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Agricultural Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: V-Anne Chernock

Date: March 14, 2007

Director of Modernization: Marin Community College District

For: [Blank]
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The Marin Community College District has made a determination that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared for both the Kentfield campus and the Indian Valley campus (two separate EIRs). This Initial Study Checklist has been prepared to summarize the issues that will be addressed in the EIR and to solicit public and agency comments related to the Kentfield campus. The sources of information used for the Checklist are identified at the end of each topic below and are listed at the end of the document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? □ □ □ □ □

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway? □ □ □ □ □

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? □ □ □ □ □

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? □ □ □ □ □

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The proposed changes at the Kentfield campus may affect views toward Mt. Tamalpais and other scenic vistas in the vicinity of the campus, such as views from College Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. This issue will be addressed in more detail in the EIR.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?

The campus is not visible from a State scenic highway. Some significant trees may be affected by new construction but this issue would be addressed in relation to (a) above. No rock outcroppings exist on the Kentfield campus. Impacts to historic buildings will be addressed under “Cultural Resources.”

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Visual impacts of the overall Bond Spending Implementation Plan will be addressed in the EIR, and visual simulations will be prepared to show the overall massing of proposed new buildings as seen from public viewing locations.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

New and modernized buildings at the Kentfield campus could create new light and glare for surrounding residents and this issue will be addressed in the EIR. The College is proposing the use of high pressure sodium fixtures in parking lots, and metal halide fixtures around building entries and courtyards. All lighting would be shielded to direct lighting downward and to prevent excess glare. The EIR will address potential glare from proposed photovoltaic (PV) systems.

Sources of Information: 1

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use?

No part of the Kentfield campus is designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The campus has been in use as an educational institution since the late 1920s. The open space portions of the campus near the Larkspur Annex (south end of campus) include the Corte Madera Creek channel and associated upland habitat. Agricultural resources will not be further addressed in the EIR.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No part of the campus is under Williamson Act contract and no part of the campus is zoned for agricultural use.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

No farming uses occur in the vicinity of the Kentfield campus.

Sources of Information: 2 and 4

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Category</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Air quality impacts will be addressed in the EIR. The project is not anticipated to conflict with the Air Quality Plan of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District because limited expansion of the campus would occur.
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

The potential for air quality violations for all criteria pollutants will be addressed in the EIR. The EIR will address construction-related emissions as well as operation-related emissions.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The EIR will identify any sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the campus (i.e, schools, residences, medical facilities, etc.) and will assess the potential for such receptors to be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations such as diesel fumes during construction and other pollutants.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No significant odors are expected to be generated by the proposed project, but the EIR will address this issue in greater detail.

Sources of Information: 1

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
 Much of the Kentfield campus has already been disturbed by either building area or parking lots. The Kentfield campus has relatively limited biological and wetland resources, with the exception of the remnant coastal salt marsh and brackish water marsh in the southeastern portion of the property. The proposed new development on the Kentfield campus would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species. As part of the initial assessments undertaken for the planning process for the Bond Spending Implementation Plan, a detailed biological assessment of the Kentfield campus was undertaken. Sensitive habitats were identified and these areas have been avoided for any new construction. New development would occur only in areas of the campus that have already been disturbed by existing campus construction. The Biological Resources section of the EIR will address this issue in greater detail.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Corte Madera Creek flows through the Kentfield campus. However, almost all of this waterway has been channelized in a concrete culvert and thus little riparian vegetation exists. At the southeast side of the campus property, Corte Madera Creek opens into the Corte Madera Canal where riparian vegetation exists. However, no new development is proposed in this portion of the campus. The EIR will address all sensitive vegetative communities on the Kentfield campus.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

The most sensitive of the natural resources at the Kentfield campus is the remnant coastal salt marsh and brackish water marsh wetlands in the southeastern portion of the property between the Larkspur Annex, Football Field, and Mackey Field. This area contains clear indicators of jurisdictional wetlands and other waters that encompass the remnant salt marsh, brackish water marsh along the Tamalpais Creek channel and other drainages, and possibly even low-lying areas in the existing parking area of Parking Lot 13. No new development is proposed in this area.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

The Kentfield campus is largely urbanized with relatively limited biological and wetland resources, with the exception of the remnant coastal salt marsh and brackish water marsh in the southeastern portion of the property. Corte Madera Creek is channelized through the campus, which greatly limits its existing habitat value, although it continues to serve as a movement corridor for the federally-listed threatened steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and other fish species.

The new pedestrian bridge proposed across Corte Madera Creek to the west of the existing bridge would be designed as a “clear span” bridge to avoid any disturbance to the creek corridor. The potential impacts on fish species will be addressed in greater detail in the EIR.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

The campus contains a number of mature specimen trees from the former Butler Estate in the northwestern portion of the property in the central campus area. The College is exempt from any local ordinances related to tree preservation but will attempt to protect significant trees as much as possible. Significant trees have been mapped by the College’s landscape architects and their locations have been considered in the layout of proposed new buildings. This issue will be further addressed in the EIR.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?

No habitat conservation plan applies to the Kentfield campus.

Sources of Information: 1 and 2
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

Three buildings of historical significance have been identified on the Kentfield campus. These are Fusselman Hall, the Administration/Children’s Center, and Dickson Hall. The EIR will evaluate potential impacts to these buildings in greater detail and recommend mitigation measures as needed. The Bond Spending Implementation Plan identifies potential changes to all of these buildings.

No historic-period archaeological sites have been identified on the Kentfield campus. One prehistoric archaeological site, CA-MRN-406, has been identified on the Kentfield campus. New construction of buildings and utilities could disturb CA-MRN-406, a possible historical resource, resulting in a need for mitigation. The EIR will address this issue in detail.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

No historic-period archaeological sites have been identified on the Kentfield campus. While one prehistoric archaeological site has been identified on the Kentfield campus, such resources (prehistoric/historic-period archaeological sites) will first be evaluated to determine if they meet CEQA’s definition of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5. If archaeological sites are identified that do not meet CEQA’s definition of a historical resource, a determination will be made regarding their classification as a “unique archaeological resource” pursuant to Section 15064.5. New construction of buildings and utilities could disturb such resources, resulting in a need for mitigation. The EIR will address this issue in detail.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No paleontological resources have been identified on the Kentfield campus. This issue is not expected to be addressed further in the EIR.
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Human remains could be disturbed during construction. Human remains have been identified on the Kentfield campus. The EIR will address this issue further and will include mitigation measures to address the possibility of remains being uncovered during the construction phase of the Bond Spending Implementation Plan.

Sources of Information: 1 and 5

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \square \]

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \square \]

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \square \]

iv) Landslides?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \square \]

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \square \]

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \square \]

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \square \]

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \square \]
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42; ii) Strong seismic ground shaking; iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; iv) Landslides?

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and rupture of a known earthquake fault would not occur at the site. However, strong ground shaking could occur at the site due to the presence of the nearby San Andreas Fault and other active faults. This issue will be addressed in greater detail in the EIR. Landslides are not expected at the site due to the level terrain and areas that would be subject to disturbance. The potential for liquefaction will be addressed in the EIR.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

A significant amount of ground disturbance could occur during construction, depending on the phasing of elements of the Bond Spending Implementation Plan. Soil erosion could occur when construction sites are disturbed, especially during heavy rainfall. The EIR will address this issue in greater detail and will include recommended mitigation measures as necessary.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

The geology of the project site will be addressed in greater detail in the EIR. Given the fairly level terrain of the campus, no major geologic impacts are anticipated. However, the EIR will include mitigation measures to ensure that all potential geologic impacts are reduced to less-than-significant levels whenever possible.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

The EIR will address site soils and how new construction needs to account for any limitations of such soils.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No septic systems are proposed for the project.

Sources of Information: 1 and 2
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

During construction, some hazardous materials (e.g., paints, solvents, asbestos waste material) may be transported to and from the campus. The transporters would be required to comply with all relevant local, state, and federal regulations. During project operation, hazardous materials may be used and hazardous
waste may be generated such as in science laboratories. The EIR will address this issue in greater detail. The EIR will also address past uses at the campus that may have resulted in leakage of hazardous materials in the soil.

b) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

Refer to (a) above. The EIR will address the College’s programs to ensure the safe handling of hazardous materials and waste in all laboratories.

c) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

The nearest school is the Kent Middle School, which is immediately adjacent to the Kentfield campus on College Avenue. The EIR will address the potential for emissions of hazardous materials during both project construction and operation.

d) **Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

The campus is not a listed hazardous materials site.

e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

The site is not within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of any airport. This issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

f) **For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

Refer to (e) above.

g) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

The proposed project is not expected to interfere with any emergency response plan. The proposed addition of a bridge across Corte Madera Creek may facilitate emergency response on the campus. However, the EIR will address this issue in greater detail.

h) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

The campus is surrounded by urban land uses and the threat of wildland fires would not apply. The availability of fire emergency response will be addressed under “Public Services.”
### VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding of as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New construction would occur in portions of the campus that have already been disturbed by earlier construction or landscaping. No violations of water quality standards are anticipated but this issue will be addressed in greater detail in the EIR.

b) **Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge** such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

The project is not anticipated to affect groundwater supplies. Currently, the College uses groundwater only for non-potable irrigation of landscaping. The potential impacts of the proposed geothermal development will be addressed in the EIR, especially as related to local groundwater. The geothermal system is proposed to reduce overall energy requirements at the campus. Underground piping would be placed under parking areas that would convey water used to moderate the heating/cooling loads for buildings. However, impacts to groundwater are not anticipated from this system.

c) **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

No major grading would be required for the Bond Spending Implementation Plan. However, minor grading would be needed in the vicinity of the new Math/Science Building and possibly for the Gateway Buildings near the intersection of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue. No major drainage pattern changes are anticipated, but the EIR will address this issue in greater detail.

d) **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

The overall construction may result in a decrease in runoff at the site due to reduced impervious surface area. However, this issue will be addressed in greater detail in the EIR. A portion of the Kentfield campus is within the 100-year floodplain. The removal of the existing Science Center would take this building out of the floodplain. Potential impacts to the floodplain from new development will be addressed further in the EIR.

e) **Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

Due to the site’s floodplain location and the recent history of flooding of the Corte Madera Creek, this issue will be addressed in greater detail in the EIR. The potential for increased runoff during storm
events (i.e., the 100-year storm) and the potential for water quality impacts will be addressed in the EIR (for both the construction and operation stages of the project).

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

No major water quality degradation is expected. However, this issue will be addressed in the EIR.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No new housing would be constructed as part of the project.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

At this time, one new maintenance building is proposed within the area of the 100-year floodplain. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding of as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

Flooding has occurred at the campus primarily in the area of the existing Science Center and surrounding parking lots, and could occur in the future, given the location of the 100-year floodplain. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No seiche, tsunami, or mudflows would affect campus development. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

Sources of Information: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a)  Physically divide an established community?

The project would not divide an established community. All new construction would occur on lands currently owned by the Marin Community College District. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

b)  Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The project could conflict with adopted policies, and this issue will be explored further in the EIR. However, it should be noted that community colleges are not subject to local land use controls and policies such as the Marin Countywide Plan or City of Larkspur General Plan. Nevertheless, it is the College’s intent to conform to policies and regulations to the greatest extent practical so that the proposed development does not significantly affect the surrounding neighborhood.

The EIR will address compatibility of the proposed development with overall height and setback regulations of the surrounding neighborhood. The EIR will also address the project’s consistency with relevant policies of the Marin Countywide Plan and the City of Larkspur General Plan.

The Land Use section of the EIR will address policy documents associated with the Bond Spending Implementation Plan such as “Design Goals, Principles, Guidelines,” and land use compatibility of the project with surrounding land uses.

c)  Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No habitat conservation plan applies to the project site.

Sources of Information: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?

No mineral resources have been mapped at the project site and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Refer to (a) above.

Sources of Information: 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a community college, the project is not subject to noise standards of local agencies. However, the EIR will address the project’s relationship to such standards as related to both construction and operation. Significant noise could be generated during demolition and new construction and mitigation measures may be necessary.
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

While significant ground borne vibration is not anticipated, the EIR will address this issue in greater detail, especially as related to construction requirements.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No substantial permanent increases in ambient noise levels are expected. Some equipment may actually be upgraded to reduce overall noise levels associated with chillers and other similar equipment. However, the EIR will address this topic in more detail.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

The EIR will address this issue in greater detail with respect to construction activities.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The Kentfield campus is not located in the vicinity of any airport and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

See (e) above.

Sources of Information: 1

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The changes at the Kentfield campus would not result in substantial growth in the area. The campus is expected to continue to provide for the community college needs of the surrounding Marin County communities. The area around the campus is currently developed and no new major development of the surrounding area is anticipated. Population and housing will not be addressed as a separate topic of the EIR.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No housing would be displaced as a result of the project. This topic will not be addressed in the EIR.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

See (b) above. This topic will not be addressed in the EIR.

Sources of Information: 1

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

Police protection?
Schools?  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐
Parks?  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐
Other public facilities?  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐

a)  Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?

The student enrollment increase would be the same as anticipated without the project and would not be likely to result in the need for construction of any new public service facilities. The demand for fire protection services may increase during demolition when large building areas would be affected and utility lines may be accidentally disturbed. New building construction could affect both police and fire service access to the site. The Public Services section of the EIR will address impacts on fire and police protection services. Impacts related to school, parks, and other public facilities will not be further addressed in the EIR since the project would not result in the need for new or altered schools, parks, or other facilities.

Sources of Information: 1

XIV. RECREATION.

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

The expected student enrollment increase would be the same as anticipated without the project and would not result in increased use of local and regional parks to the point where substantial deterioration of such facilities could occur. The College provides its own recreational facilities and these would continue to be used by students, faculty and staff. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The minor improvements proposed at the Physical Education (PE) complex of the Kentfield campus were addressed in 2006 by the adoption of a Categorical Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act. About 5,000 square feet of space at the PE complex would be removed. This space is primarily circulation area (roof areas joining the two buildings that is counted as square footage) and small locker room space. No expansion of the PE complex is proposed. Building improvements are proposed to make the complex more energy-efficient and in compliance with current building codes. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Sources of Information: 1 and 6

---

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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The issue of increased traffic would be most significant during the construction phases of the project when demolition and construction of buildings may occur simultaneously and construction vehicles would require use of local streets. The anticipated increase in the student population at the Kentfield campus would be the same as expected without the project and is not expected to result in a significant change in local traffic. However, the EIR will address increased traffic for both the construction and operation stages of the project.

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

While level of service standards are not anticipated to be exceeded, this issue will be addressed in greater detail in the EIR.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No air traffic patterns would be affected and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Hazards related to road designs or incompatible uses are not anticipated. No changes in roadway design would occur with the project. However, the EIR will evaluate the impact of construction vehicles on local roads and will address phasing of construction, staging areas, hours of construction, and potential impacts to local roads such as Kent Avenue, Laurel Avenue, and College Avenue.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

The project would not change emergency access routes in the vicinity. However, the EIR will address emergency access provisions for the entire campus and potential interference with emergency access during the demolition and construction phases of the project.
f) **Result in inadequate parking capacity?**

Some parking would be removed from the campus with new construction. Additional parking would be added in the area of the Science Center that would be removed. Recent assessments of the campus have shown that more parking exists on the Kentfield campus than is needed to meet demand. However, the parking lots that are more distant from the central campus are the lots with the least demand, and the lots near the central campus have the greatest demand. The issue of parking capacity during both construction and operation will be addressed in the EIR.

g) **Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

The EIR will address the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the campus, especially as a way of reducing the use of private vehicles (which have associated impacts on energy use, noise, and air pollutant emissions). The EIR will also address the availability of public transit serving the campus.

A public bicycle and pedestrian path currently extends through the campus adjacent to Corte Madera Creek. The EIR will address any impacts to this path during both construction and operation of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

The project is not anticipated to result in significant increased demand for wastewater treatment. However, this issue will be addressed further in the EIR.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Refer to (a) above. No new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities are anticipated for the project.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Storm water drainage will be addressed in the Hydrology section of the EIR. Due to the presence of the 100-year floodplain at the Kentfield campus, this issue will be addressed in detail in the EIR. Improved storm drainage may include bioswales and other measures to reduce overall runoff from parking and other paved surfaces on the campus.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

No new or expanded water supply entitlements are expected. However, the EIR will address this issue to ensure that no significant impacts could result.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Local service providers (i.e., Ross Valley Sanitary District) will be contacted to determine if adequate capacity exists to serve the wastewater needs of the project.
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

A significant amount of construction debris would be generated during demolition of campus buildings. The potential for recycling of such debris will be addressed in the EIR, based on County and State programs. The EIR will address the likely increase in solid waste demands during both construction and operation of the project.

g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The EIR will address the project’s compliance with all relevant regulations related to solid waste, and will address the potential for recycling of waste products (e.g., demolition debris as well as waste products such as paper, bottles, and cans). Potential and existing campus programs to encourage recycling during daily campus operations will be identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

The main potential impact associated with the Bond Spending Implementation Plan as related to the above topics is the removal of campus buildings that have been identified as historically significant. The EIR will address this issue in greater detail and will include mitigation measures as necessary.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

As a Program EIR, the EIR for the Kentfield Campus Bond Spending Implementation Plan will address cumulative campus changes over the 6-year planning horizon. In addition, the EIR may address any other related development projects in the vicinity based on information provided by the County and local nearby towns (i.e., Larkspur and Ross). Given the built-out nature of the surrounding area, the cumulative impact discussion is anticipated to focus on campus growth.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The project may have indirect substantial environmental effects on human beings (i.e., increased noise, traffic, etc.) primarily during the construction phases of the project. The EIR will address such effects in greater detail.

Sources of Information:

1. Professional judgment of environmental planners preparing the Initial Study and based on site work completed at the campus.
5. Marin Community College District, 2006. Categorical Exemption for PE Complex Improvements (on file at the Swinerton offices on the Kentfield campus) and also on the College website (www.marin.edu [Measure C Updates page]).
6. Marin Community College District, 2006b. Existing Facilities Assessments, Volumes I and II, Fall: Kentfield Campus. These can be viewed at the Swinerton offices on the Kentfield campus (Building MS-3).
7. Marin Community College District, 2006c. Bond Spending Implementation Plan, Design Guidelines, Volume 1B.