

November 22, 2005

INITIAL STUDY

FILE NO. 9037-07-81-04-05A-05EA-05G



Munger Graduate Housing Project

INITIAL STUDY
Environmental Checklist and Evaluation for Santa Clara County

File Number:	9037-7-81-05A-05G	Date:	November 23, 2005
Project Type:	Student Housing/Parking Structure/Structure Relocation	APN(s):	142-07-082
Project Location / Address	544 Salvatierra Walk, north of Campus Drive between Lane A, Law School, Stern Hall, and Arguello Way; Wilbur Field; Tressidor Lot.	GP Designation:	Academic Campus
Owner's Name	Leland Stanford Jr. University	Zoning:	A1 General Use
Applicant's Name:	Same	Urban Service Area:	PALO ALTO

Project Description:

Stanford University is proposing to construct new graduate student housing with 355 housing units (total of 600 beds) and associated facilities, including a 1,227-stall, four-story underground parking garage, utility improvements, and to restore the Wilbur parking lot currently housing temporary surge trailers to provide 143 parking stalls. To accommodate the project, five existing buildings, Drell, Owen, Rogers, Mariposa and Serra Houses will be relocated from the graduate housing site to other sites on the Stanford campus and one structure, the Campus Bike Shop, will be demolished and the use relocated elsewhere on campus. Also, during the construction phase a temporary parking lot will be created adjacent to the Law School with up to 108 parking stalls. The project proposal is subject to the County's Architectural and Site Approval (ASA) review process and will conform to architectural, housing, parking, and landscaping standards for development within the Stanford University 2000 General Use Permit (GUP) area.

The Munger Graduate Housing site is generally bounded by Campus Drive East to the south, Arguello Way to the east, Stern Hall and Nathan Abbott Way to the north, and Lane A to the west. The parking structure is east of the housing site, at Wilbur Field. Wilbur Field will be restored on the roof of the underground structure. The relocation sites for the five existing structures are Lane A for the Drell House and Owen House, which is immediately west of the project site, and the west side of the Tressider parking lot for the Rogers House, Mariposa House, and Serra House, which is approximately 1,100 feet west of the housing site (See Figure 1).

Munger Graduate Housing

The graduate housing consists of five structures totaling 459,064 square feet of floor space between four and five stories in height. The four-story structures primarily face Campus Drive East and Lane A. The housing units will consist of studios, 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom, and 4-bedroom units, and common spaces including a great hall, pub/café/kitchen, meeting space, exercise area, convenience store, and operational center for the housing complex. The project is located in both Stanford's East Campus District and Central Campus District with the boundary between the Districts actually bisecting the housing site. Approximately 150 housing units (248 beds) are in East Campus and 205 housing units (352 beds) in Central Campus.

The buildings are oriented around a pedestrian plaza and landscaped walkways. The walkways vary in width from 20 to 50 feet and will provide emergency access to the interior of the project. Placement of the buildings will require the permanent closure of Alvarado Row, north of Campus Drive. Additionally, to maintain service and emergency vehicle access, the project includes the following site improvements: development of Lane A from a functional parking lot to a street, construction of a new service lane between the graduate housing site and Stern Hall, and reconstruction of Nathan Abbott Way from a road to a combination pedestrian mall and emergency access/service lane.

Parking Structure 6 and Wilbur Lot Restoration

The new 1,227-stall parking subterranean structure is proposed to be located beneath Wilbur Field, within the East Campus district, and will provide residence parking as well as replacement parking for displaced parking primarily from the Stern Lot, Law School parking lot, Lane A lots, and Nathan Abbott Way. The underground structure consists of four levels requiring approximately 220,000 cubic yards of excavation to be hauled offsite. A portion of the excavated dirt (up to 50,000 cubic yards) may be kept on the campus and used in the approved Stanford stadium reconstruction project; the remainder of the dirt will be exported off site, used on Stanford’s lands, or disposed of at an approved disposal site.

Vehicle access into the structure is via Campus Drive East and from a new access lane from the intersection of Campus Drive East and Bowdoin Street, along Wilbur Hall. Two lanes will provide ingress and egress into the structure. The project will include the reconfiguration of Campus Drive East and Bowdoin Street intersection into a four-way stop to facilitate traffic movement to and from the structure. Campus Drive East will remain a four-lane roadway with median. Wilbur Field is currently used as an informal playfield for the campus community, and a turf play field will be installed on the parking structure roof to replace the field. Approximately 2 to 4 feet of soil will be placed on top of the concrete roof deck, which will be sloped to provide subsurface drainage. The Wilbur Lot currently contains three temporary modulars used for surge space. The modulars will be removed and Wilbur Lot will be restored with 143 parking stalls.

The project proposes a new net total of 666 parking stalls as indicated in the following table. With the project proposal, the Central Campus District will have a net reduction of 138 stalls and East Campus District will have a net increase of 804 stalls as result of this project. This is consistent with the 2000 GUP assumptions and as analyzed in the 2000 GUP EIR.

	Munger Site	PS 6	Wilbur Lot	Relocation Sites
Proposed stalls	42	1227	143	27
Existing stalls removed	<477>	<131>	<0>	<165>
Net Total	<435>	1096	143	<138>

The construction of the Munger Graduate Housing project will permanently displace approximately 450 parking stalls resulting from the closure of the Stern and Law School parking lots and the reconfiguration of Lane A. Those displaced parking stalls will be replaced by the construction of Parking Structure 6. To help alleviate the loss of parking between the closure of the Stern and Law School lots and the opening of Parking Structure 6, Stanford University proposes to construct a temporary parking lot between Stern Hall and Wilbur Hall to

accommodate up to 108 parking stalls, likely to be dedicated to student resident parking. This area currently serves as a recreation green with a basketball and volleyball court. Upon completion of Parking Structure 6 (expected in early 2008), the temporary parking lot would be removed and the area restored to its current condition.

Structure Relocations and Demolition

In order to allow construction of the Munger Residential complex, Stanford is proposing to relocate five buildings (Griffen-Drell, Owen, Mariposa, Serra, Rogers) from the project site and demolish one building (Campus Bike Shop). The Griffen-Drell and Owen Houses are two-and-a-half story structures, currently located on the project site at Campus Drive East/Alvarado Row. The Griffen-Drell structure is vacant. The Owen structure is no longer used as a residence, and instead houses academic programs. A 361 square foot 1977 addition will be removed from the Griffen-Drell structure in order to partially restore the structure to its original character. Likewise, Owen will remove 195 square feet. The Griffen-Drell and Owen structures would be relocated to an adjacent site fronting onto Lane A, directly opposite the new Munger Housing Building 5 (See Figure 1). The relocation improvements include enhanced landscaping at both the new site and reconfiguration of Lane A to create a pedestrian oriented streetscape.

The Rogers, Mariposa, and Serra Houses are located on Salvatierra Walk. All three structures house academic programs. The Rogers, Mariposa and Serra structures will be relocated to a site that currently serves as the Tressider parking lot (See Figure 2). The western portion of the parking lot will be removed. The three structures would form a new complex of residential style buildings with non-residential uses, and would face the Bechtel International Center, a two-story stucco building. This site is also proposed to include extensive landscaping. A multi-stop elevator will be installed in the Mariposa structure and later additions will be removed in order to partially restore the structure to its original character. Other proposed alterations include the removal of 615 square feet of additions to Mariposa and 179 square feet to Rogers. The Campus Bike Shop structure will be demolished and the use relocated elsewhere on campus.

The five structures identified for relocation will be disconnected from existing utilities. Owen and Griffen-Drell will each be moved in one piece and Serra House will be cut in half (in the same location as the previous move). It has not been determined if Rogers and Mariposa will be moved in one or two pieces.

All exterior windows will be boarded over for protection during the move. The interior door frames and large openings will be blocked or braced to prevent undue movement or settlement. The buildings will be cut from the foundations and have bracing and under-building support system designed and then approved by a structural engineer. The buildings will be jacked up and supported by framing members. The fireplaces will be supported with a similar steel beam support system and the vertical brick chimneys will be wrapped and secured to the structure so they remain intact during the move. Where the structures are cut, a temporary interior framed plywood wall will be installed for additional shear strength. The structures will be jacked up and then moved to their new sites over the course of a week. Site clearing and rough grading will occur at the new sites prior to the move. The remaining work will be done on the site and to the structures (foundations, structural and site work) after the houses are moved.

The Drell House will be converted from a private residence to an academic building, so this square footage contributes 3,373 gsf to the maximum square footage totals allowed under the 2000 GUP for academic space. Mariposa House, Serra House and Rogers House have proposed demolitions of newer additions, which result in a credit of academic/academic support square footage of 615 gsf, 195 gsf, and 179 gsf, and the Campus Bike Shop will be demolished also resulting in a credit of 459 gsf. Therefore, the total square footage of new academic space for this project is 1,925 gsf.

Construction Schedule

Construction of the parking structure is scheduled to start in February 2006, beginning with excavation which will last for approximately 20 weeks. The construction of the structure, following excavation, will take approximately 19 months, with a target complete date of mid-December, 2007. Relocation of the five houses (Owen, Drell, Rogers, Mariposa, & Serra) is scheduled to also start in February 2006 and will be completed within approximately 7 months. The Munger Graduate Housing complex is scheduled to start in April 2006 with initial grading and foundation placement. Construction of the buildings will begin in August 2006, with a target completion date of July 2007 for buildings 1-3 and December 2007 for buildings 4 and 5.

Construction activities will include extensive site preparation and excavation, including the removal of approximately 220,000 cubic yards underneath Wilber Field for the underground parking structure to be hauled offsite. Pavement demolition and tree removal will be required at the proposed Munger complex site, and site preparation will also be needed at the two relocation sites, although at a reduced scale. For all three areas, this demolition, grading, and site preparation activities are expected to take 6 months, lasting between February and August 2006.

The majority of construction activities will be associated with building the Munger Graduate Housing Complex (5 buildings) and underground parking garage, which in total will take approximately 19 months, lasting between July 2006 and December 2007.

Construction equipment will include large earthmoving equipment and steel erection equipment including cranes. The construction equipment will vary with the phase of construction; for example, the excavation and site preparation phases will include excavators, graders, backhoes, and cement trucks, while the building construction phase will use cranes, compressors, etc. In order to construct the Munger residences, pile driving may be required.

Construction shall be limited to between the hours of 7AM and 7PM, Monday through Saturday, with no construction activity occurring after 7PM or on Sundays.

Stanford University 2000 General Use Permit/Use of GUP Program EIR for CEQA Clearance

On December 12, 2000, the County of Santa Clara ("County") approved the 2000 Stanford University Community Plan and General Use Permit (GUP) governing development projects on the Stanford campus. The GUP allows Stanford to construct up to 2,035,000 net square feet of academic and academic support uses, 3,018 new housing units, and 2,300 net new parking spaces. As of September 1, 2005, Stanford has received building permits for 121,262 gsf of academic/academic space, 433 new housing units, and developed 305 net new parking stalls.

Prior to approval of the Community Plan and GUP, the County certified the Stanford University Draft Community Plan and General Use Permit Application Final Environmental Impact Report (2000 GUP EIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 19991121107). The 2000 GUP EIR, which is a Program EIR, explains how it is to be used in evaluating later activities governed by the GUP:

“[A]s each individual building project is developed, Santa Clara County is required to examine the proposed development and to determine whether potential effects have been fully analyzed in this Program EIR. If proposed building projects would have no effects beyond those already analyzed, the County can find that the building projects are covered by the Program EIR and no further CEQA environmental documentation would be required. If a proposed building project would have effects that were not analyzed in the Program EIR, a new environmental document would need to be prepared with additional focused environmental documentation. This approach provides an opportunity to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of CEQA compliance while achieving a high level of environmental protection.” (2000 GUP EIR, page 1-3.)

The 2000 GUP requires Stanford to build housing units commensurate with the development of academic development, with the first threshold at 605 housing units for 500,000 gsf of academic development. Table 2 of the GUP also identified the general distribution of new housing units between the various campus districts, and identified a total of 1,495 new student housing units for the East Campus district and 0 units in Campus Center district. As indicated above, this project straddles both of these districts; 150 units (248 beds) would be located on the East Campus district side of the boundary, and 205 units (352 beds) would be located on the Central Campus side of the boundary. Pursuant to GUP Condition D.5 (Permitting and Environmental Review as specified in F.2.A and F.4.B (Housing)), housing units may be developed on sites other than those specified in Figure 2 of the GUP subject to environmental review. Further, the distribution of housing in a development district may deviate from that identified on GUP Table 2 (Proposed Distribution of Residential Development), provided a proposal for an increase in housing in one development district is accompanied by an identified corresponding decrease in housing in one of the other districts, and the proposed deviation is evaluated through an environmental assessment and approved by the Santa Clara County Planning Commission. Stanford identified a corresponding 205-unit decrease for East Campus providing a new total 2000 GUP net additional housing units, with the construction of this project, of 788 for the Stanford campus.

Likewise, pursuant to GUP Condition H.1, the GUP caps net additional parking spaces at 2,300 and identifies a distribution of net new parking between the development districts. GUP Table 5 allocates 900 net additional parking spaces to the East Campus development district, and requires that if more parking is to be allocated to a particular district, the proposal must be evaluated through an environmental assessment and approved by the Planning Commission. GUP Condition G.11 also requires Stanford to submit a project-specific traffic study for parking lots or structures with a net increase in spaces of 400 or more.

In addition, pursuant to GUP Condition D.5, specific building projects under the GUP require an environmental assessment of potential impact areas including projects that will result in a distribution of housing which deviates from that identified in the GUP (as specified in GUP Condition F.4.a and b), and projects that will result in distribution of parking which deviates from that identified in the GUP (as specified in GUP Condition H.1).

With respect to the proposed Munger Graduate Housing project, both the housing distribution and proposed parking trigger the additional environmental assessment. Pursuant to GUP Condition D.6, the environmental assessment includes evaluation of transportation and circulation, hydrology, visual impacts, public services and utilities, recreational resources and open space, biological resources, and historic and archaeological resources.

The CEQA checklist used with this Initial Study incorporates the past CEQA analysis provided by the GUP Program EIR. Thus, where applicable based on identified impacts, the box “Less than significant with GUP or new mitigation incorporated” is included and refers to either the use of applicable mitigation listed within the GUP Program EIR or new mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The project setting is within the Stanford University campus. The site is developed with various academic structures, parking areas, and Wilbur Field which is used for general informal recreation purposes. The project is located adjacent to Campus Drive East to the south, the Law School and Stern Hall to the north, Wilbur Field to the west, and Lane A with Sigma Nu fraternity, Mars and Columbae House to the east. The Student Service Center is located on Campus Drive East, adjacent to proposed Buildings 2 and 4. South of Campus Drive East is a single-family residential neighborhood for the University faculty and staff (San Juan neighborhood), approximately 200 feet south from the project site, and further east of Campus Drive are student housing. Existing student housing, Stern Hall and Wilbur Hall, are approximately 75 feet north of the project site, and consist of three-story structures approximately 29 feet in height. The Law School, a three-story structure 56 feet in height, is also located north of the project site. Campus Drive East is the primary loop-road providing access throughout the central campus area. Campus Drive East is a four-lane road with divided median. Bowdoin Street is the closest through street to ingress/egress off of the central campus area from the project site.

The graduate housing site is developed with six existing structures that were originally homes, located in an area known as “the Row,” including Salvatierra Walk. The structures are oriented in a residential-like setting with associated landscaping and pedestrian walkways. Salvatierra Walk extends from Campus Drive East to Abbott Way up to the central portion of campus life, including the Campus Bookstore and post office.

The Relocation Site 1, proposed for the Owen House and Griffen-Drell House, is located adjacent to Lane A, west of the Munger Housing Building 5. Adjacent to this site are the Sigma Nu fraternity, Mars and Columbae House. These three structures, although taller, are similar in height and massing as the Owen House and Griffen-Drell House. The Relocation Site 2, proposed for siting Serra House, Mariposa House and Rogers House, is the Tressider Parking Lot, located between Lagunita Drive and Mayfield Avenue, approximately a half mile west of the current site and. The adjacent structures include the Bechtel International Center (1920 structure), and Faculty Club and Tressider Union on the north side of Lagunita Drive.

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

None.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology / Soils
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Population / Housing
- Public Services
- Resources / Recreation
- Transportation / Traffic
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- None

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case beyond the effects previously identified in the 2000 GUP EIR because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that 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.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

Signature

November 22, 2005
Date

Marina Rush
Printed name

For

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

A. AESTHETICS					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCES
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With GUP or new Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Cause an adverse effect on foreground or middle ground views from a high volume travel way (excluding scenic routes and scenic highways), recreational use area, or other public use area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3,4,12
e) Cause an adverse effect on foreground views from one or more private residences or significantly alter public views?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	11
b) Be inconsistent with the Santa Clara County General Plan regarding Scenic Routes, Scenic Approaches, or Scenic Highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 6a, 17f
d) Create a high intensity light source or glare affecting private residences, passing pedestrians, or motorists?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,4
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2,3,4, 6a,17f, 21a
f) Otherwise substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11, 21a
g) Be located on or near a ridgeline visible from the valley floor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2,17n, 21a

DISCUSSION:

Stanford University is proposing to construct new graduate student housing with 355 units (total of 600 beds) and associated facilities, 1,227-stall, four-story underground parking garage, and restore the Wilbur parking lot currently housing temporary surge trailers to provide 143 parking stalls. To accommodate the project, five existing buildings, Drell, Owen, Rogers, Mariposa and Serra Houses will be relocated from the graduate housing site to other sites on the Stanford campus and one structure, the Campus Bike Shop, will be demolished and the use relocated elsewhere on campus. The project is subject to the County's Architectural and Site Approval (ASA) review process and will conform to architectural, housing, parking, and landscaping standards for development within the Stanford University 2000 General Use Permit (GUP) area.

The project site is flat land within the main campus area of Stanford University, which is already developed with many large structures. There are no scenic vistas or scenic resources that would be affected by this project. Munger Housing Complex consists of five buildings to be sited between Campus Drive East to the south, the Law School and Stern Hall to the north, Wilbur Field to the west, and Lane A with Sigma Nu fraternity, Mars and Columbae House to the east. South of Campus Drive East is a single-family residential neighborhood (San Juan neighborhood) for Stanford faculty and staff. Building 2 and portion of Building 1 facing Campus Drive East are four stories tall and 46 feet in height, similar in size to the Student Service Center building located adjacent to Building 2. Building 3, Building 4, Building 5, and the portion of Building 1 facing Arguello Way are five stories tall and 58 feet in height. The

adjacent buildings to the north are three stories and 56 feet and 29 feet in height. While the new buildings would be slightly taller than the adjacent buildings, they are not significantly different in character, from a visual standpoint, than the existing buildings in the vicinity. The new buildings would also be set back from the street approximately 20 feet from the new emergency access road (80 feet from exterior wall to exterior wall). Therefore, the new buildings would not significantly adversely impact the aesthetic environment in the vicinity of the new buildings. Also, the building setback along Campus Drive East is 50 feet and is approximately 150 feet to the closest single family residence; therefore, it is not anticipated to adversely impact the aesthetic environment of the single family residences nor create shadows that would affect these residences as a result of the project.

The four story parking structure would be located underground and Wilbur Field would be reconstructed on top of the structure for general recreational purposes. The project will include outdoor lighting that is similar to what is currently found around the adjacent campus buildings. Within its developed campus setting, the exterior surfaces of the building will not be a significant source of glare.

The 2000 GUP sets forth requirements for specified visual resources along El Camino Real, Stanford Avenue, and development in the Lathrop District. The project, as proposed, will not be visible from any of these resources.

For these reasons, the project would have a less than significant impact on aesthetic resources.

B. AGRICULTURE 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:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With GUP or New Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Convert 10 or more acres of farmland classified as prime in the report <i>Soils of Santa Clara County</i> to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,23,24,26
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9,21a
c) Conflict with an existing Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,4,26

DISCUSSION:

The project consists of the proposed construction of graduate student housing, associated 4-story underground parking structure and structure relocations in the central campus area. The site is not used for agricultural purposes, not designated as farmland of any type, and is not under a

Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project will not result in possible impacts to agricultural resources.

C. AIR QUALITY					
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With GUP and new Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,28
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,29
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,29
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,29
e) Create objectionable odors or dust affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,21, 29, 47

DISCUSSION:

Long Term Air Quality Impacts:

The project proposes 355 new housing units (total of 600 beds) and associated parking. The 2000 GUP allowed construction for 3,018 housing units. The Program EIR analyzed the potential emissions associated with the GUP/Community Plan at build-out and determined that it was consistent with all air quality plans relevant to the Bay Area (EIR, pg. 4.11.13-15). To date, a total of 433 housing units have been approved under the 2000 GUP. As evaluated in the Fehr & Peers Traffic Report, the project will not generate any new trips beyond that considered in the GUP EIR assumptions for development allowed under the 2000 GUP. Therefore, the project as proposed is consistent with the GUP/Program EIR and will not result in any significant long-term air quality impacts.

Short Term Air Quality Impacts:

The GUP EIR acknowledged that construction-period emissions would be significant, but would be mitigated to less than significant levels. The pollutant of greatest concern associated with construction activities is PM10 (Respirable Particulate Matter), which is generated both by uncontrolled dust and diesel emissions. The San Francisco Bay Area is currently considered non-attainment with the State Standard for PM10 concentrations. Construction activities associated with the housing and underground parking structure will include the excavation of

approximately 220,000 cubic yards of dirt to be hauled offsite, grading and site improvements. Due to the construction activities associated with this project, including the excavation and exportation of the dirt, the project could generate significant amounts of dust and diesel emissions and thus could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. The impacts will be mitigated by application of standard BAAQMD dust-control mitigation measures and GUP mitigation measure AQ-1.

MITIGATION:

AQ.1 The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has identified a set of feasible PM10 control measures for all construction activities. These control measures, as previously required in the Program EIR, shall be adhered to during all construction activities.

- 1. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily;*
- 2. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard;*
- 3. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites;*
- 4. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites;*
- 5. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets;*
- 6. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more);*
- 7. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand,);*
- 8. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mp;*
- 9. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways; and*
- 10. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.*
- 11. Install wheel washers for all existing trucks, or wash off the tires of tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site.*
- 12. Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.*

AQ.2: All construction contractors shall properly maintain the equipment and where feasible, use “clean fuel” equipment and emissions control technology (eg., CNG fired engines, catalytic converters, particulate traps, etc.). Measures to reduce diesel emission would be considered feasible when they are capable of being used on equipment without interfering substantially with equipment performance. (2000 GUP EIR, mitigation measure AQ-1)

Adherence to both the programmatic BAAQMD mitigation measures as well as the GUP required mitigation to reduce diesel emissions will reduce the potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCES
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Gup and new Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
*Questions relating to the California Department of Fish & Game "de minimus impact finding" for the Certificate of Fee Exemption are listed in italics.					
a) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 7, 17b, 17o, 21a
b) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,7, 8a, 17b, 17e, 33
c) <i>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.) or tributary to an already impaired water body, as defined by section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 7, 17n, 32
d) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,7, 17b, 17o
e) <i>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,4
f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources:					
i) Tree Preservation Ordinance [Section C16]?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,31
ii) <i>Wetland Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 25-30]?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 8a
iii) <i>Riparian Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 31-41]?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 8a,

DISCUSSION:

The project sites are in an urban environment, located in the central campus, adjacent to Campus Drive East. The graduate housing and parking structure sites are developed with existing structures primarily used for academic support uses, parking lots, existing pavement, and Wilbur Field. The project site does not provide habitat for special status plant or animal species. Portions of the Stanford Campus support a population of California Tiger Salamander; however, the project site is located outside of the established Stanford University Tiger Salamander Management Zone. There are no special status plant or animal species in this area, with the possible exception of nesting raptors.

Several landscape trees are located throughout the project site, including London plane, Chinese pistache, Raywood Ash, Chinese Elm, redwoods, pines, sweet gum, eucalyptus and oaks, and are primarily located in the parking strips, Salvatierra Walk and surrounding the existing structures. Submitted landscape plans for the project show new trees proposed along the street frontages, perimeter of the new and relocated buildings, and on the interior courtyard. The project proposes to retain 106 trees, remove 30 ordinance sized trees, including 1 oak, with the remainder primarily London Plane, Chinese Pistache and other non-native species including Eucalyptus, and relocate 14 trees, primarily oaks seven to sixteen inches in diameter, to elsewhere on campus. Historically, Stanford has successfully relocated oak trees to alternative sites on campus.

Unless mitigated, the removal of trees protected by the Stanford Community Plan (trees sized over 12 inches in diameter, measured 4.5 above ground, Policy SCP-RC(i)7), Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance, and as outlined in the 2000 GUP EIR, could result in potentially significant biological impacts. Furthermore, during construction, any raptors or migratory birds nesting within mature trees located on the project site could be disrupted, possibly resulting in either nest abandonment or destruction. This would be considered a potentially significant biological impact.

The GUP EIR acknowledged these potentially significant impacts (see GUP Impact BIO-3 (potential impacts to nesting raptors) and GUP Impact BIO-7 (conflicts with the County's tree preservation ordinance). Mitigation measures were identified in the GUP EIR and adopted by the County that reduces these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

MITIGATION:

(Bio.1) Tree Removal: *As identified within the Stanford Community Plan Policy SCP-RC(i)7, 2000 GUP EIR, and as required by GUP Condition K(4), trees protected by the county's tree protection ordinance that are required to be removed will be replaced at the following ratios: 3:1 for oaks and 1:1 for other protected trees. Final landscaping plan shall show the number of trees proposed for removal with their required replacement plantings. Installation of the plantings shall be verified prior to final occupancy. (2000 GUP EIR, mitigation measure BIO-7.)*

(Bio.2) Disturbance to nesting raptors and migratory birds: *Preconstruction surveys for nesting raptors shall be conducted by a qualified ornithologist to identify active raptor nests that may be disturbed during project implementation. Between January and April (inclusive), preconstruction surveys shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction activities or tree removal. Between May and August (inclusive), preconstruction surveys no more than thirty days prior to the initiation of these activities. If an active raptor nest is found in or close enough to the construction area to be disturbed by these activities, the ornithologist shall, in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, designate a construction free buffer zone (typically 250 feet) around the nest. Stanford shall submit a report indicating the result of the survey and any designated buffer zones to the satisfaction of the County Planning Office prior to final inspection on the first demolition, building, or relocation permit issued for the project. (2000 GUP EIR, mitigation measure BIO-3.)*

(Bio.3) Potential impacts to remaining trees: Protective fencing shall be placed around the dripline of all trees sized over 12 inches in diameter, measured 4.5 above ground within the construction staging and project sites, and maintained during all construction activities.

Adherence to the mitigation measures will reduce the potential for significant impacts to a less than significant level.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES					
WOULD THE PROJECT	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Gup and new Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3, 16, 19, 21a, 40, 41
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3, 19, 21a, 40, 41,
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2,3,4,21a,40,41
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 21a, 40,41
e) Change or affect any resource listed in the County Historic Resources Database?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	16, 21a

DISCUSSION:

Archeology

The excavation for the parking structure and grading for the housing and structure relocations could possibly disturb unknown subsurface cultural resources. Potential impacts to archeological resources were evaluated under the 2000 General Use Permit EIR. Analysis within the GUP EIR included a comprehensive survey for potential archeological sites on the Campus. This analysis concluded that areas within or near the Munger Housing Site are unlikely to contain archeological resources. Per programmatic mitigation listed under the 2000 GUP EIR and County Ordinance, the following mitigation shall apply in order to prevent potentially significant impacts to unknown cultural resources:

MITIGATION:

Archeology:

(CUL.1) In the event that previously unidentified historic or prehistoric archaeological resources are discovered during building construction, the contractor shall cease work in the immediate area and the County Planning Office and Campus Archaeologist shall be contacted. An independent qualified archaeologist retained by the County at the expense of Stanford shall assess the significance of the find and make mitigation recommendations. (2000 GUP EIR, mitigation measure HA-2(b).)

(CUL.2) If archeological resources are discovered as described above, construction monitoring shall be conducted at any time ground-disturbing activities (greater than 12 inches in depth) are taking place in the immediate vicinity of the identified resources. If monitoring does not produce evidence of significant cultural resources within the project area, further mitigation shall be limited to construction monitoring, unless additional testing or other specific mitigation measures are determined by a qualified archaeologist to be necessary to ensure avoidance of damage to significant archaeological resources. A technical report of findings describing the results of all monitoring shall be prepared in accordance with professional standards. The archaeological monitoring program shall be implemented by an individual meeting the Secretary of Interior Professional Qualifications Standards in Archaeology (36 CFR 61); individual field monitors shall be qualified in the recognition of cultural resources and possess sufficient academic and field training as required to conduct the work effectively and without undue delay. (2000 GUP EIR, mitigation measure HA-2(b).)

(CUL.3) In the event that human skeletal remains are encountered, the applicant is required by County Ordinance No. B6-18 to immediately notify the County Coroner. Upon determination by the County Coroner that the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission, pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and the County Coordinator of Indian affairs. No further disturbance of the site may be made except as authorized by the County Coordinator Of Indian Affairs in accordance with the provisions of state law and this chapter. If artifacts are found on the site a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted along with the County Planning Office. No further disturbance of the artifacts may be made except as authorized by the County Planning Office. (2000 GUP EIR, mitigation measure HA-2(c).)

(CUL.4) In the event that fossilized shell or bone is uncovered during any earth-disturbing operation, contractors shall stop work in the immediate area of the find and notify the Campus Archaeologist and the County Building Inspector assigned to the project. The Campus Archaeologist shall visit the site and make recommendations for treatment of the find (including but not limited to consultation with a paleontologist and excavation, if warranted), which would be sent to the County Building Inspection Office and the County Planning Office. If a fossil find is confirmed, it will be recorded with the United States Geological Survey and curated in an appropriate repository. (2000 GUP EIR, mitigation measure HA-3.)

Adherence to the mitigation measures will reduce the potential for archeological and paleontological significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Historical Resources:

Historical resource impacts are more fully discussed in **Appendix A**, “Historic Resource Evaluation, Munger Graduate Housing Project” prepared by Carey & Company November 8, 2005. This report evaluates documentation prepared by the Stanford University Land Use and Environmental Planning Office, as well as Archives and Architecture, an independent consultant hired by the County of Santa Clara (as part of a separate project) to reevaluate properties listed in the Santa Clara County Heritage Resource Inventory. Such documentation includes State of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and draft historic context statement entitled: *The development of the Row Area of the Stanford campus (2005.)* The referenced Carey & Company evaluation, which includes mitigation measures, is summarized below.

Historic Context

The project site contains six existing buildings which would be affected by the proposed Munger Graduate Housing project; Griffen-Drell House (constructed circa 1892), Owen House (constructed circa 1896), Mariposa House (constructed circa 1892), Serra House (constructed circa 1924), Rogers House (constructed circa 1892), and Campus Bike Shop (constructed circa 1961.)

The five houses were all constructed as residences in an area of the Stanford campus encompassing Alvarado Row, Salvatierra Street, and Mayfield (formerly Lasuen) Street known as the Row. Stanford University was originally conceived as a residential campus, with housing planned in areas laid out diagonally from the four corners of the Main Quad. However, in the haste to construct the central campus academic buildings, few residences had been constructed by the time faculty arrived in the fall of 1891 when the university doors opened. In an attempt to ameliorate a faculty housing shortage, ten homes were constructed on Alvarado Row. These ten houses became known as the “Decalogue.” Following the construction of these homes, other rental houses along Alvarado Row, Salvatierra Street, and Mayfield (Lasuen) Streets were constructed to house both faculty and students. By 1899, there were more than 40 structures located on the Row. More houses were added to the Decalogue in 1906, 1908 and 1910, and new housing tracts developed to the southeast in 1914.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the character of the Row began to change when new construction was introduced into the area, many existing houses were converted to academic use, and some demolition and relocation of original campus houses occurred. New construction included a new bookstore, post office, White Plaza, Meyer Library, and the Law School. In addition, the Campus Drive Loop was constructed, which interrupted the continuity of Alvarado Row, Salvatierra Street, and Mayfield (formerly Lasuen) Street, and Salvatierra Street was closed north of Campus Drive to create Salvatierra Walk (1974.)

Existing Conditions

All of the subject buildings, except Griffen-Drell House, face Salvatierra Walk, a pedestrian walkway that leads into the Law School and heart of the Stanford Campus. Four of the houses have previously been converted to academic uses. Griffen-Drell House, located on Alvarado Row, remains a private residence.

Historic Resource Evaluation

Carey & Company conducted a peer review of previously prepared documentation completed for the six buildings: Griffen-Drell House, Owen House, Mariposa House, Serra House, Rogers House, and Campus Bike Shop.

Eligible

Carey & Company determined that Griffen-Drell House, Owen House, and Mariposa House, are eligible for listing in both the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources according to Criteria C and 3 respectively, as listed below:

National Register of Historic Places / Criterion C

Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

California Register of Historical Resources / Criterion 3

It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values;

The Griffen-Drell House, Owen House, and Mariposa House were all designed by Charles E. Hodges, resident Stanford architect from 1891 until 1906. The designs are believed to be based on pattern books widely available at the time. The houses embody distinctive characteristics of Shingle Style architecture, and the period of construction within the context of regional architecture. The Griffen-Drell House, Owen House and Mariposa House are significant as distinguishable entities in the context of late nineteenth century residential architecture in Santa Clara County.

Ineligible

Carey & Company determined that Rogers House, Serra House and the Campus Bike Shop are not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources, and are thus not “historic resources” as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act.

Rogers House was found not to meet Criterion A of the National Register or Criterion 1 of the California Register because it is not associated with either the initial development of the Row area of the Stanford University campus, or the university’s Board of Trustees decision to change land uses in the Row area. The property is also not associated with any important personages as required in Criterion B of the National Register and Criterion 2 of the California Register. It would appear to be eligible under Criterion C of the National Register and Criterion 3 of the California Register as it “is a somewhat significant and distinguishable entity in the context of late nineteenth century residential architecture, and the structure embodies distinctive characteristics of the Shingle Style and the period of construction within the context of regional architecture. However, the historic integrity of the house has been compromised by additions to the front façade and rear elevations, and alterations to the front façade including the removal of an original second story porch balcony, railings and openings.

Serra House was found not to meet Criterion A of the National Register or Criterion 1 of the California Register because the university’s Board of Trustees decision to build a home for the Chancellor does not rise to the level of a significant event. The property is also not associated with any important personages as required in Criterion B of the National Register and Criterion 2 of the California Register. Although associated with David Starr Jordan, Stanford’s first president, the house was his retirement home and not closely associated with important aspects of his career. Serra House does not appear to be eligible under Criterion C of the National Register and Criterion 3 of the California Register because it is a modest example of the Spanish Eclectic style. Although designed by renowned Palo Alto architect Birge Clark, Serra House is not a distinguished example of his work. In addition, the house was moved from its original location (330 Serra Street) in 1983 and its front entry modified.

The Campus Bike Shop was found not to meet Criterion A, B or C of the National Register or Criterion 1, 2 or 3 of the California Register because it is not compatible in use, scale or age with the Row area. The Campus Bike Shop is not associated with any important personages and does

not distinguish itself architecturally. In addition, the building was moved to its present location circa 1961, less than 50 years ago. Relocation contributed to the finding of ineligibility.

Impacts to Historic Resources

The GUP EIR acknowledged that development authorized by the GUP could have a significant impact on historical resources (2000 GUP EIR, Impact HA 1.) The GUP EIR also concluded that it was not possible to determine whether this impact could be mitigated until a site-specific impact evaluation was conducted (2000 GUP EIR, p. 4.9 11.)

The Munger Graduate Housing Project proposes to demolish the Campus Bike Shop and to relocate Griffen-Drell House, Owen House, Mariposa House, Rogers House and Serra House to two areas on the Stanford Campus.

Relocation Site 1

Griffen-Drell House and Owen House are proposed for relocation to a parking lot directly southwest of the Munger complex. In this location, the buildings will face Lane A and Building 5 of the Munger Complex. Lane A is proposed to be reconstructed as a street. The rear of the buildings will face the Mars (constructed circa 1896) and Sigma Nu (constructed circa 1896) buildings, which line Mayfield Avenue to the west.

Relocation Site 2

Mariposa House, Rogers House, Serra House are proposed for relocation to the Tressider Parking Lot, approximately 1/4 mile west of their current site. In this location the buildings will be grouped together in a row, facing a new pedestrian pathway leading from Mayfield Avenue to the Faculty Club, Tressider Union, and other Stanford Campus buildings. The houses will face the Betchel International Center (constructed circa 1920), situated across the pathway, and will back up to the Tressider Parking lot. Both relocation projects/site include landscaping and pedestrian improvements.

Evaluation of Relocation Site 1

The Carey & Company evaluation determined that the relocation of Owen House and Griffen-Drell House to the proposed site would not result in substantial adverse impacts to these buildings. The setting of the buildings would generally remain, as the proposed relocation site is directly adjacent to their present locations and within the Mayfield/East Campus Drive/Alvarado Row area. They would maintain their relationship to a street by facing Lane A. The historic resources' associative value would generally not be affected by their relocation. The historic significance of the Griffen-Drell House and Owen House is derived from their distinctive design in the Shingle Style, which is not location dependent.

Per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties the new context of the relocation site was evaluated for historic compatibility. Carey & Company concluded that the neighboring buildings facing Mayfield, Sigma Nu fraternity Mars and Columbae House, are of a similar height and would not overwhelm the two relocated buildings. Building 5 of the Munger Complex is four and one-half stories high, taller than both Owen House and Griffen-Drell House, and larger in scale. However, given their highly distinguishable architectural design, the houses would continue to maintain their historical significance. Siting two nearly identical, and highly visible buildings next to each other also reinforces their unique character. The addition of extensive landscaping throughout the new site and elements such as a

new sidewalk and walkways and the large number of trees will contribute to retaining the historic setting and feeling of Owen House and Griffen-Drell House.

Evaluation of Relocation Site 2

Carey & Company also determined that the relocation of Mariposa House, Rogers House and Serra House to the Tressider Parking lot site would not result in substantial adverse impacts to these buildings, particularly Mariposa House, a significant historic resource. The houses would form a complex of buildings that are similar in scale with each other, therefore contributing to the retention of the historic resource's setting. Currently Mariposa House faces Salvatierra Walk, a pedestrian walkway. The building would continue to maintain this relationship by facing a newly created walkway extending between Lagunita Drive and Mayfield Avenue. Also, the historic resource's associative value would generally not be affected by its relocation. The Mariposa House's historic significance is derived from its distinctive design in the Shingle Style, which is not location dependent.

Summary of Evaluation

In summary, there would be no potentially significant impacts to the three significant historic resources (Griffen-Drell House, Owen House, and Mariposa House) related to contextual changes (environment) associated with the relocation of the buildings.

Evaluation of Physical Move

In addition to evaluating the contextual changes associated with the relocation of the buildings, Carey & Company also evaluated proposed physical alterations to the three significant historic resource (Griffen-Drell House, Owen House, and Mariposa House) and potential impacts associated with physically moving the structures. Carey & Company concluded that mitigation measures would be needed to prevent potentially significant impacts to Griffen-Drell House, Owen House, and Mariposa House which may result from the proposed move and resulting rehabilitation work (alterations.)

MITIGATION:

As outlined in the Historical Evaluation prepared by Carey & Company, the following mitigations will apply, which are consistent with mitigation measure HA 1 in the 2000 GUP EIR and adopted MMRP:

(CUL.5) All proposed alterations or modifications, and relocation actions associated with Griffen-Drell House, Owen House, and Mariposa House shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

(CUL.6) BUILDING DOCUMENTATION: Prior to issuance of building permits for relocation of the Griffen-Drell House, Mariposa House and Owen House, a documentation package shall be submitted to the County of Santa Clara for review and approval by the County Historical Heritage Coordinator. Two approved documentation packages would be sent to two repositories identified by the County of Santa Clara. The documentation package shall include measured drawings (floor plans and elevations), photographs (each principal facade, interior, setting – outbuildings, landscaping, unusual features), and the State of California DPR 523 forms for the three significant historic resources. The form and content of this documentation shall meet the specifications as outlined under Mitigation Measure 1 (4.1.1) as listed in the Carey & Company Historic Resources Evaluation.

(CUL.7) RELOCATION PLAN: Prior to issuance of building permits for relocation of the Griffen-Drell House, Mariposa House and Owen House, a detailed relocation plan shall be submitted to the County of Santa Clara for review and approval by the Historical Heritage Coordinator. The relocation plan shall contain the following elements/performance standards:

- A. Existing Conditions. Evaluation of the existing physical conditions of the buildings by a qualified historical architect. If any structural conditions are present that require the services of a qualified structural engineer, the engineer would be consulted for assessment and recommendations. All existing conditions such as existing cracks, deterioration. Damage shall be noted on drawings. Consideration shall be given to attaching crack monitors to existing cracks per recommendations by the structural engineer. Minimum qualifications for the historical architect and structural engineer are listed in Attachments D and E of the Carey & Company report.*
- B. Moving Plan. A proposed moving plan, prepared in conjunction by a qualified moving contractor, historical architect, and structural engineer. The selected moving contractor shall document that they possesses a minimum of ten (10) years experience in moving historic structures. Plans shall be reviewed for compliance with the Secretary's of the Interior's Standards. If warranted, the County may contract with an outside reviewer with previous experience in moving historic structures, or with a historical architect, to peer review submitted moving plans.*
- C. Storage Plan. If the Griffen-Drell House, Mariposa House and Owen House are proposed to be moved to their respective relocation sites, but not permanently placed on their new foundations, or fully rehabilitated according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, plans shall be prepared and submitted showing that each structure will be secured and protected as follows:*
 - All windows and doors shall be protected and secured to prevent unwanted entry.*
 - The buildings shall be protected from water intrusion.*
 - The buildings shall be naturally ventilated.*
 - If the buildings are proposed to be cut apart and moved in two or more pieces, each piece would remain separate from the other and not joined at the new site until they can be set on new, permanent foundations. The open ends of the buildings shall be secured as outlined in the previous three bullet points.*
 - All buildings shall be set on temporary foundations consisting of steel beams and cribbing.*
 - All buildings on temporary foundations shall be inspected by a structural engineer on a monthly basis to evaluate for increased opportunities for damage through settling or shifting of the structures. Reports summarizing this inspection and results shall be submitted to the Planning Office at the discretion of the Historical Heritage Coordinator.*
 - The storage plan shall detail the proposed length of time that each building will be on temporary foundations. The buildings will not be allowed to be stored on the temporary foundations for more than one year unless approved by the County Historical Heritage Coordinator.*

(CUL.8) BUILDING REHABILITATION PLAN: Prior to issuance of building permits for the relocation and rehabilitation of the Griffen-Drell House, Mariposa House and Owen House, a detailed rehabilitation plan shall be submitted to the County of Santa Clara for review and

approval by the Historical Heritage Coordinator in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. This rehabilitation plan will be subject to approval by the Santa Clara County Historical Heritage Commission (HHC). The rehabilitation plan shall contain the following elements/performance standards:

- A. *Griffen-Drell House and Owen House.* Eliminate the proposed new wood deck connecting the two buildings. In its place, consideration would be given to a new design that would use one disabled access ramp with connections to the two buildings, but without an extensive deck and bringing the upper floor stairs down to the ground instead of the deck. This latter design would eliminate the need for the steps that lead from the proposed deck to the ground. A new landscape design would be prepared.
- B. *Griffen-Drell House.*
Submit historical evidence for design of the entrance and window at north elevation and the two windows.
- C. *Owen House.*
Submit historical evidence for design of the entrance and window at south elevation and two windows at east elevation.
- D. *Mariposa House.*
 1. Submit historical evidence for design of proposed new features, including new second floor window and restoration of the original balcony at north elevation, and third floor window at dormer, two new windows proposed for the second floor and new first floor door at the south elevation.
 2. Submit design for disabled access ramp.

Adherence to all of the mitigation measures listed above will mitigate any potentially significant cultural resources impacts to a less than significant level.

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With GUP and New Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6, 17L, 21a, 43
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6, 17c, 18b, 21a

iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6, 17c, 17n, 18b, 21a
iv)	Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 17L, 21a, 118b
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6, 2, 3, 21a
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 17c, 21a, 23, 24, 42
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the report, <i>Soils of Santa Clara County</i> , creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	14, 21a, 23, 24,
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,6, 21a, 23, 24,
f)	Cause substantial compaction or over-covering of soil either on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 6, 21a
g)	Cause substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 6, 21a, 42

DISCUSSION:

The 2000 GUP EIR provided a thorough analysis of the potential geology, soils and seismicity issues associated with GUP-related development and concluded that compliance with existing codes and standard would ensure that there would be no significant impacts. (2000 GUP EIR, Chapter 4.6.)

Pursuant to the GUP EIR (4.6.C), no active or potentially active faults have been mapped in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The San Andreas Fault, a major regional fault is located about five miles southwest from the project site. The Stock Farm Monocline, an area requiring special studies prior to construction, is located approximately 650 feet east of parking structure. Liquefaction and differential settlement have not been identified as hazards on the site. The site is not located in a landslide zone and is generally flat. Therefore, there is relatively little potential for erosion.

Although the project site is not on earthquake fault, it is within the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area. However, planning, design, and construction of all new structures and support facilities are carried out on a project-specific basis according to California and Santa Clara County standards. The Munger Housing Project and parking structure will entail extensive grading, over 220,000 cubic yards of dirt will be excavated and hauled offsite. The required grading will be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set forth by the County Grading Ordinance, and be evaluated by the County Land Development Engineering Office as part of the grading permit and conditions contained therein for this project. The buildings will be designed and built in conformance with the requirements of the Santa Clara County Geologic Ordinance and the California Uniform Building Code.

Furthermore, the County Geologist confirmed that the proposed parking structure is not within the Zone of Special Consideration along the lower hinge of the Stockfarm monocline. However, it is between the lower and upper hinges, and therefore a geologic evaluation report for the project will be required as follows:

(Geo.1) Prior to issuance of the building permit, submit for review by the County Geologist, three copies of a geologic evaluation report that addresses the potential for ground tilting to affect the structure. In addition, prior to Final Inspection, submit a Geologist's Construction Observations Letter that discusses the nature of exposures created during the construction of the parking structure. Any evidence of past ground deformation must be documented.

G. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS					
WOULD THE PROJECT	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With GUP and New Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	No Impact	
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 21a
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 5, 21a
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21a, 46
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21a, 47
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 21a, 22a
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5, 21a, 48
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4, 21a
h) Provide breeding grounds for vectors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 21a
i) Proposed site plan result in a safety hazard (i.e., parking layout, access, closed community, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 21a
j) Involve construction of a building, road or septic system on a slope of 30% or greater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 17n, 21a
k) Involve construction of a roadway greater than 20% slope for a distance of 300' or more?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 17n, 21a

DISCUSSION:

The Munger Housing project and parking structure will not result in the use or storage of any hazardous materials on the project site following completion. During construction, diesel fuel and other materials associated with construction equipment will be used, as is the case with all construction projects. All hazardous materials handled during construction shall be done per OSHA and other applicable regulatory standards. The project will not interfere with emergency response plan or emergency access plan, and will maintain Campus Drive East open during construction. The project site is flat and does not involve construction of structures or roadways on slopes greater than 20%. Therefore, the project will not result in any possible significant impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials.

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With GUP and New Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	34, 36
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3, 4
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 17n
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Note policy regarding flood retention in watercourse and restoration of riparian vegetation for West Branch of the Llagas.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
e) Create or contribute increased impervious surfaces and associated runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 36, 21a
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 18b, 18d
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 18b, 18d
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 4
j)	Be located in an area of special water quality concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4, 6a,
k)	Be located in an area known to have high levels of nitrates in well water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4
l)	Result in a septic field being constructed on soil where a high water table extends close to the natural land surface?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
m)	Result in a septic field being located within 50 feet of a drainage swale; 100 feet of any well, water course or water body or 200 feet of a reservoir at capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3

DISCUSSION:

Groundwater Recharge

The project site does not contain any creeks or streams and is not within an area of special water quality concern or contain high nitrate levels. In addition, there are no existing septic systems on site and none are proposed. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. As evaluated within the 2000 GUP EIR, the Munger Housing project, parking structure and structure relocations are located within sub area M-5 of the Matadero Creek Watershed. This sub area is located inside the “unconfined zone” where groundwater recharge occurs on campus.

Due to the extent of existing structures and paving currently existing on-site, the project, as proposed, will reduce the total amount of impervious surface. Thus, the project individually is not expected to have impacts on groundwater recharge. This issue is addressed in the 2000 GUP EIR (Impact HWQ-1). The adopted mitigation measure for this impact allows Stanford to do a site-specific groundwater recharge study for each project, or to do a comprehensive study and mitigation. (Mitigation measure HWQ-2.) Stanford has chosen to do the comprehensive study and mitigation. Stanford is currently completing a campus-wide recharge plan to mitigate lost recharge from all projects in the unconfined zone. In the meantime, Stanford will comply with the interim plan to divert additional creek water and convey it to Lake Lagunita for percolation.

Stormwater Runoff

In accordance with the modified C3 provisions of the NPDES permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, all projects that will result in the creation of new or replaced surfaces which are greater than one acre in size shall install permanent facilities designed to prevent pollutants in stormwater runoff from impacting downstream water bodies. The project proposes pavers and other porous pavement surfaces for the internal pedestrian/emergency access circulation and vegetated buffers. The parking structure also functions as an underground detention basin and biofilter. In addition to this, pursuant to mitigation measure HWQ-1 in the 2000 GUP EIR, Stanford has elected to prepare a comprehensive hydrology and drainage study and has completed a Storm Drainage Detention Master Plan to address C3 on a regional

approach. The Master Plan proposes several detention basins on campus in the Matadero watershed to accommodate increased runoff. Construction of the Serra Street at El Camino basin was completed in Summer 2005. This basin can accommodate 19 acres of development, and the proposed project is approximately 7.5 acres. Therefore, for any additional drainage impacts which cannot be accompanied by site specific improvements, flows will be diverted to the Serra/El Camino basin system to comply with the C3 requirements. Final details will be shown on final grading and building plans for approval by the County.

In summary, the project will not result in any significant impacts related to hydrology & water quality impacts.

I. LAND USE					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With GUP and New Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 4
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, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 9, 18a
c) Conflict with special policies:					
i) San Martin &/or South County?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 8a, 20
ii) Los Gatos Specific Plan or Lexington Watershed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 8a, 22c
iii) New Almaden Historical Area/Guadalupe Watershed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 8a
iv) Stanford?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 21
v) City of Morgan Hill Urban Growth Boundary Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 17a
vi) West Valley Hillside Preservation Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 8a

DISCUSSION:

Stanford University is proposing to construct new graduate student housing with 355 units (total of 600 beds) and associated facilities, 1,227-stall, four-story underground parking garage, utility improvements, and restore the Wilbur parking lot currently housing temporary surge trailers to provide 143 parking stalls. To accommodate the project, five existing buildings, Drell, Owen, Rogers, Mariposa and Serra Houses will be relocated from the graduate housing site to other sites on Stanford campus and one structure, Campus Bike Shop, will be demolished and the use relocated elsewhere on campus. Also, during the construction phase a temporary parking lot will be created adjacent to the Law School with up to 108 parking stalls. The project proposal is subject to the County’s Architectural and Site Approval (ASA) review process and will conform to architectural, housing, parking, and landscaping standards for development within the Stanford University 2000 General Use Permit (GUP) area.

The Munger Graduate Housing site is generally bounded by Campus Drive East to the south, Arguello Way to the east, Stern Hall and Nathan Abbott Way to the north, and Lane A to the

west. The parking structure is east of the housing site, at Wilbur Field. Wilbur Field will be restored on the roof of the underground structure. The relocation sites for the five existing structures are Lane A for the Drell House and Owen House, immediately west of the project site, and the west side of the Tressider parking lot for the Rogers House, Mariposa House, and Serra House, approximately 1,100 feet west of the housing site. The project, as proposed, will not result in any potentially significant land use impacts.

J. NOISE					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACTS				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8a, 13, 22a, 45
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	13
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 5
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 5
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or private airstrip would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 5, 22a

DISCUSSION:

Long Term (Project)

The project entails construction of a graduate residential facility and underground parking garage, with the relocation of five homes to other locations on the Stanford Campus. Due to the nature of the use proposed (Residential), the project is not anticipated to cause any potentially significant long-term noise impacts.

Long Term (Traffic)

As evaluated within the Traffic Section, construction of the Munger facility will not result in the creation of any additional traffic beyond assumed traffic levels within the 2000 GUP EIR, and confirming that the cumulative project impacts and project trip generation totals are consistent with that analyzed in the GUP EIR. In evaluating potential noise impacts generated by cumulative traffic under build-out of the GUP, the GUP EIR concluded that noise impacts would be less than significant. As the proposed Munger facility will only generate a portion of the cumulative traffic assumed under the GUP, noise impacts associated with project generated traffic will be less than significant.

Short Term (Construction Traffic Noise)

As discussed in the project description and further within the Traffic Section, construction of the Munger Graduate project will include excavation and hauling offsite of over 220,000 cubic yards of dirt from the proposed underground parking garage at Wilber Field. While it is anticipated that at least a portion of this dirt (50,000 cubic yards) will be used at another construction project on the Stanford Campus (Stanford Football Stadium Renovation), a majority of the dirt will need to be hauled away offsite. As the excavation phase of the project is estimated to take 20 weeks, and assuming that each truck can haul away 25 cubic yards of dirt, approximately 60 to 70 truck trips (two way) per day will be required.

While this additional truck traffic could result in perceptible increases in noise levels along construction routes, this impact will be less than significant as trucks will be required to adhere to an approved truck route (see Mitigation TR3 in the traffic section) which avoids residential areas. In addition, increases in traffic noise associated with hauling away dirt will be temporary per the construction schedule, as this phase will take approximately 5 months.

Short Term (Construction Noise)

During construction, extensive construction equipment and large earthmoving equipment will be used to complete the project. Construction is proposed to start as early as February 2006, and will take approximately two years to finish. Construction is scheduled to occur in phases, consisting of construction of the underground parking structure (under Wilber Field), construction of the Munger Graduate Residence complex, relocation of the five existing homes, and related utility improvements.

Construction of the parking structure is scheduled to start in February 2006, beginning with the excavation, which will last for approximately 20 weeks. The construction of the garage, following the excavation, will take approximately 19 months, with a target complete date of mid December 2007. Relocation of the five houses (Owen, Drell, Rogers, Mariposa, & Serra) is scheduled to also start in February 2006 and will be completed within approximately 7 1/2 months. The Munger Graduate Housing complex is scheduled to start in April 2006 with initial grading and foundation placement. Construction of the buildings will begin in August 2006, with a target complete date of July 2007 for buildings 1-3 and November 2007 for buildings 4 and 5.

Construction activities will include extensive site preparation and excavation, including the removal and hauling offsite of approximately 220,000 cubic yards underneath Wilber Field for the underground parking structure. Pavement demolition and tree removal will be required at the proposed Munger Complex site, and site preparation will also be needed at the two relocation sites, although at a reduced scale. For all three areas, this demolition, grading, and site preparation activities is expected to take 6 months, lasting between February and August 2006.

The majority of construction activities will be associated with building the Graduate Housing Complex (5 buildings) and underground parking garage, which in total will take approximately 19 months, lasting between July 2006 and December 2007.

Construction equipment will include large earthmoving equipment and steel erection equipment including cranes. The construction equipment will vary with the phase of construction, for example, the excavation and site preparation phases will include excavators, graders, backhoes,

and cement trucks, while the building construction phase will use cranes, compressors, etc. In order to construct the Munger residences, pile driving may be required.

Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7AM and 7PM, Monday through Saturday, with no construction activity occurring after 7PM or on Sundays.

Uses surrounding the project site include academic facilities and residences, all within the Stanford Campus property. The closest non-Stanford property is located approximately 1/2 mile east of the site along Stanford Avenue. Surrounding on-campus uses include two residential dorms (Wilbur & Stern Halls), Academic uses (Law School & Kresge Auditorium) Student / Community facilities (Columbae & Mars) and a residential neighborhood (San Juan District), largely consisting of single family homes. Uses adjacent to the Tressider parking lot where three homes will be relocated include a residential dorm (Florence Moor Hall) and academic uses (Faculty Club / Bechtel Center).

The 2000 General Use Permit EIR evaluated ambient noise levels at several locations on and off the Stanford Campus. This included 1330 Mirrielees Apartments, located along Campus Drive, approximately 1/8 of a mile east of Wilbur Field. Ambient noise levels were calculated at 58.8 dBA Leq for average ambient noise. Given the close proximity to the project site and similar background, a similar ambient noise level (approximately 59 dBA Leq) is expected to be present at the project site.

Regulatory Setting

As construction noise is temporary in nature, it is not addressed within the County General Plan. Instead, construction noise is regulated by County Noise Ordinance, which sets maximum noise levels for both the short-term operation of mobile equipment and long-term operation of stationary equipment. Short-term thresholds are applied to operations, which occur for less than 10 days in length. As the Munger Graduate Housing project will be under construction for much longer, the long-term thresholds shall apply. Under the noise ordinance, where technically and economically feasible, construction activities will be conducted in a manner that the maximum noise levels at affected properties will not exceed the following standards:

As above,		Multi Family Residential	Single Family Residential	outlined project
	Daily, 7am – 7pm, except Sunday & Holidays	65 dBA	60 dBA	
	Daily 7pm – 7am, all day Sundays & Holidays	55 dBA	50 dBA	

construction will only occur during daytime hours and will not last beyond 7pm at night or at any time on Sunday. Thus, only the Daytime 65 dBA and 60 dBA thresholds would apply. The 2000 GUP EIR evaluated anticipated noise impacts, which would occur with all anticipated construction activities for cumulative housing to be built under the General Use Permit. This included an analysis of typical construction noise associated with different construction phases. As outlined in Table 4.12-7 of the GUP EIR and as abridged below, construction noise would likely be between 75 and 84 dBA at a distance of 50 feet and between 65 and 75 dBA at a distance of 150 feet.

The	50 feet	150 feet	closest
Demolition	84 dBA	75 dBA	
Site Preparation	81 dBA	71 dBA	
Building Shell	75 dBA	65 dBA	
Pile Driving	95 dBA	85 dBA	

residential property not on Stanford Campus is over 1/2 mile (2,600+ feet) to the east, thus noise impacts at this location (due to noise reduction over distance) for the loudest construction activities during demolition would be not be louder than 51 dBA Leq. If pile driving is proposed, estimated noise levels at the closest off-site residence would be approximately 61 dBA Leq. This estimate does not account for attenuation provided by intervening buildings, which would likely reduce noise levels lower. Thus, all construction noise off the Stanford campus is estimated to be below the Noise Ordinance thresholds.

In evaluating possible construction noise impacts to residential uses on the Stanford campus, the 2000 GUP EIR states "...[N]oise sensitive areas within and outside of the Stanford campus center would be exposed to high noise levels especially during demolition and site preparation. Because the County's noise ordinance only controls noise levels at the property line, noise impacts would only be considered significant if they affected off campus receptors" This noise analysis concludes by stating "Impacts to receptors within the campus are not considered significant" (2000 GUP EIR, p. 4.12-18).

In summary, the proposed Munger Graduate Housing project would create temporary noise impacts which are consistent with the analysis included within the 2000 GUP EIR. Due to the distance between the construction project and the closest sensitive receptors off the Stanford property, noise impacts will be below adopted County Noise Ordinance thresholds and thus less than significant. As there are no new circumstances or no new significant impacts associated with the project, which fall outside of the analysis included within the 2000 GUP EIR, no additional environmental analysis is warranted at this time. Nevertheless, consistent with the GUP EIR, the following programmatic noise mitigations will apply to the project to ensure that any construction noise impacts are less than significant:

MITIGATION:

- *A construction noise mitigation plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Office prior to the issuance of final construction permits (grading / building) showing how attenuation devices, construction timing, and other mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize noise disturbance during construction activities. Per programmatic mitigation listed in the GUP EIR, the plan shall contain the following elements:*
 - *Use of best available noise control techniques such as engine enclosures, intake and exhaust silencers on equipment.*
 - *Use of a noise attenuating jacket around jackhammers*
 - *Limitations on simultaneous use of the noisiest construction equipment, such as the Pavement Breakers, Jackhammers, and Graders.*
 - *Measures to notice the public (on and off campus) of construction activities and temporary noise impacts.*

- *If pile driving will be used, hours shall be limited to between 9 am and 4pm, Monday through Friday.*
- *Coordination of classroom relocations before demolition and site preparation activities.*
- *One sign shall be posted along Campus Drive East adjacent to the project site, no smaller than 1,296 square inches in size, containing the name, telephone number, and email address of the appropriate Stanford person the public may contact to register a complaint about construction noise. Stanford shall keep a written record of all such complaints and shall provide copies of these records to the County Planning Office.*

K. POPULATION AND HOUSING					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With GUP and New Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Induce substantial growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4

DISCUSSION:

The Munger Housing project includes construction of 355 housing units (total of 600 beds). On December 12, 2000, Santa Clara County approved the 2000 Stanford University Community Plan and General Use Permit (GUP) governing development projects on the Stanford campus. The GUP allows Stanford to construct up to 2,035,000 net square feet of academic and academic support uses, 3,018 new housing units, and 2,300 net new parking spaces. As of September 1, 2005, Stanford has received building permits for 121,262 gsf of academic/academic space, 433 new housing units, and developed 305 net new parking stalls.

The 2000 GUP requires Stanford to build housing units commensurate with the development of academic development, with the first threshold at 605 housing units for 500,000 gsf of academic development. Table 2 of the GUP also identified the general distribution of new housing units between the various campus districts, and identified a total 1,495 new student housing units for the East Campus district and 0 units in Campus Center district. As indicated above, this project straddles both of these districts; 150 units (248 beds) would be located on the East Campus district side of the boundary, and 205 units (352 beds) would be located on the Central Campus side of the boundary. Pursuant to GUP Condition D.5 (Permitting and Environmental Review as specified in F.2.A and F.4.B (Housing), housing units may be developed on sites other than those specified in Figure 2 of the GUP subject to environmental review. Further, the distribution of housing in a development district may deviate from that identified on GUP Table 2 (Proposed Distribution of Residential Development), provided a proposal for an increase in housing in one development district is accompanied by an identified

corresponding decrease in housing in one of the other districts, and the proposed deviation is evaluated through an environmental assessment and approved by the Santa Clara County Planning Commission, which is the process that will be followed for this project. Stanford identified a corresponding 205-unit decrease for East Campus providing a new total 2000 GUP net additional housing units with the construction of this project of 788 for the Stanford campus.

L. PUBLIC SERVICES					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With GUP and New Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
i) Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
ii) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
iii) School facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5

DISCUSSION:

The Munger Housing project includes construction of 355 housing units (total 600 beds). On December 12, 2000, Santa Clara County approved the 2000 Stanford University Community Plan and General Use Permit (GUP) governing development projects on the Stanford campus. The GUP allows Stanford to construct up to 2,035,000 net square feet of academic and academic support uses, 3,018 new housing units, and 2,300 net new parking spaces. As of September 1, 2005, Stanford has received building permits for 121,262 gsf of academic/academic space, 433 new housing units, and developed 305 net new parking stalls. This project is consistent with the housing units, academic space and net new parking stalls allowed under the 2000 GUP, which were analyzed in the 2000 GUP EIR. Therefore, the project as proposed would not create a significant impact to existing facilities.

M. RESOURCES AND RECREATION					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With GUP and New Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	

a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 6, 44
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site as delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 6,8a
c)	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 4, 5
d)	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5
e)	Be on, within or near a public or private park, wildlife reserve, or trail or affect existing or future recreational opportunities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	17h, 21a
f)	Result in loss of open space rated as high priority for acquisition in the "Preservation 20/20" report?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	27

DISCUSSION:

The project site is located in the urban area of the Stanford campus. It does not contain any known or designated mineral resources. The residents will use recreational facilities in the area, but are unlikely to cause significant deterioration to existing facilities. Wilbur Field, currently used as informal recreational field used by the general university population, will be reconstructed on the roof level of the underground parking structure. The proposed project will not result in the loss of mineral resources or any significant impacts on the environment as a result of the use of the recreational facilities. Therefore, the project as proposed would not create a significant impact to existing facilities.

N. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC						
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE	
	YES			NO		
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With GUP and New Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 49, 53
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 49, 50, 53
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5, 6, 7, 53

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 5, 6,7, 53
e) Result in inadequate emergency access ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 48, 53
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	52, 53
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 21a
h) Not provide safe access, obstruct access to nearby uses or fail to provide for future street right of way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 6, 7, 53

DISCUSSION:

Long term traffic:

Condition G.11 of the Stanford General Use Permit (GUP) requires that a project specific traffic analysis be prepared for projects that my result in a substantially different trip generation than what was evaluated in the 2000 GUP EIR or that could substantially increase overall traffic beyond that evaluated in the 2000 GUP EIR. A two-part project specific traffic report was prepared for the project by Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants entitled “Munger Graduate Residence / PS-6 Project: GUP EIR Intersection Evaluation” (Fehr & Peers, July 2005) and “Munger Graduate Residence / PS-6 Project: Site Access & Circulation Study” (Fehr & Peers November 2005). A peer review of the Fehr & Peers Munger Graduate Housing/PS6 Traffic Reports was completed by a County-retained traffic consultant, KORVE Engineering, and is presented in two memorandums dated October 11, 2005 and November 7, 2005. These documents are contained in their entirety in Appendix B.

The traffic study concluded and KORVE confirmed that the cumulative project impacts and project trip generation totals are consistent with that analyzed in the GUP EIR. The traffic study concluded that the total trip generation at GUP EIR build-out is 311 AM peak hour trips and 588 PM peak hour trips, the cumulative trip generation with Munger/PS6 represents 46% of the AM build-out total and 22% of the PM build-out total (pg. 8, Feer & Peers, July 2005). In addition, the (cut) through traffic in the project vicinity is consistent with that analyzed in the 2000 GUP EIR. Therefore, the re-allocation of the housing units from East Campus to Central Campus will have no appreciable effect on the projected turning movement growth at the GUP intersections. In addition, the project proposal includes widening the Bowdoin Street/Campus Drive East intersection and providing a 4-way stop, which improves the intersection movements and will achieve a LOS B.

The primary vehicular access to the Munger project site is provided from Campus Drive East via either Arguello Way along the east side of the project or Lane “A” along the west side of the project. While Arguello Way will remain open to general traffic, only service vehicles, emergency vehicles and a small number of drivers using the metered parking on Galvez Street will use this access route. Retractable bollards will be installed on Bowdoin St. the roadway connection to Wilbur Hall east of Arguello Way to avoid traffic from the new parking structure circulating around this area. Lane “A” will be reconfigured to provide additional on-street parking and will continue to provide access to vehicles parking in the Haas parking lot or visiting the post office or bookstore. Lane A will also connect to an emergency route along Nathan Abbott Way, which connects to Galvez Street, providing a complete loop around the proposed Munger facility.

The primary vehicular access to the new parking structure will be via the north leg of Bowdoin Street at its intersection with Campus Drive East. Bowdoin Street will provide access to the reconfigured Wilber parking lot as well as the new parking structure. The north leg of the Campus Drive East/ Bowdoin St. intersection will be widened to accommodate a shared through right lane and separate left turn lane, and a four-way stop will be provided. Bowdoin Street, past the intersection, will be widened to 31 feet to accommodate two travel lanes and a bicycle lane in each direction. This roadway will curve around the reconstructed corner of the Wilber parking lot and connect to the new parking structure's ingress / egress ramps and continue south to access Campus Drive East. This access will be right-turn in / right turn out due to the existing median on Campus Drive East and the close proximity to the Vaden Health Center driveway.

Intersection operations were evaluated using traffic analysis software that calculated Level of Service (LOS) values for the impacted intersections based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology. The Campus Drive East/Bowdoin Street intersection currently functions as two closely spaced all-way stop intersections due to the large median on Campus Drive separating the eastbound and westbound lanes. The intersection operation analysis for these two intersections shows they currently operate at LOS B or better. An LOS B indicates that the intersection functions with short traffic delays. However, field observations showed that the delays were greater than what was calculated. The discrepancy was attributed to the unusual configuration created by the short distance between the two intersections. However, it is noted in the report prepared by Fehr & Peers that the traffic analysis software can still be used to generally determine the effects of the added project traffic. Taking into consideration the estimated added project traffic, the LOS levels are estimated to remain at LOS B or better except for the northbound PM trips, which result in an LOS F. An LOS F is defined as extreme traffic delays with intersection capacity exceeded. The intersection at Campus Drive East and Bowdoin Street will be reconfigured into a conventional 4-way stop and with the built project will operate at LOS B or better. Reconfiguration of the existing intersection will require the narrowing of the median between Vaden Health Center and Bowdoin Street to remove the need for an intermediate stop at that intersection. Also, the curb line adjacent to the Wilbur Parking Lot between Parking Structure 6 and Bowdoin St. will be adjusted south to provide consistent lanes in the westbound direction towards Junipero Serra Boulevard.

The project complies with the 2000 GUP EIR analysis and improves the Campus Drive East/Bowdoin Street intersection movements and level of service; therefore, the project will not result in any possible significant impacts related to long-term/post construction traffic.

Short-term traffic:

As described in the project description, the parking structure excavation will require removal of 220,000 cubic yards of dirt to be hauled offsite. It is anticipated that a portion of this dirt will be used on another Stanford University campus project, Stadium Renovation, but the remainder will be likely exported off site. The excavation will begin in February 2006 and will continue for approximately four to six months, with an average of 50 truck trips per day with a peak of 70 trips per day. During the construction period, impacts may arise from a substantial increase in heavy truck travel, as materials are brought in to the project site and excavated materials are hauled out. In addition, underground utilities will be extend along Campus Drive East and the existing curb line will be relocated to align with the project site, thus requiring closing the north two lanes during these improvements. Figure 3 illustrates the required Stanford area truck routes. All truck travel, either for excavating materials or for transporting construction materials to the site, would use these routes. From I-280, Alpine Road, Junipero Serra Boulevard, and

Campus Drive East would be used to reach the site. From US 101 and the east, either San Antonio Road or Woodside Road would be used to access El Camino Real. From there, trucks would follow Galvez Street to Campus Drive East.

The following Measures would mitigate the construction traffic to a less than significant impact.

MITIGATION:

- (TR.1) Bicycle and pedestrian access onto the campus and around the Stadium (outside construction areas) shall not be substantially limited by construction activities associated the Renovation project. In addition, access to public transit shall not be limited, which could include the relocation or removal of adjacent bus stops. Final construction plans shall show all pedestrian and bicycle corridors along with public transit stops adjacent to the Stadium and indicate how bicycle, pedestrian, and public transit access and circulation will be maintained during construction.*
- (TR.2) Construction materials and fill dirt delivered from off campus shall not be delivered between the hours of 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM on weekdays.*
- (TR.3) Trucks bringing in fill dirt and building materials for the project from off-site shall be required to use truck routes shown on Figure 2 of the Initial Study as designated by the cities of Palo Alto and Menlo Park.*
- (TR.4) Submit a revised site plan incorporating a Construction and Traffic Management Plan that clearly identifies the elements listed below (G.12).*
- a. Provide off-street construction related parking. Identify off-street parking location(s) on site plan for all for all construction related vehicles (employee parking and construction equipment) throughout the construction period. If adequate parking cannot be provided on the construction sites, identify on the site plan or vicinity map the satellite parking location(s) that will be used and verify in writing to the County Planning Office that a shuttle bus will be operated from these locations to the construction site.*
 - b. Prohibit impacts to accessing public transit access and movement of public transit vehicles. Identify on site plan all temporary or permanent access limitations, re-routes, lane closures, or limits to public transit movements or place a note on the site plan stating “No temporary or permanent access limitations, re-routes, lane closures, or limits to public transit movement are permitted.”*
 - c. Prohibit roadway construction activities from reducing roadway capacity during Stanford major athletic and special events. Stanford shall not limit roadway capacity during special events or during major athletic events, which attract a large number of visitors to the campus.*
 - d. Provide written notification to Stanford Police and Palo Alto Fire Department regarding construction location and construction dates. Include in the notices alternate evacuation and emergency route designations to maintain response times during construction periods, if applicable. Provide one copy of the notices to the County.*
 - e. Provide written notification to all contractors and subcontractors regarding appropriate routes and weight limits and speed limits for local roads used to access construction sites. Provide one copy of the notices to the County.*

(TR.5) Provide notification to the Cities of Palo Alto and Menlo of the construction schedule and include a copy of the Santa Clara County approved Construction and Traffic Management Plan, and provide written verification to the SC County Planning Office of the notifications.

Adherence to the mitigation measures will reduce the potential for significant impacts to a less than significant level.

O. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With GUP and New Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5,
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 21a, 38
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
d) Require new or expanded entitlements in order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 21,
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
f) Not be able to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
g) Be in non-compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5, 6
h) Employ equipment which could interfere with existing communications or broadcast systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5

DISCUSSION:

The project includes 600 new beds (total of 355 housing units). Pursuant to correspondence from Stanford University Facilities Operations (Joseph Kearney, PE, July 27, 2005), Stanford's regional domestic water has adequate capacity to serve the proposed Munger Graduate Housing project. Also, the sanitary sewer system will have adequate capacity to serve the project. The project includes up-sizing a portion of the existing sewer in Arguello Way and constructing a new sewer main in Campus Drive East to re-route sewer flow from an area up stream of the

proposed project. In addition, the project will incorporate water saving devices into the new facilities including low-flow toilets and shower heads. Therefore, the project as proposed would not create a significant impact to existing facilities.

P. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
*Questions relating to the California Department of Fish & Game "de minimus impact finding" for the Certificate of Fee Exemption are listed in italics.	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With GUP and New Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	No Impact	
a) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 to 53
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 to 53
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 to 53

DISCUSSION:

As described previously, the proposed project is the construction of the Munger Graduate Housing for 355 units, underground parking structure, utility improvements, structure relocations and demolition, reconstruction of Wilbur Parking lot, and construction of temporary parking lot located within the central Stanford University campus area. The proposed project, as mitigated, would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment or impact wildlife habitat or rare or endangered species. The project would not exceed the square footage or daily population allowed under the 2000 Stanford General Use Permit and Community Plan, and would not result in cumulative impacts not previously disclosed in the 2000 General Use Permit EIR. Mitigation has been included in the Historic Resources section to prevent potential significant impacts to identified historic resources.

1. Environmental Information Form
2. Field Inspection
3. Project Plans
4. Planner's Knowledge of Area
5. Experience With Other Projects of This Size and Nature
6. County Expert Sources: Geologist, Fire Marshal, Roads & Airports, Environmental Health, Land Development Engineering, Parks & Recreation, Zoning Administration, Comprehensive Planning, Architectural & Site Approval Committee Secretary
7. Agency Sources: Santa Clara Valley Water District, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Midpeninsula Openspace Regional District, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, CA Dept. of Fish & Game, Caltrans, U.S. Army Core of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Public Works Depts. of individual cities, Planning Depts. of individual cities,
- 8a. Santa Clara County (SCC) General Plan
- 8b. The South County Joint Area Plan
9. SCC Zoning Regulations (Ordinance)
10. County Grading Ordinance
11. SCC Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval
12. SCC Development Guidelines for Design Review
13. County Standards and Policies Manual (Vol. I - Land Development)
14. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code [1994 version]
15. Land Use Database
16. Santa Clara County Heritage Resource (including Trees) Inventory [computer database]
17. GIS Database
 - a. SCC General Plan Land Use, and Zoning
 - b. Natural Habitat Areas & Riparian Plants
 - c. Relative Seismic Stability
 - d. Archaeological Resources
 - e. Water Resources & Water Problems
 - f. Viewshed and Scenic Roads
 - g. Fire Hazard
 - h. Parks, Public Open Space, and Trails
 - i. Heritage Resources
 - j. Slope Constraint
 - k. Serpentine soils
 - l. State of California, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, and County landslide & fault zones
 - m. Water Problem/Resource
 - n. USGS Topo Quad, and Liquefaction
 - o. Dept. of Fish & Game, Natural Diversity Data
 - p. FEMA Flood Zones
18. Base Map Overlays & Textual Reports (GIS)
 - a. Paper Maps
 - b. SCC Zoning
 - c. Barclay's Santa Clara County Local Street Atlas
 - d. Color Air Photos (MPSI)
 - e. Santa Clara Valley Water District - Maps of Flood Control Facilities & Limits of 1% Flooding
 - f. Soils Overlay Air Photos
 - g. "Future Width Line" map set
19. CEQA Guidelines [Current Edition]

Area Specific: San Martin, Stanford, and Other Areas

San Martin

- 20a. San Martin Integrated Design Guidelines
- 20b. San Martin Water Quality Study
- 20c. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Santa Clara County & Santa Clara Valley Water District

Stanford

- 21a. Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP), Community Plan (CP), Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
- 21b. Stanford Protocol and Land Use Policy Agreement

Other Areas

- 22a. ALUC Land Use Plan for Areas Surrounding Airports [1992 version]
- 22b. Los Gatos Hillside Specific Area Plan
- 22c. County Lexington Basin Ordinance Relating to Sewage Disposal

Soils

23. USDA, SCS, "Soils of Santa Clara County"
24. USDA, SCS, "Soil Survey of Eastern Santa Clara County"

Agricultural Resources/Open Space

25. Right to Farm Ordinance
26. State Dept. of Conservation, "CA Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model"
27. Open Space Preservation, Report of the Preservation 2020 Task Force, April 1987 [Chapter IV]

Air Quality

28. BAAQMD Clean Air Plan (1997)
29. BAAQMD Annual Summary of Contaminant Excesses & BAAQMD, "Air Quality & Urban Development - Guidelines for Assessing Impacts of Projects & Plans" [1999]

Biological Resources/
Water Quality & Hydrological Resources/
Utilities & Service Systems"

30. Site-Specific Biological Report
31. Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance Section C16
32. Clean Water Act, Section 404
33. Riparian Inventory of Santa Clara County, Greenbelt Coalition, November 1988
34. CA Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan, San Francisco Bay Region [1995]
35. Santa Clara Valley Water District, Private Well Water Testing Program [12-98]
36. SCC Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program, Urban Runoff Management Plan [1997]
37. County Environmental Health / Septic Tank Sewage Disposal System - Bulletin "A"
38. County Environmental Health Department Tests and Reports
39. Calphotos website:
<http://www.elib.cs.berkeley.edu/photos>

Initial Study Source List*

Archaeological Resources

40. State Archaeological Clearinghouse, Sonoma State University

41. Site Specific Archaeological Reconnaissance Report

Geological Resources

42. Site Specific Geologic Report

43. State Department of Mines and Geology, Special Report #42

44. State Department of Mines and Geology, Special Report #146

Noise

45. County Noise Ordinance

Hazards & Hazardous Materials

46. Section 21151.4 of California Public Resources Code

47. State Department of Toxic Substances, Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List

48. County Office of Emergency Services Emergency Response Plan [1994 version]

Transportation/Traffic

49. Transportation Research Board, "Highway Capacity Manual", Special Report 209, 1995.

50. SCC Congestion Management Agency, "2000 Monitoring and Conformance report"

51. Official County Road Book

52. County Off-Street Parking Standards

53. Site-specific Traffic Impact Analysis Report

***Items listed in bold are the most important sources and should be referred to during the first review of the project, when they are available. The planner should refer to the other sources for a particular environmental factor if the former indicate a potential environmental impact.**
