Ohlone Community College District

2012 District Facilities Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report

SCH No. 2013012021



Prepared for: Ohlone Community College District 43600 Mission Boulevard Fremont, California 94539

Submitted by:



IMPACT SCIENCES, INC.

555 12th Street, Suite 1650 Oakland, California 94607 (510) 267-0494 November 2013

2012 DISTRICT FACILITIES MASTER PLAN Final Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for:

Ohlone Community College District 43600 Mission Boulevard Fremont, California 94539

Prepared by:

Impact Sciences, Inc. 555 12th Street, Suite 1650 Oakland, California 94607

November 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Pa	<u>age</u>
1.0	Introduction1.	.0-1
2.0	Comments on the Draft EIR and Responses to Comments2. Agency/Organization/Individual Comments	.0-1
	 A Mark Allen, Bent Wahl, and Karen Wahl, email dated July 7, 20132. B Mark Allen, email dated September 14, 20132. 	.0-2 .0-5
3.0	Errata	.0-1
4.0	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program4.	.0-1
5.0	Report Preparation	.0-1

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		Page
2.0-1	Index of Comments	2.0-1
4.0-1	2012 District Facilities Master Plan for the Ohlone Community College Fremont Campus	
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	4.0-2

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), following completion of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the Ohlone Community College District is required to consult with and obtain comments from public agencies that have jurisdiction by law or discretionary approval power with respect to the proposed project, and provide the general public with an opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR.

On June 14, 2013, the Ohlone Community College District, as the Lead Agency under CEQA, issued a Draft EIR on the 2012 District Facilities Master Plan for the Ohlone Community College Fremont Campus. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public comment period that ended on July 29, 2013. During this period, the Campus held a public meeting on the Draft EIR on June 26, 2013, to receive verbal comments. No comments were received at the Draft EIR public meeting.

CEQA requires that the Lead Agency prepare a Final EIR that must be considered by decision makers before approving or denying the proposed project. *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15132 specifies that the Final EIR shall consist of the following:

- 1. The Draft EIR or a revision to the draft.
- 2. Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary form.
- 3. A list of the persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.
- 4. The response of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in review and consultation process.
- 5. Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

The Draft EIR, which is incorporated by reference, and this document (including comments, and responses to comments, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program [MMRP]) constitute the Final EIR. A copy of the Final EIR is available on the web at http://www.Ohlonebond.org. The Final EIR is also available for review at the following location:

Ohlone Community College District 43600 Mission Boulevard Fremont, California 94539-0390 Contact: Ron Little, Vice President of Administrative Services This document has been prepared pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The Final EIR incorporates comments received on the Draft EIR, and contains responses by the Lead Agency to those comments that are relevant to the Draft EIR analysis. The Board of Trustees of the Ohlone Community College District is responsible for reviewing and certifying the adequacy of this EIR and making a decision with respect to the proposed project.

1.2 ORGANIZATION OF THIS RESPONSES TO COMMENTS DOCUMENT

This document is organized into five sections. Following this introduction (Section 1.0), Section 2.0, Comments on the Draft EIR and Responses to Comments, contains a list of persons that submitted written comments on the Draft EIR; reproductions of the written comments; and responses to those comments. Each comment is labeled with a number in the margin. Section 3.0, Errata presents changes to Draft EIR text in response to comments received on the Draft EIR as well as District-initiated minor changes to the project. Section 4.0, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, contains the MMRP for the project, and Section 5.0, Report Preparation, lists persons involved in the preparation of the Final EIR.

2.0 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

2.1 INDEX TO COMMENTS

As described in **Section 1.0, Introduction**, all comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) received in writing have been numbered, and the numbers correspond with the responses that follow. Although the second letter was received after the close of the Draft EIR circulation, the District has included it in the Final EIR. No comments were received at the Draft EIR public hearing. The individuals who commented on the Draft EIR are listed in **Table 2.0-1, Index of Comments**, below.

Table 2.0-1 Index of Comments

Letter No.	Agency/Organization/Individual – Name
А	Mark Allen, Bent Wahl, and Karen Wahl, email dated July 7, 2013
В	Mark Allen, email dated September 14, 2013

2.2 RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

This section presents all written comments received on the Draft EIR and response to individual comments.

From: Mark Allen [mailto:mkamail@pacbell.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 07, 2013 6:38 PM
To: Ron Little
Cc: 'Karen Hildebrandt-Wahl (att)'; 'Brent Wahl'
Subject: Public comment on the draft EIR for Ohlone Master plan - small correction

To: Ron Little

Subject: Response to the draft EIR letter concerning the 2012 Master Plan for Ohlone College

As residents of Witherly Lane, we are concerned about the parking garage labeled A and referred to as the North Parking Garage. During various Ohlone College Board Meeting in the mid-2000s (2005–2008) various Witherly Lane residents presented issues and concerns to the Board related to easement changes to Witherly Lane. All such meeting were recorded on video tape and notes were documented. The main issues focused on traffic / access and the Ohlone College Board agreed not to make significant changes in Witherly Lane traffic or control that would impede ingress and egress to the residents. As such, no non-emergency through traffic, bus traffic or general student parking was allowed and only Handicap and Professor parking was agreed to. Furth more, in the written easement agreement it was stated that Ohlone shall not impede the ingress, egress of the residents on Witherly

Specifically our concerns that we would like addressed as part of the EIR approval related to the Parking Garage A are the following:

- 1. We see no reference in the EIR as to the number of parking spaces in the garage, the number of parking levels or any details on the structure, or who will use this garage ? At one time we were told it would be for teachers and handicapped only and two stories. Reading the description in the EIR says it is now for students and multi-story which means what specifically ?
 - a. We are requesting the specifics in writing as too its scope, size and use of parking garage A. It is impossible to gauge our level of concern with the generalized description as it is written on page 71.
- 2. In the EIR there was no study that we saw or any details as to the impact on traffic to the Witherly Residents or lighting that was completed as part of the EIR. There is no question this garage will increase the traffic up Witherly Lane which is a two lane road at the point where the garage is being put in. Increased traffic depending on the level of traffic due to adding this garage may have a material adverse effect on our property values. This point has been supported by professional appraisers we have talked to. We already have increased traffic because Ohlone is not enforcing the written easement agreement with the Montessori School on Witherly and the specific use of a bus for dropping off and picking up students rather than parents in individual cars. The parking garage is now additive to the traffic situation on the road.
 - a. We would like to see the study that was done on the estimated traffic flow after the garage verses now. Also what are the mitigating steps that the college is taking as part of this construction of Parking Garage A to minimize the effect on the residents with regard to traffic, lighting, ect. I feel these steps need outlined in the EIR. Example: Are you going to make the road 4 lane as it would be unthinkable that two lanes would not create a bottleneck in and out of the garage and for the residents turning in and out of our drive-ways.
- 3. Thank you and please confirm receipt of this message.

Mark Allen 830 Witherly Lane

Bent and Karen Wahl 880 Witherly Lane 1

Comment Letter A Email from Mark Allen, Bent Wahl, and Karen Wahl, dated July 7, 2013 Response A-1

The concern expressed by the residents of Witherly Lane with respect to increased traffic on Witherly Lane due to the North Parking Garage (referred to as Parking Structure P1 in the Draft EIR) is noted. The proposed parking garage is not expected to substantially increase traffic on the roadway and will not impede ingress and egress of the residents.

Parking Structure P1 has not gone through the planning process as it is slated for construction sometime in 2018 at the earliest. Therefore, the design of the garage, lighting, and landscaping are still to be developed. But similar to parking garages in urban areas, it will be aesthetically designed, minimally lit, and landscaped in a manner that is consistent with the landscaping on the rest of the campus. The garage is expected to contain approximately 400 to 500 parking spaces and is currently anticipated to be located adjacent to the Smith Center on current Parking Lots T, U, and W, and not at the site shown on Figure 3.0-9 in the Draft EIR. The current concept for the parking structure is that the main parking deck will be located where the handicapped parking in Lot U is located, with one deck above that, with an elevation that is no higher than current Lot T. The garage have not been designed at this time. However, given the location just east of the Smith Center that is being considered for the garage, the access point is expected to be approximately in the area of the driveways that lead to the existing Lot W. Instead of parking on surface lots, faculty and staff would use the parking structure. The parking garage will also include some student parking. Please also see **Response B-1** with respect to the current status of this project.

The effects of the change in traffic to the campus with the implementation of the Master Plan are analyzed in the Draft EIR. The traffic on Witherly Lane is not expected to increase substantially under the Master Plan for the following reasons. First, currently most of the students use Witherly Lane to access the parking lots off of Witherly Lane as it is the closest parking that is available to the academic classes. Lots G and H on the Pine Street side of the campus are only 50 percent utilized as they are distant from the classroom buildings. Under the Master Plan, South Parking Garage (Parking Structure P3 on Draft EIR Figure 3.0-9) is planned for the south side of the campus, close to the academic classes. With the provision of the approximately 1,000-space parking structure, which would be accessed via Pine Street and would be built before the construction of Parking Structure P1, more students are expected to use that garage and there will be less use of the Witherly Lane parking lots. In other words, with the provision of closer parking on the south side of the campus, student traffic is expected to shift from Witherly Lane to Pine Street. Secondly, although Parking Structure P1 is still being considered for potential location in the northeastern portion of the campus, two parking lots (Lots D and E) which are also accessed by Witherly Lane, will be removed or significantly reduced in size due to the construction of the new soccer field and future frontage development. The spaces in Lots D and E that will be removed will be partially replaced by spaces in Parking Structure P1. Consequently the total number of parking spaces accessible via Witherly Lane will not increase substantially above existing conditions.

The effects of these changes in traffic to the campus are evaluated in the Draft EIR. As shown on Figure 4.11-9, the net change in peak hour traffic volumes on Witherly Lane would be 94 trips in the AM peak hour (79 inbound from Mission Boulevard, and 15 outbound onto Mission Boulevard), and 95 trips in the PM peak hour (60 inbound from Mission Boulevard, and 35 outbound onto Mission Boulevard). The effect of these additional trips at the intersection of Witherly Lane and Mission Boulevard is shown on Tables 4.11-9, 4.11-10, 4.11-11, with the detailed analysis calculations provided in the Draft EIR Volume II - Appendices (Traffic Modeling Output). The Draft EIR analysis concluded that the intersection of Witherly Lane and Mission Boulevard would continue to operate at an acceptable level of service during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours with the addition of project-generated trips, and the proposed project would add less than two seconds of additional delay for motorists at this intersection.

Given the small increase in traffic on Witherly Lane, there will not be a need to widen the roadway to four lanes.

Please also see **Response B-1** regarding Parking Structure P1 and the Campus's recommendation to the Ohlone Community College Board of Trustees (BOT) not to approve its implementation at the present time.

From: Mark Allen [mailto:mkamail@pacbell.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 14, 2013 7:16 PM
To: 'Ron Little'
Cc: 'Karen Hildebrandt-Wahl (att)'; 'Brent Wahl'; 'Gari Browning'; 'Mark Allen'
Subject: RE: Public comment on the draft EIR for Ohlone Master plan

Ron

I studied the your response, thank you and also studied the maps. I have 4 questions and one comment.

- 1. What happens to parking lot V in your plans ? It exists today but is not shown on your current or future map. Does it go away basically which is what I think looking at the maps ?
- 2. When you say the entrance to the parking structure will be ~ in the area of the entrance to the existing Lot W, there are two entrances currently to Lot W today when I went and looked. Are you referring to the lower entrance or the upper entrance across from the Allison School ? If it is the entrance almost directly across from the Allison school, or the upper entrance I am certain the combined traffic going into the garage and into the Allison school is going to be a disaster and not an acceptable situation for anyone. Even today the Allison school often has a person out there at peak hours morning and afternoon trying to manage their traffic and the parents cars that park and use their tennis court as a turnaround as they turn off and back onto Witherly. (much a result of not using the bus which they had repeatedly promised in Ohlone Board meetings and was written into the easement changes that they and the residents signed)
- 3. When you say the parking structure will have one deck no higher than the existing current lot T, do mean specifically the roof of the parking structure will be no higher than the current level of Lot T ? if so, this is good.
- 4. What is the current total number of parking spaces in each of Lot's W, Lot U, Lot T and Lot V.

Comment: Please know that in my case I have easement rights to two access points for 830 Witherly Lane. The lower access point now is just a locked gate across from the lower entrance to Lot W. In the future it is almost certain I will develop the property and use that access point also. Please consider this in all your studies.

I look forward to your response. Thank you.

Mark

1

Comment Letter B Email from Mark Allen dated September 14, 2013

Response B-1

The commenter requests information regarding existing parking lots in the area of Parking Structure P1. The total number of parking spaces in Lots W, U, and T are 109. (Lot V which is mentioned in the comment is a new sign designation on the campus. Lot V is a section of what are shown on Draft EIR Figure 3.0-9 as Lots W and U).

The commenter also requests information regarding the specific location where the entrance to the garage would be located on Witherly Lane. As noted in Response A-1, Parking Structure P1 has not been designed or programmed at this time. The District has recently commissioned a study by Steinberg Architects to develop and propose preliminary programming for this parking structure. Once the architects conduct this study, the District will utilize the study and other data to determine the optimum location for the structure. Recommendations will be brought forward to the college community. Once the details of the Parking Structure P1 project are developed, the District will conduct a separate environmental review for this specific project. The District has determined that it will recommend to the Board of Trustees (BOT) to exclude Parking Structure P1 from its approval action related to the 2012 District Facilities Master Plan. In other words, the BOT will be requested to approve the implementation of the Master Plan improvement projects but not the Parking Structure P1 project at this time. All references to Parking Structure P1 in the Draft EIR text and graphics have been modified to show that it will be considered in a separate environmental study and thereby excluded from this EIR.

The Campus has examined all the environmental impacts of the Master Plan as evaluated and disclosed in the Draft EIR and has determined that the proposed exclusion of the parking structure from the approval of the Master Plan implementation will not result in new environmental impacts or increase the severity of any of impacts of the Master Plan implementation that were reported in the Draft EIR.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter shows revisions to the Draft EIR subsequent to the document's publication and public review. Parking Structure P1 located in the northeastern corner of the Ohlone Community College is no longer a part of the proposed project. Therefore, all references to that parking structure in the Draft EIR have been modified to reflect that the parking structure will be evaluated at a future date.

The revisions are presented in the order in which they appear in the Draft EIR and are identified by page number in respective chapters. These revisions are shown as excerpts from the Draft EIR. Strikethrough (strikethrough) text indicates deletions and underlined (underlined) text indicates additions.

3.2 **REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIS**

3.0 Project Description

The paragraph under Parking Structures in the middle of page 3.0-15 has been revised as follows:

Parking Structures

Three new parking structures, shown as P1, P2, and P3 on **Figure 3.0-12, Proposed Vehicle Circulation**, would be constructed on the north and south ends of the upper campus. These three structures would provide 1,620 parking spaces and existing parking lots would be reconfigured for a campus total of 2,527 parking spaces, or an increase of 122 spaces from the existing parking total.

The new parking structures on the campus would provide a total of 1,620 parking spaces and existing parking lots would be reconfigured for a campus total of 2,527 parking spaces, or an increase of 122 spaces from the existing parking total. Two of the new parking structures, shown as P2 and P3 on **Figure 3.0-12**, **Proposed Vehicle Circulation**, would be constructed on the south end of the upper campus. The size, design, and location of Parking Structure P1 shall be evaluated at a future date and the Campus will conduct a separate environmental review for that specific project.

The paragraph at the bottom of page 3.0-19 has been revised as follows:

Proposed Parking Plan

The 2012 DFMP recommends 122 additional parking spaces to achieve a ratio of one parking spot to five students (1:5). Parking lots would be reconfigured to accommodate the 2,472 parking spaces needed by the year 2023. Parking improvements include a shift of the majority of parking to the upper part of the campus which would be closer to the academic core complex. Terraced parking structures <u>on</u> at the north and south ends of the upper campus would provide a total of 70 percent of the required parking spaces. The existing upper campus parking Lots M, N, O, <u>and P, R, and T</u> would be removed to provide space for the terraced Parking Structures <u>P1</u>, P2, and P3. <u>The size, design, and location of Parking Structure P1 on the upper campus shall be evaluated at a future date and the Campus will conduct a separate environmental review for this specific project. Lower campus parking lots including Lots A, E, and G would be removed entirely and parking Lots D, H, and K would be reduced in size to accommodate new facilities.</u>

Figures 3.0-9, 3.0-11 through 15 have been revised to reflect the removal of Parking Structure P1 from the project. The revised figures are presented at the end of this chapter.

4.1 Aesthetics

Figure 4.1-7 has been revised to reflect the removal of Parking Structure P1 from the project. The revised figure is presented at the end of this chapter.

The second paragraph under Impact AES-1 on page 4.1-15 is revised as follows:

Impact AES-1:Implementation of the 2012 DFMP could substantially degrade the existing
visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. (Potentially
Significant; Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Implementation of the 2012 DFMP would involve the demolition of some existing buildings, construction of new buildings, and the renovation of existing buildings on the campus in an area that is already developed. In addition, new parking structures and improved parking lots, pedestrian access, and roadways would be added. As a result, buildout of the 2012 DFMP would incrementally alter the existing visual character of the campus.

The specific designs of most of the new buildings that would be constructed on the campus are not known at this time, and the evaluation of impacts is based mainly on the general building mass, height,

and location. The mass and height of the proposed buildings would be similar to existing buildings on the campus. A majority of the new buildings would be constructed within or adjacent to the existing core of the campus, and in some cases would replace existing buildings. For example, the buildings in the campus core (Buildings 1, 2, and 8) would be demolished and replaced with Buildings A, B, C, and D, which would be similar in height to the existing buildings. Additional adjacent buildings would be removed and replaced with Building E-and Parking Structure P1. As a result, the type and scale of development on the campus after buildout of the 2012 DFMP would generally be similar to existing conditions. Proposed new buildings would not be substantially different from the existing buildings that would not be removed and would be designed to coordinate with the existing buildings in exterior appearance, height, and mass. Views of the campus from both on-campus and off-campus viewpoints with the addition of the proposed new buildings would not be substantially different from existing views.

4.3 Biological Resources

Mitigation Measure BIO-1a on page 4.3-17 of the Draft EIR is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: If construction of 2012 DFMP projects would commence anytime during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting near the campus (typically February through August in the project region), a pre-construction survey of the project vicinity for nesting birds shall be conducted. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist (i.e., experienced with the nesting behavior of bird species of the region) within two weeks of prior to the commencement of construction activities. The intent of the survey would be to determine if active nests of special-status bird species or other species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code are present within the construction zone or within 500 feet of the construction zone. The survey area shall include all trees, shrubs, and buildings in the construction zone and a surrounding 500 feet area.

4.9 Noise

The first and third paragraphs under Impact NOI-3 on page 4.9-24 are revised as follows:

Impact NOI-3: Implementation of the 2012 DFMP would add new stationary and area noise sources to the campus. However, it would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels off-campus. (*Less than Significant*)

The 2012 DFMP involves changes to portions of the central campus, with limited changes proposed along the campus edges. Five new buildings (Buildings A through E) would be located in the academic core complex in the east central portion of the campus, and new parking structures would be located in the northeast and southeast portions of the campus.

Buildings associated with the 2012 DFMP would include stationary sources of noise such as mechanical HVAC equipment. As discussed in **Impact NOI-1**, stationary equipment on the campus could generate noise levels that average 69 to 73 CNEL at 50 feet when the equipment is operating. With shielding, noise levels generated by stationary equipment would be reduced by about 15 dB(A), thus resulting in an average of 54 to 58 CNEL at 50 feet. Sound generated by a point source typically attenuates at a rate of 6.0 dB(A) for each doubling of distance from the source to the receptor. Thus, at 100 feet, new stationary equipment would average 48 to 52 CNEL, while at 200 feet new stationary equipment would average 42 to 46 CNEL. The nearest residential structures to the proposed buildings are located approximately 600 feet to the northwest across Witherly Lane. At these distances, noise from mechanical HVAC equipment would not exceed the City's 60 dB(A) Ldn long-term exterior noise standard for residential uses.

Concerning the new parking lots and structures, typical parking lot noise includes car doors closing, engines starting, and acceleration. Other occasional noises include tire squeal noise, loud stereos, and car alarms. The nearest sensitive receptors to the proposed P2 and P3 parking structures are approximately 0.3 mile to the south. In addition, there are existing parking lots that generate vehicle noise located where the parking structures are proposed. The potential for noise disturbance to the existing sensitive receptors from the parking structures is minimal.

The proposed parking lots B, C, and D, located in the northern portion of the campus south of Witherly Lane, would be smaller than the existing parking lots. Therefore, the noise to the residences located directly to the north would be less than under current conditions. Off site sensitive uses that would be nearest to the new parking structures would be residential uses north of Witherly Lane. These residences are located approximately 600 feet from the edge of proposed Parking Structure P1. Under existing conditions, residences north of Witherly Lane are already exposed to noise generated by Parking Lots B, C, and D, which are approximately 200 feet south of the residences. These parking lots would remain or be reduced in size under the 2012 DFMP. As the existing parking lots are substantially closer to the nearest residential uses than the proposed parking structures, the change in ambient noise levels at the nearest receptors due to the new parking structure would not be substantial.



SOURCE: OCCD, 2012

FIGURE **3.0-9**







1124.002•10/13





FIGURE 3.0-12

Proposed Vehicle Circulation

1124.002•10/13



SOURCE: HMC Architects, 2012

FIGURE **3.0-13**

Proposed Parking



SOURCE: OCCD, 2012

FIGURE **3.0-14**

Proposed Pedestrian Circulation



SOURCE: OCCD, 2012

FIGURE **3.0-15**

Proposed Landscape Zones

1124.002•10/13



SOURCE: HMC Architects, 2012

FIGURE **4.1-7**

Proposed Lighting

1124.002•10/13

4.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a Lead Agency establish a program to monitor and report on mitigation measures adopted as part of the environmental review process to avoid or reduce the severity and magnitude of potentially significant environmental impacts associated with project implementation. CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(1)) requires that a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be adopted at the time that the agency determines to carry out a project for which an EIR has been prepared, to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the EIR are fully implemented.

The MMRP for the 2012 District Facilities Master Plan for the Ohlone Community College Fremont Campus is presented in **Table 4.0-1**, **2012 District Facilities Master Plan Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program**. **Table 4.0-1** includes the full text of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. The MMRP describes implementation and monitoring procedures, responsibilities, and timing for each mitigation measure identified in the EIR, including:

Impact: Identifies the impact number and statement from the Final EIR.

Mitigation Measure: Provides full text of the mitigation measure as provided in the Final EIR.

Implementation Schedule: Provides the timing of when the mitigation measure is to be implemented.

Responsible Party: Designates responsibility for monitoring of the mitigation measure.

Verification: Identifies the documentation to be verified by the Responsible Agency, as appropriate.

Status/Date/Initials: Monitors implementation of the mitigation measure.

The District may modify the means by which a mitigation measure will be implemented, as long as the alternative means ensure compliance during project implementation. The Office of Administrative Services will be responsible for mitigation implementation, monitoring and reporting, and the administration of the program. The manager or department lead for this department will be directly responsible for ensuring the responsible party complies with the mitigation.

Table 4.0-12012 District Facilities Master Plan for the Ohlone Community College Fremont CampusMitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

		Implementation	Responsible		Status/ Date/
Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Schedule	Party	Verification	Initials
Aesthetics					
AES-1 : Implementation of the 2012 DFMP could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	MM AES-1: Prior to the final design of each project, a landscape architect shall review the construction footprint of the project. All feasible measures, such as changes to the building footprint, shall be used to preserve and protect healthy mature trees. Trees that cannot be saved shall be considered for re-location or replaced with new trees.	Prior to approval of construction design plans.	Administrative Services	District staff will consult with a landscape architect for any improvements that have the potential to impact healthy mature trees. The plans will consider avoidance, relocation, or replacement and will be verified by District staff.	
AES-2 : Implementation of the 2012 DFMP would create new sources of light or glare which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	 MM AES-2a: Under the Campus' existing design review process, the Campus will ensure that all future projects along the outer edge of existing campus development are designed to minimize light spill and glare. All outdoor lighting shall be focused and directed to the specific location (e.g., roads, walkways), be shielded to avoid the production of glare, minimize up light, and light spill. All light fixtures shall be located, aimed, or shielded so as to minimize stray light trespassing across property boundaries. MM AES-2b: To the extent feasible, sports field lighting shall have focused lighting fixtures to minimize spill off-site. Additionally, use of athletic fields with stadium lighting shall be restricted to operating hours ending at 10:00 PM to reduce light impacts to surrounding residential areas. 	Prior to the installation of any new lighting.	Administrative Services	District staff will consult as needed with a lighting specialist for any construction plan that has new exterior lighting. The District shall require the installation of downward- directed lighting or cutoff-type lighting to minimize light spill and nighttime glare. District staff shall verify compliance of the plans with the recommendations of the lighting specialist. The District will adopt a standard operating procedure for athletic field light to turn off at 10:00 PM.	

		Implementation	Responsible		Status/ Date/
Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Schedule	Party	Verification	Initials
Biological Resources					
BIO-1: The implementation of the 2012 DFMP could have a substantial adverse effect on special-status wildlife species.	 MM BIO-1a: If construction of 2012 DFMP projects would commence anytime during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting near the campus (typically February through August in the project region), a preconstruction survey of the project vicinity for nesting birds shall be conducted. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist (i.e., experienced with the nesting behavior of bird species of the region) two weeks prior to the commencement of construction activities. The intent of the survey would be to determine if active nests of special-status bird species or other species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code are present within the construction zone or within 500 feet of the construction zone. The survey area shall include all trees, shrubs, and buildings in the construction zone and a surrounding 500 feet area. If active nests are found in areas that could be directly affected or are within 500 feet of construction-related noise, a no-disturbance buffer zone shall be created around active nests during the breeding season or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged. The size of the buffer zones and types of construction activities restricted within them will be determined by the qualified biologist taking into account factors such as the following: Noise and human disturbance levels at the construction activity Distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the construction site and the noise and disturbance species during the rest of the survey and the noise of the nesting birds 	Two weeks prior to commencement of outdoor construction activities during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species; survey area to include all trees, shrubs and buildings within 500 feet of the project site.	Administrative Services	District staff shall select a qualified biologist to conduct the pre-construction survey. The results of the survey will be documented in a report by the biologist.	

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Schedule	Responsible Party	Verification	Status/ Date/ Initials
	Limits of construction to avoid an active nest shall be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or another appropriate barrier, and construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. The existing nests shall be removed after nesting has concluded and the nests are vacated (as determined by a qualified biologist). Exclusion methods (e.g., netting) should then be used to prevent cliff swallows or other bird species from constructing new nests prior to building demolition.				
	 Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: A qualified biologist shall conduct a roosting bat habitat evaluation prior to the demolition of any buildings. The evaluation shall determine if any buildings proposed for demolition provide potential bat roosting habitat. If it is determined that the building to be removed does not provide potential roosting habitat, no further action would be required. If suitable roost structures are identified, then surveys may be conducted to determine if roosting bats are present. If it is determined that roosting bats are present. If it is determined that roosting bats are present, then a site-specific bat protection plan shall developed by the qualified biologist to prevent disturbance of an active maternity or hibernation roost; the plan may include the use of passive bat exclusion devices, adjusting project timing to when the roost is not active, or other protective measures. It should be noted that the there are two acceptable seasonal time windows for humane exclusion: Between about March 1, when bats become active again after heavy winter rains and when evening temperatures are above 45 degrees F, and April 15, when females start giving birth to pups. Between August 31 and about October 15, or before heavy winter rains and when evening temperatures are above 45 degrees F (After that time, torpid bats are unable to fly out through the one-way exits). 	Prior to demolition of any buildings.	Administrative Services	District staff shall select a qualified biologist to conduct the pre-construction survey. The results of the survey will be documented in a report by the biologist.	

		Implementation	Responsible		Status/ Date/
Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure Additionally, conducting bat surveys during the hibernation period (generally October 16 to February 28) may not provide conclusive results as bats are inactive and may be difficult or impossible to detect. Therefore, the timing of these seasonal time windows shall be taken into consideration in planning and conducting the bat habitat evaluation/surveys.	Schedule	Party	Verification	Initials
CUL-2: Implementation of the	MM CUL-2: In the event that unknown	During any ground	Administrative	District staff shall select a	
2012 DFMP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource	archaeological resources are discovered during construction, all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease. The District shall contact a qualified archaeologist to provide direction for handling of the find, and shall implement a plan for survey and subsurface investigation as needed at the direction of the archaeologist to define the deposit and to assess the remainder of the site within the project area to determine whether the resource is significant and would be affected by the project. A written report of the results of investigations shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist and filed with the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System.	disturbance or earthmoving activities.	Services	qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find, and to prepare and implement a plan for survey and subsurface investigation.	
CUL-3: Implementation of the 2012 DFMP could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	MM CUL-3 : If known, suspected, or potential vertebrate fossil materials are discovered during construction, work will stop within a 75-foot radius of the find until a qualified professional paleontologist (as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology or consistent with Caltrans standards for a Supervising Paleontologist) can assess the nature and importance of the find and recommend appropriate treatment, if any. Based on the paleontologist's professional judgment, treatment may include preparation and recovery of fossil materials so that they can be housed in an appropriate museum or university collection, and may also include preparation of a report for publication describing the finds. The campus will be responsible for ensuring that the paleontologist's recommendations regarding treatment and reporting are implemented.	During any ground disturbance or earthmoving activities.	Administrative Services	District staff shall select a qualified paleontologist to assess the nature of the find and recommend appropriate treatment.	

Significant Impact Mitigation Measure Schedule Party CUL-4: Implementation of the 2012 DFMP could disturb any human remains, including MM CUL-4: In the event of a discovery of human bone, potential human bone, or a known or potential human burial all ground-disturbing work in the burian burian	Verification District staff shall select a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find.	Initials
Significant ImpactMitigation MeasureSchedulePartyCUL-4: Implementation of the 2012 DFMP could disturb any human remains, includingMM CUL-4: In the event of a discovery of human bone, potential human bone, or a known or potential disturbing work in the earthmovingDuring any ground disturbance or earthmovingAdministrative Services	District staff shall select a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find.	Initials
CUL-4: Implementation of the 2012 DFMP could disturb any human remains, includingMM CUL-4: In the event of a discovery of human bone, potential human bone, or a known or potential disturbance or earthmovingAdministrative Services	District staff shall select a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find.	
those interred outside of formal cemeteries.		
trom campus projects on state lands are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested		

		Implementation	Pagnangihla		Status/
Ciamificant Imment	Mitiastian Massure	Implementation	Responsible	Marifiastian	Date/
Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Schedule	Party	Verification	Initials
Geology and Soils		[
GEO-1: Development under the 2012 DFMP could expose people and structures on campus to substantial adverse effects related to seismic ground shaking and/or landslides.	MM GEO-1 : Where existing geotechnical information is not adequate, detailed geotechnical investigations shall be performed for areas that will support buildings. Such investigations for building projects on the Fremont Campus shall comply with the California Geological Survey's <i>Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California</i> (Special Publication 117), which specifically address the mitigation of landslide hazards in designated Seismic Hazard Zones (CGS 2003). All recommendations of the geotechnical investigations shall be incorporated into project designs.	Prior to approval of construction design plans for new buildings and parking structures.	Administrative Services	District staff shall select a qualified geologist to prepare a detailed geotechnical investigation.	
Hazards and Hazardous Materia	als			·	
HAZ-1: Soil or groundwater contamination could be present and, if encountered during construction, could result in the exposure of the public or construction workers to hazardous materials.	MM HAZ-1: If evidence of contaminated soil and/or groundwater, such as discolored soil, odors or oil sheen, is encountered during the removal of on-site debris or during excavation and/or grading both on and off-site, the construction contractors shall stop work and immediately inform the campus. An environmental hazardous materials professional shall be contracted to conduct an on-site assessment. If the materials are determined to pose a risk to the public or construction workers, the construction contractor shall prepare and submit a remediation plan to the appropriate agency and comply with all federal, state, and local laws. Soil remediation methods could include excavation and on-site treatment, excavation and off-site treatment or disposal, and/or treatment without excavation. Remediation alternatives for cleanup of contaminated groundwater could include in situ treatment, extraction and on-site treatment, or extraction and off-site treatment and/or disposal. Construction plans shall be modified or construction postponed to ensure that construction will not inhibit remediation activities and will not expose the public or construction workers to hazardous conditions.	During any ground disturbance or earthmoving activities.	Administrative Services	District staff shall select a hazardous materials professional to conduct an on- site assessment if evidence of contaminated soil and/or groundwater is found. If the assessment determines that materials pose a risk to the public or construction workers, District staff shall develop and implement a remediation plan and verify that every step of the remediation plan is carried out.	

		Implementation	Responsible		Status/ Date/
Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Schedule	Party	Verification	Initials
Noise					
NOI-4: Construction on the campus pursuant to the 2012 DFMP could expose existing and future noise-sensitive receptors to elevated construction noise levels and result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project.	MM NOI-4a: Construction activities on the campus shall be restricted to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM on Saturdays.	During construction contract development (the mitigation measure shall be included in the construction contract).	Administrative Services	Copies of approved construction contract(s) with the specified hours of construction shall be retained by the District. Field inspections by the District during construction shall verify that the specified hours of construction are being followed.	
	 MM NOI-4b: Prior to initiation of campus construction, the Campus shall approve a construction noise mitigation program including but not limited to the following: All noise-producing project equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with exhaust mufflers and air-inlet silencers where appropriate, in good operating condition, which meet or exceed original factory specification. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. All mobile or fixed noise-producing equipment used on the project that is regulated for noise output by local, state or federal agency shall comply with such regulation while engaged in project-related activities. Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, construction vehicle parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable from noise-sensitive land uses. Stationary noise sources such as generators or pumps shall be located away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible. 	During construction contract development (the construction noise mitigation program will be included in the construction contract).	Administrative services	Copies of approved construction contract(s) with the required construction noise mitigation measures listed in the construction noise mitigation program shall be retained by the District. Field inspections by the District during construction shall verify the measures being implemented.	

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Schedule	Responsible Party	Verification	Status/ Date/ Initials
	 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells shall be for safety warning purposes only. No project- related public address loudspeaker, two-way radio, or music system shall be audible at any adjacent noise-sensitive receptor except for emergency use. 				
	• The erection of temporary noise barriers shall be considered where project activity is unavoidably close to noise-sensitive receptors.				
	• Construction vehicle trips shall be routed as far as practical from existing sensitive uses.				
	• The loudest campus construction activities, such as demolition and pile driving, shall be considered for scheduling during academic breaks when fewer people would be disturbed by construction noise.				
	• Whenever possible, academic, administrative, and sensitive use areas that will be subject to construction noise shall be informed a week before the start of each construction project.				
NOI-5: Construction on the campus pursuant to the 2012 DFMP could generate and expose persons on the campus to excessive groundborne vibrations, although it would not expose off-campus receptors to excessive groundborne vibrations.	MM NOI-5 : Pile driving activities that could result in vibration and are within 75 feet of a classroom building, and demolition and construction activities with no pile driving that could result in vibration and are within 50 feet of a classroom building, shall be scheduled to occur on Saturdays or during periods when instruction is not occurring on the campus when feasible. If pile driving activities within 75 feet of a classroom building and demolition and construction activities within 50 feet of a classroom building are scheduled to occur during periods when instruction is occurring on the campus, a notice shall be posted in the vicinity of the affected classroom buildings notifying the campus community of the upcoming construction activities.	Prior to and during construction of facilities within 50 to 75 feet of a classroom building.	Administrative Services	District staff shall work with the construction contractor to schedule pile-driving activities on weekends or during periods when instruction is not occurring on the campus. If scheduling pile-driving activities outside of periods of instruction is not feasible, District staff shall be responsible for posting notices in the vicinity of the affected classrooms.	

5.1 LEAD AGENCY

Ohlone Community College District Board of Trustees 43600 Mission Boulevard Fremont, California 94539

Ron Little, Vice President of Administrative Services

Thomas Moore, Director of Facilities and Modernization

Christopher Wilson, Project Executive - Gilbane Building Company

7.2 EIR CONSULTANTS

Impact Sciences, Inc. 555 12th Street, Suite 1650 Oakland, California 94607

Shabnam Barati, Ph. D., Managing Principal/Project Manager

Paul Stephenson, Project Manager

Caitlin Gilleran, Staff Planner

Ian Hillway, Publications Manager

Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc.

475 14th Street, Suite 290 Oakland, California 94612

Mark Spencer, PE, Principal