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CHAPTER I
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Project Title: Science/Math/Central Plant and Fine/Performing Arts Buildings at College of Marin, Kentfield Campus

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
Marin Community College District
c/o Swinerton Management and Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 144003
Kentfield, CA 94904

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Mr. Dan Eggen or Mr. Leigh Sata, 415-884-3139

4. Project Location: College of Marin campus, 835 College Avenue, Kentfield, CA 94904

5. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:
Marin Community College District
c/o Swinerton Management and Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 144003
Kentfield, CA 94904

6. General Plan Designation: Public Facility (PF) for portion of site where project is located

7. Zoning: Public Facility (PF) for portion of site where project is located

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 Science/Math/Central Plant (referred to herein as “SMCP”) and the Fine/Performing Arts Buildings proposed on the Kentfield campus of the College of Marin.

The two new buildings (SMCP and Fine Arts), as well as the renovations for the Performing Arts Building, were addressed in the Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) completed for the Bond Spending Implementation Plan (hereinafter also referred to as the Implementation Plan) for the Kentfield campus that was certified on November 7, 2007. The Implementation Plan is the outcome and the guiding document 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 campuses - the Kentfield campus and the Indian Valley campus.

A Program EIR was prepared to address overall changes on the Kentfield campus because specific details about some of the proposed buildings were not yet available at the time of the Program EIR. It was understood that further environmental review might be necessary when such details were known. Now, floor plans have been developed for the two main buildings that are addressed herein. The Trustees will be responsible for adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration certifying that the current project meets all the requirements of the CEQA and that no significant unavoidable environmental impacts will occur. After the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the new buildings can be approved. Construction will also require the prior approval of the Division of the State Architect (DSA).

Detailed floor plans and other drawings can be reviewed at the Swinerton Management & Consulting Offices, Building MS-3, Kentfield Campus, 835 College Avenue, Kentfield, CA. The Program EIR and other associated documents can be viewed on the College’s website (http://www.marin.edu/MeasureC/public_notices/index.htm). The Program EIR on the Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin (2007-2013) is incorporated herein by reference.

Project Location and Site Characteristics
The Kentfield campus is located in central Marin County in the unincorporated community of Kentfield. The main access to the 87-acre campus is provided via Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue. Other roads abutting the campus include Laurel Avenue and Kent Avenue. A regional and project location map is provided in Figure 1-1.

Major highway access to the project site is available from State Highway 101, about 2 miles east of the campus. Sir Francis Drake Boulevard is a main exit from this highway for those coming from the north, south, and east. For those coming from west Marin County, the main access to the campus is from Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, which provides access to San Anselmo, Fairfax, Point Reyes, Inverness, and other communities to the west.

The Kentfield campus (see Figure 1-1) includes approximately 401,904 gross square feet (gsf) of building area in 22 buildings. Of this total acreage, about 13 acres are developed as the “main” campus where most of the academic buildings are concentrated. Corte Madera Creek has been channelized in a concrete channel and forms the southern boundary of the main campus (see Figure 1-1). One bridge currently provides both pedestrian and emergency vehicle access across the creek to the main campus. A new West Bridge would provide access to the project site (see Figure 1-2). This new bridge was evaluated in the Program EIR.
KENTFIELD CAMPUS PROJECT AND REGIONAL LOCATION
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SOURCE: Royston, Hanamoto, Alley and Abey (RHAA)
**Project Need**

The District has undertaken a number of studies to evaluate the existing condition of buildings at the Kentfield campus. The first study was the “Facility Condition Assessment Report” undertaken in 2003 by 3D/I (3D/I, 2003). This report formed the basis of the requested improvements for the Measure C Bond Program that was approved by the County’s voters in 2004.

Many of the Kentfield campus buildings are in a state of disrepair and two are seismically unsafe. In addition, the existing Science Building is located within the 100-year floodplain.

The proposed project responds to these conditions. The proposed SMCP would be a new building located in a higher elevation portion of the campus. A Central Plant would also be added and combined with the SMCP. The existing Fine Arts Wing of the Performing Arts Building, which was found to have limitations due to accessibility issues, would be demolished and a new Fine Arts building would be constructed farther to the east.

**Bond Spending Implementation Provisions**

At completion of the entire Implementation Plan, the campus is expected to have an enrollment of about 6,400 students, which is about a 6-percent increase (1 percent per year) over the 2006-2007 enrollment. Table 1-1 presents existing and projected enrollment and building space. As can be seen in Table 1-1, the Implementation Plan provides for a net reduction in building square footage of 40,000 to 45,000 gsf so that the College is more in line with the building space that is needed to serve the needs of the projected student population.

**Table 1-1** Existing and Projected Student Enrollment, Faculty/Staff, and Building Area for the Entire Kentfield Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Total at Completion of Bond Spending Implementation Plan</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>6,402</td>
<td>+371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Square Feet of Building Area (approximate)</td>
<td>420,100</td>
<td>375,100 to 380,100</td>
<td>-40,000 to -45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Characteristics
The site plan for the new currently proposed project is shown in Figure 1-2. As can be seen in this figure, two new buildings – the SMCP and the Fine Arts Buildings – would be constructed and an addition would be made to the Performing Arts Building located just to the west of the new Fine Arts Building. A new “West Bridge” is proposed across Corte Madera Creek to provide access to the SMCP (see Figure 1-2). As shown in the figure, the project is located in the northern portion of the campus adjacent to Laurel Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. This area of the campus is fairly level, with elevations ranging from about 14 feet above mean sea level (msl) to 32 feet above msl. The greatest topographic variations occur in the area of the proposed SMCP.

Demolition
The existing Fine Arts Wing of the Performing Arts Building (34,000 square feet), Austin Science Building, and other buildings 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. The timing of demolition is dependent upon funding. The demolition of campus buildings was addressed in the Program EIR and therefore is not addressed herein. Detailed assessments were done by a team of engineers, architects, and specialists in hazards, ventilation, and other specialties during 2006 (Marin Community College District, 2006c). Full copies of these assessments can be viewed at the offices of Swinerton Management & Consulting located on the Kentfield campus, Building MS-3, and on the College’s website.

Modernization and Construction of New Buildings
The Performing Arts Building would undergo modernization. This Initial Study also evaluates new construction of the following two buildings:

- A new SMCP that would include science classrooms and the main plant equipment for the campus such as electrical/mechanical equipment.
- A new Fine Arts Building, the Arts Plaza and the New Fine Arts Addition (wing of Performing Arts Building) with dance studios on the first floor and Lobby and Gallerie on the second floor taking the space from the demolished existing Fine Arts Wing.

The new SMCP would have a gross floor area of 76,945 square feet and a final building height of 3 to 4 stories or 61.5 feet. The Program EIR assumed a similar square footage (77,000 gsf) and a building height of 3 to 4 stories.

The existing 86,500-square-foot Performing and Fine Arts Buildings would be reduced in size to 61,500 square feet and would become the Performing Arts Building only. In the remodeled Performing Arts Building, two new dance studios would be added. The new Fine Arts Building would have a gross floor area of 22,570 square feet, spread over three floors. Elevations for both the SMCP and the Fine Arts Building are provided in Appendix B.
Site Improvements: Landscaping, Pathways, Lighting, Parking, and Utilities
In addition, the project would include overall site improvements such as new landscaping, new pathways, reconfiguration of parking lots, and new utility lines (water, wastewater, gas, electricity, and telecommunications). These site improvements were adequately evaluated in the Program EIR and thus are not addressed in detail herein.

Bridge Across Corte Madera Creek
A new clear span bridge¹ across Corte Madera Creek would be developed to the west of the existing bridge (see Figure 1-3). This bridge would be for pedestrians and bicyclists, but would also allow access for service and emergency vehicles and construction staging. To discourage normal vehicular access, some type of impediment would be constructed at one end of the bridge. The bridge is proposed to be about 16 feet wide and approximately 60 to 70 feet long. This bridge was thoroughly evaluated in the Program EIR, and thus is not evaluated herein.

Landscaping
The main areas proposed for new landscape improvements include the area between the new Fine Arts Building and the existing Performing Arts Building (the Arts Plaza) and the Central Green near Fusselman Hall. Landscape plans for the vicinity of the SMCP are shown in Figures 1-4 through 1-7. Landscape plans for the Fine Arts Building vicinity are shown in Figure 1-8.

The Design Guidelines for the Kentfield campus address the goal of new plantings that are native, drought-tolerant, and low maintenance. It should also be noted that campus landscaping would continue to be irrigated by the District’s well. 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 (Marin Community College District, 2006a).

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 the extent practicable, area lighting and security lighting would be controlled by the use of an energy management system (EMS) and/or motion detector activation to reduce energy consumption.

Parking Lots
In Parking Lot 4, the number of spaces would be reduced from 158 spaces to 30 spaces due to new construction of the SMCP as shown in Figure 1-2. The reduction in campus parking spaces was addressed in the Program EIR and is therefore not addressed in detail herein.

¹ A clear span bridge would eliminate the need to disturb the existing Corte Madera Creek channel.
See Appendix C for Planting Symbols.
See Appendix C for Planting Symbols.
LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR FINE ARTS BUILDING

See Appendix C for Planting Symbols.
Figure 1-8

ARTIST’S RENDERING OF FINE ARTS BUILDING

SOURCE: Marcy Wong and Dan Logan Architects, 2008
Utility Lines
A number of utility improvements would be made on the Kentfield campus for water, natural gas, wastewater, telecommunications (phone, fiber optics, and other signal systems), and storm drainage. These utility improvements were addressed in the Program EIR.

Existing domestic water supply to the campus is from the Marin Municipal Water District. Where practicable, 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. Some existing on-site sewer lines would be replaced. Sewers in the area of Fusselman Hall and Dickson Hall would be relocated to an area that would be adjacent to existing and new buildings.

All telecommunication services for this project would be installed at the Central Plant 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 chilled water.

Phasing of Facilities
Construction of the SMCP and Fine Arts Buildings is expected to begin in 2009 and to be completed by 2011. As related to the overall Implementation Plan, these two buildings are the first major new buildings to be constructed on the campus. As of June 2008, other two projects that were already underway were the geothermal field and the renovations of the P.E. Complex.

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.

Site Grading and Construction Staging
Site development would require moderate grading to regrade areas of demolished buildings and to prepare sites for new buildings. Demolition of existing buildings was addressed in the Program EIR and thus is not addressed herein. Grading would be balanced as much as possible and may not require the import of fill. One area of the campus that has the most slope is the area just north of Corte Madera Creek where the new SMCP would be located. Other areas of the campus are generally level.

Construction trailers and parking are proposed to be located at the Larkspur Annex (see Figure 1-1) and Parking Lot 9 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.

The new SMCP adjacent to Laurel Avenue would have construction supplies and equipment stored at an adjacent area such as Parking Lots 4, 9, or 15. The new Fine Arts Building would have construction equipment stored near Circle Drive and possibly at Parking Lots 3 and/or 16.
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 minimize 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 under construction to reduce energy consumption for campus buildings. The Fine Arts Building would be a corridor-free structure that takes advantage of its narrow width to operate mostly on natural ventilation, except in extreme temperatures and weather conditions.

Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Compliance
The District is committed to meeting certain criteria established by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification program, which allot points for various energy-saving and environmentally preferable features. All design and engineering firms hired by the District to work on the Bond projects have LEED-certified professionals on their staff assigned to the District projects. In addition, the District is using a LEED-certified commissioning agent for enhanced commissioning of all systems on new projects. The District’s goal is to meet the criteria of LEED even if certification is not formally obtained. Also, “green building” design principles are addressed at length in the Design Goals, Principles, Guidelines (Volume IB) document of the Bond Spending Implementation Plan.

Some of the green building principles for future construction include the following:

- Enhanced durability
- Improved occupant comfort
- Energy and water savings
- Reduced maintenance costs
- Conservation of natural resources
- Efficient building systems
- Elimination of waste and pollution
- Preserved air and water quality
- Natural daylighting and ventilation
- Improved indoor air quality
- Green roof and cool roof technologies
- Low ratio of windows to walls
- Use of native plants and drought-resistant plants
- Protection of existing vegetation
- Use of bio-retention ponds
- Drainage of hardscape areas into softscape (i.e., landscaped) areas
- Use of high recycled content materials for interior design
- Use of active and passive energy systems

Images of how the projects may appear are shown in Figures 1-8 to 1-10 below. An artist’s rendering of the Fine Arts Building is shown in Figure 1-8 and a model of the building as it may
appear from Circle Drive is shown in Figure 1-9. Two visual simulations for the SMCP are shown in Figure 1-10, as seen from Laurel Avenue.

Hours of Operation and Construction
Hours of operation at the Kentfield campus are typically 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Friday. Many classes are offered on weekends.

During the construction period, construction would typically occur between 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday and between 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays as per the mitigation measures of the Program EIR.

Project Objectives
The Marin Community College District is committed to upgrading the College's facilities in compliance with the Measure C Bond Program. The following objectives have been identified for the overall Implementation Plan and also apply to the specific currently proposed projects:

1. Provide functional instructional and administrative space to meet program requirements;
2. Provide upgrades to the existing Kentfield campus to serve the population in this area;
3. Provide job training and academic programs to assist the unemployed and underemployed in obtaining employment and advancement;
4. Provide lower division college classes for transfer students to 4-year university programs;
5. Participate in a collaborative partnership with other educational providers, the business community, and local government to better serve the community;
6. Improve campus facilities to accommodate a total campus population of approximately 6,400 students at completion of the Bond Spending Implementation Plan;
7. Focus development within the existing central area of the Kentfield campus;
8. Meet LEED criteria (even if formal certification is not obtained);
9. Modernize classrooms, laboratories, and libraries to meet contemporary standards of education;
10. Implement modern computer technology for the campus;
11. Replace outmoded teaching equipment;
Figure 1-9
VIEW OF FINE ARTS MODEL, AS SEEN FROM CIRCLE DRIVE
(a) Visual simulation of SMCP as seen from southwest driveway on Laurel Avenue

(b) Visual simulation of SMCP as seen from Laurel Avenue and Cedar Avenue
12. Upgrade buildings for fire safety, energy conservation, seismic safety, and campus security;
13. Improve disabled access;
14. Enhance job training; and
15. Implement “green building” practices in all capital improvement projects.

Project Approval and Funding Process
The Marin Community College District is the principal authority for the proposed project. The Board of Trustees for the District would be responsible for adopting the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The following additional agencies would be involved in discretionary approvals and permits required for various project components:

- **The Department of the State Architect (DSA)** reviews community college project designs to determine compliance with the California Building Code, including fire/life safety, structural integrity, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.
- **The State Fire Marshal's Office** has delegated fire code regulatory responsibilities for community college facilities to DSA.
- **The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)** oversees the permitting for projects that could affect water quality. The project would be covered under the State National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit, which is accomplished by filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the RWQCB. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required for the project.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project is located on the main Kentfield campus of the College of Marin and primarily surrounded by other campus buildings. However, residential uses are located to the northwest, on the northwest side of Laurel Avenue. Corte Madera Creek is located to the south of the proposed SMCP. Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, a two-lane arterial, is located to the north of the existing and proposed Fine Arts and Performing Arts Buildings.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)** The Marin Community College District is the lead agency that will approve the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. Other permits may be required for the overall construction as proposed in the Bond Spending Implementation Plan that was subject to the full EIR in 2007, but no other permits are expected to be required for the current project.
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
Board of Trustees Secretary

Date
9/18/08
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CHAPTER II
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

INTRODUCTION
This Initial Study is tiered off the Program EIR on the Bond Spending Implementation Plan for College of Marin (2007-2013) certified in November 2007 (Marin Community College District, 2007). This Program EIR is incorporated herein by reference. Since the certification of the Program EIR, the District has prepared more detailed designs for the SMCP and the Fine/Performing Arts Buildings. This Initial Study evaluates these building plans (collectively referred to as ‘the project”) in more detail to determine if additional mitigation measures are required, beyond those already identified in the Program EIR. When specific mitigation measures from the Program EIR apply to the project, such measures are discussed below under the topics that apply.

A number of sources of information were used to prepare this Initial Study checklist. These are documented by cross-reference to the number of the document or source below:

1. Site visit by authors.
5. Lacy, 2008. E-mail communication from Charles Lacy, Chief, Marin Community College Police Department, re: “Issue of ‘project’ at COM,” July 1.
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?

$\square$ Potentially Significant Impact $\square$ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated $\square$ Less Than Significant Impact $\square$ No Impact

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The projects would be located within the developed portion of the campus that is only visible from the immediate surroundings. Photographs of existing views were taken from various locations (Figure 2-1). The view of Mount Tamalpais, as seen in Figures 2-2 and 2-3, would be slightly altered by the proposed location of the new Fine Arts Building. The SMCP and Performing Arts Building addition would not affect this view. From some limited locations on Circle Drive that now have uninterrupted views of Mount Tamalpais, the new Fine Arts Building and associated landscaping would block that view. In general, the new Fine Arts Building would be just to the west of the flag pole shown in Figures 2-2 and 2-3. However, the Central Quad located southeast of the new Fine Arts Building would remain open and directly in line with major pedestrian gateways to the central campus from Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and Circle Drive, allowing uninterrupted views to Mount Tamalpais. The landscape plan for the Fine Art Building shows a row of deciduous magnolia trees being planted on the south and east curved walls. To ensure a reduced blockage of this scenic vista, the following mitigation measure is recommended.

Impact Aesthetics-1: Views of Mount Tamalpais from Circle Drive could be blocked by the Fine Arts Building if new landscaping is planted that interrupts this view.

Mitigation Measure Aesthetics-1: New landscaping at the Fine Arts Building shall not encroach into the viewshed toward Mount Tamalpais, as seen from Circle Drive. New landscaping on the south side of the building shall be deciduous and shall be in immediate proximity to the building to prevent interruption of views toward the mountain from this important pedestrian gateway to the campus.
b) **Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?**

The SMCP would require the removal of about 25 trees. These would include Bigleaf maples, ash, Coast live oaks, magnolias, walnut trees, olive trees, Japanese maples, a Valley oak, and Coast redwoods. A tree protection plan has been prepared to identify trees in the vicinity of the SMCP that would be protected. These include redwood trees and oak trees at the south end of the site, a variety of trees (oaks, manzanita, redwoods, linden trees, and Japanese maples) at the east end of the site, and a few trees at the north end of the site. For the west edge of the site, along Laurel Avenue, the protection plan includes protection of two existing Coast live oaks, an existing Cedar tree, four Sycamore trees, and three redwood trees. Review of the tree removal plan indicates that no trees in the immediate vicinity of Laurel Avenue would be removed.

The Fine/Performing Arts Buildings would require the removal of 37 mature trees. These would include oaks, lindens, prunus species, Japanese maples, persimmons, birch, magnolias, Coast redwoods, Douglas fir, cherry, cypress, loquat, and Bigleaf maples. Some of these are shown in Figure 2-4. Of the trees to be removed, many are mature trees with trunks ranging in size from 4.2 inches to 32 inches, measured in diameter breast height.

Of the total 62 trees to be removed, some would be native trees. A total of four Coast redwoods would be removed from the Fine Arts site and two Coast redwoods would be removed from the SMCP site. A total of two Coast live oaks and one Valley oak would be removed from the Fine Arts site and four Coast live oaks and one Valley oak would be removed from the SMCP site. Thus, a total of 14 native trees would be removed for construction of the project.
New landscaping is proposed in the vicinity of both buildings that would include Coast live oaks, ginkos, magnolias, prunus species, cherry tree, Deodar cedars, Coast redwood and other trees (see Appendix C). The Program EIR identified tree removal as a potentially significant impact but this impact mainly addressed trees along the Corte Madera Creek channel. Section 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Program EIR included a mitigation measure that recommended avoidance of mature trees and the hiring of an arborist to recommend construction restrictions where trees suitable for preservation could be adversely affected. As of the date of preparing this Initial Study (July 2008), an arborist had been retained.

Impact Aesthetics-2: A total of 62 trees would be removed from the campus for the SMCP and Fine/Performing Arts projects, with 16 of these being native trees. New landscaping with trees and shrubs is proposed in the vicinity of both projects to partially mitigate this impact.

\[
\text{Mitigation Measure Aesthetics-2: A total of 32 native trees shall be planted on the campus to replace the 16 native trees lost by construction, to provide a replanting ratio of 2:1. These trees shall be planted from 15-gallon containers or larger and shall be monitored for the first three years of growth to ensure survival.}
\]

c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The Program EIR did not identify any substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the site from the proposed projects. The new buildings are generally in the same location of the site as identified in the Program EIR. The SMCP design includes an exterior of solid phenolic exterior wall panels, with aluminum coping, aluminum windows and aluminum louvers. The potential colors include dark sage green and/or a light wood grain. Figure 1-10 shows the views toward the new SMCP from Laurel Avenue. Street trees would screen much of the new building.

The new Fine Arts Building would be a combination steel and concrete structure. The ground floor, housing the ceramics and sculpture classes, would be a concrete structure surrounded on one side by a curved concrete wall that would house the foundry and kilns in a semi-covered open environment. Administration space and the upper levels would be a steel structure with a panelized exterior cladding system. Windows would be large and aluminum-framed double pane glass.
While the new buildings may be more modern than the existing campus buildings, their siting, scale, and overall design would conform to the adopted Design Guidelines for the campus and no substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the campus and/or the surrounding area would occur.

**d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

Lighting of both new buildings would include low, pedestrian-scale lighting, building exterior lighting, and parking lot lighting. Parking Lot 4 near the SMCP would be significantly reduced in size but would continue to have exterior lighting. As stated in Volume IB of the “Design Goals, Principles, Guidelines” for the Bond Spending Implementation Plan (Marin Community College District, 2007), parking lot lighting would be designed for 1 footcandle light level to ensure adequate security. The recommended fixture is the Gardco Lighting parking lot pole light that would shine light directly downward to avoid excessive light and glare. Other lighting such as pedestrian lighting would be located primarily in the vicinity of buildings and along pathways and would not result in significant light or glare.

The exterior building materials for SMCP, Fine Arts, and Performing Arts would not include any reflective material.

No mitigation measures would be necessary as related to significant light and glare.

*Sources of Information: 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7*

---

**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? [Diagram]

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

<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) Would the project 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 farmland would be affected.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts exist at the campus.

c) Would the project 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 conversion of farmland would occur.

Sources of Information:  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:

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

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

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)?
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? 

Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---
☐ | ☑ | ☑ | ☐

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

Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---
☐ | ☑ | ☑ | ☐

---

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

The project would not affect population or vehicle travel forecasts used to develop the latest clean air plans.

b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Carbon monoxide is the criteria air pollutant that could affect local sensitive receptors. Monitored carbon monoxide concentrations measured in San Rafael are well below health-based ambient air quality standards. Because San Rafael is more urbanized than Kentfield, carbon monoxide concentrations are expected to be lower near the project. The Program EIR found that project increases in traffic would not trigger the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) screening thresholds for evaluating carbon monoxide concentrations at affected intersections. The project would not substantially affect traffic forecasts used in the Program EIR. Therefore, the conclusion of a less-than-significant impact is still valid.

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

The Program EIR evaluated changes to emissions of regional air pollutants associated with direct and indirect emissions from build out of the campus plan. These emissions were found to be well below the significance thresholds established by the BAAQMD; and therefore, less than significant. A diesel-powered emergency generator would be included as part of this project. The generator would be tested about once a month for about 30 minutes. Emissions associated with this testing would be minor and would not affect the conclusions of the Program EIR.

d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The project would include a diesel-powered emergency generator that would be tested periodically. In addition to small amounts of criteria air pollutants, the generator would emit diesel particulate matter (DPM). The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has identified DPM as a toxic air contaminant and developed air toxic control measures (ACTM) to control emissions. This generator would be subject to
BAAQMD permitting requirements that incorporate the ATCMs. The BAAQMD would require that the generator include toxic best available control measures (TBACT) that reduces the emissions rates from the generator. In addition, the BAAQMD would evaluate health risks to ensure that the generator would not pose a significant cancer risk. The BAAQMD would not issue an Authority to Construct permit prior to making a final permit determination that the generator is in compliance. Installation of the generator in compliance with the BAAQMD permit requirements would result in a less than significant impact.

**Impact Air-1:** Construction activities would result in temporary emissions of dust (or PM\(_{10}\)) and DPM.

- **Mitigation Measure Air-1:** The Program EIR evaluated these impacts and identified mitigation measures to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant impact. The project shall include implementation of Mitigation Measures Air-1a, Air-1b, and Air-2 from the Program EIR to reduce the impact of construction activities associated with this project to a less-than-significant level.

**Impact Air-2:** The proposed diesel-powered emergency generator at SMCP would emit diesel particulate matter (DPM) that would pose a health hazard if not adequately tested and permitted.

- **Mitigation Measure Air-2:** The District shall ensure that the proposed diesel-powered emergency generator is permitted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and that an Authority to Construct permit is obtained from BAAQMD prior to the onset of any project construction.

e) **Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

Construction activities would result in temporary odors from equipment exhaust that may be noticeable at times to nearby residences and users of the campus. However, these would be infrequent during construction, and would be less than significant.

**Sources of Information:** 2, 3, and 6
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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

-☐☐☐☐

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

The new buildings would be in the vicinity of existing development and no major habitat modifications would occur. The project therefore would not affect candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

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

The new buildings would not affect any riparian habitat. The new SMCP is set back about 120 feet from the Corte Madera Creek channel and no habitat along this concrete channel would be affected.

c) Would the project 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?

No wetlands would be affected by either the SMCP or the Fine/Performing Arts Buildings.
d) Would the project 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?

No resident or migratory fish movement or wildlife corridors would be affected by the project. The project is located in a developed portion of the College of Marin campus.

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

The District is exempt from local land use regulations but tries to abide by relevant policies and ordinances whenever possible. Also, the Bond Spending Implementation Plan includes policies to protect native vegetation and to replant with native vegetation whenever possible.

The SMCP would require the removal of about 25 trees. These would include Bigleaf maples, ash, Coast live oaks, magnolias, walnut trees, olive trees, Japanese maples, a Valley oak, and Coast redwoods. A tree protection plan has been prepared to identify trees in the vicinity of the SMCP that would be protected. These include redwood trees and oak trees at the south end of the site, a variety of trees (oaks, manzanita, redwoods, linden trees, and Japanese maples) at the east end of the site, and a few trees at the north end of the site. For the west edge of the site, along Laurel Avenue, the protection plan includes protection of two existing Coast live oaks, an existing Cedar tree, four Sycamore trees, and three redwood trees. Review of the tree removal plan indicates that no trees in the immediate vicinity of Laurel Avenue would be removed.

The Fine/Performing Arts Buildings would require the removal of 37 mature trees. These would include oaks, lindens, prunus species, Japanese maples, persimmons, birch, magnolias, Coast redwoods, Douglas fir, cherry, cypress, loquat, and Bigleaf maples. Some of these are shown in Figure 2-4. Of the trees to be removed, many are mature trees with trunks ranging in size from 4.2 inches to 32 inches, measured in diameter breast height.

Of the total 62 trees to be removed, some would be native trees. A total of four Coast redwoods would be removed from the Fine Arts site and two Coast redwoods would be removed from the SMCP site. A total of two Coast live oaks and one Valley oak would be removed from the Fine Arts site and four Coast live oaks and one Valley oak would be removed from the SMCP site. Thus, a total of 14 native trees would be removed for construction of the project.

Impact Biology-1: Mature trees, some of which are native trees, would be removed for the construction of the SMCP and the Fine/Performing Arts Buildings. New landscaping would be planted.

Mitigation Measure Biology-1: Refer to Mitigation Measure Aesthetics-2.
f) **Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?**

The project would not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plan or other such plan.

*Sources of Information: 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7*

<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>

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

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

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

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?**

The Program EIR thoroughly evaluated historic features on the Kentfield campus and mitigation measures were recommended.

b) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**

Potential impacts on archaeological resources were also documented in the Program EIR and mitigation measures were adopted by the District. Archaeological resources have been found on the campus and additional unknown resources may be uncovered during construction.

**Impact Cultural-1:** The project has the potential to affect archaeological resources on the Kentfield campus.

*Mitigation Measure Cultural-1: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measure Cultural-2a, Cultural-2b, and Cultural-3 of the Program EIR.*
c) **Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

No paleontological resources would be affected by the project.

d) **Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

Refer to (b) above.

**Sources of Information: 2**

---

### 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.

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

iv) Landslides?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

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

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

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?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

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?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact
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?

<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>

a) Would the project 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. Landslides are not expected at the site due to the level terrain. Liquefaction potential in the vicinity of the SMCP is low to moderate. Liquefaction for the Fine Arts/Performing Arts site is low. The project would be required to abide by all recommendations of the geotechnical report and no additional mitigation measures would be considered necessary.

Impact Geology-1: The new buildings could be subject to strong ground shaking and liquefaction during an earthquake, which could damage proposed structures.

Mitigation Measure Geology-1: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measures Geology-1a through Geology-1c of the Program EIR related to geotechnical investigations and compliance with the Uniform Building Code.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

The potential for soil erosion was addressed in the Program EIR and identified as a potentially significant impact due to the amount of ground disturbance for new construction.

Impact Geology-2: Soil erosion or the loss of topsoil could occur during construction, particularly during storms.

Mitigation Measure Geology-2: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measure Geology-2 of the Program EIR related to preparation of an Erosion Control and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prior to the onset of demolition, site grading, or construction.
c) **Would the project 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?**

Refer to (a) above.

d) **Would the project 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?**

Refer to (a) above. No additional mitigation measures would be necessary. The geotechnical reports completed for the projects showed that soils on both sides were not expansive.

e) **Would the project 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: 2, 4, 9, and 10**

### VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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)</td>
<td>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Both construction of the project and long-term use of the proposed buildings would involve routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials related to demolition were thoroughly evaluated in the Program EIR and are not addressed herein.

During project operation, hazardous materials may be used and hazardous waste may be generated. For example, students’ using laboratories in the proposed SMCP may use hazardous materials and generate hazardous waste. The District maintains a Hazardous Materials Business Plan that includes safety information for all labs on both the Kentfield and Indian Valley campuses (Lacy, 2008). See also (b) below.

Impact Hazards-1: The routine transportation, use, or disposal of hazardous materials associated with the project could result in hazardous conditions.

Mitigation Measure Hazards-1: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measures Hazards-1a through Hazards-1i of the Program EIR, which address hazardous materials handling during construction and building operations.
b) Would the project 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. Project construction and operation of proposed new facilities, such as laboratories in the proposed SMCP, may result in the use of hazardous materials and generation of hazardous waste. An accident could result in release of these hazardous materials into the environment. This potential already exists in some campus buildings, such as the existing Science Building.

Section VIII, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Initial Study includes mitigation measures for accidental release of hazardous materials during construction, as related to the implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). These mitigation measures include implementation of best management practices for preventing the discharge of construction-related pollutants such as diesel fuel, hydraulic oil, lead-based paint, concrete, and asbestos to the environment. Implementation of Mitigation Measures Hazards-1a through Hazards-1i of the Program EIR would also reduce hazards associated with accidents.

Impact Hazards-2: An accidental hazardous materials release could occur on the Kentfield campus with construction and operation of the project, as with current campus operations.

Mitigation Measure Hazards-2: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measures Hazards-2a and Hazards-2b of the Program EIR, which address procedures for handling hazardous materials releases.

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

Two schools are located near the Kentfield campus: Adeline E. Kent Middle School located within 0.1 mile of the Kentfield campus and the Anthony B. Bacich Elementary School located ¼-mile east of the campus. Adeline E. Kent School is within the ¼-mile radius identified in the significance criterion. Provided that mitigation measures are implemented as recommended under (a) and (b) above, the proposed project is not expected to emit hazardous emissions or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste significantly above the level that currently exists, and nearby schools would not be affected.

d) Would the project 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.

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) **Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

With implementation of mitigation measures recommended in Section XIII, Public Services, the proposed project would not be expected to interfere with any emergency response plan. The addition of a bridge across Corte Madera Creek – an improvement project that is proceeding separately from the proposed SMCP and Fine/Performing Arts Buildings evaluated in this Initial Study – may facilitate emergency response on the campus. See further discussion in Section XIII, Public Services.

h) **Would the project 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 therefore the threat of wildland fires is low. The availability of fire emergency response is addressed under Section XIII, Public Services, below.

**Sources of Information: 1, 2, and 5**

### VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | ---

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact

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?

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | ---

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact

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?

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | ---

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | ---

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact

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?

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | ---

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact

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

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | ---

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact

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?

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | ---

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | ---

Potentially Significant Impact  | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  | Less Than Significant Impact  | No Impact

**a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Each new building would have a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) developed to ensure that water quality damage would not occur during construction when sediment-laden runoff could occur during storm events. Refer to (e) below.

**b) Would the project 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)?**
No new groundwater supplies would be used for the project. Some groundwater is currently used for landscaping of the campus, but the demand for groundwater for such use is not anticipated to increase.

c) Would the project 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?

Grading would occur, primarily for the SMCP site, which has varied terrain. No major increase in impervious surface area would occur because both new buildings would be developed in areas already built up with existing buildings, paved pathways, or minor landscaping. The need for a SWPPP is addressed under (e) below.

d) Would the project 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?

Refer to (c) above.

e) Would the project 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?

As discussed in the Program EIR, the new construction could result in soil erosion, sedimentation, and other effects on water quality. Ground would be disturbed and soil would be exposed to increased erosion from storm water runoff, site watering, and wind.

**Impact Hydrology-1:** Project construction could result in increased soil erosion, sedimentation, and other effects on water quality.

**Mitigation Measure Hydrology-1:** The project shall comply with Mitigation Measures Hydrology-1a, Hydrology-1b, Hydrology-2a, Hydrology-2b, and Hydrology-3 of the Program EIR related to preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), implementation of best management practices, use of bioswales, and use of energy dissipators at creek outfalls to minimize erosion.

f) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Refer to (e) above.

g) Would the project 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 housing would be included in the proposed project.
h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No new structures would be located within the 100-year floodplain as part of the project. The existing Science Building that is located within the 100-year floodplain would be removed.

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

The project would not result in an increased hazard related to flooding. The new SMCP would allow relocation of all uses currently in the existing Science Building, which is located within the 100-year floodplain. The new SMCP and Fine/Performing Arts Buildings would not be within the 100-year floodplain.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No seiche, tsunami, or mudflows would affect campus development.

Sources of Information: 1, 2, 3, and 4

<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) Would the project physically divide an established community?

The project would occur on the existing campus of the College of Marin and would not divide an established community.
b) **Would the project 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 site is within the jurisdiction of Marin County. The project would comply with the County’s General Plan designation and zoning for the site. The County’s General Plan designation is “Public Facility” (PF) and the zoning is also “Public Facility” for the area of the campus where the project would occur. The project would be compatible with policies of the Marin Countywide Plan and the Kentfield/Greenbrae Community Plan. Potential indirect impacts related to traffic are addressed in Section IV, Transportation, of this Initial Study.

c) **Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

No habitat conservation plan or other similar plan applies to the project site.

*Sources of Information: 1, 2, and 3*

---

### 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **Would the project 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.

b) **Would the project 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: 2*
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:

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?  
   [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  [ ] Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  [ ] No Impact

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?  
   [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  [ ] Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  [ ] No Impact

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  
   [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  [ ] Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  [ ] No Impact

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  
   [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  [ ] Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  [ ] No Impact

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?  
   [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  [ ] Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  [ ] No Impact

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?  
   [ ] Potentially Significant Impact  [ ] Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated  [ ] Less Than Significant Impact  [ ] No Impact

a) Would the project result in 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?

Marin County considers exterior noise levels of 60 dBA L_{dn} or less to be compatible with institutional land uses. Based on the results of the noise monitoring survey, existing traffic noise levels would exceed 60 dBA L_{dn} within about 170 feet from the center of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. Under Year 2013 conditions, traffic noise levels were calculated to increase by less than 1 dBA above existing noise levels. A portion of the proposed Fine Arts Building would be exposed to noise levels of 60 dBA L_{dn} or higher. Outdoor areas located along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue would also be exposed to noise levels exceeding 60 dBA L_{dn}. Interior noise levels within noise sensitive uses inside the Fine Arts Building could be controlled through the use of closed windows and forced-air mechanical ventilation. With windows in the closed position, interior noise levels would be acceptable.

Impact Noise-1: A portion of the Fine Arts Building would be exposed to noise levels of 60 dBA L_{dn} or higher which could impact occupants.
Mitigation Measure Noise-1: Forced-air mechanical ventilation shall be provided to the Fine Arts Building to ensure that interior noise levels are maintained at acceptable levels.

b) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

The construction of the project may generate perceptible vibration when heavy equipment or impact tools (e.g. jackhammers, pile drivers) are used in the vicinity of nearby sensitive land uses. Distinctly perceptible groundborne vibration could be generated by heavy tracked vehicles (e.g., bulldozers or excavators) when this equipment operates within approximately 25 feet of sensitive land uses. Impact pile drivers can generate distinctly perceptible groundborne vibration at distances up to about 100 feet. However, pile drivers are not expected to be used for either the SMCP or Fine/Performing Arts Building. Residential land uses bordering the site would not likely be subject to excessive vibration levels over extended periods of time given the limited work anticipated in these areas. Groundborne vibration generated by construction activities would not be expected to result in cosmetic or structural damage. This is a less-than-significant impact.

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

The operation of mechanical equipment at the Central Plant (part of SMCP) could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels at nearby off-campus neighbors. The Central Plant would include pumps within the proposed building and other redundant equipment (emergency generator and cooling tower) to serve as back-ups in case of a power failure or a failure of the geothermal system. The proposed pumps are located within the proposed building and would not be a significant source of community noise. The operation of the pumps would be inaudible at nearby residences. The exterior mounted emergency generator and cooling tower would be situated inside the screened-in service yard. Noise levels resulting from the infrequent operation of the emergency generator are calculated to be about 55 dBA at the nearest receivers (approximately 100 feet). The emergency generator would be tested once a month for approximately half an hour and during emergencies. The cooling tower would generate noise levels of about 52 dBA at a distance of 100 feet during operation. The infrequent operation of this equipment would not result in a substantial permanent noise increase at nearby residences. However, to reduce the potential for annoyance if this equipment were to operate during sensitive time periods, the following additional mitigation measures are proposed.

Impact Noise-2: If the Central Plant equipment were operated during sensitive time periods (i.e., early morning or nighttime hours), neighbors on Laurel Avenue could be affected.

Mitigation Measure Noise-2: The District shall construct a 6-foot sound wall at the perimeter of the service yard that interrupts the sound path between the emergency generator and cooling tower to nearby residences along Laurel Avenue. Generator testing activities shall occur between 10:00 AM and 2:00 PM.
d) **Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

Construction of the SMCP would occur within about 100 feet of the nearest sensitive uses along Laurel Avenue. Average noise levels at this distance would typically range from 70 to 80 dBA during busy construction periods. These noise levels drop off at a rate of about 6 dBA per doubling of distance between the noise source and receptor. Construction activities associated with the Fine Arts Building would occur approximately 340 feet from the nearest receivers along Laurel Avenue. The intervening Performing Arts Building would provide at least 10 dBA of shielding, and construction noise levels associated with the Fine Arts Building would range from approximately 49 to 59 dBA at the nearest residences to the northwest. During construction of the SMCP, noise levels would typically be elevated by 10 to 20 dBA. If pile driving is required, construction noise levels could at times be 40 dBA above ambient conditions. On-campus buildings, outdoor areas, and residences would be intermittently exposed to high levels of noise (75 to 85 dBA) throughout the construction period.

Typically, significant noise impacts do not result when standard construction noise control measures are enforced at the project site and when the duration of the noise generating construction period is limited to one construction season (typically one year) or less. Noise generated by grading, infrastructure improvements, and the construction of building shells would not be expected to occur for periods greater than one year. To reduce noise levels from construction, a series of best practices are provided.

**Impact Noise-3:** Construction-related noise could create short-term impacts for nearby residents.

*Mitigation Measure Noise-3a:* Construction equipment shall be well maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical.

*Mitigation Measure Noise-3b:* The District shall limit construction activities to daytime hours between 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM Monday through Friday and between 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Construction activities are prohibited on Sundays and Holidays. Loud noise-generating construction-related equipment (e.g., backhoes, generators, jackhammers) shall be maintained, operated, or serviced at the construction site only from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Monday through Friday.

*Mitigation Measure Noise-3c:* To the extent feasible, the District shall route construction truck traffic to campus construction sites via Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue, avoiding the residential portions of Laurel Avenue and Kent Avenue and other streets.

*Mitigation Measure Noise-3d:* The District shall construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to residences or noise-sensitive campus areas and buildings.

*Mitigation Measure Noise-3e:* The District shall ensure that project contractors utilize ‘quiet’ models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
Mitigation Measure Noise-3f: Project contractors shall equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3g: The District shall locate all staging areas, 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.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3h: Project contractors shall prohibit all unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines, and this shall be in project specifications.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3i: The District shall notify all adjacent residences, and campus staff and students of the construction schedule in writing or by posting signs, and shall designate a disturbance coordinator, responsible for responding to complaints about construction noise. The name and telephone number of the disturbance coordinator shall be posted at the construction site and made available to adjacent residents.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3j: The District shall prohibit construction worker’s radios (etc.) from being audible beyond the limits of the construction site, and shall include this measure in project specifications.

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 project site is not located within 2 miles of an airport or within an airport land use plan area and would not be exposed to excessive noise from aircraft.

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?

Refer to (e) above.

Sources of Information: 2, 3, and 6
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)?</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>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project would not result in substantial growth in the area. As part of the adopted Bond Spending Implementation Plan, the project would help enable the College of Marin 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.

**b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No housing would be displaced as a result of the project.

**c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

See (b) above.

*Sources of Information: 1 and 2*
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</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>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 demand for fire protection services may increase during the proposed demolition of the Fine Arts, DSPS, Dance/Landscape, and Dickson Hall buildings, when large building areas would be affected and utility lines may be accidentally disturbed. The proposed construction of the SMCP and Fine/Performing Arts buildings could affect both police and fire service access to the site. Ultimately, the proposed project could improve emergency conditions in this part of the campus. For example, the proposed demolition of the existing Dance/Landscape and Dickson Hall buildings could improve emergency access, as the Kentfield Fire Protection District (KFPD) fire chief has noted that emergency access at these existing buildings is poor (Marin Community College District, 2007).

The project would not result in the need for construction of any new public service facilities. The project would not result in the need for new or altered schools, parks, or other facilities.

Impact Services-1: Building demolition, construction, and renovation proposed by the project could temporarily interfere with emergency access to portions of the campus.
**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 Policy Authority, for plans for construction staging in the Larkspur Annex area) to ensure that emergency access is adequate during project construction.

**Impact Services-2**: Depending on final site and building designs, existing emergency access problems on the campus could continue.

**Mitigation Measure 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.

**Sources of Information**: 1 and 2

---

**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?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [x] No Impact

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?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [x] No Impact

**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 project would not be expected to result in increased use of existing neighborhood or regional parks. The College provides its own recreational facilities and these would continue to be used by students, faculty, and staff.
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 project does not include recreational facilities and would not require construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

*Sources of Information: 1 and 2*

---

### XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential impacts to the street system resulting from increased enrollment anticipated at the Kentfield campus following completion of the Implementation Plan were evaluated in the Program EIR. Enrollment at the Kentfield campus is anticipated to increase by 6 percent by the time the Implementation Plan is completed, which would cause in increase in traffic to and from the campus.**
described in the Program EIR, the increased student enrollment (and including a corresponding increase in the number of faculty and employees) is forecasted to generate 56 motor vehicle trips during the AM peak hour, 45 vehicle trips during the PM peak hour, and 928 daily vehicle trips, upon completion of the Implementation Plan. Based on that level of traffic generation, impacts to study intersections and roadways accessing campus were found to be less than significant.

During construction, an increase in traffic on area roadways would result from construction traffic to and from the campus; this would include construction employees (traveling to and form the site each day) and construction-related deliveries. The increase in vehicle trips during construction would be less than the amount of traffic evaluated in the Program EIR. Construction activities would occur between 2009 and 2011 and would not exceed the following thresholds:

- No more than 100 construction employees are anticipated on site at any one time during periods of construction. Based on that level of staffing, trips generated by construction employees traveling to and from the site each day would be less than 200 daily vehicle trips. Since construction would begin at 7:00 AM each weekday, inbound trips by construction workers will generally occur prior to the AM peak hour. Afternoon shifts by construction workers would generally end at 3:30 PM and would be anticipated to avoid the PM peak hour.

- No more than an average of four deliveries per day would be anticipated to and from the construction site during construction. Deliveries of construction materials would be scheduled to occur between the hours of 7:00 AM and 3:30 PM, thus avoiding the AM and PM peak hours.

Construction staging would occur in Parking Lots 4 and 9, as well as the Larkspur Annex. Internal circulation (including the movement of construction materials and vehicles from Parking Lot 9 to and from the building sites) would be accommodated by the new bridge to be constructed over Corte Madera Creek.

For the reasons described above, increased traffic would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

As described in (a) above, the project would not exceed the level of traffic evaluated in the Program EIR. The Program EIR found that impacts to congestion management agency facilities would be less than significant. Furthermore, since fewer than 100 peak hour trips would be generated, the project is exempt from the requirements of the CMP land use analysis program.

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

The Kentfield campus is not located near a major airport and the project would have no impact on air traffic patterns.
d) **Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

The Program EIR found that completion of the Implementation Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature. However, the Program EIR found that, if not properly planned and monitored, ongoing construction could result in hazardous conditions for vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle travel on campus. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant.

The following impact statements and mitigation measures included in the Program EIR would apply to the currently proposed project.

**Impact Transportation-1: Ongoing campus construction may affect vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian circulation within campus and on adjoining streets.**

**Mitigation Measure Transportation-1:** The District shall develop a Construction Management Plan (CMP) prior to commencement of any construction activities. The CMP should include:

- Location of construction staging and a description of the level and type of construction-related traffic.
- Identification of all construction hauling and delivery routes.
- A set of 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.
- Provision of dedicated parking for all construction employees, site visitors, and inspectors.
- Description of the number of construction employees during individual project phases, and hours of arrival of departure for those employees, and a forecast of the number of peak hour and daily trips to be generated by construction employees.
- Provisions to remove construction-related debris.
- Designated pedestrian and bicycle facilities around the construction and staging areas.
- Description of measures to avoid impacts to adjoining streets and transit facilities (including bus stop locations) near campus.

The combination of the above elements in a CMP would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

See Appendix D for the proposed Construction Management Plan.

e) **Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

Impacts to emergency access resulting from restricted access to portions of campus during periods of construction are potentially significant.
Impact Transportation-2: Refer to Impact Services-1.

Mitigation Measure Transportation-2: Refer to Mitigation Measure Services-1 of this Initial Study.

f) Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?

The Program EIR evaluated parking supply and demand, and found that upon completion of the Implementation Plan, parking capacity would exceed demand by over 600 spaces. The supply of parking spaces would be temporarily reduced during construction of the project, resulting in a temporary elimination of no more than 500 spaces, due to the need to temporarily close all or a portion of some parking lots to allow for construction staging and/or parking of construction employees’ vehicles. Given the excess supply described in the Program EIR, the remaining parking supply will be adequate to accommodate parking demand.

g) Would the project conflict with adopted polices, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

The Program EIR found that the Implementation Plan would not result in significant impacts to plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. Improvements resulting from the project would include new and upgraded paths on campus that would facilitate travel for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Sources of Information: 2 and 3

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

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?

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?

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
a) **Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

The project is not expected to cause exceedance of Regional Water Quality Control Board wastewater treatment requirements. The project is not anticipated to result in significant increased demand for wastewater treatment. When the site for the new SMCP is prepared, the original flow direction for wastewater needs to be redirected around this project in a system of new wastewater lines. The new buildings proposed by the project are expected to include water conservation measures that would help minimize wastewater generation.

As discussed in the Program EIR, existing nearby wastewater pipelines and the wastewater treatment plant would have sufficient capacity to handle development under the Bond Spending Implementation Plan, of which the project is a part.

b) **Would the project 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. The project is not expected to create a need for new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project is not anticipated to result in significant increased demand for water or wastewater treatment services provided by the Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD) or Ross Valley Sanitary District (RVSD), respectively. The new buildings proposed by the project are expected to include water conservation measures that would help minimize water demand and wastewater generation.

The new buildings proposed by the project would include water efficiency measures that should provide water savings of up to 30 percent. This would be achieved by using waterless urinals, dual flush toilets, and low-flow faucets for sinks and showers. Higher efficiencies of new heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment would also reduce the creation of condensate and cooling water needs.
c) **Would the project 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?**

The District plans to have two detention basins in the vicinity of the new pedestrian West Bridge just south of the SMCP. New storm drain lines will be constructed to carry runoff from the SMCP area and Fine/Performing Arts sites to these detention basins where water will be temporarily held during storm events and eventually discharged to Corte Madera Creek via an inlet. No significant impacts from the detention basins are anticipated and water quality would be improved by the ability of the basins to reduce sediments going into Corte Madera Creek.


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

The project would not result in a need for new or expanded water supply entitlements. Also, as already noted, the new buildings proposed by the project are expected to include water conservation measures that would help minimize water demand. As discussed in the Program EIR, MMWD consumption records indicate that the College of Marin’s water use has declined steadily in recent years and is only about one-half of the College’s annual water entitlement of 111.67 acre-feet. For this reason, MMWD expects to absorb the anticipated increase in water use caused by development under the Bond Spending Implementation Plan, of which the project is a part, with little impact on facilities or supplies.


e) **Would the project 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?**

Refer to (a) above. As discussed in the Program EIR, existing nearby wastewater pipelines and the wastewater treatment plant would have sufficient capacity to handle development under the Bond Spending Implementation Plan, of which the project is a part.


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

Both construction of the project and long-term use of the proposed buildings would generate solid waste that would require disposal.

The Program EIR concluded that long-term operations under the Bond Spending Implementation Plan would not generate substantial additional solid waste requiring landfill disposal, since ultimately the campus building area would decrease and student enrollment would increase only slightly. This conclusion also applies to the currently proposed project, which is a part of the Implementation Plan. The currently proposed project would renovate the existing Performing Arts Building and replace other existing buildings with new buildings; while overall building area on the campus may increase after the project is constructed, this increase would only be temporary based on the overall Implementation Plan.
The project’s main solid waste impact would be the significant amount of construction debris that would be generated during the proposed building demolition and new building construction. However, the Bond Spending Implementation Plan, of which the proposed project is a part, contains design guidelines stating that a minimum of 50 percent of construction waste will be recycled, that demolition material will be evaluated for reuse, and that cut and fill will be equalized to reduce soil transport and landfill costs. As discussed in the Program EIR, demolition debris recyclers have indicated that they would be able to handle recyclable material generated by building demolition and renovation on the campus, and Redwood Landfill staff have indicated that the landfill would have adequate space to accept the remaining demolition debris. The Program EIR therefore concluded that development under the Bond Spending Implementation Plan would have a less-than-significant impact on landfill capacity. This conclusion also applies to the currently proposed project, which is a part of the Implementation Plan.

g) Would the project comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The project is not expected to cause any conflicts with federal, State, or local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The Marin Community College District, while exempt from local land use controls, would review regulations such as Marin County’s Waste Management Plan (WMP) and construction debris recycling requirements and determine if compliance is feasible. As described under (f) above, in accordance with the Bond Spending Implementation Plan design guidelines, the project would recycle at least 50 percent of the anticipated construction waste, meeting Marin County’s requirement for a recycling rate of at least 50 percent.

Sources of Information: 1 and 2
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.)

No major projects are proposed in the vicinity of the campus that would result in significant cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts related to all campus development from the Bond Spending Implementation Plan were addressed in the Program EIR. This Program EIR is incorporated herein by reference.

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

No direct or indirect substantial adverse effects of on human beings would occur with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Sources of Information: 1, 2, and 3
APPENDIX A
APPLICANT’S APPROVAL OF MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure Aesthetics-1: New landscaping at the Fine Arts Building shall not encroach into the viewshed toward Mount Tamalpais, as seen from Circle Drive. New landscaping on the south side of the building shall be deciduous and shall be in immediate proximity to the building to prevent interruption of views toward the mountain from this important pedestrian gateway to the campus.

Mitigation Measure Aesthetics-2: A total of 32 native trees shall be planted on the campus to replace the 16 native trees lost by construction, to provide a replanting ratio of 2:1. These trees shall be planted from 15-gallon containers or larger and shall be monitored for the first three years of growth to ensure survival.

Mitigation Measure Air-1: The Program EIR evaluated these impacts and identified mitigation measures to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant impact. The project shall include implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1a, AIR-1b, and AIR-2 from the Program EIR to reduce the impact of construction activities associated with this project to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure Air-2: The District shall ensure that the proposed diesel-powered emergency generator is permitted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and that an Authority to Construct permit is obtained from BAAQMD prior to the onset of any project construction.

Mitigation Measure Biology-1: Refer to Mitigation Measure Aesthetics-2.

Mitigation Measure Cultural-1: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measure Cultural-2a, Cultural-2b, and Cultural-3 of the Program EIR.

Mitigation Measure Geology-1: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measures Geology-1a through Geology-1c of the Program EIR related to geotechnical investigations and compliance with the Uniform Building Code.

Mitigation Measure Geology-2: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measure Geology-2 of the Program EIR related to preparation of an Erosion Control and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prior to the onset of demolition, site grading, or construction.

Mitigation Measure Hazards-1: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measures Hazards-1a through Hazards-1i of the Program EIR, which address hazardous materials handling during construction and building operations.

Mitigation Measure Hazards-2: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measures Hazards-2a and Hazards-2b of the Program EIR, which address procedures for handling hazardous materials releases.
Mitigation Measure Hydrology-1: The project shall comply with Mitigation Measures Hydrology-1a, Hydrology-1b, Hydrology-2a, Hydrology-2b, and Hydrology-3 of the Program EIR related to preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), implementation of best management practices, use of bioswales, and use of energy dissipators at creek outfalls to minimize erosion.

Mitigation Measure Noise-1: Forced-air mechanical ventilation shall be provided to the Fine Arts Building to ensure that interior noise levels are maintained at acceptable levels.

Mitigation Measure Noise-2: The District shall construct a 6-foot sound wall at the perimeter of the service yard that interrupts the sound path between the emergency generator and cooling tower to nearby residences along Laurel Avenue. Generator testing activities shall occur between 10:00 AM and 2:00 PM.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3a: Construction equipment shall be well maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3b: The District shall limit construction activities to daytime hours between 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM Monday through Friday and between 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Construction activities are prohibited on Sundays and Holidays. Loud noise-generating construction-related equipment (e.g., backhoes, generators, jackhammers) shall be maintained, operated, or serviced at the construction site only from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Monday through Friday.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3c: To the extent feasible, the District shall route construction truck traffic to campus construction sites via Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and College Avenue, avoiding the residential portions of Laurel Avenue and Kent Avenue and other streets.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3d: The District shall construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to residences or noise-sensitive campus areas and buildings.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3e: The District shall ensure that project contractors utilize ‘quiet’ models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3f: Project contractors shall equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3g: The District shall locate all staging areas, 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.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3h: Project contractors shall prohibit all unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines, and this shall be in project specifications.
Mitigation Measure Noise-3i: The District shall notify all adjacent residences, and campus staff and students of the construction schedule in writing or by posting signs, and shall designate a disturbance coordinator, responsible for responding to complaints about construction noise. The name and telephone number of the disturbance coordinator shall be posted at the construction site and made available to adjacent residents.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3j: The District shall prohibit construction worker’s radios (etc.) from being audible beyond the limits of the construction site, and shall include this measure in project specifications.

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 Policy Authority, for plans for construction staging in the Larkspur Annex area) to ensure that emergency access is adequate during project construction.

Mitigation Measure 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.

Mitigation Measure Transportation-1: The District shall develop a Construction Management Plan (CMP) prior to commencement of any construction activities. The CMP should include:

- Location of construction staging and a description of the level and type of construction-related traffic.
- Identification of all construction hauling and delivery routes.
- A set of 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.
- Provision of dedicated parking for all construction employees, site visitors, and inspectors.
- Description of the number of construction employees during individual project phases, and hours of arrival of departure for those employees, and a forecast of the number of peak hour and daily trips to be generated by construction employees.
- Provisions to remove construction-related debris.
- Designated pedestrian and bicycle facilities around the construction and staging areas.
- Description of measures to avoid impacts to adjoining streets and transit facilities (including bus stop locations) near campus.

Mitigation Measure Transportation-2: Refer to Mitigation Measure Services-1 of this Initial Study.
The above mitigation measures shall be implemented as part of the proposed project.

[Signature]

[Title]

[Date]
APPENDIX B
ELEVATIONS FOR SMCP AND FINE ARTS BUILDINGS
ELEVATIONS FOR FINE ARTS BUILDING: EAST AND WEST

SOURCE: Marcy Wong & Donn Logan Architects

Figure B-2
ELEVATIONS FOR FINE ARTS BUILDING: NORTH AND SOUTH

SOURCE: Marcy Wong & Donn Logan Architects

Figure B-3
APPENDIX C
PLANT SCHEDULE
# PLANTING SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>ABBREVIATION</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>JUVE</th>
<th>CALIPER</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>SPREAD</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AKE P5L</td>
<td>Acer palmatum</td>
<td>Japanese maple</td>
<td>24&quot; BOX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOK C3L</td>
<td>Aesculus californica</td>
<td>California buckeye</td>
<td>15 GAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR B7T</td>
<td>Capriscus tomentosus 'Thunderbolt'</td>
<td>European Hornbeam</td>
<td>15 GAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR F6C</td>
<td>Carpinus fremontii</td>
<td>Coast beech</td>
<td>15 GAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP T5R</td>
<td>Chaena thomsonii</td>
<td>Honey locust</td>
<td>15 GAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAD E7L</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora 'Stellata'</td>
<td>Star Magnolia</td>
<td>24&quot; BOX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAD S7L</td>
<td>Magnolia sp.</td>
<td>Star Magnolia</td>
<td>15 GAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS S6L</td>
<td>Quercus sp.</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>15&quot; BOX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS R8M</td>
<td>Salix semperflorens</td>
<td>Coast redwood</td>
<td>15 GAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LARGE SHRUBS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>ABBREVIATION</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>JUVE</th>
<th>CALIPER</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>SPREAD</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARB 10T</td>
<td>Arbutus unedo</td>
<td>European strawberry tree</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB 21T</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</td>
<td>Bearberry</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEB L9T</td>
<td>Deschampsia 'Goldrush'</td>
<td>Goldrush</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DER L2C</td>
<td>Erica cinerea 'Sarvis'</td>
<td>Winter heather</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGG S9T</td>
<td>Eryngium revolutum</td>
<td>Big Bluestem</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC ANT</td>
<td>Elaeagnus angustifolia</td>
<td>Russian olive</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUX R7S</td>
<td>Nuxia amabili 'Nana'</td>
<td>Bear's Breeches</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLS OSA</td>
<td>Pachysandra 'Variegata'</td>
<td>Japanese form</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH Q1L</td>
<td>Rhododendron cinnabarinum</td>
<td>Cinnabar rose</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE S8L</td>
<td>Pyracantha taxifolia</td>
<td>Firethorn</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD CLE</td>
<td>Salix chinensis</td>
<td>Chinese willow</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC F8M</td>
<td>Vaccinium oxycoccus</td>
<td>Blueberry</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MEDIUM SHRUBS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>ABBREVIATION</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>JUVE</th>
<th>CALIPER</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>SPREAD</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAM O2L</td>
<td>Lamiastrum flavum</td>
<td>Yellow star</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM O3L</td>
<td>Lamiastrum album</td>
<td>White star</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCR N8L</td>
<td>Geum chilense</td>
<td>Knapweed</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGC C8L</td>
<td>Euphorbia cotyledon</td>
<td>Spurge</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS E5L</td>
<td>Rhus typhina</td>
<td>Smooth sumac</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS F5L</td>
<td>Rhus typhina</td>
<td>Smooth sumac</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP R8L</td>
<td>Prunus serotina</td>
<td>Black cherry</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUL R2L</td>
<td>Tulipa perfoliata</td>
<td>Perfoliate tulip</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BON R4L</td>
<td>Berberis thunbergii 'Dawn'</td>
<td>Dawn berberis</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BON R5L</td>
<td>Berberis thunbergii</td>
<td>Dawn berberis</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BON R6L</td>
<td>Berberis thunbergii</td>
<td>Dawn berberis</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BON R7L</td>
<td>Berberis thunbergii</td>
<td>Dawn berberis</td>
<td>3 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SMALL SHRUBS & GROUNDCOVERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>ABBREVIATION</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>JUVE</th>
<th>CALIPER</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>SPREAD</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARA 10T</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</td>
<td>Bearberry</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARA 20T</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</td>
<td>Bearberry</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARA 30T</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</td>
<td>Bearberry</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARA 40T</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</td>
<td>Bearberry</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARA 50T</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</td>
<td>Bearberry</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARA 60T</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</td>
<td>Bearberry</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB 10T</td>
<td>Arbutus unedo</td>
<td>European strawberry tree</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR 10T</td>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>White beech</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR 20T</td>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>White beech</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR 30T</td>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>White beech</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR 40T</td>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>White beech</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR 50T</td>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>White beech</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR 60T</td>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>White beech</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR 70T</td>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>White beech</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR 80T</td>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>White beech</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR 90T</td>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>White beech</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## VINES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>ABBREVIATION</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>JUVE</th>
<th>CALIPER</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>SPREAD</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSC 15L</td>
<td>Ficus pumila</td>
<td>Smokey fig</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix C**

**PLANTING SYMBOLS**

**SOURCE:** RHAA, 2008
Mitigation Measures Transportation (DRAFT)

The Bond Program consists of several projects. The dynamics of the campus will be continuously tested by new challenges as the projects evolve. Access routes, staging areas, parking, traffic patterns, pedestrian facilities will be subject to changes that can only be captured in general terms. New challenges will have to be addressed as they occur. For that reason the District is relying on maps of the Campus that are being developed with every new project or phase of a project that requires substantial changes in any of the aforementioned categories. These “Staging Plans” are issued with every new project. They clearly show the new work area, construction parking, staging areas, major haul routes, disabled parking and other important facts that evolve from any new project. When more than one project has a significant impact on college and outside operations the “Staging Plans” capture the different areas and attempts to deal with them in such a manner that congestion and hauling routes are clearly kept apart in and outside of the campus.

Significant input and thought goes into these “Staging Plans” as they need to address continued Campus operations and outside traffic influences. With the onset of every new project and depending on the time of the year, consideration must be given to issues that are particular for the season in relationship to typical traffic categories in and outside of campus. At all times special consideration must be given to emergency access. For that reason the District has developed a special relationship with the local Fire District and discusses continuously changed conditions.

To develop a “Complete Management Plan” for the duration of the Program is not possible due to the nature of these projects. As the Division of the State Architect determines, through their review cycles, when a project is released the plans could be easily derailed by several months. To attempt to put this in a known framework would not be effective. The Staging Plans provide the means of continuously adapting to the changing conditions.

The two major projects, the new Science Math Power Plant Complex (SMPC) and the Fine Arts Relocation (FA/PA), will be staged as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>SMCP</th>
<th>FA/PA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Staging Area</td>
<td>West end of Lot # 9 &amp; Lot # 4</td>
<td>Circle Dr. &amp; Grassy Area at FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling and Delivery Routes</td>
<td>College Ave., Lot # 6 &amp; Bridge, Kent Ave.</td>
<td>Sir Francis Drake, Laurel Ave., Circle Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Parking</td>
<td>Lot #9 &amp; #15</td>
<td>Circle Dr., Magnolia Ave, Annex (shuttle) &amp; Lot # 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Workers (max.)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Parking Spaces (due to cars and staging)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrival of Work Forces</td>
<td>6:30 to 7:00 am</td>
<td>6:30 to 7:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure of Work Forces</td>
<td>3:30 to 4:00 pm</td>
<td>3:30 to 4:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>SMCP</td>
<td>FA/PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Departure Direction</td>
<td>Magnolia &amp; Kent Ave.</td>
<td>Sir Francis Drake, Laurel Ave., Circle Dr., Magnolia Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Access for Pedestrian</td>
<td>SFD Blvd and College Ave.</td>
<td>SFD Blvd. and College Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Construction</td>
<td>October 2008 to June 2012</td>
<td>July 2009 to December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Construction</td>
<td>August 2009 to October 2011</td>
<td>November 2009 to June 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>