LANDBANK CENTRAL & WOLFE CAMPUS

Draft Environmental Impact Report

SCH # 2013082063

Prepared for
City of Sunnyvale

April 2014

LANDBANK CENTRAL & WOLFE CAMPUS

Draft Environmental Impact Report

SCH # 2013082063

Prepared for
City of Sunnyvale

April 2014

350 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza
Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94612
510.839.5066
www.esassoc.com

Los Angeles

Orlando

Palm Springs

Petaluma

Portland

Sacramento

San Diego

San Francisco

Santa Cruz

Seattle

Tampa

Woodland Hills

D120442.01

OUR COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY | ESA helps a variety of public and private sector clients plan and prepare for climate change and emerging regulations that limit GHG emissions. ESA is a registered assessor with the California Climate Action Registry, a Climate Leader, and founding reporter for the Climate Registry. ESA is also a corporate member of the U.S. Green Building Council and the Business Council on Climate Change (BC3). Internally, ESA has adopted a Sustainability Vision and Policy Statement and a plan to reduce waste and energy within our operations. This document was produced using recycled paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Landbank Central & Wolfe Campus
Draft Environmental Impact Report

		Page
	List of Acronyms	**v**
	Summary	**S-1**
S.1	Purpose of This Document	S-1
S.2	Project Description	S-1
S.3	Project Objectives	S-2
S.4	Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures	S-2
S.5	Significant Unavoidable Impacts	S-3
S.6	Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes	S-3
S.7	Effects Found Not to be Significant	S-4
S.8	Alternatives	S-4
S.9	Major Conclusions, Areas of Controversy, and Issues to be Resolved	S-5
S.10	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	S-6
1.	**Introduction**	**1-1**
1.1	Purpose of This Document	1-1
1.2	Project Overview	1-1
1.3	Organization of the Document	1-1
1.4	Use of this Document by Permitting Agencies	1-2
2.	**Project Description**	**2-1**
2.1	Introduction	2-1
2.2	Location	2-1
2.3	Project Site Background	2-8
2.4	Project Description	2-8
2.5	Project Construction	2-20
2.6	Project Objectives	2-20
2.7	Required Approvals	2-22
3.	**Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures**	**3.1-1**
3.1	Land Use and Planning	3.1-1
3.2	Population and Housing	3.2-1
3.3	Aesthetics	3.3-1
3.4	Traffic and Transportation	3.4-1
3.5	Air Quality	3.5-1
3.6	Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	3.6-1
3.7	Noise	3.7-1
3.8	Biological Resources	3.8-1
3.9	Geology and Soils	3.9-1
3.10	Hydrology and Water Quality	3.10-1

		Page
3.	**Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures (continued)**	
3.11	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3.11-1
3.12	Cultural Resources	3.12-1
3.13	Utilities and Service Systems	3.13-1
3.14	Public Services	3.14-1
4.	**Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts**	**4-1**
4.1	Cumulative Impacts	4-1
4.2	Growth-Inducing Impacts	4-23
5.	**Alternatives to the Project**	**5-1**
5.1	Alternatives Considered but Rejected	5-2
5.2	Alternatives Considered in the EIR	5-2
5.3	Comparison of Alternatives with the Project	5-4
6.	**Report Authors**	**6-1**

Appendices (*CD inside back cover*)

A. Notice of Preparation
B. Scoping Comments Received
C. Traffic Technical Appendix
D. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Appendix
E. Traffic Noise Technical Appendix
F. Applicant's Traffic Demand Management Program

List of Tables

S-1	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	S-7
2-1	Building Space Allocation	2-10
2-2	Parking Allocation	2-16
3.1-1	Building Height, Lot Coverage and Floor Area Ratio for M-S Zoning Districts	3.1-5
3.1-2	Project Consistency with General Plan Relevant Land Use Policies	3.1-7
3.2-1	Population Trends: City and County	3.2-1
3.2-2	Household Trends: City and County	3.2-1
3.2-3	Job Trends: City and County	3.2-2
3.2-4	Labor Force Distribution	3.2-3
3.2-5	Regional Housing Need Allocations	3.2-4
3.4-1	Definitions for Intersection Level of Service	3.4-4
3.4-2	Intersection Levels of Service (LOS) – Existing Conditions	3.4-5
3.4-3	Freeway Levels of Service (LOS) – Existing Conditions	3.4-7
3.4-4	Proposed Project Trip Generation	3.4-15
3.4-5	Intersection Levels of Service (LOS) – Existing Plus Project Conditions	3.4-18
3.4-6	Intersection Levels of Service (LOS) – Background Plus Project Conditions	3.4-21
3.4-7	Freeway Levels of Service (LOS) – Existing Plus Project Conditions	3.4-22
3.5-1	Air Quality Data Summary (2010-2012) – Jackson Street, San Jose	3.5-3
3.5-2	Ambient Air Quality Standards and Bay Area Attainment Status	3.5-7
3.5-3	Peak Day Construction-Related Pollutant Emissions without Mitigation	3.5-13
3.5-4	Peak Day Construction-Related Pollutant Emissions with Mitigation	3.5-15

Page

List of Tables (continued)

3.5-5	Unmitigated Operational Criteria Pollutant Emissions	3.5-16
3.5-6	Mitigated Operational Criteria Pollutant Emissions	3.5-17
3.6-1	Estimated Construction-Related GHG Emissions	3.6-13
3.6-2	Project Increment Operational GHG Emissions	3.6-14
3.7-1	Acceptable Noise Levels	3.7-6
3.7-2	Significant Noise Impacts from New Development on Existing Land Use	3.7-7
3.7-3	Typical Noise Levels from Construction Activity	3.7-10
3.7-4	Typical Noise Levels from Construction Equipment	3.7-10
3.7-5	Peak-Hour Traffic Noise Levels in the Vicinity of the Project	3.7-15
3.8-1	Potential for Special-Status Species Occurrence	3.8-3
3.9-1	Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale	3.9-5
3.9-2	Faults in the Project Site Vicinity	3.9-7
3.9-3	Modified National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program Soil Classifications	3.9-10
3.11-1	Regulatory Sites Listed in the Project Site Vicinity	3.11-3
3.12-1	Criteria for Determining Paleontological Potential	3.12-2
3.12-2	Cultural Resources Investigations within ½-Mile of the Project Site	3.12-8
3.13-1	Solid Waste Transfer and Disposal Facilities	3.13-4
3.14-1	School District Enrollment	3.14-2
3.14-2	Existing Park and Open Space within the City	3.14-3
4-1	Cumulative Projects	4-3
4-2	Intersection Levels of Service (LOS) – Cumulative Plus Project Conditions	4-10
5-1	Comparison of Impacts: Proposed Project and Alternatives	5-5
5-2	Ability of Alternatives to Satisfy Project Objectives	5-10

List of Figures

2-1	Project Location	2-2
2-2	Area Plan	2-3
2-3	Site Plan	2-4
2-4	Site Illustrative Plan	2-5
2-5	Renderings	2-6
2-6	Renderings	2-7
2-7	Existing Conditions Plan	2-9
2-8	Campus Elevations	2-11
2-9	Campus Elevations	2-12
2-10	Courtyard Elevations	2-13
2-11	Landscape Plan	2-14
2-12	Proposed Vehicular Parking and Circulation	2-15
2-13	Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation	2-17
2-14	Proposed Removal of Protected Trees	2-18
2-15	Proposed Tree Planting	2-19
2-16	Conceptual Grading Plan	2-21
3.1-1	Project Site and Vicinity Land Use Designations	3.1-3
3.1-2	Project Site and Vicinity Zoning	3.1-4
3.3-1	Photos of Existing Site	3.3-2
3.3-2	Photos of Existing Site	3.3-3
3.3-3	Viewpoint Map	3.3-5
3.3-4	Viewpoint 1	3.3-6
3.3-5	Viewpoint 2	3.3-7

Page

List of Figures (continued)

3.3-6	Viewpoint 3	3.3-8
3.3-7	Viewpoint 4	3.3-9
3.3-8	Viewpoint 5	3.3-10
3.3-9	Viewpoint 6	3.3-11
3.3-10	Viewpoint 7	3.3-12
3.3-11	Viewpoint 8	3.3-13
3.3-12	Existing and Simulated Views, Viewpoint 3	3.3-18
3.3-13	Existing and Simulated Views, Viewpoint 6	3.3-19
3.3-14	Existing and Simulated Views, Viewpoint 8	3.3-20
3.4-1	Existing Transit and Shuttle Service	3.4-8
3.4-2	Existing Bicycle Facilities	3.4-10
3.4-3	Estimated Trip Distribution	3.4-17
3.9-1	Fault Activity	3.9-6
4-1	Location of Other Projects for the Cumulative Impact Analysis	4-5

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ABAG	The Association of Bay Area Governments
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission
ARB	Air Resources Board
ARDTP	Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan
ASCE	American Society of Civil Engineers
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BCDC	San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
BMP	best management practices
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CAP	Clean Air Plan
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CASQA	California Stormwater Quality Association
CBC	California Building Code
CBCIP	City Bicycle Capital Improvement Program
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLIS	Compensation and Liability Information System
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGS	California Geological Survey
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
COLD	Cold Freshwater Habitat
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CRPR	California Rare Plant Ranks
CSC	California Species of Special Concern
CVP	Central Valley Project
CWA	Clean Water Act
DBA	decibel A-weighting
DLRP	Division of Land Resource Protection
DNL	day-night average sound level
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DPR	California Department of Parks and Recreation
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
DWR	Department of Water Resources
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESRL	Earth System Research Laboratory
FAR	Floor Area Ratio

FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIP	Federal Implementation Plan
FSC	Federal Species of Concern
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FUDS	Formerly Used Defense Sites
GHG	greenhouse gas
GVW	gross vehicle weight
GWP	global warming potential
HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
HFC	hydrofluorocarbons
HMMP	hazardous materials management plan
IBC	International Building Code
IPCC	International Panel on Climate Change
LDN	day-night average sound level
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LID	Low Impact Development
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
LUTE	General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element
LVW	loaded vehicle weight
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCCD	Marin Community College District
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MMI	Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale
MRP	Municipal Regional Permit
MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NEHRP	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NOI	Notice of Intent
NO_X	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWIC	Northwest Information Center
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyls
PFC	perfluorocarbons
PGA	peak ground acceleration
PM	Parcel Map
PPV	peak particle velocities
PSHA	probabilistic seismic hazard assessment
PUC	California Public Utilities Commission
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976
RHNA	Regional Housing Need Allocation
ROG	reactive organic gases
RTP	Regional Transportation Plans
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SAB	State Allocation Board

SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCS	sustainable communities strategy
SCVURPPP	Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program
SCVWD	Santa Clara Valley Water District
SDP	Special Development Permit
SF_6	sulfur hexafluoride
SFHA	Special Flood Hazard Areas
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SIP	State Implementation Plans
SLIC	Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanup Database
SMARTS	Stormwater Multiple Applications and Report Tracking Systems
SMC	Sunnyvale Municipal Code
SVP	Society of Vertebrate Paleontology
SWMP	Stormwater Management Plan
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	California State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminants
TCM	Transportation Control Measures
TDM	Traffic Demand Management
TIA	Traffic Impact Analysis
TIS	Traffic Impact Study
TM	Tentative Map
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
UCMP	University of California Museum of Paleontology
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UP	Use Permit
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UST	underground storage tanks
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VAR	Variance
VDECS	Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy
VOC	volatile organic compound
WARM	Warm Freshwater Habitat
WBWG	Western Bat Working Group
WILD	Wildlife Habitat
WPCP	Water Pollution Control Plant
WSA	Water Supply Assessment
ZNE	zero net energy

SUMMARY

S.1 Purpose of This Document

Landbank Investments LLC, a private developer (the applicant), has submitted an application to the City of Sunnyvale for approvals necessary for development of the Landbank Central & Wolfe Campus project (referred to below as the "Project"). The Project includes development of three six-story office buildings, a two-story amenities building, and a parking garage on a site currently occupied by several one-story industrial buildings, located at the intersection of East Arques Avenue and North Wolfe Road in Sunnyvale. The Project is the subject of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

This EIR is an informational document intended to disclose to the public and decision-makers the potential environmental effects of the Project. It has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statute and *Guidelines.*[1]

S.2 Project Description

The Project site is a 17.84 acre area that is bounded to the north by East Arques Avenue and to the west by North Wolfe Road in Sunnyvale. To the south of the Project site is Central Expressway, and to the east is the City of Sunnyvale corporation yard, the terminus of East California Avenue, and several businesses. The Project site is about one mile south of US Highway 101, and about two miles north of State Highway 82 (El Camino Real). The Project site consists of nine developed parcels, each containing a one-story industrial building, and the current right-of-way for Santa Ana Court.

The main components of the Project include the following:

- Demolition of nine existing, 1-story industrial tilt-up buildings (total floor area 258,279 square feet (sf), each on its own parcel. The nine parcels total 777,170 sf and give a collective Floor Area Ratio (FAR)[2] of 34% for the current site uses.
- Re-zoning of the Project site, from the existing designation of M-S (Industrial and Service) to the proposed designation of M-S FAR 100% (Industrial and Service, allowable FAR of 100%), or a use permit to authorize FAR of 100%.

---

1 The CEQA statute is contained in California Public Resources Code, §§21000–21177; the CEQA *Guidelines* are codified as Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq.

2 FAR is the ratio of occupiable building floor area to lot size, and may be expressed as a percentage (used in this document) or as a decimal. Thus, 34% FAR is the same as .34 FAR.

- Resubdivision of the Project site and vacation of an existing public right of way (Santa Ana Court), along with a Development Agreement.
- A special development permit to allow the construction of three interconnected, six-story (four office floors above two floors of podium parking), Class-A office buildings, a six-level parking garage (including rooftop parking), and a separate two-story amenities building, with a total aggregate floor area of approximately 777,000 square feet (excluding parking, which is not considered in FAR calculations), for a net addition of approximately 519,000 square feet of floor area (excluding parking).

A complete description of the Project is included in Chapter 2, Project Description.

S.3 Project Objectives

The objectives for the Project are as follows:

1. Replace the existing underutilized and outdated concrete tilt-up structures with a superior, architecturally significant technology campus that may include office, R&D, lab, test, light manufacturing, biotech, life sciences and other related technology uses, high quality pedestrian and bicycle paths, transit connections, abundant open space and landscaping, abundant on-site amenities and various features to promote enhanced sustainability.
2. Develop a Class A, headquarter-style campus of sufficient size and sufficient quality that will attract and accommodate large scaled leading edge technology tenants. Typical components include attractive site configurations, large floor plates, ample on-site amenities, on-site parking, and efficient employee collaboration space.
3. Develop a project that is compatible with the land uses in the surrounding area and with the local transportation system.
4. Construct an environmentally focused campus that will be LEED Platinum certified.
5. Develop a bicycle and pedestrian focused project that is well connected to the road network and public transportation system, including Caltrain, and that maximizes the use of transportation demand management program components and activities to minimize the use of single-occupant motor vehicles.
6. Enhance the appearance, streetscape and visual quality of this site by incorporating high quality finishes, varied façade treatments, public art, a highly integrated campus circulation system and open spaces with landscape features, and landscaped streetscapes along adjacent arterial streets.
7. Develop a project of a sufficient density and a superior quality that is economically feasible, and that will easily attract investment capital and construction financing.
8. Develop a project that provides short-term and long-term employment opportunities.

S.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential environmental impacts of the Project are summarized in Table S-1 at the end of this Summary chapter. For each significant impact, the table includes a summary of mitigation

measure(s) and an indication of whether the impact would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Chapter 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures for a complete discussion of each impact and associated mitigation, as well as Chapter 4, Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts. Project compliance with existing laws and regulations is assumed in the impact analysis.

S.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The Project, if implemented, could result in significant adverse environmental impacts. Mitigation measures proposed as part of the Project or added in this EIR would avoid or reduce most of the impacts to a less-than-significant level (see Table S-1). However, even after implementation of mitigation measures identified and described in this EIR, the following impact would remain significant and should be considered an unavoidable consequence of Project approval:

- **Impact NOI-1:** Construction of the Project would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels.

In addition, the following traffic impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable. However, Mitigation Measure TR-1 (reconfigure intersection of Commercial Street and Central Expressway), if implemented, would reduce these impacts to less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1 is outside of the control of the lead agency, the City of Sunnyvale; therefore, implementation cannot be guaranteed.

- **Impact TR-1:** The Project would increase traffic volumes at area intersections.
- **Impact TR-2:** The Project, in combination with approved developments in the study area that are not yet built or occupied, would increase traffic volumes at area intersections.
- **Impact CUM-TR:** The Project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future development Projects in the study area, would increase traffic volumes at area intersections.

S.6 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

A significant irreversible environmental change may be attributable to a project if the project were to use large amounts of nonrenewable resources, if a project were to involve or require improvements which commit future generations to similar uses, or from irreversible damage that could result from environmental accidents associated with the project (CEQA *Guidelines*, §15126.2(c)). The applicant, however, is committed to meeting high standards for sustainable development, including a goal of achieving the LEED Platinum standard, so the use of nonrenewable resources would be minimized. Furthermore, the Project would not require upgrading or extension of infrastructure into previously undeveloped areas, so the Project would not commit future generations to similar uses. Finally, the Project site is not in a highly sensitive area, and the Project would not pose the risk of a major environmental accident. For these reasons, the Project would not be expected to result in a significant irreversible environmental change.

S.7 Effects Found Not to be Significant

The Project is not expected to have an adverse effect on the environment in the following areas, for the reasons stated:

- **Mineral Resources:** No known mineral resources exist at the Project site. The Project would therefore not impact the ability to recover known mineral resources.
- **Agricultural and Forest Resources:** No agricultural or forest resources exist at nor near the Project site. The Project would therefore not impact agricultural or forest resources.

These topics are not further examined in this EIR.

S.8 Alternatives

Chapter 5 describes and analyzes a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project. This includes three alternatives that were considered but rejected as infeasible or incapable of reducing the impacts associated with the Project; and three other alternatives that are either required by CEQA (the No Project Alternative) or that are considered feasible, capable of reducing or avoiding Project impacts, and capable of meeting at least some of the Project's objectives; these three are examined in depth in Chapter 5. Each of the three selected alternatives is described briefly here. Please see Chapter 5 for the full description and analysis.

No Project Alternative

The required No Project Alternative must examine the existing conditions and reasonably foreseeable future conditions that would exist if the Project were not approved (CEQA *Guidelines* §15126.6(e)). This Alternative assumes that the Project would not be implemented. The existing buildings at the Project site would not be demolished, the site would not be re-zoned, and the proposed new buildings would not be built.

Reduced Development Alternative

The Reduced Development Alternative would limit the amount of development allowed within the Project Site. Specifically, this Alternative would re-zone the Project site not to M-S 100% (allowable FAR of 100%) as proposed, but rather to M-S 70% (allowable FAR of 70%, plus an additional 5% FAR for a LEED Gold or Platinum project). This would limit the occupiable floor space within the buildings to about 582,877 sf, or an increase of 324,600 above the existing development at the Project site. This would reduce the expected number of employees working in the new buildings from the anticipated 2,500 employees for the Project as proposed, to about 1,875, which would allow for the elimination of one occupied floor, thus reducing the development from four to three floors of occupied space, or a reduction in the footprint of the buildings. This would also reduce the need for parking, as the Project as proposed includes about one parking space for each anticipated employee. Under this Alternative, parking spaces would be reduced by 25%, from the proposed 2,541 to 1,906. Reducing the number of parking spaces

would enable a substantial decrease in the size of the Proposed parking garage, or elimination of one of the podium parking levels from the buildings.

Alternative Transportation Alternative

This Alternative emphasizes use of alternative, non-automobile transportation for employees of the proposed research and development campus. Alternative forms of transportation include walking, bicycling, use of car pools and vanpools, and use of mass transit. This Alternative does not limit occupiable floor space for the proposed buildings, but does limit parking. When combined with provision of non-automobile choices for transportation, limiting parking can be an effective means of encouraging employees to use alternative means of transportation. Specifically, this Alternative would include 2,137 parking spaces, or about 16% fewer than the Project's proposed 2,541 spaces. This could allow the parking garage to be reduced in size from six stories to four or five stories, or elimination of some of the podium level parking. In addition, this alternative would implement the applicant's Travel Demand Management (TDM) Program, with a goal of reducing trip generation by 15%.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Of the alternatives assessed in this EIR, the alternative with the least environmental impact is the No Project Alternative. This alternative would avoid all significant environmental impacts that would occur under the proposed Project. The No Project Alternative would not, however, fully meet any of the Project objectives and would meet two only partially. CEQA *Guidelines* §15126(e)(2) states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

Among the other alternatives, the Alternative Transportation Alternative would reduce several impacts related to traffic, including intersection level of service, air quality, and cumulative biological resources impacts. While this alternative does not appear capable of avoiding the significant avoidable impacts of the Project as proposed, it would reduce the severity of impacts and make mitigation of significant impacts simpler. Therefore, the Alternative Transportation Alternative is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative. Note, however, that this alternative would, from an environmental perspective, be only marginally superior to the Project as proposed.

S.9 Major Conclusions, Areas of Controversy, and Issues to be Resolved

The following are the major conclusions of this EIR, including areas of known controversy and issues that remain to be resolved.

1. The Project would result in significant impacts in the following environmental topic areas:
    - Aesthetics;

- Traffic and Transportation;
- Air Quality;
- Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change
- Noise;
- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;
- Cumulative Traffic.

As noted above, all impacts except for noise and cumulative traffic impacts can, with the application of mitigation measures specified in this EIR, be reduced to less than significant.

2. Three alternatives to the Project are examined in Chapter 5. Two of the alternatives appear capable of meeting, or partially meeting, the Project applicant's objectives, but could also reduce some of the Project's significant impacts. It is unlikely, however, that either of these alternatives would avoid all of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project.

3. Consistency of the Project with relevant City of Sunnyvale plans and policies is examined in 3.1, Land Use and Planning. The Project appears to be consistent with City plans and policies. The final determination of consistency is, however, the decision of the Planning Commission and City Council.

S.10 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table S-1 provides a summary of all of the impacts and mitigation measures identified in this EIR. The table indicates if an impact is significant; if so, the measures specified for reducing or avoiding the impact are provided. The table also shows if the mitigation measures can be expected to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. The full text of the impacts can be found in Chapter 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, and Chapter 4, Cumulative and Growth Inducing Impacts.

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Land Use and Planning		
Impact LU-1: The Project could conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of the City of Sunnyvale adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Population and Housing		
Impact PH-1: The Project could induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Aesthetics		
Impact AES-1: The Project could have an adverse effect on a scenic vista. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact AES-2: The Project could degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Project site and its surroundings. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact AES-3: The Project would create a new source of light which could adversely affect nighttime views in the Project area. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact AES-4: The Project could create a new source of glare. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure AES-4:** Prior to issuance of Project building permits, the applicant shall complete and submit to the City of Sunnyvale Community Development Department documents showing that the potential for the proposed new buildings to cause a new source of reflected light and glare has been examined, and that any necessary design alterations have been made to avoid an impact of this kind. Design alterations may include, but are not limited to, selection of exterior building materials that are less reflective; use of exterior building elements that break up reflective surfaces; and re-design of the shape or orientation of the buildings. These documents and any necessary design alterations shall be to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.	Less than Significant
Traffic and Transportation		
Impact TR-1: The Project would increase traffic volumes at area intersections, affecting traffic flow conditions. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure TR-1:** The City of Sunnyvale, in cooperation with Santa Clara County, shall reconstruct/reconfigure the Commercial Street / Central Expressway intersection to a full four-legged signalized intersection, with eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes on Central Expressway, and restriping northbound and southbound Commercial Street for one shared left-turn/through lane and one exclusive right turn lane, or as may be approved by Santa Clara County. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1, operations at this intersection would improve to LOS D or better. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1, it is expected that some local existing traffic in the vicinity of this intersection would be re-distributed. This would not, however, be expected to adversely affect any of the study intersections to the extent that LOS would decrease.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Traffic and Transportation (cont.)		
Impact TR-2: The Project, in combination with approved developments in the study area that are not yet built or occupied, would increase traffic volumes at area intersections, affecting traffic flow conditions. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure TR-2:** Implement Mitigation Measure TR-1 (reconstruct/reconfigure the Commercial Street / Central Expressway intersection to a full four-legged signalized intersection, with eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes on Central Expressway, and restriping northbound and southbound Commercial Street for one shared left-turn/through lane and one exclusive right turn lane). As was described for Mitigation Measure TR-1, the peak hour volume signal warrant (Warrant 3) would be met during the p.m. peak hour under Existing plus Project Conditions. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1, operations at this intersection would improve to LOS D or better.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact TR-3: The Project would increase traffic volumes on area freeways, affecting traffic flow conditions. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact TR-4: The Project would increase traffic volumes on area roadways and at area intersections, potentially affecting traffic safety. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure TR-4:** The proposed Project would contribute a fair share payment (proportionate to added proposed Project traffic volumes) to the Santa Clara County Roads Department's Central Expressway Project that would add auxiliary lanes in both directions between North Wolfe Road and Lawrence Expressway.	Less than Significant
Impact TR-5: The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact TR-6: The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact TR-7: The Project would not conflict with existing or planned transit facilities. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact TR-8 The Project could conflict with adopted policies and standards regarding site access by automobiles, pedestrians and bicyclists. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure TR-8a: Design Changes to Improve Vehicle Access.** 1. Widen driveway #4 to accommodate three lanes: one inbound and two outbound (one for left turns and one for right turns). This three-lane cross section shall be 36 feet wide to accommodate three 12-foot lanes and be extended for the entire 488-foot length shown in the site plan to accommodate maximum queues. The widened section can be achieved by increasing the pavement width in the direction of the easternmost property line shown in the site plan. 2. The same 36-foot cross section shall be provided at East Arques Avenue Driveway #3 between the Project's auto court and East Arques Avenue to accommodate maximum queues that may result from up to 25 outbound left turns and 50 outbound right turns during the p.m. peak hour. This 36-foot width shall also meet City fire access standards. **Mitigation Measure TR-8b: Design Changes to Improve Pedestrian Access.** The Project applicant shall work with the City to provide new sidewalk to close the remaining gap between the east edge of the Project site and the East Arques Avenue / Commercial Street intersection. The resulting continuous sidewalk is expected to increase transit use to the Project site, as well as enhance existing Project pedestrian and bicycle access, thereby helping the Project meet City peak hour vehicle trip reduction goals.	Less than Significant

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Traffic and Transportation (cont.)		
Impact TR-9 (cont.)	**Mitigation Measure TR-8c: Design Changes to Improve Bicycle Access.** 1. To meet the City's CBCIP's requirement, the Project applicant shall work with the City to dedicate East Arques Avenue Project frontage to accommodate widening for a Class II bicycle lane to eliminate the existing bike lane gap in the eastbound direction. That improvement is expected to enhance existing Project bicycle access, as well as increase transit use to the Project site, thereby helping the Project meet City peak-hour vehicle trip reduction goals. 2. In conjunction with improvements to the Commercial Street-Central Expressway intersection (Mitigation Measure TR-1), the Project applicant shall work with the City to re-stripe Commercial Street between Central Expressway and Kifer Road to include Class II bicycle lanes in both directions. This can be accommodated within the existing 40-foot curb-to-curb width.	
Impact TR-9: The Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Air Quality		
Impact AIR-1: Project construction would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure AIR-1a: Off-Road Equipment Control Measures.** All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements: a. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel generators shall be prohibited; b. All off-road equipment shall have: i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) Tier 3 off-road emission standards, or ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS). **Mitigation Measure AIR-1b: Architectural Coatings.** ROG emissions from the use of architectural coatings shall be reduced by implementing either or both of the following measures: i. Architectural coatings shall be applied over the course of 4 months or longer, in order to reduce daily ROG emissions to below the significance threshold. ii. A minimum of 67% of exterior building materials shall be prefinished to reduce ROG emissions as a condition of the building permit. **Mitigation Measure AIR-1c: Best Management Practices for Controlling Particulate Emissions.** The following BAAQMD Best Management Practices for particulate control will be required for all construction activities within the Project site. These measures will reduce particulate emissions primarily during soil movement, grading and demolition activities by also during vehicle and equipment movement on unpaved project sites 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.	Less than Significant

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (cont.)		
Impact AIR-1 (cont.)	2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. 5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. 6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, § 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. 7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.	
Impact AIR-2: Construction of the Project would increase emission of toxic air contaminants (TACs), and increase health risks for nearby residents. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact AIR-3: Operation of the Project would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure AIR-3: Low Emission Backup Diesel Generator.** The engine for the proposed back-up diesel generator shall meet U.S. EPA Tier Level 3 emission requirements.	Less than Significant
Impact AIR-4: Project operations would increase emission of toxic air contaminants, and increase health risks for nearby residents. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact AIR-5: The Project could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
Impact GHG-1: The Project would result in an increase in GHG emissions. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure GHG-1: Construction-Related GHG Reduction Measures.** The following BAAQMD-suggested measures shall be implemented during Project construction: • Use alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15% of the fleet; • Use locally sourced building materials for at least 10% of overall materials brought to site; and • Recycle or reuse at least 50% of construction waste or demolition materials.	Less than Significant
Impact GHG-2: The Project could conflict with the AB 32 Scoping Plan or City of Sunnyvale Plans and Policies for reducing GHG emissions. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Noise		
Impact NOI-1: Construction of the Project would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure NOI-1a: Construction Noise Control Measures.** The applicant shall employ site-specific noise attenuation measures during Project construction to reduce the generation of construction noise. These measures shall be included in a Noise Control Plan that shall be submitted for review and approval by the City of Sunnyvale Building Services Division to ensure that construction noise is consistent with the standards set forth in the City's Noise ordinance. Measures specified in the Noise Control Plan and implemented during Project construction shall include, at a minimum, the following noise control strategies: • Equipment and trucks used for construction shall use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds; • Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible; this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures, such as use of drills rather than impact tools, shall be used; • Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or include other measures. **Mitigation Measure NOI-1b: Pile Driving Noise-Reducing Techniques and Muffling Devices.** Noise-reducing pile-driving techniques shall be employed during Project construction. These techniques shall include: • Installing intake and exhaust mufflers on pile-driving equipment; • Vibrating piles into place when feasible, and installing shrouds around the pile-driving hammer where feasible; • Implement "quiet" pile-driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles and the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration), where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions; • Use cushion blocks to dampen impact noise, if feasible based on soil conditions. Cushion blocks are blocks of material that are used with impact hammer pile drivers. They consist of blocks of material placed atop a piling during installation to minimize noise generated when driving the pile. Materials typically used for cushion blocks include wood, nylon and micarta (a composite material); • At least 48 hours prior to pile-driving activities, the applicant shall notify building owners and occupants within 600 feet of the Project site of the dates, hours, and expected duration of such activities.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact NOI-2: Project Construction could generate groundborne vibration. (Less than significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact NOI-3: Occupants of the proposed new buildings could be exposed to high noise levels. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Noise (cont.)		
Impact NOI-4: NOI-4: Project operations could cause a long-term increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity. (Less than significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1: Project construction could kill or injure special status birds at the Project site. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Avoidance.** Initial site development activities, including vegetation clearing, shall be scheduled to avoid the nesting season. If Project activities are scheduled to take place outside the nesting season, all impacts to nesting birds would be avoided. The nesting season is considered to be from February 1 through August 31. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Pre-construction/Pre-disturbance Surveys.** If it is not possible to schedule vegetation clearing outside of the breeding season (between 1 September and 31 January), then pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified ornithologist to ensure that no nests will be disturbed or destroyed during Project implementation. Surveys shall be conducted no more than ten days prior to the initiation of Project activities. During the survey, the ornithologist will inspect all trees and other potential nesting habitats (e.g., trees, shrubs, and buildings) within and immediately adjacent to the impact areas for nests. If an active nest is found sufficiently close to work areas to be disturbed by Project activities, the ornithologist will determine the extent of a work-free buffer zone to be established around the nest (typically 300-500 feet for raptors [i.e., hawks and owls] and 100-250 feet for songbirds) to ensure that no nests of species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code will be disturbed during Project implementation. The extent of the work-free buffer zone shall be determined by the ornithologist based on the species' sensitivity to disturbance (which can vary among species); the level of noise or construction disturbance; line of sight between the nest and disturbance; ambient noise levels; and consideration of other topographical or artificial barriers. Work-free buffer zones shall be maintained until after the breeding season or until after the qualified ornithologist determines the young have fledged (usually late June through mid-July). **Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Inhibition of Nesting.** If Project activities will not be initiated until after the start of the nesting season, then all potential nesting substrates (e.g., bushes, trees, grasses, and other vegetation, as well as buildings) that are scheduled to be removed shall be removed prior to the start of the nesting season (i.e., prior to 1 February). This will preclude the initiation of nests on these substrates, and minimize the potential for delay of the Project due to the presence of active nests.	Less than Significant
Impact BIO-2: The Project could result in increased bird collisions with buildings. (Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact BIO-3: Project operations could have indirect adverse impacts on nesting special-status birds on site. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact BIO-4: Project construction could kill or injure roosting and breeding bats. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Pre-Construction Bat Surveys.** No more than two weeks in advance of tree removal or demolition of underutilized or vacant buildings on-site, a qualified bat biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for bat roosts. If a bat colony is located within the Project site during pre-construction surveys, the Project shall be redesigned to avoid impacts. A no-disturbance buffer of 100 feet shall be established around active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes. If there is a maternity colony present and the Project cannot be redesigned to avoid removal of the tree or structure inhabited by the bats, demolition of that tree or	Less than Significant

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (cont.)		
Impact BIO-4 (cont.)	structure shall not commence until after young are flying (i.e., after July 31, confirmed by a qualified bat biologist) or before maternity colonies form the following year (i.e. prior to March 1). Bat roosts initiated during construction are presumed to be unaffected, and no buffer would be necessary. However, the "take" of individuals is prohibited.	
Impact BIO-5: Project operations could have indirect adverse impacts on roosting and breeding bats on site. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact BIO-6: Project operations could have indirect adverse impacts on serpentine soils and associated special status species, through the process of nitrogen deposition. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact BIO-7: The Project could result in the removal of protected trees. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Geology and Soils		
Impact GEO-1: Surface rupture during an earthquake fault could expose people or structures at the Project site to loss, injury, or death. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact GEO-2: Large earthquakes could damage the proposed buildings, impairing and/or disrupting their intended operations. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact GEO-3: Project construction could cause substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact GEO-4: Liquefaction and lateral spreading could damage the proposed new buildings, impairing and/or disrupting their intended operations. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact GEO-5: The proposed new buildings could be subject to damage if placed on problematic soils. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HYD-1: The Project could violate water quality standards or violate waste discharge requirements. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)		
Impact HYD-2: The Project could deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact HYD-3: The Project could alter existing drainage patterns, causing downstream erosion, siltation, or flooding. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact HYD-4: The Project could result in increased stormwater runoff from the Project site. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact HYD-5: The Project could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Impact HAZ-1: The Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact HAZ-2: The Project could 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. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Cultural Resources		
Impact CUL-1: The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact CUL-2: The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Archaeological Monitoring Program.** Prior to authorization to proceed, or issuance of grading permits, an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Qualification Standards (qualified archaeologist) shall prepare an archaeological monitoring plan. The plan shall include (but not be limited to) the following issues: • Training program for all construction and field workers involved in ground disturbance; • Person(s) responsible for conducting monitoring activities, including Native American monitor(s), if deemed necessary; • Person(s) responsible for overseeing and directing the monitors;	Less than Significant

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources		
Impact CUL-2 (cont.)	• How the monitoring shall be conducted and the required format and content of monitoring reports; • Schedule for submittal of monitoring reports and person(s) responsible for review and approval of monitoring reports; • Protocol for notifications in case of encountering cultural resources, as well as methods for evaluating significance, developing and implementing plan to avoid or mitigate significant resource impacts, Native American participation and consultation, collection and curation plan, and consistency with applicable laws including California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and PRC §5097.98; • Methods to ensure security of cultural resources sites if identified; • Protocol for notifying the City of Sunnyvale, Native Americans, and local authorities (i.e. Sheriff, Police) should site looting and other illegal activities occur during construction with reference to PRC §5097.99. Monitoring shall be conducted following removal of the existing buildings and during initial grading of the Project site as well as during all deep (greater than 5 feet) ground disturbing activities. During the course of the monitoring, the qualified archaeologist may adjust the frequency—from continuous to intermittent—of the monitoring based on the conditions and professional judgment regarding the potential to impact resources. If prehistoric or historic-period cultural materials are encountered, all construction activities within 100 feet shall halt and the Project applicant and the City of Sunnyvale shall be notified. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If the find is determined to be potentially significant qualifying as either a historical resource pursuant to CEQA *Guidelines* §15064.5 or as a unique archaeological resource as defined by PRC §21083.2, the archaeologist in consultation with the City of Sunnyvale and the appropriate Native American representative shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Consistent with CEQA *Guidelines* §15126.4(b)(3), preservation in place may be accomplished through planning construction to avoid the resource; incorporating the resource within open space; capping and covering the resource; or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. If avoidance is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the City of Sunnyvale and the appropriate Native American representative, shall prepare and implement a detailed Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (ARDTP). Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of PRC §21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of (but would not be not limited to) sample excavation, artifact collection, site documentation, and historical research, with the aim to target the recovery of important scientific data contained in the portion(s) of the significant resource to be impacted by the Project. The ARDTP shall include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context, reporting of results within a timely manner and subject to review and comments by the appropriate Native American representative before being finalized, curation of artifacts and data at a local facility acceptable to the appropriate Native American representative, and dissemination of final confidential reports to the appropriate Native American representative, the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, the City of Sunnyvale, and interested professionals.	

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources (cont.)		
Impact CUL-3: The Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact CUL-4: The Project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.** In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction activities, such activities within 100 feet of the find shall cease. The Santa Clara County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. The Coroner will determine if the remains are Native American. If the remains are determined to be Native American, and no investigation of the cause of death is required, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) will be contacted within 24 hours. The NAHC will then identify and contact the person or persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of the deceased Native American(s), who in turn would make recommendations to the Project applicant and the City of Sunnyvale for the appropriate means of treating the human remains and any grave goods.	Less than Significant
Utilities and Service Systems		
Impact UTL-1: Wastewater produced by the Project could exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact UTL-2: Project demand for wastewater treatment could exceed the capacity of existing facilities (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact UTL-3: Stormwater runoff from the Project site could exceed the capacity of existing facilities. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact UTL-4: Project demand for water could exceed available supply. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact UTL-5: Project-related waste generation could exceed the capacity of local landfills or conflict with local and State plans and regulations regarding solid waste. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Public Services		
Impact SRV-1: Development of the proposed Project could result in an increase in demand for police services. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact SRV-2: Development of the proposed Project could result in an increase in calls for fire protection and emergency medical response services. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Public Services (cont.)		
Impact SRV-3: The Project could result in increased enrollment in area schools. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact SRV-4: Implementation of the Project could result in increased use and degradation of existing parks and recreational facilities. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact SRV-5: The Project would include the construction of recreational facilities which could have an adverse impact on the environment. (Less than Significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Impact SRV-6: Development of the Project could result in increased use of other governmental facilities, including libraries. (Less than significant)	None required	Less than Significant
Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts		
Impact CUM-TR: The Project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future development Projects in the study area, would increase traffic volumes at area intersections. (Significant)	**Mitigation Measure CUM-TR:** Implement Mitigation Measure TR-1 (reconstruct/reconfigure the Commercial Street / Central Expressway intersection to a full four-legged signalized intersection, with eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes on Central Expressway, and restriping northbound and southbound Commercial Street for one shared left-turn/through lane and one exclusive right turn lane). As was described for Mitigation Measure TR-1 I Section 3.4, Traffic and Transportation, the peak hour volume signal warrant (Warrant 3) would be met during the p.m. peak hour under Existing plus Project Conditions. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1, operations at this intersection would improve to LOS E or better under Cumulative Plus Project conditions.	Significant and Unavoidable

CHAPTER 1
Introduction

1.1 Purpose of This Document

Landbank Investments LLC, a private developer (the applicant), has submitted an application to the City of Sunnyvale for approvals necessary for development of the Landbank Central Sunnyvale Campus project (referred to below as the "Project"). The Project includes development of three six-story office buildings, a two-story amenities building, and a parking garage on a site currently occupied by several one-story industrial buildings, located at the intersection of East Arques Avenue and North Wolfe Road in Sunnyvale. The Project is the subject of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

This EIR is an informational document intended to disclose to the public and decision-makers the potential environmental effects of the Project. It has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statute and *Guidelines.*[1]

1.2 Project Overview

The Project site consists of 17.84 acres and nine developed parcels, each containing a one-story industrial building. The Project includes demolition of these buildings, which total 258,279 square feet (sf). The Project would require rezoning of the Project site from the existing designation of M-S (Industrial and Service) to the proposed designation of M-S FAR 100 (Industrial and Service, allowable Floor Area Ratio [FAR] of 100%), or a use permit, resubdivision of the Project site, the vacation of an existing public right of way (Santa Ana Court), along with a Development Agreement. The Project includes construction of three connected, six-story, Class-A office buildings, a six-level parking garage, and a separate two-story amenities building. A complete project description is included in Chapter 2, Project Description.

1.3 Organization of the Document

This document is organized into the following chapters:

Summary: The EIR summary, prepared in accordance with State CEQA *Guidelines* §15123, contains an overview of key elements of the EIR. The Summary includes a condensed version of the Project Description presented in Chapter 2, including Project objectives. A comprehensive

[1] The CEQA statute is contained in California Public Resources Code, §§21000–21177; the CEQA *Guidelines* are codified as Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq.

overview of all environmental impacts and mitigation measures, along with the level of significance before and after mitigation, is presented in a table format for reader convenience. This chapter describes Alternatives to the Project, and describes how their environmental impacts compare to the proposed Project. The Summary discusses the potential for irreversible environmental changes, and lists any significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project. It also includes major conclusions, areas of controversy, and issues remaining to be resolved.

Chapter 1 – Introduction.

Chapter 2 – Project Description: The Project Description is prepared pursuant to State CEQA *Guidelines* §15124 and contains a discussion of the Project attributes through text, figures, and tables. Specifically, this chapter includes an overview of the Project, a description of the Project site and location, a discussion of objectives for the Project, and a discussion of Project characteristics.

Chapter 3 – Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures: This chapter contains several sections. Each section is devoted to a particular resource area, such as air quality or biological resources. Each section begins with a description of the environmental and regulatory setting, followed by a discussion of whether the Project has the potential for any environmental impacts. Where there is potential for a significant adverse environmental effect, mitigation measures are presented to reduce or avoid the impacts.

Chapter 4 – Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts: Provides discussions of whether the Project's impacts could combine with impacts of other related projects in a cumulative manner, and whether the Project has the potential to induce growth in the region.

Chapter 5 – Analysis of Alternatives: Describes and analyzes feasible alternatives to the Project that meet at least some of the Project's objectives, but do so in a less environmentally harmful manner.

Chapter 6 – Report Authors: Lists report authors by section and City staff that assisted with the preparation and review of the EIR.

Appendices: The appendices provide background and technical information pertaining to the Project, the CEQA process, and the impact analysis.

1.4 Use of this Document by Permitting Agencies

In accordance with CEQA, the City of Sunnyvale will consider the environmental implications of the Project before making a decision to approve the applications for the Project. Other agencies that may rely on this EIR when considering approvals for the Project include the State Water Resources Control Board, which issues the State Construction General Permit; the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, which issues permits for disposal of dewatering discharge during construction activities; and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, which permits stationary sources of air pollutant emissions, and the County of Santa Clara.