

# Appendix C

## General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis



**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

Policy	Project Inconsistent	Discussion
<i>Aesthetics Policies</i>		
C-PR 37: The natural scenery along many of Santa Clara County’s highways should be protected from land uses and other activities which would diminish its aesthetic beauty.	No	The proposed project would result in changes to public views of hillsides on a segment of U.S. 101 south of Gilroy. U.S. 101 is designated as a Scenic Highway in the County General Plan. Consistent with policy C-PR 43 and C-PR 45, buildings would be set back more than 100 feet from U.S. 101 and equipment in the processing area would be screened from view by a 40-foot tall berm installed within the first few months of mining. The project is subject to Architecture and Site Approval and design review which will assure the scenic quality of the area. Consistent with policy C-RC 61, R-RC 75, and R-RC-101 the long-term quarried areas, including those visible from U.S. 101, would be reclaimed, recontoured, and revegetated to blend with the local landscape and topography, consistent with SMARA and County requirements. However, the installation of a screening berm and visual alterations to the topography would alter the visual integrity along Route 101 south of Gilroy. Development on ridgelines would be avoided.
CP-38: Land use should be controlled along scenic roads so as to relate to the location and functions of these roads and should be subject to design review and conditions to assure the scenic quality of the corridor.	Yes	
C-PR 39: The visual integrity of the scenic gateways to the South County (Pacheco Pass, Hecker Pass, Route 101 south of Gilroy, and a Coyote greenbelt area north of Morgan Hill) should be protected.	Yes	
R-PR 39: The natural scenery which exists along many of the County’s highways should be protected from land uses and other activities which would diminish its aesthetic qualities.	No	
C-PR 43: New structures should be located where they will not have a negative impact on the scenic quality of the area, and in rural areas they should generally be set back at least 100 feet from the scenic roads and highways to minimize their visual impact.	No	
C-PR 45: Activities along scenic highways that are of a substantially unsightly nature, such as equipment storage or maintenance, fuel tanks, refuse storage or processing and service yards, should be screened from view.	No	
C-RC 57: The scenic and aesthetic qualities of both the natural and built environments should be preserved and enhanced for their importance to the overall quality of life for Santa Clara County.	No	
C-RC 60: Hillsides, ridgelines, scenic transportation corridors, major county entryways, and other areas designated as being of special scenic significance should receive additional consideration and protections due to their prominence, visibility, or symbolic value.	No	

<b>Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis</b>		
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
C-RC 61: Public and private development and infrastructure located in areas of special scenic significance should not create a major, lasting adverse visual impacts.	No	
R-RC 75: New quarrying activities should be discouraged where significantly visible from the Valley floor, where screening techniques cannot minimize the visual impact of the quarry operation, and/or where later rehabilitation of the site will not reduce the remaining visual impacts to a less-than-significant level.	No	
R-RC 95: The scenic and aesthetic qualities of both the natural and built environments should be preserved and enhanced for their importance to the overall quality of life for Santa Clara County.	No	
R-RC 96: The general approach to scenic resource preservation for the rural unincorporated areas consists of the following strategies: 1. Minimize scenic impacts in rural areas through control of allowable development densities. 2. Limit development impacts on highly significant scenic resources, such as, ridgelines, prominent hillsides, streams, transportation corridors and county entranceways.	No	
R-RC 97: Scenic qualities of the rural areas of Santa Clara County shall be maintained and enhanced through existing land use and development policies. Development compatible with scenic resource conservation should be encouraged.	No	
R-RC 98: Hillsides, ridgelines, scenic transportation corridors, major county entryways, stream environments, and other areas designated as being of special scenic significance should receive utmost consideration and protection due to their prominence, visibility, and overall contribution to the quality of life in Santa Clara County.	No	
R-RC 101: Roads, building sites, structures and public facilities shall not be allowed to create major or lasting visible scars on the landscape.	No	

**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

Policy	Project Inconsistent	Discussion
R-GD 17: Design Review Zoning Districts, including Design Review Guidelines, shall apply to primary viewshed areas most immediately and directly visible from the valley floor, lands up to and including the first ridge, or those within approximately 1 to 2 miles' distance from the edge of the valley floor.	No	
R-GD 31: Ridgelines and ridge areas have special significance for both public policy and private interests. Ridgeline and hillside development that creates a major negative visual impact from the valley floor should be avoided or mitigated, particularly for those areas most immediately visible from the valley floor. Ridgeline development policy should also take into account the need to allow reasonable use and development of private land.	Yes	The northern portion of the quarry during Phase 1 and 2 will mine the ridge located between the ephemeral drainages and will be graded to slope at 2:1 with 10-foot-wide benches every 40 vertical feet. The northwesterly corner of the mined area will include mining the ridge of the bluff along with the removal of a knob to a depth of 250 feet. The southern portion of the quarry will be mined to a quarry floor of approximately 900 feet in width that will be graded to have a cross slope of about 5 to 7 percent for the westerly 100 feet. Excavation activities would be visible on the upper slopes of hillsides as part of Phases 1 and 2. The project would have a significant impact as described in the EIR
R-LU 16: Hillsides: Mountainous lands and foothills unsuitable and/or unplanned for annexation and urban development. Lands so designated shall be preserved largely in natural resource related and open space uses in order to: a. support and enhance rural character; b. protect and promote wise management of natural resources; c. avoid risks associated with the natural hazards characteristic of those areas; and d. protect the quality of reservoir watersheds critical to the region's water supply.	No	The project does not propose an annexation and/or urban development. The landforms have been preserved for the wise management of natural resources, which involves the extraction of saleable aggregate.
R-LU 17: These lands also contain such important resources as grazing lands, mineral deposits, forests, wildlife habitat, rare or locally unique plant and animal communities, historic and archeological sites, and recreational and scenic areas of regional importance, which serve to define the setting for the urbanized portions of the County. Given the importance of these lands to	No	The proposed mining use is a conditionally permitted use such that the extraction of commercially saleable material is a wise use of the landforms.

**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
the County’s overall quality of life, allowable uses shall be consistent with the conservation and wise use of these resources and levels of development shall be limited to avoid increased demand for public services and facilities.		
R-RC 102: Structures on ridgelines must be located, constructed or landscaped so that they do not create a major negative visual impact from the Valley floor. Land should be divided in such a way that building sites, if possible, are not located on ridgelines.	No	The project does not include structures on ridgelines.
R-RC 103: Development in rural areas should be landscaped with fire resistant and/or native plants which are ecologically compatible with the area.	No	Reclaimed areas will be resoiled with topsoil and other soil materials and will be revegetated with hydro seeding, and planting of native trees. The project site will be re-seeded with native/naturalized plant seeds.
<i>Agriculture</i>		
C-RC 40: Long term land use stability and dependability to preserve agriculture shall be maintained and enhanced by the following general means: a. limiting the loss of valuable farmland from unnecessary and/or premature urban expansion and development; b. regulating non-agricultural uses in agricultural areas, and their intensity and impacts on adjacent lands; c. maintaining agriculturally viable parcel sizes; and d. minimizing conflicts between adjacent agricultural and non-agricultural land uses, through such means as right-to-farm legislation and mediation of nuisance claims.	No	While some cultivated cropland would be lost on a temporary basis as a result of construction and operation of the processing plant, it would not be lost permanently to urban development. The project would not affect the Sargent Ranch parcel sizes and would not conflict with adjacent agricultural and non-agricultural land uses given the distance of separation from such uses.
<i>Air Quality</i>		
HE-G.1: Continue to utilize and comply with the Air District’s project- and plan-level thresholds of significance for air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions.	No	The project would implement mitigation measures (described in Section 3.3 Air Quality) to reduce emissions and dust, consistent with General Plan policies.
HE-G.2: Coordinate with the Air District to promote and implement stationary and area source emission measures.	No	The project would obtain permits for stationary equipment from BAAQMD, as relevant, to ensure compliance with emissions-reduction measures.
HE-G.3: Fleet upgrades. Promote Air District mobile source measures to reduce emissions by accelerating the replacement of	No	The Project would be regulated by a Permit to Operate issued by BAAQMD. This permit applies

**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

Policy	Project Inconsistent	Discussion
older, dirtier vehicles and equipment, and by expanding the use of zero emission and plug-in vehicles.		to aggregate processing equipment and requires controls in the water spray systems, throughput limits, and performance standards (e.g., opacity limits), and would include requirements to use electric-powered equipment and to implement reporting. The Project would include new equipment.
HE-G.4: Encourage mobile source emission reduction from off-road equipment such as construction, farming, lawn and garden, and recreational vehicles by retrofitting, retiring and replacing equipment and by using alternate fuel vehicles.	No	The project would utilize an existing rail spur to replace vehicle trips and would utilize an electrically-powered conveyor belt (instead of diesel-fueled trucks, which would be more inefficient) to move mined material.
HE-G.7: Sensitive receptor uses. Promote measures to protect sensitive receptor uses, such as residential areas, schools, day care centers, recreational playfields and trails, and medical facilities by locating uses away from major roadways and stationary area sources of pollution, where possible, or incorporating feasible, effective mitigation measures.	No	The closest sensitive receptors to where quarry activities would occur are residences in the Betabel RV Resort on Betabel Road, between about 1,600 feet to 2,600 feet southeast of the boundary of the Phase 4 mining area. Active areas of the quarry, where equipment would typically be used are located over 1,600 feet from the closest receptor. Since proposed on-site active quarry areas would be over 1,000 feet from sensitive receptors, those receptors would not be exposed to emissions at levels that would result in a substantial health risk.
<i>Biology</i>		
C-RC 27: Habitat types and biodiversity within Santa Clara County and the region should be maintained and enhanced for their ecological, functional, aesthetic, and recreational importance.	No	The project would maintain the most ecologically sensitive areas of Sargent Ranch by not extending beyond the mining project boundaries and mitigate for impacts to areas disturbed by the quarry.
C-RC 31: Areas of habitat richest in biodiversity and necessary for preserving threatened or endangered species should be formally designated to receive greatest priority for preservation, including baylands and riparian areas, serpentine areas, and other habitat types of major significance.	No	

**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

Policy	Project Inconsistent	Discussion
<p>C-RC 28: The general approach to preserving and enhancing habitat and biodiversity countywide should include the following strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve current knowledge and awareness of habitats and natural areas.</li> <li>• Protect the biological integrity of critical habitat areas.</li> <li>• Encourage habitat restoration.</li> <li>• Evaluate the effectiveness of environmental mitigations</li> </ul>	<p align="center">No</p>	
<p>C-RC 33: Linkages and corridors between habitat areas should be provided to allow for migration and otherwise compensate for the effects of habitat fragmentation.</p>	<p align="center">No</p>	<p>The project would preserve linkages with a bridge creek crossing and by elevating the conveyor belt. MM 3.4-1 through MM 3.4-10 would address potential impacts to wildlife corridors.</p>
<p>C-RC 34: Restoration of habitats should be encouraged and utilized where feasible, especially in cases where habitat preservation and flood control, water quality, or other objectives can be successfully combined.</p>	<p align="center">No</p>	<p>Habitat preservation, management, and enhancement would occur, and a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan would be prepared as part of MM 3.4-1(a), as well as other Biological Resources-related mitigation measures described in Section 3.4 of this EIR.</p>
<p>C-RC 36: Specific project mitigations for the purpose of preserving habitat should be monitored for a period of time to assure the likelihood of their effectiveness.</p>	<p align="center">No</p>	
<p>R-RC 1: Natural and heritage resources shall be protected and conserved for their ecological, functional, economic, aesthetic, and recreational values.</p>	<p align="center">No</p>	
<p>R-RC 19: Habitat types and biodiversity within Santa Clara County and the region should be maintained and enhanced for their ecological, functional, aesthetic, educational, medicinal, and recreational importance.</p>	<p align="center">No</p>	<p>The project would maintain the most ecologically sensitive areas of Sargent Ranch by not extending beyond the mining project boundaries and mitigate for impacts to areas disturbed by the quarry.</p>
<p>R-RC 20: Strategies and policies for maintaining and enhancing habitat and biodiversity should include the following: 1. Improve current knowledge and awareness of habitats and natural areas. 2. Protect the biological integrity of critical habitat areas. 3. Encourage habitat restoration wherever possible. 4. Evaluate the effectiveness of project mitigations as required under CEQA</p>	<p align="center">No</p>	<p>This would be accomplished through implementation of MM 3.4-1(a), which requires that a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan be prepared.</p>

**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

Policy	Project Inconsistent	Discussion
R-RC 24: Areas of habitat richest in diversity, of particularly fragile ecological nature, or necessary for preserving threatened or endangered species should receive special consideration for preservation as open space and protection from development impacts. Examples include baylands and riparian areas, serpentine geology, and other critical habitat areas identified by local legislative bodies.	No	The project would maintain the most ecologically sensitive areas of Sargent Ranch by not extending beyond the mining project boundaries and mitigate for impacts to areas disturbed by the quarry.
R-RC 31: Natural streams, riparian areas, and freshwater marshes shall be left in their natural state providing for percolation and water quality, fisheries, wildlife habitat, aesthetic relief, and educational or recreational uses that are environmentally compatible. Streams which may still provide spawning areas for anadromous fish species should be protected from pollution and development impacts which would degrade the quality of the stream environment.	No	The project would avoid riparian habitat and streams. Tar Creek would be improved with the installation of a free-span bridge replacing the in-stream, at-grade crossing that currently exists. The proposed free-span bridge (replacing an at-grade water crossing) would minimize impacts to the Tar Creek riparian area. Implementation of the project SWPPP and NPDES permit requirements would ensure protection of fish habitat from sedimentation.
R-RC 32: Riparian and freshwater habitats shall be protected through the following general means: a. setback of development from the top of the bank; b. regulation of tree and vegetation removal; c. reducing or eliminating use of herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers by public agencies; d. control and design of grading, road construction, and bridges to minimize environmental impacts and avoid alteration of the streambed and stream banks (free-span bridges and arch culverts, for example); and e. protection of endemic, native vegetation.	No	
R-RC 39: Within areas immediately adjacent to the stream buffer area, new development should minimize environmental impacts on the protected buffer area, and screening of obtrusive or unsightly aspects of a project should be considered as a means of preserving the scenic value of riparian areas.	No	
R-RC 44: Healthy, mature specimen trees should be protected from cutting.	No	While trees would be removed as part of the project, they would be replaced consistent with the Santa Clara County Office Guide to Evaluating Oak Woodlands Impacts, as part of MM 3.14-16(b).



**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

Policy	Project Inconsistent	Discussion
R-RC 49: Retention and planting of native plant species shall be encouraged, especially for landscape uses.	No	The project would not retain native plants as it would remove trees from the site. However, native and naturalized plant species are proposed as part of the revegetation mix, similar to existing conditions on-site. The policy encourages use of native species, but does not require them. The project proposes a plant mix that is primarily native; therefore, the project is consistent with this policy
R-RC 51: Preservation of habitat linkages and migration corridors should be encouraged where needed to allow for species migration, prevent species isolation, and otherwise compensate for the effects of habitat fragmentation.	Yes	The project would preserve linkages with a bridge creek crossing and by elevating the conveyor belt. However, the project has a significant and unavoidable impact on wildlife migration. Project operations would interfere substantially with wildlife movement. Given the location of the Project site, in an area where movement of animals in multiple directions and among multiple populations is very important, a reduction in the frequency of successful crossings over a 30 to 35-year period would have implications for regional movements, gene exchange, and potentially population viability.
R-RC 53: Restoration of habitats should be encouraged and utilized wherever feasible, especially in cases where habitat preservation and flood control, water quality, or other objectives can be successfully combined.	No	Restoration would occur consistent with the proposed Reclamation Plan objectives, including habitat restoration.
R-RC 56: Specific mitigation required for new development for conserving habitat should be monitored as required by state law to assess their effectiveness and the need for improved mitigations for future projects.	No	A Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan would be prepared as part of MM 3.4-1(a).
<i>Cultural Resources</i>		
R-RC 81: Heritage resources within rural unincorporated areas shall be preserved, restored wherever possible, and commemorated as appropriate for their scientific, cultural, historic, and place values.	Yes	The project would likely impact archaeological resources. Mitigation measures would reduce archaeological impacts to a less-than-significant level, consistent with General Plan policies. Impacts

**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

Policy	Project Inconsistent	Discussion
R-RC 85: No heritage resource shall knowingly be allowed to be destroyed or lost through a discretionary action (zoning, subdivision site approval, grading permit, building permit, etc.) of the County of Santa Clara unless: a. the site or resource has been reviewed by experts and the County Historic Heritage Commission and has been found to be of insignificant value; or b. there is an overriding public benefit from the project and compensating mitigation to offset the loss is made part of the project.	No	to tribal cultural resources would be lessened with mitigation described within this document, but not to a less-than-significant level. The overriding public benefit would be described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations if the project is approved.
R-RC 86: Projects in areas found to have heritage resources shall be conditioned and designed to avoid loss or degradation of the resources. Where conflict with the resource is unavoidable, mitigation measures that offset the impact may be imposed.	No	
R-RC 88: For projects receiving environmental assessment, expert opinions and field reconnaissance may be required if needed at the applicant’s expense to determine the presence, extent, and condition of suspected heritage resources and the likely impact of the project upon the resources.	No	
R-RC 92: The participation of concerned citizens and professionals dealing with heritage resources in the identification of sites and the review and conditioning of projects by its boards and commissions shall be encouraged by the County.	No	
<i>Energy</i>		
C-RC 77: Energy efficiency and conservation efforts in the transportation, industrial, commercial, residential, agricultural, and public sectors shall be encouraged at the local, county (sub-regional), and regional level.	No	Consistent with General Plan policies C-RC 77, C-RC 78, and C-RC 83, the proposed project has incorporated energy efficient features into the project design. The inclusion of a conveyor belt to move material from the mining pits to the processing plant reduces the reliance on fossil fuels that would be used by vehicles that would be needed to move material from the Phase 1 and Phase 2 mining areas. The conveyor belt is diesel-fueled but would
C-RC 78: The objectives of the state energy plan should be implemented at the local and regional level through an overall strategy consisting of: a) Reducing transportation energy demand and oil-dependency; b) Conserving energy in residential, commercial, agricultural, and industrial sectors; and c) Increasing consumer and general public awareness through education.	No	

<b>Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis</b>		
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
C-RC 83: Industrial and agricultural processes should be modified wherever feasible to take advantage of energy savings, to reduce operational costs, and enhance competitiveness.	No	be more efficient overall than large trucks in terms of diesel fuel usage.
<i>Geology and Soils</i>		
R-GD 20: Grading and terrain alteration to conduct lawful activities and use of property should conserve the natural landscape and resources, minimize erosion impacts, protect scenic resources, habitat, and water resources. Grading should not exacerbate existing natural hazards, particularly geologic hazards.	No	Consistent with policies R-GD 20, R-HS 19, and R-HS 21, implementation of MM 3.7-2a and MM 3.7-2b would reduce impacts from geologic hazards and slope failure to less-than-significant levels. In addition, the Reclamation Plan, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permitting requirements would reduce the erosion impacts of the project consistent with policy R-RC 13. The project would result in less-than-significant impacts to scenic resources, and mitigation measures have been included to protect habitat, and water resources
R-RC 13: Sedimentation and erosion shall be minimized through controls over development, including grading, quarrying, vegetation removal, road and bridge construction, and other uses which pose such a threat to water quality.	No	
R-HS 19: In areas of high potential for activation of landslides, there shall be no avoidable alteration of the land or hydrology which is likely to increase the hazard potential, including: a) Saturation due to drainage or septic systems; b) Removal of vegetative cover; and c) Steepening of slopes or undercutting the base of a slope.	No	
R-HS 13: Where needed to adequately assess the hazards of a proposal, the County shall require on-site investigations and analysis by certified professionals.	No	The County Geologist had reviewed the project plans, geotechnical reports, and peer reviews. The County Geologist would review interim and final slope stability reports prepared as part of MM 3.7-2a and MM 3.7-2b.
R-HS 21: Proposals involving potential geologic or seismic hazards shall be referred to the County Geologist for review and recommendations.	No	
R-RC 4: Public and private development projects shall be evaluated and conditioned to assure they are environmentally sound, do not degrade natural resources, and that all reasonable steps are taken to mitigate potentially adverse impacts.	Yes	The project includes mitigation measures for significant impacts and significant unavoidable impacts, even where impacts remain significant after mitigation. The project would result in significant unavoidable impacts to natural resources, including but not limited to the potential to destroy paleontological resources important to Santa Clara County.

<b>Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis</b>		
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>		
HE-G.1: Continue to utilize and comply with the Air District's project- and plan-level thresholds of significance for air pollutants and GHG emissions.	No	The proposed project would be consistent with County General Plan Health Element and BAAQMD 2017 Clean Air Plan (CAP) policies. With implementation of MM-3.81.1a, the project would not conflict with long-term state goals established in the Climate Change Scoping Plan and 2017 CAP. Further, the project would utilize GHG-free electricity provided by Silicon Valley Clean Energy.
HE-G.2: Coordinate with the Air District implement stationary and area source emission measures.	No	
HE-G.5: Support efforts to reduce GHG emissions from mobile sources, such as reducing vehicle trips, vehicle use, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), vehicle idling, and traffic congestion. These efforts may include improved transit service, better roadway system efficiency, state-of-the-art signal timing and Intelligent Transportation Systems, transportation demand management, parking and roadway pricing strategies, and growth management measures.	No	
HE-G.10: Promote energy conservation and efficiency in homes, businesses, schools, and other infrastructure to reduce energy use and criteria pollutant and GHG emissions.	No	
HE-G.11: Renewable energy. Encourage renewable energy, such as solar and wind turbines, on commercial, industrial, and residential buildings.	No	
HE-G.12: Energy technologies. Support regional and local initiatives that promote integrated building systems, distributed generation, demand response programs, smart grid infrastructure, energy storage and backup, and electric transportation infrastructure.	No	Consistent with MM 3.8-1c, the applicant is required to prepare a plan for County review and approval to install solar panels prior to commencement of project operations.
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>		
C-HS 46: Hazardous materials, whether commercial, industrial, agricultural, or residential in character, should not be disposed of in any wastewater or on-site wastewater treatment system.	No	Consistent with Policy C-HS 46, the project would dispose of hazardous materials consistent with the hazardous materials business plan and not in any wastewater treatment system.
R-HS 10: In all hazard areas, projects shall be designed and conditioned to avoid placement of structures and improvements where they would: a. be directly jeopardized by hazards; b.	No	The project has been designed to avoid and minimize hazards identified as part of the technical reports contained within the EIR appendices. The

<b>Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis</b>		
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
increase the hazard potential; and/or, c. increase risks to neighboring properties.		<p>project would not increase hazards at adjacent properties, as described within this EIR. Further, the project would dispose of hazardous materials consistent with the hazardous materials business plan.</p> <p>The project would not unnecessarily limit the availability of sites suitable for potential hazardous waste management facilities because it is used for ranching operations prior to the project, and would be reclaimed for ranching operations after the project.</p>
R-HS 11: Proposals for General Plan amendments, zone changes, use permits, variances, building site approvals, and all land development applications subject to environmental assessment shall be reviewed for the presence of hazardous conditions, utilizing the best, most up-to-date information available. If a development proposal would require a major investment or addition to public infrastructure in areas subject to high hazards, objective estimates of the probable public costs of maintaining and repairing the infrastructure should be provided to decision-makers.	No	
C-HS 14: All feasible measures to safely and effectively manage hazardous materials and site hazardous materials treatment facilities should be used, including complying with all federal and state mandates.	No	
C-HS 15: To achieve a more effective, efficient and economical regulatory environment, all feasible means to simplify and coordinate locally implemented hazardous materials management regulations should be considered.	No	
C-HS 15.2: The cities and Santa Clara County shall ensure that all relevant discretionary land use and development decisions: a. are consistent with the intent and provisions of the Countywide Hazardous Waste Management Plan (CHWMP), especially the facilities siting map and criteria, which identify potentially suitable areas for siting needed waste management facilities; and, b. do not unnecessarily limit the availability of sites suitable for potential hazardous waste management facilities, as identified in the CHWMP facilities siting criteria and map.	No	
R-HS 28: Development projects shall be reviewed by the County Fire Marshall's Office for safety code compliance and should also be referred if necessary to the appropriate fire protection authority or district for further review and recommendations.	No	
<i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>		

**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

Policy	Project Inconsistent	Discussion
C-HS 42: The long-term viability and safety of underground aquifers and groundwater systems countywide shall be protected to highest degree feasible.	No	The project would not affect the long-term viability or safety of the aquifer, as described in this EIR.
C-HS 44: All new on-site wastewater treatment systems should be located only in areas where: a. there is reasonable assurance that they will function well over a long period; b. they can be designed to have a minimum negative impact on the environment; and c. they will not contaminate wells, groundwater or surface water.	No	The on-site wastewater treatment system would be permitted pursuant to the County’s ordinance codes to protect wells, groundwater and surface water, as required by the County Department of Environmental Health.
R-RC 8: The strategies for assuring water quantity and quality for the rural unincorporated areas shall include: 1. Require adequate water quantity and quality as a pre-condition of development approval, 2. Reduce the water quality impacts of rural land use and development, 3. Develop comprehensive watershed management plans.	No	As described in detail within this EIR, proposed quarry activities would not pose a significant potential hazard or threat to water quality, would minimize sedimentation and erosion through the implementation of controls, and would include mitigation measures for potential increases in siltation and/or pollution of water resources, in conformance with these General Plan policies.
R-HS 47: The long-term viability and safety of surface and groundwater supplies countywide shall be protected from contamination to the highest degree feasible.	No	As described in detail within this EIR, proposed quarry activities would not pose a significant potential hazard or threat to water quality, would minimize sedimentation and erosion through the implementation of controls, and would include mitigation measures for potential increases in siltation and/or pollution of water resources, in conformance with these General Plan policies. Further, the project includes an Industrial Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, which would be implemented during project construction and operation.
R-RC 10: For lands designated as Resource Conservation Areas (Hillsides, Ranchlands, Agriculture, and Baylands) and for Rural Residential areas, water resources shall be protected by encouraging land uses compatible and consistent with maintenance of surface and ground water quality. Uses that pose a significant potential hazard to water quality should not be allowed unless the potential impacts can be adequately mitigated. The amounts of impervious surfaces in the immediate vicinity of water courses or reservoirs should be minimized.	No	
R-RC 13: Sedimentation and erosion shall be minimized through controls over development, including grading, quarrying, vegetation removal, road and bridge construction, and other uses which pose such a threat to water quality.	No	

**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

Policy	Project Inconsistent	Discussion
R-RC 35: Flood control modifications to be made in streams that have substantial existing natural areas should employ flood control designs which enhance riparian resources and avoid to the maximum extent possible significant alteration of the stream, its hydrology, and its environs.	No	Proposed flood modifications (berms to protect the processing plant) would be constructed
Policy R-RC 37: Lands near creeks, streams, and freshwater marshes shall be considered to be in a protected buffer area, consisting of the following: 1. 150 feet from the top bank on both sides where the creek or stream is predominantly in its natural state; 2. 100 feet from the top bank on both sides of the waterway where the creek or stream has had major alterations; and 3. In the case that neither (1) nor (2) are applicable, an area sufficient to protect the stream environment from adverse impacts of adjacent development, including impacts upon habitat, from sedimentation, biochemical, thermal and aesthetic impacts.	No	The project would avoid impacts to the streambed and bank and would remove an existing at-grade crossing through the streambed. The free-span bridge would require minimal disturbance as it would span the creek and the 100-foot-wide riparian corridor. The project does not include any of the restricted activities described in Policy R-RC 38.
Policy R-RC 38: Within the aforementioned buffer areas, the following restrictions and requirements shall apply to public projects, residential subdivisions, and other private non-residential development: a. No building, structure or parking lots are allowed, exceptions being those minor structures required as part of flood control projects; b. No despoiling or polluting actions shall be allowed, including grubbing, clearing, unrestricted grazing, tree cutting, grading, or debris or organic waste disposal, except for actions such as those necessary for fire suppression, maintenance of flood control channels, or removal of dead or diseased vegetation, so long as it will not adversely impact habitat value; and c. Endangered plant and animal species shall be protected within the area.	No	
R-RC 43: Large scale grading and clearing of land should not be allowed if it will significantly degrade valuable habitat or impair surface water quality.	No	Implementation of the Industrial SWPPP and NPDES requirements would ensure water quality impacts are avoided and/or minimized.
R-RC 73: The extraction of mineral resources, including sand and gravel, should be carefully conditioned and regulated to mitigate potential adverse environmental impacts, including mitigation	No	

<b>Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis</b>		
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
measures for potential increases in siltation and/or pollution of water resources in order to adequately protect the local water supply.		
<i>Hydrology and Water Quality (General Plan Part 5: South County Joint Area Plan)</i>		
SC 7.0: New development should not exceed the water supply, and management of water should be made more efficient through appropriate means, such as watershed protection, percolation, reclamation, and conservation.	No	The project would be generally consistent with these policies. While a new well would be required for project water supply, the Water Supply Assessment concludes sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project and other planned growth.
SC 7.8: New development should not exceed the water supply, and use of water should be made more efficient through appropriate means, such as conservation and reclamation.	No	
R-LU 36: The general intent of the Ranchlands designation is to maintain the existing conditions of very low intensity uses, rural lifestyle, and limited public access. Development policies shall protect and enhance the continued use of the land for ranching.	No	Existing site access routes would be improved as part of the project. No incompatible development is proposed.
R-LU 39: The primary use shall be ranching. Other allowable uses shall be agriculture, low intensity recreational uses, mineral extraction, land in its natural state, hunting, wildlife refuges, very low density residential development; and very low intensity commercial, industrial, or institutional uses, provided that they primarily support ranching activities or the enhancement, protections, study, or appreciation of the natural resources of the area.	No	The project end use would be Ranching. The project Reclamation Plan outlines the restoration that would occur at the site to ensure availability for this future use.
<i>Minerals</i>		
R-RC 69: Existing sites and access routes for regionally significant resources should be protected from incompatible land uses and development that would preclude or unnecessarily limit resource availability.	No	The project would not preclude or unnecessarily limit resource availability as it would extract resources available onsite. It would preserve access routes from incompatible land uses in order to extract resources from the site.
C-RC 44: Local supplies of mineral resources should be recognized for their importance to the local, regional, and state economy. Countywide strategies for preserving and managing mineral resources include: a. Ensuring continued availability of	No	The project proposes mineral extraction, which is an allowable use. The proposed project would be consistent with General Plan policies related to mineral resources, in that resources have been



<b>Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis</b>		
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
mineral resources to meet long term demand; b. Mitigating environmental impacts of extraction and transportation; and c. Reclaiming sites for appropriate subsequent land uses.		identified and would be mined and reclaimed consistent with the County-issued use permit, including mitigation for environmental impacts (as described in this EIR).
C-RC 45: Current and future demand for mineral resources in Santa Clara County, particularly construction aggregates, should be ensured by the following means: 1. Inventorying existing sites, identifying and properly designating potential new sites for protections measures; 2. Preserving deposits and access routes; 3. Increased use of recycled material; and 4. Proper development of new quarry sites	No	
C-RC 47: Potentially adverse environmental impacts from extraction and transport of mineral resources should be minimized to the greatest extent possible, including, but not limited to: a. nuisances, such as dust, odor, debris, and noise; b. disruption and damage to natural features, such as ground cover, topography, drainage, habitat, groundwater, and related issues; and c. increased traffic volumes and damage to road surfaces.	No	
C-RC 48: Reclamation for safe and beneficial future use of mineral resource extraction sites should be ensured through adequate planning, discretionary land use controls, and monitoring of reclamation plan implementation.	No	
R-RC 67: Local supplies of mineral resources should be recognized for their importance to the local, regional, and state economy. Strategies for preserving and managing mineral resources include: a. ensuring continued availability of mineral resources to meet long term demand; b. mitigating environmental impacts of extraction and transportation; and c. reclaiming sites for appropriate subsequent land uses.	No	
R-RC 68: Current and future demand for mineral resources in Santa Clara County, particularly construction aggregates, should be ensured by the following means: a. inventorying existing sites, as well as identifying and properly designating potential sites for	No	

<b>Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis</b>		
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
protection measures; b. preserving deposits and access routes; c. increased use of recycled material; and d. development of new quarry sites.		
R-RC 69: Existing sites and access routes for regionally significant resources should be protected from incompatible land uses and development that would preclude or unnecessarily limit resource availability.	No	
R-RC 70: When making land use decisions involving mineral resource areas of state or regional significance, decisions about alternative land uses should be carefully balanced against the importance of the mineral deposits to their market region as a whole.	No	
R-RC 71: Potential mineral resource areas in addition to those that are currently state-designated zones should be identified to augment diminishing supplies available from existing quarries.	No	
R-RC 72: Environmental Impact Reports shall be mandated for new quarries or for significant expansions of existing quarries not located in the State-designated resource sectors. Borrow pits and similar short-term quarries shall be subject to an environmental assessment and may require an environmental impact report.	No	
R-RC 74: Alternatives to proposed quarry sites should be thoroughly investigated in the Environmental Impact Report, and reasons for rejection should be clearly justified.	No	EIR Section 7.0 Alternatives includes a detailed alternatives analysis.
R-RC 76: Any new quarry should incorporate adequate buffers and screening within its boundaries to protect existing and future uses on adjacent lands.	No	Active areas of the quarry, where equipment would typically be used are located over 1,600 feet from other uses on adjacent lands.
<i>Noise</i>		
R-HS 3: New development in areas of noise impact (areas subject to sound levels of 55 DNL or greater) should be approved, denied, or conditioned so as to achieve a satisfactory noise level for those who will use or occupy the facility (as defined in “Noise Compatibility Standards for Land Use” and “Maximum Interior Noise Levels For Intermittent Noise”).	No	The project would not exceed County noise standards.

<b>Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis</b>		
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
R-RC 77: Noise impacts to residences along haul routes should be reduced to the maximum extent possible. Sound barriers should be erected where necessary to minimize truck noise impacts on private residences located near quarry access points to public roads.	No	
C-HS 24: Environments for all residents of Santa Clara County free from noises that jeopardize their health and well-being should be provided through measures which promote noise and land use compatibility.	No	
C-HS 25: Noise impacts from public and private projects should be mitigated. Implementation Recommendations: C-HS(i) 23: Project design review should assess noise impacts on surrounding land uses. C-HS(i) 24: Where necessary, construct sound walls or other noise mitigations. C-HS(i) 25: Prohibit construction in areas which exceed applicable interior and exterior standards, unless suitable mitigation measures can be implemented. C-HS(i) 26: Require project-specific noise studies to assess actual and projected dB noise contours for proposed land uses likely to generate significant noise. C-HS(i) 27: Take noise compatibility impacts into account in developing local land use plans.	No	
C-HS 26: New development in areas of noise impact (areas subject to sound levels of 55 DNL or greater) should be approved, denied, or conditioned so as to achieve a satisfactory noise level for those who will use or occupy the facility (as defined in “Noise Compatibility Standards for Land Use” and “Maximum Interior Noise Levels for Intermittent Noise”	No	
<i>Public Services and Recreation</i>		
R-HS 9: Development in rural unincorporated areas affected by natural hazards should be designed located, and otherwise regulated to avoid or reduce associated risks to an acceptable	No	The proposed project would allow low development densities and would reduce geological and fire

**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
level. In areas of highest potential hazard, such as floodways, active landslides, fault traces, and airport safety zones, no new habitable structures shall be allowed. In other areas of lesser hazards, there shall be no major structures for involuntary occupancy, such as schools, hospitals, correctional facilities, or convalescent centers.		hazards consistent with SMARA General Plan policies.
R-HS 12: Proposals shall be conditioned as necessary to conform with County General Plan policies on public safety. Projects which cannot be conditioned to avoid hazards shall be conditioned to reduce the risks associated with natural hazards to an acceptable level or shall be denied.	No	The proposed project would allow low development densities and would reduce geological and fire hazards consistent with SMARA General Plan policies.
<i>Transportation and Traffic</i>		
R-RC 78: Access to new quarry sites should make maximum use of major thoroughfares, such as expressways, freeways, and designated truck routes, avoiding impacts upon local-serving routes. Where feasible, alternatives to truck transportation should be encouraged.	No	The project would use existing on-site roadways to access U.S. 101. The project would also utilize an existing rail line adjacent to the site,
R-TR 9: Rural roads should be designed and built to standards that will assure driving safety and provide access for emergency vehicles.	No	Access to the site would be provided via U.S. 101 and Old Monterey Road. Improvements would be designed and implemented according to Caltrans and County of Santa Clara standards for safety and emergency access; therefore, the project would not conflict with General Plan policies with regard to access and safety.
R-TR 11: New development which would significantly impact private or public roads, should be allowed only when safety hazards and roadway deterioration will be mitigated to a less-than- significant level.	No	Access to the site would be provided via U.S. 101 and Old Monterey Road. Improvements would be designed and implemented according to Caltrans and County of Santa Clara standards for safety and emergency access; therefore, the project would not conflict with General Plan policies with regard to access and safety.
R-TR 14: Environmental impacts of roadway construction and expansion should be mitigated to a less-than-significant level	No	Further, impacts to archaeological resources as a result of roadway improvements would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.

<b>Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis</b>		
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>		
C-RC 8: Environmental impacts of all state and local water supply planning and decision-making should be taken into full consideration.	No	The Water Supply Assessment (Appendix I), adequate water supply is available to meet Project demand.
C-RC 12: More efficient use of water for agricultural irrigation and industrial processes should be promoted through improved technology and practices.	No	The project would reuse and recycle water on-site.
C-RC 64: Countywide solid waste management efforts shall be guided by the hierarchy of strategies outlined below, emphasizing resource recovery in accordance with state law: a. Source reduction and reuse, b. Recycling and composting, c. Transformation, and d. Landfilling as final option.	No	No existing facilities would be demolished during Project construction; therefore, construction would not generate demolition debris. Construction would not include other activities that generate large amounts of solid waste; most construction waste would be packaging from delivery of Project components and building materials (e.g., plastic wrap, pallets) and ranch-related items (e.g., barbed wire) found onsite. Further, the project would be required to comply with recycling requirements which would further reduce solid waste.
C-RC 65: All solid waste management services and facilities shall conform to applicable federal, state, and local regulations and standards.	No	
C-RC 67: Adequate solid waste collection and recycling services shall be provided to all county residents. Recycling services for all commercial and industrial establishments shall be evaluated and expanded wherever feasible.	No	Given the limited utility connections and services required by the proposed project, it would not conflict with pertinent General Plan policies.
R-HS 22: Adequate access and water supplies for fire safety shall be required for all new development, including building sites, subdivision, and clustered development.	No	Given the limited utility connections and services required by the proposed project, it would not conflict with pertinent General Plan policies. Fire water would be supplied by on-site tanks at the processing plant and water trucks that would provide water throughout the site for dust control.
R-RC 9: Development in rural unincorporated areas shall be required to demonstrate adequate quantity and quality of water supply prior to receiving development approval.	No	
R-RC 79: Recycling of concrete, asphalt, dirt, and other materials should be encouraged where appropriate, both at quarry sites and at locations in other parts of the County.	No	
R-HS 42: All new conventional on-site wastewater treatment systems shall be located only in areas where there is reasonable assurance that they will function effectively over a long period,	No	The project would obtain County permits for the proposed on-site wastewater treatment system, thus meeting the requirements of R-HS 42 and R-HS 43.

**Appendix C: General Plan Policies Consistency Analysis**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Project Inconsistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
they can be designed to have a minimum negative impact on the environment, and they will not contaminate wells, or surface and groundwater supplies.		
R-HS 43: No on-site wastewater treatment system, either conventional or alternative systems, shall be allowed where site characteristics impede their operation, including: a. a high seasonal groundwater conditions; b. soils with wastewater percolation rates less than one minute per inch or greater than 120 minutes per inch; c. limited depth to bedrock; or d. slopes in excess of 20% without appropriate studies.	No	