

ATTACHMENT H

Mitigated Negative Declaration

County of Santa Clara
Office of the County Clerk-Recorder
Business Division

County Government Center
70 West Hedding Street, E. Wing, 1st Floor
San Jose, California 95110 (408) 299-5665



Santa Clara County Clerk – Recorder's Office
State of California



Document No.: 17108
Number of Pages: 34
Filed and Posted On: 11/23/2011
Through: 12/14/2011
CRO Order Number: 465486
Fee Total: 0.00

REGINA ALCOMENDRAS, County Clerk – Recorder
by **Laura Luna, Deputy Clerk – Recorder**, *LL*

CEQA DOCUMENT DECLARATION

ENVIRONMENTAL FILING FEE RECEIPT

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

1. LEAD AGENCY: City of Sunnyvale
2. PROJECT TITLE: Application for an Amendment to Onizuka Air Force Station Redevelopment Plan.
3. APPLICANT NAME: City of Sunnyvale PHONE: 408-730-7429
4. APPLICANT ADDRESS: 456 W. Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale, CA 94086
5. PROJECT APPLICANT IS A: Local Public Agency School District Other Special District State Agency Private Entity
6. NOTICE TO BE POSTED FOR 21 DAYS.
7. CLASSIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

a. PROJECTS THAT ARE SUBJECT TO DFG FEES

- | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. <u>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT</u> (PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE §21152) | \$ 2,839.25 | \$ <u>0.00</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. <u>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</u> (PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE §21080(C)) | \$ 2,044.00 | \$ <u>0.00</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. <u>APPLICATION FEE WATER DIVERSION</u> (STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD ONLY) | \$ 965.50 | \$ <u>0.00</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. <u>PROJECTS SUBJECT TO CERTIFIED REGULATORY PROGRAMS</u> | \$ 949.50 | \$ <u>0.00</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. <u>COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEE</u> (REQUIRED FOR a-1 THROUGH a-4 ABOVE)
Fish & Game Code §711.4(e) | \$ 50.00 | \$ <u>0.00</u> |

b. PROJECTS THAT ARE EXEMPT FROM DFG FEES

- | | | |
|---|----------|----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. NOTICE OF EXEMPTION (\$50.00 COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEE REQUIRED) | \$ 50.00 | \$ <u>0.00</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. A COMPLETED "CEQA FILING FEE NO EFFECT DETERMINATION FORM" FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME, DOCUMENTING THE DFG'S DETERMINATION THAT THE PROJECT WILL HAVE NO EFFECT ON FISH, WILDLIFE AND HABITAT, OR AN OFFICIAL, DATED RECEIPT / PROOF OF PAYMENT SHOWING PREVIOUS PAYMENT OF THE DFG FILING FEE FOR THE *SAME PROJECT IS ATTACHED (\$50.00 COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEE REQUIRED) | | |
| DOCUMENT TYPE: <input type="checkbox"/> ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> NEGATIVE DECLARATION | \$ 50.00 | \$ <u>0.00</u> |

c. NOTICES THAT ARE NOT SUBJECT TO DFG FEES OR COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEES

- | | | | |
|---|---|--------|------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOTICE OF PREPARATION | <input type="checkbox"/> NOTICE OF INTENT | NO FEE | \$ <u>NO FEE</u> |
|---|---|--------|------------------|

8. OTHER: _____ FEE (IF APPLICABLE): \$ _____
9. TOTAL RECEIVED..... \$ 0.00

*NOTE: "**SAME PROJECT**" MEANS **NO** CHANGES. IF THE DOCUMENT SUBMITTED IS NOT THE SAME (OTHER THAN DATES), A "NO EFFECT DETERMINATION" LETTER FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR THE **SUBSEQUENT** FILING OR THE APPROPRIATE FEES ARE REQUIRED.

THIS FORM MUST BE COMPLETED AND ATTACHED TO THE FRONT OF ALL CEQA DOCUMENTS LISTED ABOVE (INCLUDING COPIES) SUBMITTED FOR FILING. WE WILL NEED AN ORIGINAL (WET SIGNATURE) AND THREE COPIES. (YOUR ORIGINAL WILL BE RETURNED TO YOU AT THE TIME OF FILING.)

CHECKS FOR ALL FEES SHOULD BE MADE PAYABLE TO: SANTA CLARA COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER

PLEASE NOTE: FEES ARE ANNUALLY ADJUSTED (Fish & Game Code §711.4(b)); PLEASE CHECK WITH THIS OFFICE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR THE LATEST FEE INFORMATION.

"... NO PROJECT SHALL BE OPERATIVE, VESTED, OR FINAL, NOR SHALL LOCAL GOVERNMENT PERMITS FOR THE PROJECT BE VALID, UNTIL THE FILING FEES REQUIRED PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION ARE PAID." Fish & Game Code §711.4(c)(3)



PLANNING DIVISION
CITY OF SUNNYVALE
P.O. BOX 3707
SUNNYVALE, CALIFORNIA 94088-3707

File#:

17108

11/23/2011

File Number: 2011-7636
No. 11-20

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This form is provided as a notification of an intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration which has been prepared in compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended, and Resolution #118-04.

PROJECT TITLE:

Application for an **Amendment to Onizuka Air Force Station Redevelopment Plan** filed by the **City of Sunnyvale**.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION (APN):

2011-7636: Adoption of Amendments to the Onizuka Air Force Station Local Redevelopment Authority Redevelopment Plan, Legally Binding Agreement, Homeless Assistance Submission, and District Agreement. (APN: 110-27-034, 036, 037)

WHERE TO VIEW THIS DOCUMENT:

The **Mitigated Negative Declaration**, its supporting documentation and details relating to the project are on file and available for review and comment in the Office of the Secretary of the Planning Commission, City Hall, 456 West Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale.

This **Mitigated Negative Declaration** may be protested in writing by any person prior to 5:00 p.m. on **Tuesday, December 13, 2011**. Protest shall be filed in the Department of Community Development, 456 W. Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale and shall include a written statement specifying anticipated environmental effects which may be significant. A protest of a **Mitigated Negative Declaration** will be considered by the adopting authority, whose action on the protest may be appealed.

HEARING INFORMATION:

A public hearing on the project is scheduled for:

Tuesday, December 13, 2011 at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 456 West Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale.

TOXIC SITE INFORMATION:

(No) listed toxic sites are present at the project location.

Circulated On November 23, 2011

Signed: _____

Andrew Miner, Principal Planner

Project Title	2011-7636 – Onizuka Air Force Station Redevelopment Plan
Lead Agency Name and Address	City of Sunnyvale P.O. Box 3707, Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707
Contact Person	Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner
Phone Number	408-730-7429
Project Location	1080 Innovation Way at North Mathilda Ave.
Applicant's Name	City of Sunnyvale
Project Address	1080 Innovation Way (APN: 110-27-035, 036 and 037) Sunnyvale, CA 94089
Zoning	Moffett Park Industrial (MPI)
General Plan	Moffett Park Specific Plan
Other Public Agencies whose approval is required	Department of Defense

MOFFETT PARK SPECIFIC PLAN AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

The subject site is within the boundaries of the Moffett Park Specific Plan (MPSP). The City of Sunnyvale adopted the 1,100-acre MPSP in the spring of 2004. The MPSP contemplates build-out of high-tech corporate campus style of projects over a 20-year timeframe. The MPSP also includes a provision for a Development Reserve to allow exemplary projects the benefit of additional floor area beyond the standard FAR restrictions of the sub-districts. The Development Reserve square footage was not applied to individual parcels or general areas, but rather to the entire MPSP area. The subject site is not allowed access to the Development Reserve for additional floor area as designated in the MPSP. However, square footage may be removed from the Development Reserve as a means to reduce potential impacts in regards to traffic at the discretion of the City of Sunnyvale.

In 2003, the Sunnyvale City Council certified the program-level MPSP Environmental Impact Report. As part of the EIR, it was found that there were significant unavoidable environmental impacts resulting from the proposed MPSP. The Council at that time opted to make statements of overriding consideration for these unavoidable impacts, and deemed them to be acceptable in view of the significant economic and social benefits which the approval of the MPSP would make possible.

The statements of overriding consideration were made for the following unavoidable impacts:

Air Quality - Future area source and vehicular emissions under the proposed Moffett Park Specific Plan may result in operational air quality impacts.

Traffic and Circulation – Freeway Operations: Implementation and subsequent build-out of the proposed General Plan Amendment would not impact any additional study freeway segments beyond those impacted under General Plan 2020 Conditions. However, the implementation and subsequent build-out of the proposed General Plan Amendment would increase the severity and level of significance of impacts along several freeway segments that would be significantly impacted under General Plan 2020 conditions.

Expressway Conditions: There are no feasible mitigations measures to reduce the level of service impacts at the Central Expressway and Oakmead Parkway (City of Santa Clara) intersection, and the Central Expressway and Bowers Avenue (City of Santa Clara) intersection.

Mathilda Avenue Corridor: The Mathilda Avenue corridor will be impacted under the proposed Project in the A.M. peak hour and the P.M. peak hour.

Housing and Population - The proposed General Plan Amendment would not allow for the future construction of residential units in the MPSP area. However, the intensity of future industrial and commercial development that could be facilitated under the proposed MPSP would generate a substantial number of jobs and would indirectly induce population and housing growth throughout the region.

Cumulative Growth Impacts - Full build-out of the MPSP, along with other foreseeable development in the area will have an overall cumulative impact on the region, affecting air quality, transportation and the jobs/housing ratio.

In 2006, a project (Jay Paul Company's Moffett Towers Lot 1 and Lot 3) was approved for a rezoning of a portion of the Lockheed-Martin campus. This project required a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) since the Lot 3 portion of the was proposed at a higher intensity than what is permitted under the 2004 MPSP or other Sunnyvale Municipal Code requirement, resulting in the need for an amendment to the MPSP and Lot 3's zoning. The zoning of the balance of the site (Lot 1) was unaffected. It was determined that the increased development intensity proposed has the potential to result in major revisions to the previously certified program-level MPSP EIR. Similar to the 2003 MPSP EIR, the Council at that time opted to make statements of overriding consideration for these unavoidable environmental impacts.

In 2011, three additional projects were approved within the MPSP area. They included the following:

Planning Application 2011-7119, located at 807 Eleventh Ave. and it allowed addition of a new 200,000 square foot building (Building 5) at the Ariba/Moffett Towers campuses.

Planning Application 2011-7170, located at 1100 Enterprise Way which allowed modification of Building 'D' at the Moffett Towers campus (net increase of 125,000 sf.).

Planning Application 2011-7495, located at 399 and 589 Java Drive which allowed a new 315,000 square foot new office building, a 24,000 square foot amenities building and new 5-story parking structure, parcel map to merge all parcels together.

The applications noted above and the current project is tiering from the 2003 MPSP programmatic EIR and do not require a subsequent EIR under CEQA section 21166 and Guidelines section 15162. Based on the Initial Study below, the projects do not trigger the events listed in CEQA section 21166 and Guidelines section 15162.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

The Onizuka Air Force Station was identified for closure in 2006, with a closure date of September 13, 2011. As part of the base closure process, the Air Force completed an Environmental Assessment (EA) as required by the National Environmental Protection Act. The EA studied the three alternatives considered by the adopted 2008 Onizuka AFS Redevelopment Plan which included an Automotive Retail Center, Corporate Office, and a Hotel, Conference Center and Office Alternative. The assessment found

the proposed alternatives would not result in either short- or long-term significant impacts. The resources analyzed in detail were: socioeconomics, land use/aesthetics, transportation, utilities, hazardous materials management, hazardous waste management, Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) sites, storage tanks, asbestos-containing material (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP), geology and soils, water resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, and environmental justice.

The EA disclosed instances of the hazardous materials at the site including, Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACM), Lead-Based Paint and a few hazardous materials spills at the site. Exposure to ACM and Lead-Based Paint would be mitigated through standard demolition requirements which manage containment during demolition. According to the Air Force document, the noted spills have been cleaned and each incident has been closed. Based on this and completion of the Final Environmental Assessment and issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact, the Air Force has determined that the site is suitable for disposal and reuse. Supplemental soil sampling and additional environmental assessment may be warranted for either the higher education uses or park use.

The Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) adopted the Onizuka Air Force Station Redevelopment Plan in 2008, with the preferred auto center land use. In 2009, the LRA conducted a refinement study to evaluate the feasibility of the preferred auto center use. The study found that the preferred use was feasible, but it lacked support from local auto retailers due to limited size, costs and economy. The LRA directed staff to amend the Redevelopment Plan to include one acre for emergency services, approximately four acres for the Veteran Administration, approximately nine acres for educational use and approximately four acres uses consistent with the Moffett Park Specific Plan. The amended Redevelopment Plan identifies these uses as the preferred land uses for the site. The Redevelopment Plan also accommodates alternative location of the requested housing claims at the site for approximately four acres and 96 homeless housing units. The identified site is located near East Maude Avenue and North Wolfe Road (620 E. Maude Ave). The proposed project for this site is still being refined and is only conceptual. The alternative site may accommodate a different range of units and density and is subject to separate review, including environmental, by the City of Sunnyvale.

The preferred land uses in the Redevelopment Plan are consistent with the uses allowed in the Moffett Park Specific Plan Zoning. Future redevelopment of the site will require refined project details and separate project specific environmental review. It is noted that the Veterans Administration will be operating office uses on approximately 4 acres, which is not subject to the City regulations. In addition, the southern portion of the site may be redeveloped with residential uses regardless of the current zoning designation. Redevelopment of the remaining areas will be subject to further environmental review once defined projects have been identified. The proposed conceptual plan is tiering from the 2003 MPSP programmatic EIR and does not require a subsequent EIR under CEQA section 21166 and Guidelines section 15162. Based on the Initial Study below, the plan does not trigger the events listed in CEQA section 21166 and Guidelines section 15162.

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration reviews the proposed Onizuka Air Force Station Redevelopment Plan ("Plan"). The site is approximately 18 acres and is located within the MPSP area. The site is currently zoned Moffett Park Industrial (MP-I) which allows various uses. The Plan proposes conceptual land uses for the Onizuka Air Force Station, which is approximately 18 acres. The proposed conceptual land uses include the following:

- **Emergency Services (1.3 Acres)**

The land identified for Emergency Services will allow provide additional land for the adjacent fire station for improved access and training area. Emergency services are allowed Minimal improvements such as fencing and lighting adjustments will be required initially. No other improvements are anticipated for this area. The Air Force Station closed on September 30, 2011

and is currently under “caretaker” status until the final Reuse Plan and been approved the appropriate government agencies.

- **Office for Veterans Administration (4.41 Acres)**

The VA has requested land through a Fed-to-Fed transfer for additional administrative office space. The land area includes four buildings and surface parking. The VA will be remodeling the existing buildings to better suite their office space needs. Remodeling may also include some exterior changes and demolition to address areas of the building that cross property lines. The VA site is Federally owned land and is not subject to state or local requirement and it is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Any future additions or changes to the site will require the appropriate National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) review.

- **Education (9.56 Acres)**

Foothill-De Anza Community College District (District) has requested land to allow for a new Education Center to replace their center currently located in the City of Palo Alto. The District has indicated that they would propose to construct the Education Center in two phases. First would accommodate 55,000 square feet of educational space and a 556 surface parking lot. The second phase would accommodate an additional 55,000 square feet of educational space and a new four story parking structure. The District is not subject to local requirements such as General Plan and Zoning. Once the district finalizes proposed plans for the site, they will be processing the appropriate CEQA document to further analyze the projected student population and its impacts on the surrounding area. The District will be the Lead Agency responsible for CEQA review.

- **Moffett Park Specific Plan (4.6 Acres)**

The southern portion of the site will allow uses which are consistent with the MPSP. Uses for this area may included additional land for the education use or any other uses allowed as permitted as of right or through a use permit.

On-site Development: The existing Air Force Station closed on September 13, 2011 and is currently in a “Care Taker” status. The Air Force Station began gearing down after it was identified for closure in 2006 with the anticipated closure date of September 13, 2011. Some minor structures, such as satellite dishes have been removed from the site and the existing power plant has been decommissioned.

Construction Activities and Schedule: None. The proposed Plan is conceptual and does not include any type of construction schedule.

Surrounding Uses and Setting: The subject site is located within the Moffett Park Specific Plan area. Office campuses are located to the north and west of the site. Commercial space and a hotel exist to the east of the site and California Highway 237 is to the south of the site.

Off-site Improvements: No off-site improvements are proposed as part of the project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
6. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
7. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
8. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project
9. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | |

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE (see checklist for further information):

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?
 Yes
 No

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 the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? Yes
 No

Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Yes
 No

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potential significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Checklist Preparer: Shaunn Mendrin

Date: November 23, 2011

Title: Senior Planner

City of Sunnyvale

Signature:

Planning	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
1. Aesthetics -Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, historic buildings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale General Plan Map, Open Space Sub-element City Guidelines www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description Onizuka Air Force Station EA and FONSI Addendum to 2004 Historic Building Inventory and Evaluation Report - February 2010
2. Aesthetics -Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings including significant adverse visual changes to neighborhood character?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale General Plan Map, Open Space Sub-element City Guidelines www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description
3. Aesthetics -Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale General Plan Map, Open Space Sub-element City Guidelines www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description
4. Population and Housing - 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) in a way that is inconsistent with the Sunnyvale General Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Land Use and Transportation Element of the General Plan, General Plan Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description Onizuka Air Force Station EA and FONSI
5. Population and Housing -Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Housing Sub-Element, Land Use and Transportation Element and General Plan Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description
6. Population and Housing -Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Housing Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description
7. Land Use Planning - Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale General Plan Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description

Planning	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
8. Land Use Planning conflict - With the Sunnyvale General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) area or related specific plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Land Use and Transportation Element, Sunnyvale General Plan, Title 19 (Zoning) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code http://qcode.us/codes/sunnyvale/view.php?topic=19&frames=off
9. Transportation and Traffic - Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parking Requirements (Section 19.46) in the Sunnyvale Municipal Code. http://qcode.us/codes/sunnyvale/view.php?topic=19-4-19_46&frames=off
10. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - For a project located the Moffett Field AICUZ or 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Moffett Field AICUZ, Sunnyvale Zoning Map, Sunnyvale General Plan Map. www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
11. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There are no private airstrips in or in the vicinity of Sunnyvale
12. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - For a project within the vicinity of Moffett Federal Airfield, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Moffett Field AICUZ, Sunnyvale Zoning Map, Sunnyvale General Plan Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
13. Agricultural Resources - Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Zoning Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com

Planning	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
14. Noise - Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the Noise Sub-Element, Noise limits in the Sunnyvale Municipal Code, or applicable standards of the California Building Code?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Noise Sub-Element, SMC www.sunnyvaleplanning.com 19.42 Noise Ordinance http://qcode.us/codes/sunnyvale/view.php?topic=19&frames=off .
15. Noise -Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Noise Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description
16. Noise - A substantial permanent or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Noise Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
17. Biological Resources - Have a substantially adverse impact 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 U.S Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Plan Map Project Description
18. Biological Resources -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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Plan Map Project Description
19. Biological Resources -Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Plan Map Project Description
20. Biological Resources -Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMC 19.90 Tree Preservation Ordinance Sunnyvale Inventory of Heritage Trees
21. Biological Resources -Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description

Planning	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?					
22. Historic and Cultural Resources - Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or a substantial adverse change in an archeological resource?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Heritage Preservation Sub-Element, Sunnyvale Inventory or Heritage Resources
23. Historic and Cultural Resources - Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Description. Planned grading will disturb the site and may affect sub-surface resources if they exist.
24. Public Services - Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or expanded public schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The following public school districts are located in the City of Sunnyvale: Fremont Union High School District, Sunnyvale Elementary School District, Cupertino Union School District and Santa Clara Unified School District. Project Description
25. Air Quality - Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the BAAQMD air quality plan? How close is the use to a major road, hwy. or freeway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Sunnyvale General Plan Map Sunnyvale Air Quality Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Environ Report, November 2011
26. Air Quality - Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Project Description Environ Report, November 2011
27. Air Quality -Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of any agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Project Description Environ Report, November 2011
28. Air Quality -Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Sunnyvale Air Quality Sub-Element Project Description
29. Air Quality -Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Sunnyvale Air Quality Sub-Element

Planning	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
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)?					www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description
30. Air Quality -Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Sunnyvale Air Quality Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description Environ Report, November 2011
31. Seismic Safety -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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Seismic Safety and Safety Sub-Element of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
32. Seismic Safety - Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Seismic Safety and Safety Sub-Element of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
33. Seismic Safety-Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Seismic Safety and Safety Sub-Element of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
34. Seismic Safety-Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Seismic Safety and Safety Sub-Element of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.sunnyvaleplanning.com

Further Discussion if “Less than Significant” with or without mitigation:

1. Aesthetics: The preferred land uses of the Plan would result in the demolition and redevelopment of the 9.56 4.6 acre parcels. A historic building inventory and evaluation was conducted in 2004 as part of the development of the redevelopment plan to determine if the site qualified as a significant historic resource. The inventory study found that the existing site could not be deemed eligible for the California Register of Historic Sites and that it was not a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA. However, based on the available information, the City determined that the site may be potentially eligible as a local Heritage Resource and/or as a local Heritage Resource District.

In 2009, the Air Force re-evaluated the site and buildings and conducted further consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the City of Sunnyvale. As a result of the re-evaluation,

buildings 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 10031, and 10032 were recommended as National Register-eligible as the U.S. Air Force Satellite Test Center Historic District under the Criteria A (association with historic events) and Criteria G (achieving significance within the past 50 years).

The proposed redevelopment of the site and transition of land from the Federal Government to the LRA or private developer could result in the potential impact to a historic resource. During the consultation with the Air Force, Veterans Administration and SHPO, through the Section 106 process as required by the National Historic Preservation Act, it was determined that the historic significance of the site resulted from the missions and operations conducted within the buildings rather than the structures themselves. Therefore, demolition of the existing structures would result in a less than significant impact since the additional studies found that the buildings were not resources.

4. Population and Housing (Less than Significant): The project site was established in 1960 and is approximately 18 acres and has 28 structures with 615,000 square feet of floor area. The current zoning for the site is MP-I, which has a maximum floor area ratio of 35%. The maximum total floor area allowed under current zoning would be approximately 274,000 square feet, which is well below the existing floor area at the site. The EA prepared by the Air Force, notes that employment in 2006 consisted of 75 military, 170 civilian, and 534 contract personnel. Onizuka closed in September 2011 and it is currently under caretaker status. The proposed redevelopment plan includes office space and educational uses at the site. It is anticipated that redevelopment will result in a net decrease in the gross building floor area located at the site.

The MPSP FEIR identified the potential impacts to population and housing resulting from the increase of floor area within the MPSP area. Increases resulted from new increased zoning density (floor area) and access to the Moffett Park Development Reserve. The subject site is not allowed floor area above 35%, which was the baseline floor area for the MPSP area and it does not have access to the Development Reserve for the MPSP area. As noted above, the resulting redevelopment of the site would be well below what has traditionally existed at the project site. Projects which result in an increase in floor area are required to pay a Housing Mitigation fee to mitigate potential new jobs by providing housing funds for the creation of new housing units. Redevelopment of the site, as per the Plan, is not anticipated to result in an increase in floor area.

9. Transportation and Traffic - Parking (Less than Significant): Implementation of the proposed plan would result in land uses that would need to provide parking. The current zoning establishes a maximum and minimum amount of parking allowed, which is evaluated when formal project proposal is provided. It is anticipated that the future land uses at the site would provide parking within the allowed range, or alternatives based on further evaluation of the proposed use and site configuration.

14. Noise (Less than Significant with Mitigation): The subject site is located adjacent to State Highway 237 and the Noise Chapter of the General Plan indicates that the projected noise levels at the site would range from 70 Ldn to greater than 75 Ldn. The General Plan establishes thresholds for certain types of land uses which may be normally acceptable or conditionally acceptable depending on the project noise levels. The proposed Plan would result in educational uses and office space which may be located within projected conditionally acceptable noise level areas. At this time building locations and design have not been finalized. The General Plan requires the completion of a noise analysis to determine what sound insulation or additional requirements may be needed for any new development at the site.

22. Historic and Cultural Remains (Less than Significant with Mitigation): During the preparation of the EA, the Air Force consulted with the, Veterans Administration, City of Sunnyvale and SHPO, through the Section 106 process as required by the National Historic Preservation Act. It was determined that the

historic significance of the site resulted from the missions and operations conducted within the buildings rather than the structures themselves. The discussion resulted in the following items to be preserved or recorded:

- Relocation of the Challenger memorial to the Veterans Administration site at Onizuka. Responsible Origination: Veterans Administration
- Interpretive display documenting the history of the Onizuka AFS within the lobby of the Veterans Administration building at the site. Responsible Origination: Veterans Administration, subject to review and approval by SHPO
- The completion of a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level-II Type Documentation. Materials will assist in the completion of the interpretative display. Responsible Origination: Air Force
- Completion of a lesson plan documenting the Air Force Station's role in the Cold War era. Responsible Origination: Air Force and to be provided to local school districts by the City of Sunnyvale.

The Air Force, Veteran Administration and California SHPO have all concurred with the recommended documentation steps through a Memorandum of Understanding in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the BRAC process. The impact was considered to be a less than significant.

23. Historic and Cultural Remains (Less than Significant with Mitigation): The propose plan does not include construction details; however, land disturbance may occur resulting from future demolition and construction. Although there are no known archeological sites on the subject site, there still remains the possibility of discovery of Native American remains during grading since there are archeological sites in the greater vicinity. In the event of a discovery, project grading could result in potential disturbance of subsurface cultural resources which would result in a significant impact unless mitigated. There are no surface historic resources currently known to be on the project site. Although the discovery of cultural resources on these sites are not anticipated and the following mitigation measure has been included in the project to reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level:

- WHAT: 1) For projects involving substantial ground disturbance, the individual project sponsor shall be required to contact the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) to determine whether the particular project is located in a sensitive area. Future development projects that the CHRIS determines may be located in a sensitive area--i.e., on or adjoining an identified archaeological site--shall proceed only after the project sponsor contracts with a qualified archaeologist to conduct a determination in regard to cultural values remaining on the site and warranted mitigation measures.
- 2) If a significant archaeological resource is identified during grading, the City and project proponent shall seek to avoid damaging effects to the resource. Preservation in place to maintain the relationship between the artifact(s) and the archaeological context is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to an archaeological site. Preservation may be accomplished by:
- Planning construction to avoid the archaeological site;
 - Incorporating the site within a park, green space, or other open space element;
 - Covering the site with a layer of chemically stable soil; or
 - Deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement.
- 3) When in-place mitigation is determined by the City to be infeasible, a data recovery plan, which makes provisions for adequate recovery of the scientifically consequential information about the site, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any additional excavation being undertaken. Such studies must be submitted to the California

Historical Resources Regional Information Center. If Native American artifacts are indicated, the studies must also be submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission. Identified cultural resources shall be recorded on form DPR 422 (archaeological sites). Mitigation measures recommended by these two groups and required by the City shall be undertaken, if necessary, prior to resumption of construction activities.

A data recovery plan and data recovery shall not be required if the City determines that testing or studies already completed have adequately recovered the necessary data, provided that the data have already been documented in another EIR or are available for review at the California Historical Resource Regional Information Center [CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)].

In the event that subsurface cultural resources are otherwise encountered during approved ground-disturbing activities for a project area construction activity, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures described above.

If human remains are found, special rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) shall apply.

WHEN: These mitigation measures shall be converted into conditions of approval for the project. Conditions will be applicable during the construction of the project.

WHO: The property owner will be solely responsible for implementation and maintenance of these mitigation measures.

HOW: The mitigation measure shall to be incorporated into futures construction plans.

25., 26., 27. and 30. Air Quality (Less than Significant with Mitigation): The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) 2011 CEQA Guidelines thresholds of significance provide that a development project would have a significant cumulative impact unless: 1) the project can be shown to be in compliance with a qualified Climate Action Plan, 2) project emissions of CO₂ equivalent greenhouse gases (CO₂ e) are less than 1,100 metric tons per year, or 3) project emissions of CO₂ equivalent greenhouse gases are less than 4.6 metric tons per year per service population (residents plus employees). The City of Sunnyvale does not have a Climate Action Plan at the time of the writing of this Initial Study.

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis was completed for the proposed Plan by Environ on November 18, 2011 and is available for review at the City of Sunnyvale's One-Stop Counter. The report concludes that the Plan will result in both annual (operational-related) and one-time (construction-related) emissions. ENVIRON's conservative analyses indicate that the Project does not exceed the thresholds of significance for GHGs or criteria pollutant emissions in the categories that are applicable to the Project.

The Project will also result in carbon monoxide (CO) emissions from mobile sources. Based on the size of the Project and estimated Project-related traffic, and existing traffic in the area, it is not expected that any of the intersections near the Project would contribute to a violation of CO air quality standards.

The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines also recommend evaluation of potential site health impacts on off-site sensitive receptors from sources including operational and construction activities. The Project is not anticipated to have any operational sources that require further evaluation. The shortest distance between the fence line of construction and the nearest sensitive receptor for the educational land uses

(community college and parking lot) is less than its BAAQMD required minimum offset. As such, further analysis may be required for the educational land uses when they undergo their entitlement process. The BAAQMD CEQA guidelines require the evaluation of offsite cumulative sources (stationary and mobile emissions) within a 1,000 foot zone of influence surrounding the receptors/site if sensitive receptors (e.g., residents, day care children) are to be located onsite. As the Project is not anticipated to have any new sensitive receptors located onsite, further evaluation of offsite cumulative sources is not necessary. An evaluation of offsite cumulative sources within a 1,000 foot zone of influence of the Project may need to be conducted due to toxic air contaminant (TACs) emissions from construction. However, it is anticipated that the Project will likely not be cumulatively considerable.

Responsible Division: Planning Division

Completed by: Shaunn Mendrin

Date: November 18, 2 2011

Transportation	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
35. Exceeds the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all modes of transportation including nonmotorized travel and all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	City's Land Use and Transportation Element, Santa Clara County Transportation Plan. Traffic Study by Fehr & Peers, dated November 2011.
36. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measurements, or other standards 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"/>	Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program and Technical Guidelines (for conducting TIA and LOS thresholds).
37. Results in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in air traffic levels or a change in flight patterns or location that results in substantial safety risks to vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale General Plan including the Land Use and Transportation Element.
38. Substantially increase hazards 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	City and CA Standard Plans & Standard Specifications. Traffic Study by Fehr & Peers, dated November 2011.
39. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit or nonmotorized transportation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Bicycle Plan, VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines, and VTA Short Range Transit Plan. Traffic Study by Fehr & Peers, dated November 2011.

Transportation	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
40. Affect the multi-modal performance of the highway and/or street and/or rail and/or off road nonmotorized trail transportation facilities, in terms of structural, operational, or perception-based measures of effectiveness (e.g. quality of service for nonmotorized and transit modes)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	VTA Community Design and Transportation Manual.
41. Reduce, sever, or eliminate pedestrian or bicycle circulation or access, or preclude future planned and approved bicycle or pedestrian circulation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian and Bicycle Opportunities Studies and associated capital projects. Traffic Study by Fehr & Peers, dated November 2011.
42. Cause a degradation of the performance or availability of all transit including buses, light or heavy rail for people or goods movement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	VTA Transit Operations Performance Report, VTA Short Range Transit Plan, and Valley Transportation Plan for 2035.

Further Discussion if “Less Than Significant” with or without mitigation:

35., 38. and 39. Transportation (Less than Significant with Mitigation) – A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) has been prepared by Fehr & Peers, dated November 2011. This study is available for review at the City of Sunnyvale’s One-Stop Counter.

The Fehr & Peers report presents the results of the TIA and concludes there are no new significant impacts resulting from the proposed Plan, because the proposed uses do not increase the number of trips assumed in the baseline analysis of the TIF. The project would result in a less than significant traffic impact.

The following is the executive summary from the TIA:

PROJECT TRAFFIC ESTIMATES

The amount of traffic anticipated to be added to the surrounding roadway system by the proposed projects were estimated based data published in Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) Trip Generation 8th Edition (2008).

Two trip reductions strategies based on VTA’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines (March 2009) were applied to the Project traffic estimates to determine the number of net new trips generated by the project. Because of the Project’s proximity to the existing Moffett Park light rail station, Fehr & Peers applied a three percent reduction for employment that is within 2,000 feet of a light rail station to account for transit ridership. Fehr & Peers also applied a five percent transportation demand management (TDM) trip reduction to the office and R&D uses, assuming that the office developments would provide some level of TDM programs, such as financial incentives with Eco Pass participation.

The proposed project is estimated to generate 2,600 net new daily vehicle trips, 307 net new AM peak-hour trips, and 310 net new PM peak-hour trips.

INTERSECTION IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Existing Plus Project Conditions

Measured against the City of Sunnyvale's and VTA's level of service standards, the project is not expected to have significant impacts at any of the study intersections under Existing plus Project conditions; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Background Plus Project Conditions

The Project is projected to operate at unacceptable service levels at the following three intersections:

Under Background plus Project Conditions the following three signalized intersections are projected to operate at unacceptable service levels during the identified peak hours.

- Int. 1. Enterprise Way/Manila Drive/Moffett Park Drive: the addition of project traffic exacerbates unacceptable LOS F operation during the AM peak hour
- Int. 6. Mathilda Avenue/Moffett Park Drive: the addition of project traffic exacerbates unacceptable LOS F operations during the AM and PM peak hours
- Int. 7. Mathilda Avenue/SR 237 Westbound Ramps: the addition of project traffic exacerbates unacceptable LOS F operations during the AM and PM peak hour

In each case the critical delay increases by more than four seconds (and the critical V/C ratio increases by more than 0.01 between the Background No Project and Background Plus Project Scenario and the project would be considered to have a significant impact. However, the City's TIF program was developed when the Onizuka Air Force Base was in operation and the TIF and associated improvements and fee structure took into account the amount of traffic that the air force uses were generating in their baseline analysis. Based on the analysis presented in the Onizuka Redevelopment Traffic Analysis Technical Memorandum (Fehr & Peers, March 2008), the air force uses were estimated to generate 4,970 daily vehicle trips, 736 AM peak hour trips (648 inbound and 88 outbound) and 700 PM peak hour trips (119 inbound and 581 outbound). The trips generated by the air base uses on the site are greater than those generated by the proposed project (2,600 net new daily vehicle trips, including 307 and 310 net new AM and PM peak hour trips, respectively) and the project is considered to have less-than-significant impact, because the proposed uses do not increase the number of trips assumed in the baseline analysis of the TIF.

Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions the Mathilda Avenue/SR 237 Eastbound Ramp intersection in addition to the three intersections identified under Background Conditions are projected to operate at unacceptable service levels. In each case the critical delay increases by more than four seconds and the critical V/C ratio increases by more than 0.01 between the Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Project scenarios and the project would be considered to have a significant impact. However, as discussed under Background Conditions, the project is considered to have less-than-significant impact, because the proposed uses generate less trips than allowed under air base uses, which were assumed in the baseline analysis of the City's TIF program.

FREEWAY SEGMENT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Existing Plus Project Conditions

The proposed project will not have a significant impact on any of the study freeway segments, as the addition of project traffic will not degrade operations on any segment to unacceptable LOS F or exacerbate unacceptable LOS F operations by adding traffic equal to at least one percent of a freeway segment's capacity; therefore, no mitigation is required.

TRANSIT SERVICE

The proposed project will generate demand for existing transit services in the area, which can be accommodated by the existing supply. Transit impacts are considered significant if the proposed project conflicts with existing or planned transit facilities or generates potential transit trips and does not provide adequate facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists to access transit routes and stops. Based on these criteria, the project would not have a potentially significant impact on transit service.

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

The proposed Project would generate bicycle demand on the adjacent roadways, which immediately around the project site have limited designated bicycle facilities. Bike lanes are provided on 11th Avenue; however no designated facilities are currently available on Innovation Way or Moffett Park Drive and Mathilda Avenue only is designated as a bike route north of Innovation Way. The City has plans to provide bike lanes on Moffett Park Drive between Enterprise Way and Innovation Way and a bike route between Innovation Way and Mathilda Avenue, since right-of-way constraints limit the feasibility of bike lanes in the segment east of Innovation Way.

VEHICLE AND BICYCLE PARKING

Based on the requirements of the MPSP, the office uses of the project would be required to provide a minimum of 403 parking spaces and maximum of 488 parking spaces at the Onizuka Redevelopment site. The project description does not contain sufficient information to fully evaluate the college's required parking supply. However, the project does anticipate to supply parking for 556 cars.

The office uses of the project will need to supply 21 bicycle spaces on site. Of these, 75 percent (16) will be Class I bicycle lockers and remaining 25 percent (5) will be Class II bicycle facilities. The MSPS and City Municipal Code do not include parking supply requirements for college uses; though VTA's TIA Guidelines do recommend that college uses should provide Class I bicycle lockers for every 30 employee and one spot for every nine student seats (25 percent Class I and 75 percent Class II). The project description does not contain sufficient information to fully evaluate the college's required bicycle parking supply; though the City should work with project applicant to provide adequate number of Class I and Class II bicycle parking facilities.

SITE ACCESS AND ON-SITE CIRCULATION

The preferred land use plan for the project site provides a general site diagram for future development. Absent from the land use plan are the location of project driveways and an internal circulation system to illustrate auto, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic and the site plan is not detailed enough to evaluate on-site circulation. The City will evaluate on-site circulation when a more detailed site plan is available.

Building	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
43. Hydrology and Water Quality - Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, 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"/>	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map Effective 5/18/09 www.sunnyvaleplanning.com , California Building Code, Title 16 (Building) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code Project Description
44. Hydrology and Water Quality - 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"/>	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map Effective 5/18/09 www.sunnyvaleplanning.com , California Building Code, Title 16 (Building) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code Project Description
45. Hydrology and Water Quality - 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"/>	1995 ABAG Dam Inundation Map www.abag.ca.gov , California Building Code, Title 16 (Building) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code Project Description
46. Geology and Soils -Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Municipal Code 12.60, Storm Water Quality Best Sunnyvale Management Practices Guideline Manual Project Description Blueprint for a Clean Bay
47. Geology and Soils -Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety and Seismic Safety Sub-Element, www.sunnyvaleplanning.com California Plumbing, Mechanical, and Electrical Codes and Title 16 (Building) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code
48. Geology and Soils -Be located on expansive soil, as defined by the current building code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	California Plumbing, Mechanical, and Electrical Codes and Title 16 (Building) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code

Further Discussion if “Less than Significant” with or without mitigation:

46. Geology and Soils (Less than Significant): The proposed Plan would result in demolition and site preparation and grading prior to construction. During the time the existing topsoil is exposed and there is a potential for erosion and loss of soil. There is no surface run-off anticipated during construction and no long-term run-off expected after construction. This aspect of the project will be less than significant with

the implementation of Sunnyvale's Municipal Code 12.60, Storm Water Quality Best Management Practices, Regional Water Quality Boards C.3 permit requirements, and the Blueprint for a Clean Bay.

47. Geology and Soils (Less than Significant): The project site is not located in an area with any active faults, but may experience strong seismic ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. Through the City's implementation of the Uniform Building Code requirements for areas with potential for seismic activity, this aspect of the project will be less than significant.

Responsible Division: Planning Division

Completed by: Shaunn Mendrin

Date: November 21, 2011

Engineering	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
49. Utilities and Service Systems: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Sunnyvale Wastewater Management Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
50. Utilities and Service Systems: Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Sunnyvale Waste Water Management Sub-Element Water Resources Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
51. Utilities and Service Systems: Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Sunnyvale Waste Water Management Sub-Element Water Resources Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
52. Utilities and Service Systems: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Water Resources Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
53. Utilities and Service Systems: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Sunnyvale Wastewater Management Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
54. Utilities and Service Systems: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Solid Waste Management Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
55. Hydrology and Water Quality - Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Region 2 Municipal Regional Permit

Engineering	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
56. Hydrology and Water Quality - Substantially degrade groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Santa Clara Valley Water District Groundwater Protection Ordinance www.valleywater.org
57. Hydrology and Water Quality - Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project description Water Resources Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
58. Hydrology and Water Quality - Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems in a manner which could create flooding or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RWQCB, Region 2 Municipal Regional Permit, Stormwater Quality BMP Guidance Manual for New and Redevelopment Projects www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
59. Hydrology and Water Quality - Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams www.valleywater.org City of Sunnyvale Stormwater Quality Best Management Practices (BMP) Guidance Manual for New and Redevelopment Projects www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
60. Utilities and Service Systems: Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Solid Waste Management Sub-Element of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.sunnyvaleplanning.com

Engineering	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
61. Public Services Infrastructure? Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description

Further Discussion if “Less than Significant” with or without mitigation:

51. and 58. Utilities and Service Systems (Less than Significant): Implementation of the Plan would result in the removal and reconstruction of existing hardscape areas, which would be subject to the current National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. This would result in the future construction of new stormwater management devices on the property. Current regulations require the use of Low Impact Development (LID) devices, unless infiltration and rainwater harvesting are infeasible. The types of devices used to treat stormwater will be dependent of the time plans are developed and implemented. Treatment measures will be either revised by the City of Sunnyvale or the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The stormwater management measures will be privately constructed and maintained by the project developer. The project will not require an expansion of the City’s existing treatment or stormwater system since the stormwater is being infiltrated or treated on-site prior to its release. The project but it will not cause a degradation or significant impact to the City. These impacts are less than significant.

Responsible Division: Planning Division

Completed by: Shaunn Mendrin

Date: November 21, 2011

Public Services - Public Safety	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
62. Public Services Police and Fire protection - Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Law Enforcement Sub-Element Sunnyvale Fire Services Sub-Element Safety and Seismic Safety Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
63. Public Services Police and Fire protection - Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	California Building Code SMC Section 16.52 Fire Code

Further Discussion if “Less than Significant” with or without mitigation: None required.

Responsible Division: Planning Division

Completed by: Shaunn Mendrin

Date: November 21, 2011

Public Safety – Hazardous Materials	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
64. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description
65. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Description
66. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description
67. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Hazardous Waste & Substances List (State of California) List of Known Contaminants in Sunnyvale
68. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Seismic Safety and Safety Sub-Element of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.sunnyvaleplanning.com

Further Discussion if “Less than Significant” with or without mitigation:

65. Public Safety – Hazardous Materials (Less than Significant): The former Onizuka Air Force Station used hazardous materials at the site as part of the day to day activities. A Hazardous Materials Pharmacy was established that the site (Building 1007), which was a staging area to hold materials for use and disposal. All hazardous materials were disposed off site at a permitted facility. The EA prepared for the closure of the facility evaluated the hazardous materials used at the site and areas were releases had been noted, referred to as areas of concern. All areas of concern have been closed. Implementation of the proposed plans is not anticipated to result in the use of significant hazardous materials at the site.

Community Services	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
69. Public Services Parks - Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open Space & Recreation Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description
70. Recreation - Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open Space & Recreation Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description
71. Recreation - Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open Space & Recreation Sub-Element www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Project Description

Further Discussion if "Less than Significant" with or without mitigation: None Required

Responsible Division: Planning Division

Completed by: Shaunn Mendrin

Date: November 21, 2011

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST REFERENCE LIST

Note:All references are the most recent version as of the date the Initial Study was prepared:
Page 28 of 30

City of Sunnyvale General Plan:

- A. General Plan Map
- B. Air Quality Sub-Element (1993)
- C. Arts Sub-Element (1995)
- D. Community Design Sub-Element (1990)
- E. Community Engagement Sub-Element (2007)
- F. Fire Services Sub-Element (1995)
- G. Community Vision (2007)
- H. Fiscal Sub-Element (2006)
- I. Heritage Preservation Sub-Element (1995)
- J. Housing & Community Revitalization Sub-Element (2009)
- K. Land Use & Transportation Sub-Element (1997)
Revised 4/28/09 with Allocation of Street Space Policies
- L. Law Enforcement Sub-Element (1995)
- M. Legislative Management Sub-Element (1999)
- N. Library Sub-Element (2003)
- O. Noise Sub-Element (1997)
- P. Open Space and Recreation Sub-Element (2006) *Updated with Parks of the Future Study 4/28/2009. Revised 4/24/09.*
- Q. Safety & Seismic Safety Sub-Element (2008)
- R. Socio-Economic Sub-Element (1989)
- S. Solid Waste Management Sub-Element (1996)
- T. Support Services Sub-Element (1988)
- U. Surface Run-off Sub-Element (1993)
- V. Wastewater Management Sub-Element (1996)
- W. Water Resources Sub-Element (2008)

City of Sunnyvale Municipal Code:

- A. Title 8 Health and Sanitation
- B. Title 9 Public Peace, Safety or Welfare
- C. Title 10 Vehicles and Traffic
- D. Title 12 Water and Sewers
- E. Chapter 12.60 Storm Water Management
- F. Title 13 Streets and Sidewalks
- G. Title 16 Buildings and Construction
- H. Chapter 16.52 Fire Code
- I. Chapter 16.54 Building Standards for Buildings Exceeding Seventy –Five Feet in Height
- J. Title 18 Subdivisions
- K. Title 19 Zoning
- L. Chapter 19.28 Downtown Specific Plan District
- M. Chapter 19.29 Moffett Park Specific plan District
- N. Chapter 19.39 Green Building Regulations
- O. Chapter 19.42 Operating Standards
- P. Chapter 19.54 Wireless Telecommunication Facilities

- Q. Chapter 19.81 Streamside Development Review
- R. Chapter 19.96 Heritage Preservation
- S. Title 20 Hazardous Materials

Specific Plans:

- A. Downtown Specific Plan
- B. El Camino Real Precise Plan
- C. Lockheed Site Master Use Permit
- D. Moffett Park Specific Plan
- E. 101 & Lawrence Site Specific Plan
- F. Southern Pacific Corridor Plan
- G. Lakeside Specific Plan
- H. Arques Campus Specific Plan

Environmental Impact Reports:

- A. Futures Study Environmental Impact Report
- B. Lockheed Site Master Use Permit Environmental Impact Report
- C. Tasman Corridor LRT Environmental Impact Study (supplemental)
- D. Kaiser Permanente Medical Center Replacement Center Environmental Impact Report (City of Santa Clara)
- E. Downtown Development Program Environmental Impact Report
- F. Caribbean-Moffett Park Environmental Impact Report
- G. Southern Pacific Corridor Plan Environmental Impact Report
- H. East Sunnyvale ITR General Plan Amendment EIR
- I. Palo Alto Medical Foundation Medical Clinic Project EIR
- J. Luminaire (Lawrence Station Road/Hwy 237 residential) EIR
- K. NASA Ames Development Plan Programmatic EIS
- L. Mary Avenue Overpass EIR
- M. Mathilda Avenue Bridge EIR

Maps:

- A. General Plan Map
- B. Zoning Map
- C. City of Sunnyvale Aerial Maps
- D. Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FEMA)
- E. Santa Clara County Assessors Parcel
- F. Utility Maps
- G. Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Study Map

Note: All references are the most recent version as of the date the Initial Study was prepared:

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST REFERENCE LIST

Note:All references are the most recent version as of the date the Initial Study was prepared:
Page 29 of 30

H. Noise Sub-Element Appendix A 2010 Noise Conditions Map

Lists / Inventories:

A. Sunnyvale Cultural Resources Inventory List

B. Heritage Landmark Designation List

C. Santa Clara County Heritage Resource Inventory

D. Hazardous Waste & Substances Sites List (State of California)

E. List of Known Contaminants in Sunnyvale

F. USFWS / CA Dept. F&G Endangered and Threatened Animals of California

<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/TEAnimals.pdf>

G. USFWS / CA Dept. F&G Endangered, Threatened and Rare Plants of California

<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/TEPlants.pdf>

Legislation / Acts / Bills / Resource Agency

Codes and Permits:

A. Subdivision Map Act

B. San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit

C. Santa Clara County Valley Water District Groundwater Protection Ordinance

D. The Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List
www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm

E. The Leaking Underground Petroleum Storage Tank List
www.geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov

F. The Federal EPA Superfund List
www.epa.gov/region9/cleanup/california.html
Section 404 of Clean Water Act

Transportation:

A. California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual

B. California Department of Transportation Traffic Manual

C. California Department of Transportation Standard Plans & Standard Specifications

D. Highway Capacity Manual

E. Institute of Transportation Engineers - Trip Generation Manual & Trip Generation Handbook

F. Institute of Transportation Engineers - Traffic Engineering Handbook

G. Institute of Transportation Engineers - Manual of Traffic Engineering Studies

H. Institute of Transportation Engineers - Transportation Planning Handbook

I. Institute of Transportation Engineers - Manual of Traffic Signal Design

J. Institute of Transportation Engineers - Transportation and Land Development

K. U.S. Dept. of Transportation Federal Highway Administration Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Street and Highways & CA Supplements

L. California Vehicle Code

M. Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program and Technical Guidelines

N. Santa Clara County Transportation Agency Short Range Transit Plan

O. Santa Clara County Transportation Plan for 2035

P. Traffic Volume Studies, City of Sunnyvale Public Works Department of Traffic Engineering Division

Q. Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System

R. Sunnyvale Zoning Ordinance – including Titles 10 & 13

S. City of Sunnyvale General Plan – land Use and Transportation Element

T. City of Sunnyvale Bicycle Plan

U. City of Sunnyvale Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program

V. Valley Transportation Authority Bicycle Technical Guidelines

W. Valley Transportation Authority Community Design & Transportation – Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use

X. Santa Clara County Sub-Regional Deficiency Plan

Y. City of Sunnyvale Deficiency Plan

Z. AASHTO: A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets

AA. City of Sunnyvale Pedestrian and Bicycle Opportunities Studies

BB. Valley Transportation Authority Operations Performance Report

Public Works:

A. Standard Specifications and Details of the Department of Public Works

B. Storm Drain Master Plan

C. Sanitary Sewer Master Plan

D. Water Master Plan

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST REFERENCE LIST

Note:All references are the most recent version as of the date the Initial Study was prepared:
Page 30 of 30

- E. Solid Waste Management Plan of Santa Clara County
- F. Geotechnical Investigation Reports
- G. Engineering Division Project Files
- H. Subdivision and Parcel Map Files

Other:

- A. Traffic Study by Fehr & Peers, dated November 2011.
- B. Air Quality and Green House Gas report by Environ, dated November 2011.

Miscellaneous Agency Plans:

- A. ABAG Projections 2010
- B. Bay Area Clean Air Plan
- C. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines
- D. Criteria of the National Register of Historic Places

Building Safety:

- A. California Building Code
- B. California Energy Code
- C. California Plumbing Code
- D. California Mechanical Code
- E. California Electrical Code
- F. California Fire Code
- G. Title 16.52 Sunnyvale Municipal Code
- H. Title 16.53 Sunnyvale Municipal Code
- I. Title 16.54 Sunnyvale Municipal Code
- J. Title 19 California Code of Regulations

Guidelines and Best Management Practices

- A. Storm Water Quality Best Management Practices Guidelines Manual 2007
- B. Sunnyvale Citywide Design Guidelines
- C. Sunnyvale Industrial Guidelines
- D. Sunnyvale Single-Family Design Techniques
- E. Sunnyvale Eichler Guidelines
- F. Blueprint for a Clean Bay
- G. SCVWD Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams
- H. The United States Secretary of the Interior 's Guidelines for Rehabilitation
- I. Criteria of the National Register of Historic Places

Additional Project References:

- A. Project Description
- B. Onizuka Air Force Station Redevelopment Plan
- C. Onizuka Air Force Station EA and FONSI – May 2011
- D. Addendum to 2004 Historic Building Inventory and Evaluation Report - February 2010