



Council Meeting: May 12, 2009

SUBJECT: Approve Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update to Include the Current Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utilities Project.

REPORT IN BRIEF

The Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utilities Project is within the area covered by the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update. An addendum has been prepared to address the proposed Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Project and finds that the existing EIR adequately addresses potential impacts. This particular project includes grant funds requiring review under both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The NEPA clearance has already been obtained from Caltrans, acting as lead agency for NEPA. An addendum to the existing Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update final EIR is appropriate since new information specific to the subject project is available and relevant to the project. This addendum may be approved by the agency that originally certified the Downtown EIR, and such approval may be done as part of a regular City Council agenda item and does not require recirculation or a public hearing.

The Murphy Avenue Utilities and Streetscape project design is based on the Streetscape Master Plan approved by the City Council on November 22, 2005 (RTC 05-351) and as presented to the City Council in a study session on September 9, 2008. The project is out to bid with a bid opening scheduled in May 2009. This schedule is being maintained to comply with grants received from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Valley Transportation Agency (VTA).

BACKGROUND

The Environmental Impact Report for the Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update was certified in 2003. At the time of this document certain environmental conditions, such as the PCE (dry-cleaning fluid) plume were unknown. While environmental work to remediate potential threats of the PCE is on-going in the area, a soil management plan will be implemented during construction to identify possible soil contamination for protection of workers and the general public. Current indications from environmental monitoring do not suggest that work for the project would be directly impacted. However, since the monitoring cannot be completely accurate, safety precautions are taken as if the soil were contaminated until measurements can be evaluated to indicate an acceptable work environment.

Work under the original Murphy Avenue Master Plan included removing portions of ceilings along breezeways and connecting Murphy Avenue to parking lots on the east and west. This work could affect and possibly have an impact on buildings in the historic Murphy Station Landmark District. Therefore, a much more extensive historical survey and analysis would have been required. In order to stay on schedule for use of grant funds, the breezeway portion affecting buildings was eliminated from the project.

The project includes the historic portion of Murphy Avenue between Washington on the south and Evelyn Avenue on the north, from storefront to storefront in width. Features will improve pedestrian access between the multi-modal transportation stations, Plaza del Sol and Murphy Avenue through the Frances Street parking lot and intersection improvements at Murphy/Washington, Murphy/Evelyn and Frances Street/Evelyn Avenue. Sidewalk improvements to the North side of Washington Avenue and the South side of Evelyn Avenue were added based on comments received at the September Study Session to complete what would otherwise be gaps in the downtown improvements. The work is designed to comply with requirements of funding by a Transportation for Livable Communities grant from MTC (\$1.3 million) and a Valley Transportation Agency grant (\$396,612) for better pedestrian access to transit facilities.

Construction will include improvements to the water and sanitary sewer lines in Murphy Avenue and the sewer line in Evelyn Avenue between Murphy and Sunnyvale Avenue. Replacement of this aging infrastructure was identified in the capital improvement programs under Projects 826810 and 825451 and is funded from the water and sewer funds to provide reliability, and reduce the need to make future repairs through the new streetscape surfaces.

Murphy Avenue will be repaved, in part with decorative concrete pavers, new curbs, and improved storm drainage. Improvements include new street lighting and enhancements to the electrical system to support decorative (twinkle) lights in trees and electrical systems to support musical performances, holiday lighting, and other community events. Other features include improved utility boxes and lids with colored concrete sidewalks that reflect the patterning in the street and identify the “moveable zone” (where merchants are allowed to have temporary moveable displays) near buildings, new tree wells and grates, raised seating decks, benches, news and bicycle racks, decorative concrete planters, and irrigation. The donated clock tower and interpretive plaques will each be preserved and remounted on new pedestals.

The construction of the improvements to Murphy Avenue will be staged to allow businesses to remain open and to minimize disruption. Preliminary work will

be done on Evelyn and Washington without disruption on Murphy Avenue until the end of the Summer Music series in September. After the Summer Music series work will begin on Murphy Avenue, continuing into winter months, as requested by the Downtown Business Association. Staff will continue to work closely with the Downtown Business Association throughout the process. The work is not intended to replace, but to enhance the existing ambiance of Murphy Avenue.

EXISTING POLICY

Downtown Specific Plan Goals and Policies

The Goals and Policies of the Specific plan create the basic priorities for implementing the downtown vision. Goals are intended as “high level outcomes” desired for the community and policies are definite courses of actions to guide present and future decisions. The primary goals for the Downtown Specific Plan are:

- Protect and enhance existing neighborhoods
- Improve the street character

DISCUSSION

The work being done on Murphy Avenue is designed to complement and coordinate features of other downtown developments. The Murphy Avenue master plan previously approved by the Council, did not include bringing the sidewalks along the north side of Washington between Frances and Sunnyvale Avenue, and the sidewalk on the south side of Evelyn between Frances and Sunnyvale Avenue, up to the new downtown standards. The redevelopment of the properties along these street segments is not imminent and these gaps in the redevelopment of the overall downtown area would be obvious by their older design and condition.

After the Council briefing on September 9, 2008, these segments were included in the Murphy Avenue streetscape plan. The designer presented a proposal to include this work that was within the existing design contract optional services budget and the design is now underway.

The concept of day-lighting and revising breezeways presented potential impacts to the historical nature of the adjacent buildings that they are attached to and would require additional time and budget to complete necessary historical and environmental documentation. The breezeway improvements will be presented as a future capital improvement project. The streetscape project has been modified accordingly to keep it on target with a scheduled opening in March of 2010.

The utility construction includes the replacements of water and sewer laterals from the mains to the building line for each of 37 lots on Murphy, Washington and Evelyn. The utilities projects (mentioned above) are annually funded projects for the replacement of aging infrastructure from the two enterprise funds and can fully fund the Murphy utility improvements.

The Community Development and Public Works Staff is working out an agreement with the Downtown Sunnyvale Mixed Use, LLC, under terms of the ARDDOPA to share funding of certain Washington Avenue improvements that interface with the Murphy Avenue project. These include street, storm water, crosswalks, and gateway structures. Additionally, staff is currently seeking additional grant funds which may apply to the project.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated for approval of the addendum.

PUBLIC CONTACT

Public Contact was made by posting the Council agenda on the City's official notice bulletin board outside City Hall, at the Senior Center, Community Center, and Department of Public Safety; and by making the agenda and report available at the Sunnyvale Public Library, the Office of the City Clerk, and on the City's Web site. Staff of Community Development and Public Works also met with the Sunnyvale Downtown Association on project development and will continue to do so throughout the remaining design and construction.

ALTERNATIVES

- 1) Approve the attached addendum to the 2003 EIR for Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update. Council approval will allow the project to continue to construction.
- 2) Do not approve the attached addendum to the 2003 EIR for Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update. No approval will result in loss of grant funds.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends Alternative No. 1: Approve the attached addendum to the 2003 EIR for Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update. Council approval will allow the project to continue to construction.

Reviewed by:

Marvin Rose, Director, Department of Public Works

Prepared by: Mark Rogge, Assistant Director of Public Works

Approved by:

Gary Luebbers
City Manager

Attachment:

A) Addendum to Downtown EIR

ATTACHMENT A

MURPHY AVENUE STREETScape AND UTILITY REPLACEMENT PROJECT

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM

SUNNYVALE DOWNTOWN IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE 2003 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ADDENDUM

SCH Number 1988110186

January 13, 2009

Prepared by:
RBF Consulting
111 W. St. John Street, Suite 850
San Jose, CA 95113
408-993-9224

Lead Agency:
City of Sunnyvale
456 West Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94088

Addendum to the Program Environmental Impact Report for the 2003 Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update, certified by the Sunnyvale City Council on June 17, 2003, by Resolution number 123-03.

Project Title: Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project

Project Number: Federal-Aid: CML-5213 (028)
City of Sunnyvale: TR-08/02-09

Lead Agency: City of Sunnyvale
456 West Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Project Location: 100 Block Murphy Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Sunnyvale proposes to provide streetscape and sidewalk improvements to the 100 block of Murphy Avenue between Washington and Evelyn Avenues including storm, sanitary, grease, water and lighting/power utilities and paving treatments and site appurtenances; intersection improvements of Murphy Avenue/Washington Avenue; intersection improvements of Murphy Avenue/Evelyn Avenue including in-roadway warning lights (IRWL) pedestrian crossing; intersection improvements of Evelyn Avenue/Frances Avenue; sanitary utility improvements on Evelyn Avenue between Murphy Avenue and Sunnyvale Avenue; sidewalk, lighting and tree planting improvements on the north side of Washington Avenue between Frances Avenue and Sunnyvale Avenue; sidewalk, lighting and tree planting improvement on the south side of Evelyn Avenue between Frances Avenue and Sunnyvale Avenue; and pedestrian crossing improvements within the parking lot between Murphy Avenue and Frances Avenue east of Plaza Del Sol.

The scope of work includes modifying the existing sidewalk layout and replacing the existing sidewalk paving, providing new street furnishings, lighting, crosswalk paving, and signage, and constructing landscape improvements. Existing street trees on Murprhy Ave. will be maintained, with new trees added to replace deceased or missing trees, and larger tree grates will also be constructed. New sidewalk paving, street trees and tree grates will be installed on north side of Washington Avenue and south side of Evelyn Avenue.

1.1 Purpose of this Addendum

This document is an Addendum to the 2003 Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update Final EIR. This Addendum has been prepared to address the proposed Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project. Preparation of this Addendum is in accord with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including all amendments thereto, and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 through 15387), as amended 2007.

In an effort to update the Downtown Improvement Program, the City of Sunnyvale has taken the following actions:

- The environmental effects of the proposed Downtown Improvement Program were analyzed in a Downtown Improvement Program Update Final EIR (Program EIR) for the Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update, which was certified by the City Council on June 17, 2003 (Resolution No. 123-03).
- On June 17, 2003, the City Council adopted amendments to the City of Sunnyvale General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element and to the Zoning Code to designate specific entitlements for blocks in the downtown core, including land uses, densities, and building heights.
- On October 14, 2003, the City Council found that proposed revisions to the 1993 Downtown Specific Plan were considered as part of the project analyzed in the Program EIR for the Downtown Improvement Program Update, and further found that the proposed revised Downtown Specific Plan is consistent with the City's General Plan. Based upon the revised plan's consistency with the General Plan and subject to the implementation of the Mitigation Monitoring Program as a condition of approval, the City Council approved and adopted the Downtown Specific Plan 2003 (Resolution No. 149-03).

In order to reduce paperwork and delay, CEQA encourages lead agencies to use a "previously prepared EIR when it adequately addresses the proposed project" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15006 (f)). According to Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, a lead agency should prepare an Addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary and when none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines (which calls for the preparation of a Subsequent EIR) have occurred. Section 15162 requires preparation of a Subsequent EIR when one or more of the following conditions have occurred:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

- (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.”

Where none of the above-referenced conditions requiring the preparation of a Subsequent EIR are met, the CEQA Guidelines require a lead agency to prepare an Addendum to the previously certified EIR, including a brief explanation, supported by substantial evidence, of the decision to not prepare a Subsequent EIR (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164(a)).

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, this Addendum has been prepared to describe the details of the proposed Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project (Project) and analyze how the impacts of the Project relate to the setting, impacts and mitigation measures described in the 2003 Final EIR prepared for the Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update. As described in this Addendum, substantial evidence shows that the proposed Project would not involve any new significant impacts or result in a substantial increase in the severity of significant impacts identified in the Final EIR. Nor does it show that new mitigation measures are required. Therefore, a Subsequent EIR is not required, and an Addendum to the previously certified Final EIR is an appropriate document to address development of the proposed Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project.

1.2 Environmental Process

According to Section 15164(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, an Addendum does not need to be circulated for public review, but can be attached to the Final EIR. The City of Sunnyvale will consider this Addendum to the Final EIR prior to making a final decision on the proposed Project.

1.3 Scope of this Document

Section 2.0 of this document describes the proposed development of the Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project. Section 3.0 analyzes the potential environmental impacts that could potentially occur with the City's adoption of the Project. Section 4.0 provides findings justifying the adoption of an Addendum to the Final EIR for the proposed Project.

1.4 Sunnyvale downtown Improvement Program Update 2003 Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) and subsequent Addendums

The Final EIR fully identifies potentially significant impacts, including growth inducing and cumulative impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives. The Final EIR consists of the Draft EIR, comments and responses, and the Mitigation and Monitoring Program. Copies of the Final EIR are available for review at the City of Sunnyvale during normal business hours.

Through a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), an Addendum to the 2003 Final EIR was prepared in conjunction with the 2004 Forum Special Development Permit (SDP) approval. The Addendum tiered from the original 2003 Final EIR. In July 2004, an Addendum to the EIR was adopted for Specific Plan changes. In August 2004, the MND was approved for the SDP proposed changes. In May 2007 a second Addendum to the EIR was approved for additional Specific Plan changes (hotel and office area).

1.5 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CEQA requires the preparation of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for any environmental document containing mitigation measures. The MMRP adopted in connection with certification of the Final EIR is applicable to this Addendum.

2.0 OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The Historic Murphy District is the vibrant commercial core to Sunnyvale's unique downtown. A strong mix of uses hinges on the vitality of this core district, which has become progressively isolated with the increased presence of traffic and limited pedestrian walkability. The 2003 Downtown Specific Plan envisions an expanded commercial core that provides over 60 acres of mixed-use developments, complemented with almost 30 acres of medium- to high-density housing over the next 20 years. Improved pedestrian connections, within and at the edge of the district, would establish it as a pedestrian-friendly commercial corridor linking future downtown land uses to Sunnyvale's major transit hubs.

The Project proposes to make streetscape and utility improvements in the 100 block of Murphy Avenue and at intersections at the north and south ends of the block that would enhance the physical and visual pedestrian connections between downtown transit facilities and future mixed-use and high-density residential developments such as the Town Center Mall and Town and Country redevelopments located immediately to the south of the Project site. Additionally, the Project includes sanitary sewer replacement at Evelyn Avenue between Murphy Avenue and Sunnyvale Avenue and sidewalk improvements on Washington and Evelyn Avenues between Frances Street and Sunnyvale Avenue.

Project Elements

1. New pedestrian crossing through parking lot west of Murphy Avenue.
2. Improved intersection at Frances Street and Evelyn Avenue with enhanced pedestrian crossings (City standard paver crosswalks, no curb cut improvements).
3. Improved intersection at Washington Avenue and Murphy Avenue with enhanced pedestrian crossings and north side gateway span (at-grade crossings with City standard paver crosswalks).
4. Streetscape improvements along Murphy Avenue including: tree preservation, new street and sidewalk paving, lighting, and street furniture.

5. Utility replacement along Murphy Avenue including sanitary sewer and water main (all new laterals – sanitary, grease, water, fire service).
6. Improved intersection at Evelyn Avenue and Murphy Avenue with enhanced pedestrian crossing and south side gateway span (City standard paver crosswalks, IRWL on Westside only).
7. Sanitary sewer replacement at Evelyn Avenue between Murphy Avenue and Sunnyvale Avenue.
8. North side Washington Avenue City standard sidewalk improvements between alley (Frances/Murphy) to Sunnyvale Avenue, paving, street trees, lighting and minor lateral utility improvements.
9. South side Evelyn Avenue mid-block between Frances Street and Murphy Avenue to mid-block Murphy Avenue and Sunnyvale Avenue. Downtown City standard sidewalk improvements, paving, street trees, street lights, furnishings and minor lateral utility improvements.
10. (Optional) New pedestrian paving through existing breezeways connecting east and west parking areas to Murphy Avenue. This element is not included in the Project analysis for this Addendum.

Background – MTC TLC Funding

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) approved the City of Sunnyvale's application for the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) 2006 Capital Program Project. The TLC funds would be allocated to the following improvements:

1. **Murphy Avenue Intersections:** District gateway columns located at the Evelyn and Washington Avenue intersections to better announce Murphy Avenue from the Multi Modal Station and from adjacent arterials such as Mathilda Avenue. Lighted crosswalk safety features and pavers extending throughout the intersections to slow drivers and significantly increase safety for pedestrians.
2. **District Edge Improvements:** New district perimeter seat walls, crosswalk pavers at each parking lot entrance, pedestrian-scaled historic streetlights with banners, and new street trees to better define the perimeter of the Historic Murphy District. Improvements would welcome visitors arriving by transit by immersing them in a more pedestrian-friendly environment.
3. **Pedestrian Walkways in Parking Lots:** Pedestrian walkway paving through back parking lots to provide safer access for pedestrians.

2.2 Project Location

The Project site is located in the City of Sunnyvale and encompasses both sides of the 100 block of Murphy Avenue and the parking lot on the east side of Frances Street, located between the streets of Evelyn Avenue and Washington Avenue (north and south) and Frances Street and Sunnyvale Avenue (east and west) in downtown Sunnyvale, California. The Project site is identified as Murphy Avenue District in the Downtown Improvement Program Update 2003 EIR – see Figures 2.2-1 *Regional Location Map* and 2.2-2 *Project Area Districts*.

2.3 Environmental Setting

The project site is located in an urban setting, downtown Sunnyvale. The City of Sunnyvale is bounded by San Francisco Bay to the north, the cities of Mountain View and Los Altos to the west, the City of Cupertino to the south, the city of Santa Clara to the east, and the City of San Jose to the northeast. Regional access to the project area is provided by four freeways: U.S. 101 to the north, Interstate 280 (I-280) to the south, State Route 85 (SR 85) to the west, and SR 237 to the north. Subregional access is provided by El Camino Real, an east-west roadway that forms the southern boundary of the Downtown Improvement Program area; Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road, a north-south roadway that connects with Sunnyvale Avenue in the eastern portion of the project area; and Mathilda Avenue, a north-south roadway that traverses the western portion of the project area and connects with Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road south of the project area.

Both sides of Murphy Avenue are lined with small commercial businesses consisting of restaurants, cafes and retail stores – see Figure 2.3-1 *Existing Conditions*. Parking lots are located behind the store rows to the east and west of Murphy Avenue, and Plaza del Sol is located at the corner of Evelyn Avenue and Frances Street, one block west of Murphy Avenue. The Project includes improved connectivity to Plaza del Sol through the west parking lot.

2.4 Project Characteristics

The 100% Design Plans for the Project include the following design elements – see Figures 2.4-1 thru 2.4-7 *Construction Plans* and Figures 2.4-8 and 2.4-9 *Site Details*:

Historic District Plan Elements

1. **Frances Street Pedestrian connection to Plaza Del Sol:** The pedestrian crossing through the parking lot is proposed as 10' wide and constructed of integrally colored concrete with saw cut patterning. The proposed truncated dome pavers would border the drive aisles through the parking area. New curbs, planters and accent trees (with irrigation from Frances Street) would support and define the new pedestrian route. Net loss of parking spaces would be approximately 10 - 12 spaces. An important component to the success of this feature is coordination with the district way finding signage program. In addition to this program, there is an opportunity to provide a mural, with possible historic themes and directional value, on the back wall at the eastern terminus of the parking lot crossing.
2. **Murphy at Washington and Evelyn Intersections, Frances and Evelyn Intersection Improvements:** The design proposal for the two intersections north and south of the 100 block of Murphy Avenue includes slightly raising the grade as possible across the central area of each intersection, resulting in an improved pedestrian condition and would also provide traffic calming effects. At-grade crosswalk lights would be installed across Evelyn Avenue further enhancing the pedestrian connection. Materials proposed for the three intersections include downtown City standard paver crosswalks with concrete banding and intersection with new asphalt concrete paving. A row of eight cast iron bollards connected by chain are proposed along the Northern edge of the Evelyn Avenue intersection and retractable bollards at each end of Murphy Avenue for events.
3. **Gateway Columns and Arch Span:** These vertical elements are proposed for each corner of both Murphy Avenue intersections. The design draws on the motif of the historic Hendy Ironworks street lights. The columns would be composed of a concrete base and metal work, with the metal archways providing Historic Station signage and integrated lighting.
4. **District Edge Improvements:** Sidewalk improvements flanking Murphy Avenue on Washington and Evelyn would include sidewalk decorative paving, street trees, street lights, and site elements to help support the district-wide improvements and enhance the attraction to the area.

Murphy Avenue Landscape Design Elements

1. **Sidewalk Paving:** Integrally colored concrete with saw cut patterning is proposed throughout the sidewalks, with one section of sidewalk on the east and west side of the central plaza consisting of interlocking pavers.
2. **Curbs:** 4" high by 12" wide curbs are proposed throughout (except where flush condition with truncated dome pavers exists at the central plaza). The color of curbs would be tinted to provide a subtle contrast.
3. **Trench Grate Drain:** 6" cast iron trench grate drain is proposed at raised mid-block plaza crossings.

4. **Street Paving:** Proposed material for roadway paving is Basalite Country cobble 6" x 9" pavers with 6" x 6" paver bands. Parking bays are integral colored concrete (as base bid with pavers as add alternate). Parking bays and drive aisles would slope toward a tinted concrete valley gutter that would separate the two.
5. **Tree Grates:** 6' square, cast iron tree grates are proposed for all 24 of the London Plane trees. The grates would replace the 4' grates that many of the mature trees have out grown.
6. **Raised tree wells:** Slightly raised tree wells will be provided for the 16 Red Maple trees currently growing in the planter areas along the street. A 4" high integrally colored concrete curb will preserve the grade around the trees and allow an application of aggregate mulch over the root area of the trees. RHAA is also exploring an optional design feature to create a seating element built around the tree that would also serve to protect the tree and the root area within the central plaza area.
7. **Gateway columns and archway:** The master plan design concept is being developed by Square Peg in coordination with the downtown signage program. Current direction includes pre-cast concrete base with a columnar infill of metal grill work terminating with a metal sphere at the top. The metal grill work will have lighting, with the arch signage illuminated with LED. Columns will be of sufficient height to support event banners.
8. **Street lighting:** All of the existing street lighting along the 100 block of Murphy Avenue will be removed and stored by the City for future use on other projects. Proposed removed fixtures are as follows: 6 cobra head lights, 9 single fixture pole mounted acorn lights, and 4 double fixture pole mounted acorn lights. 4 new double fixture lights (one at each corner) and 15 single fixture lights will be installed. A staggered layout is proposed. Fixtures and poles will be as specified by the City Standards. Street tree twinkle lights will be installed with power source coming from the street light column receptacles or at tree well bases.
9. **Litter receptacles and ash urns:** The existing trash receptacles will be re-used as follows: Clean and repaint (e) trash receptacles, 11. An additional 5 new litter receptacles to be provided as specified by the City Standards. Existing ash urns will not be replaced.
10. **Benches:** Proposal replaces existing dilapidated benches with 19 new 6' iron benches as specified by the City Standards. At the central plaza, seating decks may replace up to 12 benches as an add alternate.
11. **News racks:** Consolidated news racks will be provided at the locations called for the plan. 5 installation locations total.
12. **Bike racks:** New loop style bike racks to be installed in pairs as located on the plan, currently in 8 different locations (20 total loops) are located on each side of Murphy. Rack product as specified by City Standards.

13. **Historic clock:** The historic clock shall be removed during construction and re-installed in its current location.
14. **Interpretive plaque and pedestal:** The two interpretive plaques will be removed and installed on a new cast concrete pedestal.
15. **Planters:** Decorative, pre-cast concrete planters with an appropriate mix of perennials are proposed to replace existing planters. Oak Park Residence Vase by Nichols Bros. Stoneworks, quantities and sizes as follows: 8 @ 37"; 38 @ 25.5".
16. **Irrigation:** A new hard piped drip and stream spray irrigation system will be installed for the new planters and for the existing and proposed trees. System components to include: new automatic controller, new pvc main line (each side of Murphy Ave), quick coupling valves, stream spray and in-ground drip for the trees and drip emitters or stream spray for the planters.

3.0 EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This Section discusses the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project. The discussion is based on the Environmental Checklist found in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update 2003 Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR).

3.1 Environmental Analysis

1. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The 2003 EIR established three overall goals pertaining to project area visual factors and aesthetic improvement:

- Improve the street character of boulevards, avenues and streets;
- Improve and build upon existing assets; and
- Create a sense of arrival and address.

The EIR further addressed the potential impacts on the visual characteristics and special visual features for each of the Downtown Districts. The analysis for the Murphy Avenue District concluded less-than-significant and beneficial visual impacts on this district.

Design Plan recommendations for this district includes maintenance of entertainment uses and modest increases to restaurant, retail, and second floor office uses. The

Murphy Avenue Design Guidelines would also remain applicable to this district, which establish maximum building heights of 16 to 25 feet (or up to 36 feet with setback). Existing City regulations also require any building alterations to be in keeping with the historic character of the District. As a result, the proposed project would be expected to have a less-than-significant impact on this visually sensitive district. In addition, the Design Plan calls for improved street tree planting along Washington avenue between Mathilda and Sunnyvale Avenues with an 11-foot to 13-foot wide landscaped median and pedestrian-scale light poles, which if implemented would also have beneficial visual impacts on this district (2003 EIR).

The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista because approval of the project would result in improvements to the streetscape, paving and lighting features that are in need of maintenance, repair or replacement. No changes would be made to the existing buildings. Further, the proposed improvements must undergo design review by the City and be approved by City Council. The Project site is not located in a state scenic highway. The proposed Project would not create a new source of light or glare and would replace existing lights and light poles that are compatible with the historic character of the Murphy Avenue District – see Figure 2.4-8 *Site Details*.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe aesthetic impacts, and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 20)

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: {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.}				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- c. *Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

Discussion:

The project site is an existing urban development and does not consist of lands identified as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use nor does it have Williamson Act contracts. Approval of the proposed project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use and no impact would result.
 (Sources: 1, 2, 9)

3. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase 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)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. <i>Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the regional agency responsible for overseeing compliance with state and federal laws, regulations and programs regarding air quality. The BAAQMD has prepared and implements specific plans to meet the applicable laws, regulations and programs. Among them are the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan (1994), the Bay Area Clean Air Plan (1997), and the Ozone Attainment Plan (1999). The BAAQMD has also developed CEQA guidelines to assist lead agencies in evaluating the significance of air quality impacts.

In formulating its compliance strategies, the BAAQMD relies on planned land uses established by local general plans. When a project proposes to change planned uses assumed in an adopted general plan (by requesting a general plan amendment), the project may depart from the assumptions used to formulate BAAQMD plans in such a way that the cumulative results of incremental changes may hamper or prevent the BAAQMD from achieving its goals. Land use patterns influence transportation needs and motor vehicles are the primary source of air pollution. Projects proposed in jurisdictions with general plans that are consistent with the BAAQMD's Clean Air Plan and projects that conform to those general plans would not have cumulative impacts. An amendment to the Sunnyvale General Plan is not proposed at this time.

The Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, as approval of the project would not result in changes to land uses approved in the Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update of 2003

The proposed Project would not change the existing use of the site. The site is convenient to the multi-modal transportation center, local bus service and downtown mixed uses including commercial, residential and office. No additional traffic trip generation or parking is associated with the project. The proposed physical improvements to Murphy Avenue include sidewalk improvements, landscaping and the installation of bicycle parking that would act as incentives for pedestrian, bicycle and transit modes of travel, all of which are considered "smart-growth" strategies. Implementation of the Project would assist in reducing the cumulative impacts on long-term regional emissions of ozone precursors associated with other redevelopment activities in the downtown area. Short-term construction related activities would be regulated by best management practices to contain dust and emissions from construction and equipment.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the release of emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors, nor would it result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment under the BAAQMD's Clean Air Plan.

The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project does not require deep ground excavation. The 2003 Program EIR disclosed that due to the large number of contaminated sites in the Downtown Specific Plan area vicinity, there is a possibility that construction workers and/or future occupants could be exposed to soil and/or groundwater contamination. The EIR further concluded that compliance with all established requirements and regulations of the City of Sunnyvale, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) would ensure that possible health and safety impacts

would be less than significant. The EIR further set out procedures or steps that would typically be involved in the implementation of these regulatory requirements.

The proposed improvements to the Project site consist of above ground modifications and trenching that is shallow enough not to encroach into potentially contaminated soil or groundwater in the area. Furthermore, the City conducted soil samples within the Project site and found no significant levels of purgeable organics which could be a source of soil gas vapors. Additionally, the existing and proposed uses and structures on the site do not create emissions. Therefore, approval of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Approval of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors nor would it result in any related impacts. The proposed landscaping feature improvements would provide a *beneficial impact*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts with respect to objectionable odors.

Due to federal funding sources for portions of the Project improvements, the Project is subject to NEPA review by Caltrans. On September 26, 2008 Caltrans issued a Categorical Exemption for the Project: *In non-attainment or maintenance areas for Federal air quality standards, the Project is either exempt from all conformity requirements, or conformity analysis has been completed pursuant to 42 USC 7506(c) and 40 CFR 93.*

The proposed Project would not result in new or more severe impacts and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18)

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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"/>
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</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>c. <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></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>d. <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.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>e. <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></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>f. <i>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>g. <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></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

The project site is currently developed as a developed urban street with limited trees and landscaping. There are no natural habitats on the site for special-status animal species to occupy. The proposed landscaping and tree planting improvements would be a *beneficial impact* to the site. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans that apply to the project site. As such, there would be no related impact. Due to the low wildlife habitat value and the nonexistence of sensitive natural communities on the project site, the general impact of the project on vegetation and wildlife values would not be significant and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 20)

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The 2003 Downtown Specific Plan identifies Murphy Avenue as a local historic resource, the Murphy Station Landmark District. The Project footprint runs through this historic district. The one area of historic terrazzo paving in front of the movie theater at 146 South Murphy Avenue will be preserved in place, with the proposed new sidewalk being constructed around the terrazzo paved area. All work will take place within the public right-of-way. Caltrans, acting as the lead agency under the delegated authority of the Federal Highway Administration, is providing the Project oversight as federal funds are involved.

On October 16, 2007 Caltrans issued a Preliminary Environmental Studies (PES) Form which did not require additional historic records search. However, Caltrans made a site visit on March 18, 2008 and revised the PES Form to require a Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) and Area of Potential Effects (APE) Map (see Attachment A).

On March 18, 2008, the Office of Cultural Resource Studies (OCRS) issued the first of two memoranda regarding the cultural significance of the Project, requesting a record search be conducted, and that more information be provided on the Historic Murphy District (HMD) (see Attachment A). The memorandum also noted that presence of the local historic district may require that cultural resource studies be completed for the project, including an APE Map, Historic Resources Evaluation Report (HRER), and Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR).

On May 20, 2008, OCRS Professionally Qualified Staff (PQS) person, Alicia Otani, PQS Principal Architectural Historian, met with project consultants James Ingels of Royston Hanamoto Alley & Abey, and Becky Urbano, Preservation Services Manager of Garavaglia Architecture, to review updated project information and the results of the records search and survey completed by Ms. Urbano. Ms. Urbano confirmed that the HMD is listed only at the local level, and is not in the California Register, nor has it been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The block-long district was built primarily in the first forty years of the 20th century, with some contemporary infill and renovations. Detailed project mapping and a digital slide show were reviewed to determine the extent of the proposed work.

Following this meeting, Ms. Otani reviewed the new project information with Brett Rushing, PQS Principal Investigator, for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The new project information and clarification regarding the status of the HMD allowed OCRS to revise its initial report requests. Given the nature of the proposed undertaking, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for archaeology and built resources is limited to the areas of direct impact; the project footprints along Murphy Avenue, Washington, and Evelyn Avenues, Frances Street, and the West Parking Lot. This APE has been determined following a review of the submitted Preliminary Environmental Studies (PES) form, Field Review form, and more recent project description and plans.

The OCRS May 20, 2008 memorandum summarized the project review by Ms. Otani and Mr. Rushing and concluded that no cultural resources would be affected by the proposed project and no nearby archaeological resources were discovered. The review supports Caltrans' determination that the Project will have no potential to affect historic properties or resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Finally, due to the nature of the undertaking, it was determined that the project would have no potential to affect cultural resources, and is therefore exempt from further review pursuant to the PA, Stipulation VII, a Screened Undertaking. The undertaking has been screened and determined to be exempt under Class 11 (modifying existing features such as slopes, ditches, curbs, sidewalks, etc. within or adjacent to the right of way), Class 13 (addition or replacement of devices such as glare screen, median barrier, fencing, guardrail, safety barriers, energy attenuators, guide posts, markers, safety cables, ladders, lighting, hoists, and signs), Class 14 (removal or replacement of roadway markings, etc.), and Class 25 (establishment, replacement, or removal of landscaping, vegetation, or irrigation systems, etc.) of Attachment 2, "Screened Undertakings" in the PA. No additional studies are required by OCRS (see Attachment A).

The project site improvements would not cause negative effects to the historic structures along Murphy Avenue, but would enhance the area with compatible landscaping and enhanced

connectivity which would be considered a *beneficial impact* to the area. The project site does not contain unique geologic features. In addition, no known unique paleontological resources exist in the project area. As such, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts to historical resources and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20)

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</i>				
1. <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.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. <i>Strong seismic ground shaking?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. <i>Seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. <i>Landslides?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. e. <i>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994),</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

creating substantial risks to life or property?

- 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?*

Discussion:

According to the Final EIR, no known active faults traverse the project site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture or fault offset would be considered remote.

The project site and its surroundings may experience intense seismic ground shaking during a major earthquake on any one of a number of active faults in the region, including the San Andreas, Hayward, Concord-Green Valley, Calaveras, and Rodgers Creek Faults. The severity of seismic shaking at any given location depends on various factors, including earthquake magnitude, distance to the causative fault, depth to bedrock, physical characteristics of underlying soil and bedrock, and local topography. The proposed Project includes infrastructure construction which would by law be designed and constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code guidelines for Seismic Zone 4 to avoid or minimize potential damage from seismic shaking. These measures would be expected to reduce project-related seismic safety impacts to less-than-significant.

The project site is flat and there are no hills or slopes in the nearby vicinity. The proposed improvements to the site do not involve the creation of steep slopes (15% or greater) that may have the potential to slide. Thus, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts associated with landslides.

The City of Sunnyvale provides sanitary sewer services and development of the project site does not depend upon the use of septic systems for the disposal of wastewater. As such, there would be no related impact.

(Sources: 1, 2, 9, 11)

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project
 Addendum to Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update
 2003 EIR

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>b. <i>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?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c. <i>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>d. <i>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?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>e. <i>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>f. <i>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>g. <i>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>h. <i>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?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

The proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan area nor is it within two miles of a public use airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The project site is not located in an area that would be subject to wildland fires. The proposed project would not physically interfere with any existing emergency response plans. Therefore, no impacts would occur due to the proposed project.

However, the Project is located within one-quarter mile of two schools. If contaminated soils are disturbed during construction activities at the Project site, there is the potential for transport of hazardous materials to remove such contaminated soils from the site.

The following discussion identifies recent studies at the adjacent Sunnyvale Town Center Redevelopment site and within the Murphy Avenue Project site that conclude there are contaminated soils and groundwater in the vicinity. Due to the nature of fairly shallow excavation activities required for the proposed Project, it is unlikely that deeply situated contaminated soils and groundwater would be encountered during construction and subsequent activities at the Project site. However, as further discussed below, the City of Sunnyvale has conducted site specific investigations and soil samplings to ensure that the potential impacts to public health and safety would be *less-than-significant*.

2003 EIR Mitigation Measures

Due to the large number of contaminated sites in the project vicinity, there is a possibility that project construction could encounter contamination and expose construction workers to existing hazardous materials. In order to mitigate this possible health and safety impact to *less-than-significant*, the following steps would be implemented:

(a) *Soil Contamination.* In order to mitigate potential health hazards related to construction personnel or future occupant exposure to soil contamination, developers would complete the following steps for each site proposed for disturbance as part of a project-facilitated construction activity in the project area:

- Step 1 Investigate the site to determine whether it has a record of hazardous material discharge into soils, and if so, characterize the site according to the nature and extent of soil contamination that is present before development activities proceed at that site.
- Step 2 Based on the proposed activities associated with the future project proposed, determine the need for further investigation and/or remediation of the soils conditions on the contaminated site. For example, if the area is slated for commercial land use, such as a retail center, the majority of the site will be paved and there will be little or no contact with contaminated soil. Industrial cleanup levels would likely be applicable. If the slated development activity could involve human contact with soils, such as may be the case with residential use, then Step 3 should be completed. If no human contact is anticipated, then no further mitigation is necessary.
- Step 3 If it is determined that extensive soil contact would accompany the intended use of the site, undertake a Phase II investigation, involving soil sampling at a minimum.

Should further investigation reveal high levels of hazardous materials in the site soils, mitigate health and safety risks according to City of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara County department of Environmental Health, and Regional Water Quality Control Board regulations. This would include site-specific health and safety plans prepared prior to undertaking any building or utility construction. Also, if buildings are situated over soils that are significantly contaminated, undertake measures to either remove the chemicals or prevent contaminants from entering and collecting within the building. If remediation of contaminated soil is infeasible, a deed restriction would be necessary to limit site use and eliminate unacceptable risks to health or the environment.

(b) *Surface or Groundwater Contamination.* In order to reduce potential health hazards due to construction personnel or future occupant exposure to surface water or groundwater contamination, developers would complete the following steps for each site proposed for disturbance as part of a project-facilitated construction activity in the project area:

- Step 1 Investigate the site to determine whether it has a record of hazardous material discharge into surface or groundwater, and if so, characterize the site according to the nature and extent of contamination that is present before development activities proceed at that site.
- Step 2 Install drainage improvements in order to prevent transport and spreading of hazardous materials that may spill or accumulate on-site.
- Step 3 If investigations indicate evidence of chemical/environmental hazards in site surface water and/or groundwater, then mitigation measures acceptable to the RWQCB would be required to remediate the site prior to development activity.
- Step 4 Inform construction personnel of the proximity to recognized contaminated sites and advise them of health and safety procedures to prevent exposure to hazardous chemicals in surface water/groundwater.

Recent Project Site and Vicinity Investigations and Findings

Recent redevelopment activity in the Sunnyvale Town Center Redevelopment Site has encountered contaminated soil, soil gas vapors and contaminated ground water. Environmental investigation and remediation work has been on-going at the Town Center site since 2006. A brief summary of select reports generated as part of the Town Center site work is listed below, with an emphasis on how findings may impact the Murphy Avenue Project (ISA, URS August 8, 2008):

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment – Sunnyvale Town Center Mall, Golder Associates, Draft November 14, 2006; Final March 5, 2007 – found up to four potential dry cleaning operations historically located at the site may have resulted in PCE impacts at the eastern portion of the Town Center Mall site, portions of which are directly south of Murphy Avenue. Sampling activities indicated the presence of PCE in groundwater at concentrations exceeding the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs).

Limited Phase II Environmental Investigation – Sunnyvale Town Center Mall, URS Corp, February 28, 2007 – found that concentrations of PCE in soil-gas and groundwater at the site exceeded residential ESLs.

Due Diligence Assessment – Sunnyvale Town Center Mall, Treadwell & Rollo Inc., March 29, 2007 – found elevated concentration of PCE in excess of residential ESLs for groundwater both at the Town Center Mall site and at two borings collected from within the boundaries of the proposed Murphy Avenue Project site and concluded that the Murphy Avenue Project site is impacted by PCE likely resulting from activities at the former Town Center Mall site.

Supplemental Site Investigation – Sunnyvale Town Center Mall, Treadwell & Rollo, February 26, 2008, Revised May 22, 2008 – Soil, soil-gas, and groundwater sampling and analysis for VOCs were performed both at the former Town Center Mall site and downgradient, including boring location TR-31 which was located within the boundaries of the Murphy Avenue Project site. PCE was detected in groundwater samples from this boring at concentrations exceeding its residential MCL, and the VOCs acetone and carbon disulfide were detected at concentrations below their residential MCLs. No other VOCs were detected in samples from this boring. T&R concluded that PCE in soil does not exceed regulatory criteria and that additional soil sampling is not warranted, and that impacts to soil-gas are likely due to the presence of PCE in groundwater. This report confirmed that previous evidence that releases at the former Town Center Mall site have impacted the Murphy Avenue Project site.

SVE IRM System Installation and Startup Report – Sunnyvale Town Center Redevelopment Site, Treadwell & Rollo Inc., February 29, 2008 – T&R designed two soil vapor extraction (SVE) systems for the former Town Center Mall site, one each for the northeastern and southeastern soil-gas plumes. The SVE system is designed to reduce concentrations of PCE in soil-gas both on and off-site, and will be decommissioned and demolished in late 2008 to allow for development of the Town Center Mall site. Unless PCE in groundwater is remediated, PCE in soil gas will likely rebound at that time.

Groundwater Pilot Test Work Plan – Sunnyvale Town Center redevelopment Site, Treadwell & Rollo, June 13, 2008 – Remediation would include injection of a Ferox Zero Valent Iron (ZVI) solution to directly treat PCE at the site, and installation of a vegetable oil biobarrier wall with injection of microbes to facilitate the remediation of PCE at the northern edge of the former Town Center Mall site. Up to six ZVI injections would be performed along Washington Avenue and Murphy Avenue. If fully implemented, this strategy would take several years to treat all PCE contamination at the site. It would also likely prevent further migration of PCE in groundwater from the site downgradient to areas including the Murphy Avenue Project site. Though some direct treatment of groundwater along Murphy Avenue and Washington Avenue are planned, most groundwater within the proposed Murphy Avenue Streetscape Project would not be fully remediated.

SVE Monthly Monitoring Report – June 2008 – Sunnyvale Town Center redevelopment Site, Treadwell & Rollo, July 14, 2008 – As of June 2008, the two SVE systems had extracted a total of approximately 280 pounds of PCE. Concentrations of PCE have been reduced by two orders of magnitude at most locations during operation of the SVE systems.

Initial Site Assessment for Murphy Avenue Streetscape Project – URS, August 8, 2008 - URS concluded that likely environmental concerns do exist at the Project site which may require

time or cost to investigate or remediate. Table 1 and Figure 3.0-1, located at the end of this Addendum, identify the parcels of environmental concern within the Murphy Avenue Project site.

One recognized environmental condition (REC) associated with the site was identified.

- Documents provided by the City of Sunnyvale include information regarding the presence of PCE in the groundwater and soil gas beneath the site due to historical releases at the former Sunnyvale Town Center Mall site located immediately south (upgradient) of the site. Reports regarding investigation and remediation at this property will be updated by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and are publicly available at their website.

Several potential RECs located within the boundaries of the site were identified.

- Several cleaning facilities were historically located within the site boundaries – see ISA Table 1 and Figure 3.0-1 *Areas of Environmental Concern* (#s 2, 3, 4, 9 & 10).
- Several gas/service stations and repair shops or shops which may have used or manufactured hydrocarbons were historically located within the site – ISA Table 1 and Figure 3.0-1 *Areas of Environmental Concern* (#s 1, 7, 16 & 17).
- Several print shops or photography shops were historically located within the site – ISA Table 1 and Figure 3.0-1 *Areas of Environmental Concern* (#s 0, 1, 5, 6, 11).
- Several laboratories were historically located within the site boundaries - see ISA Table 1 and Figure 3.0-1 *Areas of Environmental Concern* (#s 8 & 18).
- A lumber yard was historically located within the site along Sunnyvale Avenue at the current location of the parking lot east of the businesses on Murphy Avenue - see ISA Table 1 and Figure 3.0-1 *Areas of Environmental Concern* (#s 8 & 12).

Additionally, one potential REC located near the site with the potential of causing site impacts was identified.

- A lumber yard was historically located across the street from the current parking lot east of the businesses on Murphy Avenue – see ISA Table 1 and Figure 3.0-1 *Areas of Environmental Concern* (# 13).

A site listed on the federal National Priority List (NPL) is located downgradient of the site at 401 West Hendy Street – see ISA Table 1 and Figure 3.0-1 *Areas of Environmental Concern* (# 15). This is the former location of a Northrop Grumman Marine Systems site, also identified as a former Westinghouse Manufacturing site. This site is listed on the NPL list due to a leak of a PCB-containing tank. URS concluded that this site is unlikely to have impacted the Project site because it is a sufficient distance downgradient of the site.

URS concluded that there are several potential recognized environmental conditions (RECs) within the boundaries of the Project site due to historical activities at the site, including the presence of historical print shops, photography shops, laboratories, mechanical repair shops, dry cleaners, gas stations, and lumber yards.

Project Site Soil Sampling

The proposed Murphy Avenue Streetscape Project improvements would replace some existing paving materials and would generally not require more than surface excavation. The proposed utility replacements (sanitary sewer system, water system, storm drain system and PG&E gas and electric) would require more excavation, but not significantly deep enough to encounter the

potentially contaminated groundwater and soils. However, the City of Sunnyvale conducted site specific soil samplings in the areas that would be disturbed by the Project construction. Soil samples were collected by Curtis & Tompkins during September 2008 and no VOCs were detected within the Project site.

Caltrans NEPA Determination

The City of Sunnyvale sent the URS ISA and the soil sample findings to Caltrans. Caltrans concluded that the Project is a Categorical Exclusion for NEPA under (see Attachment B):

- 23 CFR 771.117(c)(3,8)
- 23 CFR 771.117(d)()
- Activity __ listed in the MOU between FHWA and the State

This Addendum finds there are no additional mitigation measures necessary to reduce potential public health and safety impacts from hazardous materials to less than significant.

(Sources: 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18)

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>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)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area,</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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?

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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"/> |
| 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"/> |
| 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"/> |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

The project construction-period runoff could contribute to the degradation of regional water quality. Standard City and Regional Water Quality Control Board water quality requirements for issuance of construction permits are expected to be adequate to address this water quality concern.

The project area is already urbanized and does not provide a source of groundwater or groundwater recharge. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts associated with groundwater supply and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

The proposed project includes improvements to existing storm drains. However, the project area is already urbanized, and the proposed project would not change drainage rates, volumes, or patterns in the project area or surrounding vicinity. There are no streams or rivers in the project area. Thus, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts to drainage patterns and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

Additionally, the project site is not located in an area that would be subject to flooding in the event of dam failure. Thus, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts with respect to flooding and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

No housing is planned for the proposed project; therefore, the project would have no impact. The project site is level and inland, and the location is not susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Thus, there would be no impact with respect to these types of inundation.

(Sources: 1, 11)

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>Physically divide an established community?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The Murphy Avenue District includes the General Plan-designated Murphy Station Landmark District, the City's historic main street, and contains the greatest existing concentration of restaurants and entertainment activities in the downtown. The proposed project is consistent with the objectives of the City of Sunnyvale General Plan and Downtown Improvement Program. The land use as Retail/Restaurant/Entertainment would remain the same. The Downtown Design Plan recommendations for this district are limited to maintenance of entertainment uses and modest increases to restaurant, retail, and second floor office uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in severe impacts and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

There are no adopted habitat conservation plans that apply to the project site. As such, there would be no related impact.

(Sources: 1, 2, 5, 9, 11)

10. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The Final EIR did not identify any significant mineral deposit areas in the Sunnyvale area in general, or specifically in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, no impact would result.

(Sources: 1, 2)

11. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Discussion:

Construction activities generate considerable amounts of noise, especially during the demolition phase and the construction of project infrastructure when heavy equipment is used. The effects of noise resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise-generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors.

Construction activities would occur along Murphy Avenue, Evelyn Avenue and Frances Street which are fronted by commercial uses. Evelyn Avenue has a higher noise level due to the location of the CalTrains Station. Construction activities would comply with the mitigation measures outlined in the 2003 EIR to reduce noise impacts to **less-than-significant**; therefore, no additional mitigation measures would be required.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan nor is it within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Thus, there would be no related impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 9, 11, 20)

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The proposed project would not result in the construction of new homes, businesses or roads. No housing is located in the project site. Accordingly, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

(Sources: 1, 2, 11)

13. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

The proposed project is an improvement project which would upgrade utility services to an existing downtown district and would not result in the adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of government facilities or acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public service. Therefore, the proposed project would improve fire fighting capabilities in the project area, and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

(Sources: 1, 2, 5, 11)

14. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The proposed project does not increase density of housing or commercial use and would not generate additional need for parks and recreational facilities. The proposed streetscape improvements include benches along Murphy and improved pedestrian connectivity to Plaza del Sol. These improvements are designed to enhance pedestrian use of the outdoor setting which would provide a *beneficial impact*.

(Sources: 1, 2, 11)

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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 on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
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"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>

Discussion:

There are no airports near the project site. As such, there would be no related impact.

The proposed project would replace pavement along Murphy Avenue and sidewalks with improved and enhanced features that would promote safer pedestrian uses within the area. The project would provide bicycle parking, improved pedestrian connectivity to Plaza del Sol and adjacent parking lots and garages. The project would remove approximately 10 parking spaces in the west parking lot to add a pedestrian pathway through the parking lot and across Frances Street to connect to Plaza del Sol. However, the connectivity improvements would enhance pedestrian connectivity to the bus and train services on Frances Street and across from Plaza del Sol on Evelyn Avenue. The traffic generation would be equivalent to, or less than, existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts associated with traffic and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

Construction activities for the proposed project would be phased, and traffic would be routed through the project area to ensure access to existing business which would remain open during construction of the proposed streetscape and utility improvements (see Attachment C). All intersections would maintain two-way traffic by breaking up the work in half or thirds of the intersection. The one block closure of Murphy Avenue (if this option is selected) would have limited disturbance with rear entrances to businesses and pedestrian access required during all phases of construction. The impact to local traffic would be minimal as construction staging within the street can maintain the critical traffic patterns, transit access and schedules.

(Sources: 1, 11, 19)

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. <i>Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>Have sufficient water supplies</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- e. *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*
- f. *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*
- g. *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

Discussion:

The project proposes to replace and upgrade existing utility services to the businesses along Murphy Avenue and to support the streetscape improvements including lighting. The utility replacement project includes:

Sanitary Sewer System

- ◆ Replacement of existing main and laterals, connect new laterals to existing building laterals on Murphy Avenue and Evelyn Avenue
- ◆ Add grease traps where required on Murphy Avenue, add cleanouts

Water System

- ◆ Replacement of existing main and laterals, connect new laterals to existing building laterals on Murphy Avenue
- ◆ Relocate water meters where feasible to align with curb, install new water meter box and cover per City detail
- ◆ Install new fire services with box and blow off as determine by City Fire Department
- ◆ Utility covers to be concrete pan lids to closely match sidewalk paving treatment

Storm Drain System

- ◆ Installation of additional catch basins and valley gutters on Murphy Avenue
- ◆ C-3 water quality treatment – passive or mechanical

PG&E Gas and Electric

- ◆ Murphy Avenue streetscape and sidewalk improvements: replace street lights, relocate existing controller box and meters, provide new power feeds and outlets for twinkle tree lights and events
- ◆ Power for safety improvements at intersection of Murphy Avenue at Evelyn Avenue
- ◆ New pole lights for pedestrian walkways in existing parking lot for access to Plaza del Sol
- ◆ Possible replacement of existing gas main
- ◆ Utility covers to receive concrete pan lids to match sidewalk, if possible

The proposed project would replace and upgrade existing utility services which would be a *beneficial impact* to existing businesses and public uses within the project area, and no additional mitigations are necessary.

(Sources: 1, 2, 11)

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
<p>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></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b. <i>Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

effects of probable future projects)?

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

Discussion:

As described throughout this document, the proposed project site is already urban development with no natural habitats or wetland, and the proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment nor impact special status habitat or plant and wildlife species. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

The proposed project would not result in individually limited impacts that when considered in combination with the effects of past projects, current projects, and probable future projects, would be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe cumulative impacts and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

As described throughout this document, the proposed project would not result in substantial environmental effects on human beings. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 17)

4.0 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The following findings are based on the analysis provided in Section 3.0:

- Adoption of the proposed project would not cause a conflict with the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, or Redevelopment Plan.
- Adoption of the proposed project would not result in any new significant impacts or increase the severity of a significant impact that was previously analyzed in the 2003 Final EIR.
- No additional mitigation measures would be required as a result of adopting the proposed project.
- The proposed project would not require major revisions to the 2003 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project.
- Substantial changes have not occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken.

Based on the above findings, the proposed project would not require the preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant the requirements of Section 15162(a) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Sources

The following is a list of references used in the preparation of this document. Unless attached herein, copies of all reference documents are on file with the City of Sunnyvale.

1. *Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update 2003 Final EIR*
2. *City of Sunnyvale Downtown Specific Plan 2003*
3. *Murphy Avenue Design Guidelines, 1994*
4. *Town Center Redevelopment Project Addendum to the Program Environmental Impact Report for the 2003 Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update, (July 2007)*
5. *City of Sunnyvale General Plan, (1997)*
6. *Sunnyvale Downtown Specific Plan, (1993)*
7. *Sunnyvale Downtown Redevelopment Plan, (1975, amended 1986 and 1993)*
8. *Sunnyvale Downtown Design Plan, (April 2002)*
9. *City of Sunnyvale Zoning Ordinance*
10. *Fact Sheet: Proposed Interim Cleanup Plan for the Sunnyvale Town Center Mall Redevelopment, October 2007*
11. *Royston-Hanamoto-Alley & Abey 30% Conceptual Project Plans, July 2008*
12. *Initial Site Assessment Murphy Avenue Streetscape Project, URS, August 8, 2008*
13. *Preliminary Historic Evaluation Memorandum, Garavaglia, May 30, 2008*
14. *Cultural Resources Review of Murphy Avenue Streetscape Revitalization Project Memorandum, Department of Transportation, March 18, 2008 and May 20, 2008*
15. *Traffic Routing Memorandum, RHAA, July 11, 2008*
16. *Preliminary Environmental Studies (PES) Form, Caltrans, October 16, 2007 and March 18, 2008*
17. *Categorical Exclusion, Caltrans, September 26, 2008*
18. *Purgeable Organics by GC/MS Soil Samples, Curtis & Tompkins, September 2008*
19. *Preliminary Traffic Routing and Construction Staging*
20. *Site inspections by Tricia Schimpp, RBF Consulting, November 2007 – October 2008*

Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project
Addendum to Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update
2003 EIR

This page intentionally left blank.

FIGURES

The following is a list of figures used in the preparation of this document. Copies of the figures are on file with the City of Sunnyvale.

Figure 2.2-1	Regional Location Map
Figure 2.2-2	Project Area Districts Map
Figure 2.3-1	Existing Conditions Map
Figure 2.4-1	Construction Plan – South (11x17)
Figure 2.4-2	Construction Plan – Central (11x17)
Figure 2.4-3	Construction Plan – North (11x17)
Figure 2.4-4	Frances Parking Lot Crossing
Figure 2.4-5	Frances Street / Evelyn Avenue Intersection
Figure 2.4-6	N. Washington Avenue Sidewalks
Figure 2.4-7	S. Evelyn Avenue Sidewalks
Figure 2.4-8	Site Details -1
Figure 2.4-9	Site Details -2
Figure 3.0-1	Areas of Environmental Concern (URS ISA)
Figure 3.0-1	Table 1 Areas of Environmental Concern (URS ISA)

Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project
Addendum to Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update
2003 EIR

This page intentionally left blank.

Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project
Addendum to Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update
2003 EIR

ATTACHMENT A

**Caltrans Preliminary Environmental Studies (PES) Form
Dated October 16, 2007, Revised March 18, 2008**

**Caltrans Office of Cultural Resource Studies
Memorandum dated March 18, 2008
Memorandum date May 20, 2008**

Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project
Addendum to Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update
2003 EIR

This page intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT B

Caltrans Categorical Exclusion September 26, 2008

Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project
Addendum to Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update
2003 EIR

This page intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT C

Traffic Routing and Construction Staging

Murphy Avenue Streetscape and Utility Replacement Project
Addendum to Sunnyvale Downtown Improvement Program Update
2003 EIR

This page intentionally left blank.