DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

District and Community Center Building and Parking Lot 1H; State Clearinghouse #2004052080

Lead Agency:
Foothill-De Anza Community College District
12345 El Monte Road
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022-4599

May 2008

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW - INITIAL STUDY

1. **Project Title:**

   District and Community Center Building and Parking Lot 1H; SCH#2004052080

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

   Foothill-De Anza Community College District
   12345 El Monte Road
   Los Altos Hills, California 94022

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**

   Charles Allen, PE
   Executive Director, Facilities and Operations
   (650) 949-6150
   Allencharles@fhda.edu

4. **Project Location:**

   The Project is located on the Foothill Community College Campus, in the Town of Los Altos Hills, Santa Clara County. The campus is south of Interstate 280, bounded by El Monte Road to the south, Crescent Lane and Elena Road to the west, and Josefa Lane to the northwest. The portion of the Foothill College campus affected by this amendment to the original Project definition ("Amended Project") is the southeasterly area near the Administration Building.

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

   Foothill- De Anza Community College District
   12345 El Monte Road
   Los Altos Hills, California 94022

6. **General Plan Designation:**

   The General Plan of the Town of Los Altos Hills designates the Foothill Community College campus site as authorized for "Public Facility" land uses. The Project as amended would maintain the use of the site as a "public facility"; a publicly funded and operated Community College within the statewide California Community College system.

7. **Zoning Designation:**

   The entire incorporated area of the Town of Los Altos Hills is zoned "R-1A"; authorized for residential uses, of one acre minimum parcel size, with agricultural uses permitted. The Town does not have any zone districts in which community college campuses are authorized, since the Town does not exercise land use regulatory authority over community colleges or

the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, a political subdivision of the State of California. See Government Code Sections 53090-53096.

8. **Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)**

The Project was originally defined in a Draft Environmental Impact Report dated June, 2004, and a Final Environmental Impact Report dated June, 2005 ("EIR"), identified together by the State Clearinghouse number SCH # 2004052082. As originally defined, the Project was the demolition and removal of the vacant residential structure known as the Griffin House, and construction of a two-storey, approximately 17,500-22,500 gross square foot college administration building (known as the District and Community Center Building or "DCC Building") on the former site of the Griffin House. The original Project also included certain renovations of the existing District Administration Building ("Administration Building") nearby, and construction of "Parking Lot 1H", a 350-space surface parking lot southeasterly of the Administration Building. This parking lot has been constructed. The original Project (the DCC Building, etc.) itself was proposed as a modification to an earlier-defined, larger project; a general "Revised Facilities Master Plan" covering the construction of several new buildings on the Foothill College campus. Implementation of the "Facilities Master Plan" was analyzed for CEQA purposes by means of a Program EIR ("Program EIR"), SCH # 2001012040, certified in 2002.

The factual information contained in the Program EIR and the EIR, which describes in detail the environmental impacts of (a) constructing the DCC Building at its originally proposed location, and (b) not constructing the DCC Building at that location, along with applicable mitigation measures, is incorporated herein by this reference (see CEQA Guideline 15150). The purpose of this Initial Study is to set forth the environmental effects of the Amended Project; in particular, the environmental effects of not constructing the DCC Building in its originally proposed location-- leaving the Griffin House untouched—the conceptual equivalent of the EIR's "No Project Alternative" for Cultural/Historical analysis purposes, along with construction of a smaller new administration building nearby.

This Initial Study addresses the potential environmental effects of amending the original Project definition to delete from it any physical alteration or demolition of the Griffin House, and to build a smaller administration building to the east of the Griffin House site. The Amended Project would result in no physical changes to the Griffin House other than ongoing inspections and maintenance, and construction of a new, smaller administration building (the "ETS Building"), approximately 14,000 square feet in gross floor area to the east of the Griffin House. The ETS Building would be capable of housing some of the administrative functions originally intended to be housed in the DCC Building, predominantly the Educational Technology Services ("ETS") operations. The ETS Building would be located approximately 70 feet east of the Griffin House and the Administration Building, and would be separated from the Griffin House by a landscaped courtyard area. See Diagram A1.0, attached. While the previous DCC Building would have housed approximately 61 college employees, the new ETS Building would house approximately 49 employees.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

The Foothill Community College campus is approximately 136.4 acres in size, and is fully developed as an integrated complex of academic buildings, administration and support

buildings, athletic facilities, parking lots, pedestrian pathways and landscaping. It comprises a compact, pedestrian-friendly urbanized academic environment, designed for ease of pedestrian access. Peripheral functions such as vehicle parking lots and expansive athletic fields are located outside the more densely developed campus "core". The ETS Building would be located within the campus core, close to existing buildings, particularly the Administration Building, for functional efficiency and the convenience of students and faculty, college administrators, staff and visitors.

Outside the college campus itself, surrounding land uses are predominantly residential, with more rural, lower density development to the west, and relatively more dense development to the northeast, across Interstate 280.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval or participation agreements):**

Approval of the Amended Project; that is, the design of the ETS Building, by the California Office of the State Architect, is necessary because the Project Sponsor/Owner, the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, is a political subdivision of the State of California.

No building permit approvals for the Amended Project by the Town of Los Altos Hills are necessary. Sewerage connections must be approved by the Town of Los Altos Hills, the Santa Clara County Fire Department must approve the site access and fire hydrants/water pressure, and the Purissima Hills Water District must approve the water connection.

Runoff control must be approved by the Santa Clara County Valley Water District, and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board must approve the NPDES General Permit and the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

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.

X ☐ 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 the 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.

Charles Allen — Signature

April 3, 2008 — Date

CHARLES ALLEN — Printed Name

FOOTHILL DEANZA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT — For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources identified in the parentheses following each question and listed in the References section of this document.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1.	**AESTHETICS.** Would the project:				
	a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
	b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
	c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐

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

Discussion: The aesthetic setting in which the Griffin House stands is completely "urbanized", in the sense of having been redeveloped from its original rural residential setting into a relatively dense college campus occupied by single-storey and two-storey buildings, modern landscaping, tennis courts, storage buildings, streets, area lighting and parking lots. The immediate surroundings of the Griffin House have been fully improved, and no longer embody the aesthetic qualities of the original rural residential setting. The existing Administration Building is only a few feet from the front of the Griffin House, and the predominant aesthetic theme of the area is "college campus administration enclave", rather than "isolated rural residence".

The Amended Project consists of (a) leaving the existing vacant residential structure (Griffin House) in its current physical condition, unaltered, and (b) building a new two-storey college administration building nearby to the east, in a location designed to harmonize with existing building densities, pedestrian and vehicular access patterns, and the existing design, materials, colors, height and architectural appearance of adjacent buildings and landscaping that are immediately visible in the vicinity of the Griffin House and Administration Building. The Amended Project would preserve the present aesthetic appearance of the Griffin House intact and unchanged.

The new ETS Building is smaller and less visually obtrusive than the previously proposed DCC Building, but it would introduce a new source of night light into the area. It would be built to an architectural design and appearance preserving open, convenient pedestrian access between buildings, blending compatibly with the exterior appearance, size and materials of the Administration Building, and extending the existing design, materials and spatial relationships of sidewalks, landscape vegetation, building masses and outdoor lighting fixtures. No "scenic vista" would be affected by the Amended Project, since it would occur in a fairly secluded area of campus, occupied by mature trees, at the southeastern corner entrance of the campus, in a location invisible to the campus as a whole. As the primary "front door" to campus, the area near the Administration Building has been designed and built to high aesthetic standards. The new ETS Building would continue this policy, and would be designed and built to aesthetic standards meeting or exceeding those evident in the Administration Building itself. It would be located near the historic Griffin House, but separated from it by a new, fully landscaped courtyard area, trees and sidewalks. The new ETS Building would be visible from the Griffin House, but it will be of a modern, pleasant design, incorporating aesthetic themes and materials intended to harmonize with the nearby Administration Building. The new courtyard area east of the Griffin House would comprise a visual amenity in its own right, while partially obscuring the view of the new ETS Building from the Griffin House, and softening and blending together the appearance of all of the buildings in the immediate vicinity.

For these reasons, the Amended Project will not substantially degrade the appearance of the Griffin House's immediate setting, or otherwise damage the appearance of an historic building. The new ETS Building, while not completely designed as yet, will be designed by a prominent and well-regarded Peninsula architectural firm familiar with

Foothill College campus design themes. It will implement the Project Sponsor's longstanding policy (embodied in the existing Administration Building) of ensuring that the aesthetic appearance of this campus administrative area, frequented by the District Board of Trustees, visitors and official guests, is maintained and not degraded. The existing visual character and quality of the Griffin House and the area near the Administration Building will be maintained and most probably enhanced by construction of the ETS Building and its landscaped courtyard nearby, since the new building will define and enclose a discrete, landscaped "administration area" bounded by the Administration Building on the south, the Griffin House on the north, and the ETS Building on the east, substituting for the present easterly view of tennis courts and a parking lot. Area lighting near the new ETS Building will be of the same low-level, non-glaring nature as presently exists nearby; causing no adverse visual effects and serving only to illuminate the immediate area sufficiently for the safety and convenience of pedestrians and staff access. The new ETS Building will shield the area near the Griffin House and its southern and eastern exposures from obtrusive nearby tennis court night lighting. (See Exhibit A1.0, Exhibit A2.0, Environmental Impact Report on "Foothill College Projects" SCH # 2001012040, By Impact Sciences, Inc., dated March, 2002, and Environmental Impact Report on "District and Community Center Building and Parking Lot 1H" ("EIR"), by Placemakers, Inc., dated June, 2005)

Mitigation Measures:

The new ETS Building shall be built to an architectural design and appearance preserving open, convenient pedestrian access between buildings, blending compatibly with the exterior appearance, size and materials of the Administration Building, to aesthetic standards meeting or exceeding those of the Administration Building, and extending the existing design, materials and spatial relationships of sidewalks, landscape vegetation, building masses and outdoor lighting fixtures. The Campus Lighting Plan shall be updated to include the ETS Building and its area lighting, including measures to minimize light spillover and glare. No physical alterations or changes shall be made to the Griffin House, beyond ongoing routine inspections and maintenance.

Finding:

Through implementation of the foregoing mitigation measures, ensuring maintenance of the existing aesthetic qualities of the Griffin House and the area immediately surrounding the Griffin House and Administration Building, the Amended Project will cause no significant adverse effect upon the aesthetic qualities of the Griffin House or the Foothill College Campus.

		Potentially	Potentially Significant Unless	Less Than
2.	**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:			

	Significant Impact	Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
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 non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: The Amended Project is located on a fully developed community college campus, in an area that has been partially paved, landscaped and otherwise converted to "urban" uses. No prime farmland, unique farmland or other farmland will be affected by the Amended Project.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

Finding: No Impact.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	X ☐	☐	☐

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

Discussion: The Amended Project would not violate any applicable air quality standards or create odors, but it would generate dust during grading and temporary construction activities for the ETS Building, which is considered a significant adverse environmental effect. The Amended Project will generate dust only through construction of a building smaller than the originally proposed DCC Building, along with related landscaping work, and it omits any parking lot construction.

Mitigation Measures: All construction contractors implementing the Amended Project shall comply with dust control measures and best practices imposed by the Project Sponsor, including at a minimum the following:

* Water all active construction areas at least twice daily, when natural precipitation is lacking. Use recycled water if available.
* Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials.
* Apply water twice daily to all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
* Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
* Observe campus speed limit of 15 miles per hour.
* Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as is practicable.

Finding: Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above will reduce the Amended Project's temporary adverse construction effects on air quality to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the				

	Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: The Amended Project omits any parking lot construction, and consists mainly of construction of a building smaller than the originally proposed DCC Building. All construction work will be located more than 300 feet northwesterly of Adobe Creek, outside the presumed maximum travel radius for California red-legged frogs, California Tiger Salamanders and Western pond turtles. None of these animals has been observed on the site of the ETS Building. The new ETS Building would be located approximately 500 feet away from Adobe Creek, and its site has been disturbed by previous construction, active "urban" activities, pedestrian and vehicle traffic, and night lighting. The ETS building site does not contain suitable habitat for any special status wildlife species, including burrowing owls. The Amended Project would not cause significant erosion, siltation or dust that could adversely affect red-legged frogs or tiger salamanders or their habitat. The Amended Project would not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Tree Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional or state plan. All substantial trees removed for construction of the ETS Building will be replaced in the immediate vicinity by similar trees, at a 2-to-1 ratio, in order to ensure maintenance of the existing aesthetic, biological and habitat qualities of the area near the Administration Building.

Mitigation Measures: If California tiger salamanders are observed within the grading/construction area, they shall be relocated by a qualified biologist (in possession of a valid Scientific Collecting Permit) to a suitable area outside the construction area, such as appropriate habitat areas of Adobe Creek. If red-legged frogs are observed in the construction area, the Project Sponsor shall postpone construction in the affected construction area and consult with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to determine appropriate avoidance measures to protect red-legged frogs. If burrowing owls are observed in a construction area during their nesting season, their active nest burrows shall be avoided. If they are observed in a construction area outside of their nesting season, the owls shall be excluded from their burrows in accordance with California Department of Fish and Game protocols, under the supervision of a qualified biologist. All substantial healthy trees removed for construction of the ETS Building will be replaced in the immediate vicinity by similar trees, at a 2-to-1 ratio.

Finding: Implementation of the foregoing mitigation measures will ensure that the Amended Project's adverse biological effects will be less than significant, by avoiding sensitive habitat areas (Adobe Creek

and its buffer area), by preventing adverse effects on sensitive animal species (avoiding any "take" of specimens or active nests) and by replacing mature trees with two trees of a similar type, nearby.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5.	**CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: The Amended Project will not adversely affect any known or suspected archeological, geological or paleontological resources or human remains. The Griffin House will not be physically altered in any way, but will be maintained in its current physical condition. The cement fish pond southeasterly of the Amended Project site will not be altered. If significant cultural resources are discovered during construction of the ETS Building or the landscaped courtyard to the east of the Griffin House, a qualified archeologist will be consulted immediately to determine the proper response, complying with all applicable State laws and regulations governing cultural resources and human remains.

While the Amended Project will further "urbanize" the presently developed physical setting of the Griffin House, the historical significance of the Griffin House derives principally from the identity and historical significance of its original owners and architects, and not from its immediate surroundings. To the degree that the Griffin House has architectural significance, that factor will not be significantly adversely affected by the Amended Project, which will maintain the Griffin House in its present physical condition, untouched. The immediate surroundings of the Griffin House for decades have been redeveloped as an active community college campus, and the addition of a landscaped courtyard and another administration building to the east, adding cumulatively to the developed character of the house's surroundings to a relatively small degree, will not materially adversely change the historical significance of the Griffin House.

Mitigation Measures: No physical alterations or changes shall be made to the Griffin House, beyond ongoing routine inspections and maintenance. Before construction of the Amended Project begins, the Project Sponsor shall identify a qualified archeologist to whom construction crews shall refer all discoveries of archeological, paleontological, geological and other cultural resources found during construction. The archeologist shall implement and oversee responses to all such discoveries in compliance with all applicable State laws and regulations.

Finding: The alterations to the physical setting of the Griffin House will continue the redevelopment of this location as a community college campus that has occurred over the past 50-plus years. It will further obscure the original "rural residential" setting of the Griffin House to a slight degree, while at the same time, substantially beautifying this area of campus with new sidewalks, a landscaped courtyard, attractive night lighting and an enclosed "enclave" aesthetic, by shielding the area from the active, brightly illuminated tennis courts and parking lot immediately to the east. The Amended Project will have no significantly adverse direct effect upon the architectural qualities of the Griffin House itself, since the Griffin House will not be physically altered in any way. The Amended Project, by leaving the Griffin House intact in its original location, will not detract from the known and recorded historical significance of the house's original owners, architects or period design, or detract from its significance to early Santa Clara Valley history. The Amended Project, as mitigated, therefore has been determined to pose a less than significant adverse effect on the historical significance of the Griffin House, and to pose no other significant adverse cultural effects.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. **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:	☐	☐ X ☐	☐	
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 know fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	X ☐	☐	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	X ☐	☐	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit of 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?	☐	X ☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	X ☐	☐	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems				

where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? ☐ ☐ ☐ X ☐

Discussion: Section 5.3 of the Program EIR; Geology, Seismicity and Soils, containing a more detailed discussion of relevant technical geological factors, is incorporated herein by this reference. The Monta Vista Fault crosses the Foothill College campus, but the site of the Amended Project is not within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, and this site would not be subject to fault rupture. The entire campus would be subject to strong seismic ground shaking in the event of a major earthquake in the San Francisco Bay Area. All new construction, including that of the Amended Project, is required to comply with Title 24 of the California Building Code, governing seismic safety. The Amended Project will not occur in the lower elevation areas of Parking Lot 1H, nearer to Adobe Creek, and so liquefaction is considered to be a less significant risk than with the original Project, and not a significant risk. Surficial soils on campus have a moderate to high potential for shrink-swell movement due to changing moisture content. No septic tanks would be affected by the Amended Project.

Mitigation Measures: In order to mitigate potential exposure to strong ground shaking in the event of a major earthquake, seismic hazards related to ground failure and geotechnical hazards related to the expansive properties of soils at the site, Mitigation Measures "Geo 3" [conduct a site-specific geotechnical analysis of the soils and foundation conditions for the ETS Building site and design structural foundations accordingly], "Geo 5" [develop and implement an erosion control plan substantially identical to that described in the Program EIR for all areas graded as part of the Amended Project], "Geo 6" [conduct a focused geotechnical investigation for each steep, cut or filled, or otherwise geologically unusual area affected by the Amended Project, if any] and "Geo 7" [for areas affected by expansive soils, implement feasible design and construction methods capable of protecting against weakening or failure of foundations, slabs and pavements due to expansive soils], which are identified and further described in the Program EIR, shall be implemented. No additional geological mitigation measures are necessary.

Finding: Through implementation of the mitigation measures summarized above, including compliance with statewide seismic safety building techniques, potential hazards to building occupants and property damage, will be feasibly and effectively minimized, and so the Amended Project's effects on Geology and Soils will be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project involve:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
g)	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?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: The Amended Project involves no demolition, unlike the original Project, which analyzed demolition of the Griffin House. The potential for release of asbestos or other potentially hazardous materials therefore is substantially eliminated. Construction of the ETS Building (and associated remodeling of the Administration Building) will involve only routine handling of chemicals and materials used in modern construction, and will be subject to standard safety practices and regulations designed to ensure the safety of workers and building occupants. The ETS Building will be used for only office/administration functions, and will not include laboratories or other activities involving the storage, use or handling of significant quantities of hazardous materials.

Mitigation Measures: None needed.

Finding: The Amended Project, by avoiding any physical alteration of the Griffin House, will pose no significant adverse effects due to use or handling of hazardous materials.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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 (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?)	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site 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?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as j) a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
k) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: Section 5.4 of the Program EIR, Hydrology, is incorporated herein by this reference. Unlike the original Project, the Amended Project will not involve construction of an impervious parking lot. Its adverse effects on groundwater

infiltration and recharge therefore will be substantially less than those of the Project. The ETS building will be smaller in impervious area than the DCC Building would have been, and so its rain runoff will be commensurately smaller. The site of the ETS Building has been previously developed, and is largely impervious, owing to existing sidewalks and old asphalt paved areas that would be replaced by the new building. Creation of a new landscaped courtyard west of the ETS Building will capture much of the runoff from the new building and its nearby sidewalks, allowing infiltration before any runoff reaches Adobe Creek. The new building site is approximately 500 feet northwesterly of Adobe Creek. The slope from the building site to the creek is slight, flattening to nearly level roughly 400 feet from the creek. Surface runoff and its effects, therefore, will be insignificantly altered by the Amended Project. The Amended Project will not violate any waste discharge or water quality requirements, or provide any residential housing. It would be located out of any 100-year flood or dam inundation zone. The Foothill College campus is not likely to be exposed to seiche [seismic sloshing of enclosed water bodies], tsunamis or mudflows, since Felt Lake, the nearest enclosed lake, is approximately three miles north of campus, San Francisco Bay is roughly 11 miles away, and the campus is located on a hill and fully developed, minimizing mudflow risks.

Mitigation Measures: None needed beyond the normal landscaping and drainage/runoff control techniques which will be incorporated into the design of Amended Project improvements.

Finding: The Amended Project will pose less than significant adverse effect on hydrology an water quality.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9.	**LAND USE PLANNING**. Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: There is no residential community on the Foothill College campus. The Amended Project would serve to enclose, rather than divide, the "Administration area" of campus, insulating it from the noise, light and glare of the easterly adjacent tennis courts, parking lot and athletic fields. It would conflict with no applicable Town of Los Altos Hills zoning or other land use regulations, since the Town has no land use regulatory jurisdiction over the Foothill College campus; a facility of the State of California, a "superior jurisdiction" not subject to municipal land use regulatory

authority. It is consistent with the Los Altos Hills General Plan. The Amended Project would be compatible with the Foothill College Facilities Master Plan.

Mitigation Measures: None needed.

Finding: The Amended Project would conflict with no land use planning regulations, and pose no significant adverse effect on land use planning principles.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. **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?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: The Foothill College campus is fully developed and not available as a mineral extraction resource. Mineral resource recovery activities are prohibited by Town of Los Altos Hills General Plan regulations and not authorized by the Foothill College Facilities Master Plan.

Mitigation Measures: None needed.

Finding: The Amended Project would pose no significant adverse effect on mineral resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. **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, specific plan, noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

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

Discussion: Chapter 5.6 of the Program EIR, Noise, is incorporated herein by this reference. The new ETS Building would be located approximately 900 feet from the nearest single-family residences and approximately 500 feet away from the nearest classrooms. These distances, coupled with intervening buildings and vegetation, will provide attenuation of temporary construction noise. No other noise would be associated with the new ETS Building. Temporary construction noise, potentially exceeding 70 dBA, the normally acceptable level, would be objectionable to affected classrooms. No pile drivers, causing ground vibration/noise, would be used. The campus is well outside (12 miles west of) the Airport Land Use Plan boundaries for the San Jose International Airport, and outside a 2-mile radius from other airstrips.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation Measures 1a [limiting construction hours to 7:00 am to 6:00 pm on weekdays, and 7:00 am to 5:00 pm on weekends], 1b [noise-reduction techniques on construction equipment], and 1e [temporary relocation of classes during high construction noise intervals], more fully described in the Program EIR, shall be implemented by the Amended Project Sponsor.

Finding: Implementation of the foregoing mitigation measures will reduce the adverse effects of temporary construction noise to less than significant levels.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. **POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: Implementation of the Amended project would not change the number of students, faculty or administrators on the Foothill College campus. Instead, it would provide needed office space for the employees and administrative functions currently occupying crowded and substandard facilities on campus. Its impacts, if any, would be insignificant and less than those of the original Project, since the amount of new office area to be constructed is smaller.

Mitigation Measures: None needed.

Finding: The Amended Project would pose no significant adverse effect on population or housing.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. **PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: The Amended Project would not change the student, faculty or other employee population of the Foothill College campus. It would not increase demand for school facilities, police services, park or recreational services, or other government services. The College maintains its own police department. Addition of the new ETS Building would add to the number of buildings served by the Santa Clara County Fire Department, at a location readily served by fire response crews.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation Measures Service 3a through 3e [compliance with all applicable fire and life safety construction methods, installation fire hydrants, sprinklers and related infrastructure, and approval of emergency access plans], more fully described in the Program EIR, which is incorporated herein by this reference, shall be implemented by the Amended Project Sponsor.

Finding: Implementation of the foregoing mitigation measures will reduce the adverse effects of the Amended Project on fire protection/safety services to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. **RECREATION.** Would the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: The Amended project would not result in any increase in the residential, employee or student population of the campus, and so will not cause an increase in demand for recreational services or resources.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

Finding: The Amended Project will pose no significant adverse effect on recreation services or resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. **TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.** Would the proposal result in:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle traps, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: The original Project's traffic and circulation effects were evaluated in the Program EIR, at a different location. Section 5.1 of the Program EIR, Transportation and Circulation, is incorporated herein by this reference. The ETS Building will contain approximately 20% fewer college employees than were planned for the larger DCC Building, all of whom currently occupy office spaces in the Administration building or scattered through other buildings nearby. Until Parking Lot 1H and its associated circulation improvements were constructed, vehicle parking for college administration employees was located in several areas, and internal circulation was awkward and occasionally congested. By moving the new, smaller ETS Building closer to the newly-constructed Parking Lot 1H and its improved circulation improvements, the Amended Project will avoid minor, occasional congestion at intersections and avoid problems of inadequate parking spaces. These reduced adverse effects, compared to the original Project, will be attained due to an improvement in vehicle circulation movements resulting from construction (in 2006) of Parking Lot 1H and associated circulation improvements in the access road leading to the new parking lot, and from the ability of the fewer ETS Building employees to park near the new ETS Building. Instead of having to rely on the small visitor parking lot at the entrance to the Administration area, employees and visitors now are able to drive directly east as they enter the Administration area, into the new 350-space Parking Lot 1H, which contains more than adequate parking for anticipated demand.

No additional campus employees will result from the Amended Project. The Amended Project will not contribute any additional vehicle trips to traffic congestion leading to or from the Foothill College campus from Highway 280 and major surface arterials, since it will add no new students, faculty or other employees to existing vehicle trips. When compared to the "baseline" of existing traffic congestion, the Amended Project, by adding no employees or additional vehicle trips, will pose no significant adverse effect.

Mitigation Measures: None needed.

Finding: The Amended Project will pose no significant adverse effects on traffic, circulation or parking.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16.	**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?)	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: Section 5.8 of the Program EIR, Public Utilities, is incorporated herein by this reference. The Amended Project will add a new office building of approximately 14,000 square feet of gross floor area. The employees who will occupy the ETS Building currently occupy other office space nearby, and so their domestic water consumption and solid waste and waste water generation will be relocated, not significantly increased. The new building will consume domestic and exterior landscaping water, and will generate wastewater and solid waste, at levels comparable to similar office buildings and landscaped areas throughout the campus. These levels may comprise a small cumulative addition to the total water and wastewater consumption and solid waste generation, but it will be insignificant in the context of the entire campus. Adequate water supply, wastewater treatment capacity and landfill capacity to serve the Amended Project is provided by utility companies and municipal providers.

Mitigation Measures: None needed.

Finding: The Amended Project will pose no significant adverse effects on utilities and service systems.

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

17. **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or				

	wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐
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.)	☐	☐	X ☐	☐
c)	Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	X ☐

Discussion: By avoiding any physical alteration to the Griffin House, the Amended Project will pose no significant adverse effect upon, and will not eliminate, any examples of the major periods of California history. If the Griffin House is an artifact or an example of important periods of California history or architecture, it nevertheless will not be affected by the Amended Project. The cumulative effects of campus "urbanization" near the Griffin House, caused by building a landscaped courtyard nearby, and a two-storey administration building beyond the courtyard, will further lend to the dominant aesthetic theme of the Griffin House's immediate setting becoming one of "College Administration Enclave", rather than 'Early Twentieth Century Rural Residence". A rural residential character surrounding the Griffin House has not existed for over 50 years, ever since the Foothill College campus was built up around the old house. The objective effects of the Amended Project on the Griffin House's immediate setting will be to enhance and enclose it, shielding it from light, noise and glare from the east, and unifying it in appearance, building massing, pedestrian circulation and landscaping.

Mitigation Measures: None needed.

Finding: The Amended Project will pose only cumulative aesthetic effects upon the immediate setting of the Griffin House; effects that adversely affect the house's historical significance only insignificantly. These effects will be substantially counterbalanced and mitigated by the Amended Project's positive cumulative aesthetic effects, derived from the improved, unified appearance of the house's setting following implementation of the Amended Project. The house itself will be maintained intact, with its physical structure and its historical significance not significantly adversely affected by the Amended Project.

REFERENCES:

1. Exhibits A1.0, A2.0; Site Plan and Diagram of location and setting for District Offices ("ETS Building") and Floor Plan for ETS Building at Foothill College, dated January 29, 2008, by Cody, Anderson, Wasney Architects.

2. Environmental Impact Report on "Foothill College Projects", SCH # 2001012040, By Impact Sciences, Inc., dated March, 2002.

3. Environmental Impact Report on "District and Community Center Building and Parking Lot 1H" ("EIR"), SCH # 2004052082, by Placemakers, Inc., dated June, 2005.