

CHAPTER 2 SUMMARY

2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The West Valley – Mission Community College District (WVMCCD or District), the lead agency, proposes to adopt the Mission College Educational and Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan). Plan implementation result in development of a range of projects through 2025, and they are summarized according to four categories, as follows:

- *Maintenance Projects:* Includes maintenance, repair, and/or replacement of various building finishes or utility systems. These projects will be implemented concurrent with more extensive interior remodel or modification/conversion projects.
- *Demolition Projects:* The master plan indicates the demolition requirement for the Main Building, Central Plant, and the Mission Transportables (MT Buildings). Demolition of the above-noted buildings is a mandatory requirement of the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) in order for the College to be eligible for 50-50 matching State funding for the replacement projects.
- *Interior Remodel Projects:* Construction activities in this category would include classroom modifications, smart classroom construction, disabled access improvements, utility system upgrades, including data and communications systems, upgrades of fire/life safety/security infrastructure.
- *Renovation, Expansion and New Construction Projects:* Renovation and expansion projects could include activities described in the above category, but also include building additions or exterior renovation work. These improvements would be necessary to change a building’s use on campus or expand its current capabilities. Conversion/modification projects would consolidate services or academic departments, provide permanent facilities for projects in the preceding categories, or provide additional space for various college programs.

2.2 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR presents a description of the existing environmental setting, an analysis of environmental impacts resulting from Plan implementation, and required or proposed mitigation measures. These impacts and mitigation measures are summarized in Table 2-1. Impacts are identified as either “Potentially Significant” or “Less than Significant.” If an impact is potentially significant, mitigation measures are listed to reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels.

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impact	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Land Use</i>			
4.1-1: The project would alter existing land uses on the site.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
<i>Biological Resources</i>			
4.2-1: Implementation of the Mission College Master Plan would result in the loss of habitat for burrowing owls.	Significant	4.2-1: The District shall continue to maintain habitat in Areas 1 and 2 consistent with the 1994 Management Plan, two addenda, and as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.2-2: Construction of Master Plan improvements would have the potential to directly harm individual owls or nesting pairs, as well as directly or indirectly cause the failure of nesting activity.	Potentially Significant	4.2-2: Prior to project construction as well as the abandonment of management areas, owl protection measures shall be implemented as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.2-3: The proposed project could result in mortalities of white-tailed kite, loggerhead shrike, and other migratory raptors and passerines	Potentially Significant	To avoid "take" of white-tailed kite, loggerhead shrike and other migratory raptors and passerines, site clearing, non-disturbance buffer, and nest removal measures shall be implemented as required by this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.2-4: The proposed project could result in the loss of bat roosting habitat, and/or potential "take" of bats roosting inside the structures	Potentially Significant	4.2-4: To avoid "take" and/or further evaluate presence or absence of bats, a qualified bat biologist shall conduct a bat habitat assessment as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.2-5: The proposed project could result in the loss of a population of Congdon's tarplant.	Potentially Significant	4.2-5: To preserve the existing population of Congdon's tarplant on the campus, a conservation easement or similar instrument shall be placed on the population area for protection from development and maintenance activities as described in this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.2-6: Maintenance of campus facilities (i.e., ball fields, grounds) could result in direct or indirect adverse effects on the preserved population of Congdon's tarplant.	Potentially Significant	4.2-6: To protect the preserved Congdon's tarplant population, maintenance activities around the population shall be restricted as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.2-7: Future landscaping could result in the planting of invasive species capable of spreading into Calabazas Creek.	Potentially Significant	4.2-7: In order to prevent the spread of invasive plant species into the Calabazas Creek corridor, use of non-native ornamental species shall be prohibited from new landscaping as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (CONT'D)

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impact	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>			
4.3-1: Hazardous materials could be encountered in the soil during ground-disturbing activities associated with the Master Plan projects.	Potentially Significant	4.3-1: For any construction projects involving ground disturbance, the District shall retain a qualified professional to update the environmental database review for applicable construction activities. Soil sampling and preparation of site safety plans or material disposal plans will be done where applicable as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.3-2: Hazardous building materials may be present in buildings and utilities that are planned for renovation or demolition under the proposed Master Plan.	Potentially Significant	4.3-2: For every proposed project involving demolition, remodeling, or renovation of existing structures, the contractor(s) shall have a hazardous building materials survey completed by a Registered Environmental Assessor or a registered engineer as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.3-3: Remodeling, renovation, or demolition of existing facilities that are used for hazardous materials storage could expose construction workers, campus staff and students, or the public to hazardous materials, which could cause human health or environmental effects without proper precautions.	Less than Significant	4.3-3: None required beyond compliance with hazardous materials facility and UST closure requirements of the Santa Clara Fire Department.	Less than Significant
4.3-4: Implementation of the Master Plan projects could result in an increase in the quantities of chemicals stored and used on campus, and could also increase the volume of hazardous wastes produced.	Less than Significant	4.3-4: None required beyond compliance with requirements in state and federal requirements governing the transportation and use of hazardous materials and Santa Clara Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division requirements.	Less than Significant
<i>Traffic and Circulation</i>			
4.4-1: Future traffic increases due to Master Plan implementation would incrementally degrade service level operation at study intersections.	Potentially Significant	4.4-1: There are planned improvements at two CMP intersections affected by the project and it would be appropriate for the District to make a fair share contribution toward intersection improvements as mitigation.	Less than Significant
4.4-2: Proposed access to the Mission College campus is currently adequate and would remain unchanged with Plan implementation.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (CONT'D)

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impact	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Traffic and Circulation (cont'd)</i>			
4.4-3: The basic circulation pattern provided by existing campus roadways is currently adequate, and proposed minor reconfiguration of campus roadways would not significantly alter the basic campus circulation pattern. However, provisions for emergency access should be included in future specific development plans.	Potentially Significant	4.4-3: When specific development plans are prepared for planned pedestrian and vehicular access improvements (Sequence IV), the internal loop road and main arterial walkways throughout the campus shall be designed to provide adequate access for emergency vehicles (police and fire) and approved service and maintenance vehicles.	Less than Significant
4.4-4: Pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation would be improved with Plan implementation.	Beneficial	None required.	Not applicable
4.4-5: Project construction could temporarily disrupt access to transit facilities.	Potentially Significant	4.4-5: Master Plan projects shall be phased to ensure bus access to and from the Mission College stop during construction. Safe, convenient, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant access to and from the bus stop by pedestrians should be maintained during all campus construction projects. The District shall consult with the Valley Transportation Authority early in the planning process for the proposed bus facility to ensure safe operation and convenient passenger access.	Less than Significant
4.4-6: Proposed addition of parking facilities under the proposed Master Plan would be adequate to accommodate Plan-related increases in parking demand.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
<i>Air Quality</i>			
4.5-1: Construction and demolition activities associated with Plan implementation would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions.	Temporarily Significant	4.5-1: Construction activities must comply with the BAAQMD's dust and exhaust emission control measures as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.5-2: Mobile emissions generated by Plan-related traffic and area source emissions generated by the Plan's additional building space would increase local and regional vehicular emissions.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (CONT'D)

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impact	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Air Quality (con'td)</i>			
4.5-3: Master Plan implementation could result in increased stationary source emissions, which includes various toxic air contaminants (TACs) and associated odors.	Potentially Significant	4.5-3: Any proposed emergency generators shall be subject to review by the BAAQMD to determine if applicable permits are required.	Less than Significant
4.5-4: Projected student enrollments at Mission College are projected to increase at a rate greater than population growth rates assumed in the Clean Air Plan.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
4.5-5: Mobile emissions generated by Plan-related traffic in addition to growth in the surrounding communities would cumulatively increase local and regional emissions.	Potentially Significant for Regional Emissions; Less than Significant for Local Emissions	4.5-5: In addition to the college's existing permit parking program and existing bicycle facilities, the District shall implement transportation control measures at Mission College to reduce the college's contributions to cumulative regional increases in PM10 emissions by promoting alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable
<i>Noise</i>			
4.6-1: Project construction would result in temporary short-term noise increases due to the operation of heavy equipment.	Temporarily Significant	4.6-1: The District will incorporate time limits and noise-control measures into certain construction projects as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.6-2: Traffic increases on local roadways due to projected increases in student enrollments and cumulative development would increase noise levels along these roads.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
4.6-3: Implementation of the Master Plan would increase noise generated on campus.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
4.6-4: Existing and future noise levels on the Mission College campus would be compatible with continued educational uses when compared to Santa Clara Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Noise.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
4.6-5: Cumulative construction noise impacts could result if planned construction projects occurred in the same vicinity at the same time. In addition, cumulative traffic increases on local roadways would increase noise levels along local roads.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (CONT'D)

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impact	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Cultural Resources</i>			
4.7-1: Construction activities proposed by the Master Plan could disturb unknown subsurface cultural resources.	Potentially Significant and Unavoidable	4.7-1: Prior to commencement of any actual construction activities on the western perimeter of the campus, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to monitor all construction-related earthmoving activities as specified in this EIR. For proposed central campus improvements, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to review future improvements as specified in this EIR.	Potentially Significant and Unavoidable
<i>Public Services and Utilities</i>			
4.8-1: Implementation of the Master Plan could increase the demand for fire protection services on campus.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
4.8-2: The proposed Master Plan projects would incrementally increase domestic water demand within the service area of Santa Clara.	Potentially Significant	4.8-2: The proposed Master Plan development projects shall implement water conservation measures as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant
4.8-3: Increases in enrolled students would generate additional wastewater collection and treatment demands on the Santa Clara wastewater collection system and the San Jose/Santa Clara County Water Pollution Control Plant.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
4.8-4: Master Plan implementation would result in temporary and long-term increases in solid waste.	Potentially Significant	4.8-4: The proposed Master Plan development projects shall participate in the re-use and recycling program implemented by the College as specified in this EIR.	Less than Significant
<i>Energy</i>			
4.9-1: Construction of new campus facilities would result in short-term increases in energy demand.	Less than Significant	No measures required because measures required elsewhere in this EIR will ensure that fuels are not used in a wasteful manner.	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (CONT'D)

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impact	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Energy (cont'd)</i>			
4.9-2: Operation of campus facilities would increase energy demand.	Potentially Significant	4.9-2: Pursuant to the Governor's Green Building Executive Order (S-20-04) and associated Green Building Action Plan, all new and renovated buildings at Mission College shall be designed to and certified as "LEED Silver" or higher (or an equivalent recognized standard at the time future projects are being designed). In addition, Energy Star electrical equipment shall be utilized in new buildings and interior remodeling projects on campus, where feasible. Where appropriate, building designs should also be consistent with <i>Best Practices Manual</i> by the Collaborative for High Performance Schools (CHPS).	Less than Significant
<i>Climate Change</i>			
4.10-1: Plan implementation would result in increases in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and would have the potential to conflict with the state goal of reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020.	Less than Significant	No measures required because measures required elsewhere in this EIR (to address other identified impacts) as well as required compliance with existing and future regulations and policies pursuant to AB 32 will reduce Plan-related GHG emissions.	Less than Significant

Significant Unavoidable Impacts. All but one of the significant and potentially significant impacts that are identified in this EIR for the proposed project would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels by mitigation measures that are proposed by the District or measures that are recommended in the EIR. The proposed Master Plan specifies the buildout of the Mission College campus with a varied range of facilities to attain the college's objectives of providing a broad range of educational services. Due to the moderate to high archaeological sensitivity of the campus area and the fact that construction of the proposed swimming pool and underground utility vaults would require disturbance of soils to depths greater than were typically associated with past agricultural use and foundation construction of existing buildings, the potential to encounter and disturb unknown buried resources cannot be completely eliminated. If archaeological resources are encountered that qualify as "unique archaeological resources" but not qualify as "historical resources," Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 would be sufficient to render the impact less than significant, even if any such resources cannot feasibly be preserved.¹ If any such unearthed resources qualify as "historical resources" and avoidance is infeasible, however, the impact would be significant as a matter of law, as the construction or grading activities at issue would destroy or significantly damage the resource, causing a "substantial adverse change" in the significance of the resource. Although the District does not know with certainty that any unearthed archaeological or historical resources could not be feasibly avoided, the possibility that avoidance may not be feasible requires a conservative finding of *potentially significant and unavoidable* in light of the language in Section 15064.5 to the effect that a "substantial adverse change" (e.g., destruction) in the significance of any such resource necessarily translates into a significant effect. Chapter 4, Section 4.4 of this report provides a detailed discussion of the required finding for such circumstances.

Growth-Inducing Impacts. Section 15126.2(d) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires an EIR to discuss "the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth." The project could be considered to induce growth if it causes the local growth rate to exceed growth rates projected by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). For the period between 2005 and 2025, ABAG estimates population growth of 1% per year for the Bay Area as a whole (ABAG, 2007), 1.2% for Santa Clara County, and 1.6% for Santa Clara and surrounding communities.

The District's anticipated growth rate of 2.6% per year in student enrollments would appear to exceed ABAG's projected growth rate for the region, and therefore, could be considered growth-inducing. However, Mission College, like other community colleges, provides educational facilities for local residents and does not provide on-campus housing. Therefore, the college itself does not generate new population, but rather accommodates the increased demand for educational services that results from population increases in surrounding areas. Therefore, any future increase in student enrollments at the

¹ Excavation and data recovery are a viable form of mitigation under Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, and nothing in the law requires a finding of significance under such circumstances.

college would not necessarily cause the population in Santa Clara to increase, but rather, Plan implementation would accommodate future growth that is anticipated by ABAG in Santa Clara and other surrounding communities as well.

Cumulative Impacts. This Program EIR evaluates the cumulative or combined impacts of all 29 planned projects on this campus, and potentially significant cumulative impacts on the Mission College campus relate primarily to habitat removal (Impact 4.2-1), construction noise (Impact 4.6-5), and solid waste generation (Impact 4.8-4). Cumulative impacts on the surrounding communities relate primarily to cumulative traffic impacts on two nearby intersections (Impact 4.4-1). Although this effect would be *cumulatively considerable*, a fair share contribution by the District to these intersection improvements would reduce the Master Plan's contribution to less than cumulatively considerable (i.e., less than significant). Cumulative impacts on local air quality (Impact 4.5-5) and traffic noise increases (Impact 4.6-5) would be *less than cumulatively considerable*. Cumulative impacts on the region relate to regional air quality (Impact 4.5-5) and climate change (Impact 4.10-1) impacts. Cumulative increases in regional air pollutant emissions (even with the project increment included) would be *less than cumulatively considerable*. The one exception is PM10 and PM2.5 increases associated with fugitive dust sources, where cumulative growth in surrounding communities and Plan implementation would exacerbate projected regional increases and the Bay Area is currently non-attainment for PM10. Although these increases would be *cumulatively considerable*, implementation of BAAQMD dust and exhaust control measures (Mitigation Measure 4.5-1) in addition to transportation control measures (Mitigation Measure 4.5-5) would reduce the Master Plan's contribution to less than cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of proposed Master Plan policies and mitigation measures required elsewhere in this EIR (to address other identified impacts) would help to reduce the Master Plan's incremental GHG contributions. In addition, policies and regulations that have been or will be adopted by 2012 pursuant to AB 32 and the December 2008 Scoping Plan will achieve additional major reductions in GHG emissions statewide. As time passes, and the CARB has adopted all of these policies and regulations, building codes will almost certainly become more stringent from an energy conservation standpoint, both motor vehicles and power plants will generate fewer GHG emissions, and landfills will install improved methane capture and destruction features, reducing GHG emissions related to solid waste generation. Therefore, additional reductions in GHG emissions are expected to occur at the Mission College campus because specific building projects developed on campus over the next 16 years will be required to comply with these existing and future regulations and policies. Based on the combination of these factors, the Master Plan would not generate sufficient GHG emissions to contribute considerably to the cumulative effects of GHG emissions such that it would impair the state's goal of reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020 (pursuant to AB 32) (*less than cumulatively considerable*).

Alternatives. CEQA Section 15126.6(a) requires that an EIR analyze "a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of any project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project." The discussion of alternatives needs to focus on alternatives to the project which are capable of avoiding or

substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. CEQA also requires that an EIR evaluate the “No Project” Alternative (Section 15126(d)(3)). The alternatives presented in this EIR include CEQA-required alternatives that would have a range in the magnitude of environmental impact: No Project Alternative, Modified Design Alternative, Lower Student Enrollment Alternative, and Campus Buildout/Mixed Use Alternative. A tabular comparison summary of these alternatives is presented in **Table 2-2**.

This EIR identifies the Modified Design Alternative as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The Modified Design Alternative implements 17 of the mitigation measures recommended under the Biological Resources, Transportation and Traffic, Air Quality, Noise, Cultural Resources, Public Services, and Energy Resources sections of the EIR. The incorporation of these design measures into the Master Plan would reduce 16 of the identified significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

It was determined that the Lower Student Enrollment Alternative would not preclude the nature and extent of improvement projects specified by the Master Plan, and therefore, the environmental effects would essentially be the same as or similar in scope to those identified for the Master Plan. However, this alternative would not meet the District’s Master Plan objective to provide open access for educational services to all members of the community. By law, community colleges are an open access institution; therefore, this College cannot limit or close enrollment to any person age 18 or over, or a high school graduate.

While diminishing certain potential traffic effects, the Campus Buildout/Mixed Use Alternative would potentially result in greater biological, hazards, air quality, noise, cultural, and services impacts than the proposed Master Plan, in part due to residential and/or commercial elements of the alternative. These elements also do not directly support the educational mission of the College as identified by the Master Plan.

TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Impact	Proposed Master Plan	No Project Alternative	Modified Design Alternative	Lower Enrollment Alternative	Campus Buildout/ Mixed Use Alternative
<i>Project Objectives</i>					
Meets Principal Project Objectives?	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
<i>Biological Resources</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation of the Mission College Master Plan would result in both short-term and long-term loss of habitat for burrowing owls. 	PSM	-- LTS	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction of Master Plan improvements would have the potential to directly harm individual owls or nesting pairs, as well as directly or indirectly cause the failure of nesting activity. 	PSM	-- LTS	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed project could result in mortalities of white-tailed kite, loggerhead shrike, and other migratory raptors and passerines. 	PSM	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM	= PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed project could result in the loss of bat roosting habitat, and/or potential "take" of bats roosting inside the structures. 	PSM	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM	= PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed project could result in the loss of a population of Congdon's tarplant. 	PSM	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM	+ PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintenance of campus facilities (i.e., ball fields, grounds) could result in direct or indirect adverse effects on the preserved population of Congdon's tarplant. 	PSM	- LTS	= PSM	= PSM	+ PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Future landscaping could result in the planting of invasive species capable of spreading into Calabazas Creek. 	PSM	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM	= PSM
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hazardous materials could be encountered in the soil during ground-disturbing activities associated with the Master Plan projects. 	PSM	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM	+ PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hazardous building materials may be present in buildings and utilities that are planned for renovation or demolition under the proposed Master Plan. 	PSM	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM	= PSM
<p>LTS = Less than Significant PSM = Potentially Significant but can be Mitigated to a Less-than-Significant Level PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable "=" Same Level of Impact as Project "--" Less Impact than Project "+" More Impact than Project</p>					

TABLE 2-2 (CONT'D)
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Impact	Proposed Master Plan	No Project Alternative	Modified Design Alternative	Lower Enrollment Alternative	Campus Buildout/ Mixed Use Alternative
<i>Transportation and Traffic</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Future traffic increases due to Master Plan implementation would incrementally degrade service level operation at study intersections. 	PSM	-- LTS	= PSM	-- PSM	+ PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The basic circulation pattern provided by existing campus roadways is currently adequate, and proposed minor reconfiguration of campus roadways would not significantly alter the basic campus circulation pattern. However, provisions for emergency access should be included in future specific development plans. 	PSM	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM	-- PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project construction could temporarily disrupt access to transit facilities. 	PSM	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM	= PSM
<i>Air Quality</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction and demolition activities associated with Plan implementation would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions. 	PSM	-- LTS	-- PSM	-- PSM	+ PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Master Plan implementation could result in increased stationary source emissions, which includes various toxic air contaminants (TACs) and associated odors. 	PSM	-- LTS	= PSM	= PSM	+ PSM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mobile emissions generated by Plan-related traffic in addition to growth in the surrounding communities would cumulatively increase local and regional emissions. 	PSM	-- LTS	= LTS	-- LTS	+ LTS
<i>Noise</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project construction would result in temporary short-term noise increases due to the operation of heavy equipment. 	PSM	-- LTS	-- PSM	= PSM	+ PSM
<i>Cultural Resources</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction activities proposed by the Master Plan could disturb unknown subsurface cultural resources. 	PSU	-- LTS	-- PSM	-- PSU	+ PSU
LTS = Less than Significant PSM = Potentially Significant but can be Mitigated to a Less-than-Significant Level PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable "=" Same Level of Impact as Project "--" Less Impact than Project "+" More Impact than Project					

TABLE 2-2 (CONT'D)
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Impact	Proposed Master Plan	No Project Alternative	Modified Design Alternative	Lower Enrollment Alternative	Campus Buildout/ Mixed Use Alternative
<i>Public Services</i>					
▪ The proposed Master Plan projects would incrementally increase domestic water demand within the service area of Santa Clara.	PSM	-- LTS	-- PSM	= PSM	+ PSM
▪ Master Plan implementation would result in temporary and long-term increases in solid waste.	PSM	-- LTS	-- PSM	-- PSM	+ PSM
<i>Energy Resources</i>					
▪ Construction of new campus facilities would result in short-term increases in energy demand.	PSM	-- LTS	-- LTS	-- LTS	+ LTS
▪ Operation of campus facilities would increase energy demand.	PSM	-- LTS	-- PSM	-- PSM	+ PSM
LTS = Less than Significant PSM = Potentially Significant but can be Mitigated to a Less-than-Significant Level PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable "=" Same Level of Impact as Project "--" Less Impact than Project "+" More Impact than Project					