

# INITIAL STUDY

## Environmental Checklist and Evaluation for Santa Clara County

<b>File Number:</b>	N/A	<b>Date:</b> 9/7/2007
<b>Project Type:</b>	Government	<b>APN(s):</b> Multiple
<b>Project Location / Address</b>	2500 Cunningham Avenue and property within AIA of Reid Hillview Airport. Various for County CLUP amendments	<b>GP Designation:</b> Multiple
<b>Owner's Name</b>	County of Santa Clara. Various within Airport A.I.A's.	<b>Zoning:</b> Multiple
<b>Applicant's Name:</b>	Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission	<b>Urban Service Areas:</b> SAN JOSE, SANTA CLARA, PALO ALTO
<b>Project Description</b>		
<p>The Project is an amendment to the Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission's Land Use Plan for Areas Surrounding Santa Clara County Airports (Land Use Plan) ("County CLUP") and is undertaken pursuant to the ALUC's authority under Public Utilities Code § 21670 et seq. The amendments include: (1) the adoption of a new airport-specific Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Reid Hillview Airport ("Reid Hillview CLUP"); (2) amendment of the County CLUP to incorporate by reference the current FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Maps for each County airport and amendment of policies related to those maps; and (3) amendment of the County CLUP to adopt a definition and review process for "Minor Projects."</p> <p><b>(1) <u>Adoption of Reid Hillview CLUP-</u></b></p> <p>The new Reid Hillview CLUP is intended to be a comprehensive, self-contained CLUP for Reid Hillview Airport. It includes several new policies and the following map modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ALUC referral boundaries ("Airport Influence Areas" or "AIAs")</li> <li>• 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours</li> <li>• Incorporation of the FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Map by reference</li> <li>• Airport Safety Zones</li> </ul> <p>The purpose of the Reid Hillview Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) is to safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of Reid-Hillview Airport and those who use the Airport. The CLUP seeks to protect the public from the adverse effects of small aircraft. Specifically, the CLUP seeks to ensure that people and facilities are not concentrated in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, and ensure that no structures or activities adversely affect navigable airspace. The implementation of the CLUP is intended to prevent future incompatible development from encroaching on the Airport and allow for development in accordance with the current Airport Master Plan.</p> <p>In formulating the CLUP, the ALUC established policies suggested for the regulation of land use, building height, safety, and noise insulation within areas adjacent to each of the public airports in the county. The four maps (AIA, Noise Contours, FAR Part 77 and Safety Zones,) are used by the ALUC to determine the applicability of ALUC policies and compatibility between new uses and airport operations in terms of noise and safety. The purpose of each of these maps is described below:</p>		

**Reid-Hillview referral boundary (AIA)** – The Airport Influence Area (AIA), defines the referral boundary for Reid-Hillview airport. When the City of San Jose chooses to amend its general plan, or adopt or amend any specific plans, zoning ordinances, or building regulations, that would affect property within the AIA, the City must first refer the proposed action to the ALUC. Voluntary referrals can also be made for other types of actions/projects that may be impacted by the airport operations. The new AIA area has been mapped to follow major existing roads and identified property boundaries to eliminate uncertainty in determining if a property will fall within the zone. The increase in area of the AIA from the existing Land Use Plan is 1,059 acres, from 2,937 acres to 3,997 acres.

**60, 65, and 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours** – These maps delineate the predicted Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) boundary of the respective decibels as a result of airport operations at Reid-Hillview. If a project is referred to the ALUC and is within the 60, 65, or 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours, the applicable noise policies would apply. Although the new adopted maps will include a 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contour, the contour is entirely located on airport property. Therefore, no development other than projects on airport property would be affected by the 70 dBA CNEL. The new 60 dBA CNEL encompasses 356.3 acres. The old 60 dBA CNEL is 366.6 acres, for a net decrease of 10.28 acres. The new 65 dBA CNEL is 145 acres. The old 65 dBA CNEL is 127.1 acres, for a net increase of 17.87 acres.

**FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Map** - Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77, *Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace*, establishes imaginary surfaces for airports and runways as a means to identify objects that are obstructions to air navigation. Each surface is defined as a slope-ratio, or at a certain altitude above the airport elevation, measured at Mean Sea Level (MSL). Projects located within the AIA are evaluated for consistency with the FAR Part 77 height restrictions. This is an FAA map that is updated as necessary as a result of changes in the airport runway(s). It is not a County or ALUC map.

**Safety Zones** – Airport safety zones are established to minimize the amount of people exposed to potential airplane hazards. The Reid-Hillview CLUP uses the threshold adopted by the airport and the FAA for positioning the FAA Runway Protection Zones as depicted on the FAA approved Airport Layout Plan, as a basis for positioning the safety zones. Furthermore, the safety zones defined for Reid-Hillview Airport are based on the guidance for General Aviation Airports with runways less than 4,000 feet in the California *Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* (January 2002) adopted by the State of California, Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics (“2002 Handbook”) pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 21674.7. The following describes these safety zones:

#### ***Runway Protection Zone***

The function of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) is to enhance the protection of people and property on the ground and aircraft occupants. RPZs should be clear of all objects, structures and activities. At Reid Hillview Airport, the RPZ as adopted by the airport and the FAA begins 200 feet out from the runway thresholds. It is a trapezoidal area centered on the extended runway centerline. The size is related to the expected aircraft use and the visibility minimums for that particular runway.

#### ***Turning Sector Defined***

A geometric feature defined as a “Turning Sector” bound some of the safety zones. This feature is constructed as follows:

Each runway end has a sector, which is bounded on the inside by the extended runway centerline. The radius of these sectors is 3,000 feet with the center point located 1,000 feet along the runway centerline from the runway threshold towards the opposite end of the runway.

The arc for the sector is swung away from the opposite runway. The interior angle of the sector is 30 degrees from the extended runway centerline. The two closest turning sector center-points are connected with a straight line and a tangent line that connects the two associated arcs. The Turning Sector is defined as the outside bounds of the feature constructed above. There is one Turning Sector for each end of the runway system.

### ***Inner Safety Zone***

The Inner Safety Zone (ISZ) is located within the Turning Sector boundary described above. The ISZ represents the approach and departure corridors that have the second highest level of exposure to potential aircraft accidents. The ISZ is centered on the line midway between the runway centerlines starting at the apex of the Turning Sector boundary and except as noted below, extends to the outer arc of the Turning Sector boundary. The length of the runway determines the dimensions.

### ***Turning Safety Zone***

The Turning Safety Zone (TSZ) represents the approach and departure areas that have the third highest level of exposure to potential aircraft accidents.

### ***Outer Safety Zone***

The Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) extends out from the Turning Sector arc. The OSZ is a rectangular area centered on the line midway between the extended runway centerlines starting at the outer end of the Turning Sector arc. The length of the runway determines the dimensions. The OSZ for northwest ends of the runways is a rectangular area 1,300 feet wide and 1,500 feet long at the center, centered on the line midway between the extended runway centerlines, starting at the outer edge of the ISZ and extending away from the runway threshold. There is no OSZ for the southwest ends of the runways due to the extended ISZ.

### ***Sideline Safety Zone***

The Sideline Safety Zone (SSZ) is an area along side and parallel to the runways. This area is not normally overflowed by aircraft except by aircraft losing directional control on takeoff (especially twin-engine aircraft).

### ***Traffic Pattern Zone***

The Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) is within other portions of the airport area that are routinely overflowed by aircraft. The potential for aircraft accidents is relatively low and the need for land use restrictions is minimal. The TPZ excludes all other zones described above. For this airport, the TPZ is the surface area underlying the FAR Part 77 Horizontal Surface. The perimeter of the TPZ is constructed by swinging arcs of 5,000 feet out for Runways 31L-13R and for Runways 31R-13L from a point 200 feet out from each runway pavement end on the extended centerline and connecting the arcs with lines tangent to these arcs.

The current safety zones are two areas rectangular in shape, at each end of the runway, with three areas corresponding to safety policies within them. Both the north and south safety areas encompass a total of 283.6 acres. The combined area of the new safety zone area is 3,241 acres, for a net increase of 2,957.4 acres. As all safety zones are within the AIA, all general plan amendments, rezoning, specific plans, or modifications to building regulations for affected properties within the safety zones, would be required to be reviewed by the ALUC for consistency with the safety policies in the Reid-Hillview CLUP.

In summary, both the Safety Zones and AIA zones have increased in area to capture area that airplanes fly over that was not previously considered. The 60-dBA CNEL has decreased by 10.28 acres and the 65 dBA CNEL has increased 17.87 acres. The decrease in the 60-dBA CNEL contour and the increase in the 65 dBA CNEL is due to a more precise modeling of the average noise measurements than was previously available.

Also, incorporated into the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Amendment are three non-Reid Hillview Airport amendments. These amendments are as follows:

- 1- Incorporation of the FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Map for each of the four County Airports by reference to the most current version in use by the FAA (San Jose International Airport, Palo Alto Airport, South County Airport, and Reid Hillview).
- 2- Include consistent reference to the FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Map and Safety Zone, within the County CLUP.
- 3- Adopt a definition of “Minor Projects” for each County Airport.

## **(2) FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Maps and Text Amendments**

**FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Map** - Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77, *Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace*, establishes imaginary surfaces for airports and runways as a means to identify objects that are obstructions to air navigation. Each surface is defined as a slope-ratio, or at a certain altitude above the airport elevation, measured at Mean Sea Level (MSL). Projects located within the AIA are evaluated for consistency with the FAR Part 77 height restrictions. This is an FAA map that is updated as necessary as a result of changes in the airport runway(s). It is not a County or ALUC map. The current Santa Clara County CLUP is using an outdated version of the maps, and requires a CLUP amendment each time the FAA updates the map to implement the map. To avoid having to process a CLUP amendment each time the FAA updates the map, the ALUC wishes to include language that adopts the most current version of the map for each County Airport by reference as follows:

The Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77, *Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace* Map shall be incorporated by reference of the most current version for each of the four Santa Clara County Airports (San Jose International, Reid Hillview Airport, South County Airport and Palo Alto Airport).

**Reference to the FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Map and Safety Zone, within the County CLUP-** The Current County CLUP is inconsistent with regard to reference to the FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Map and a reference to the San Jose International Airport Safety Zone. Therefore, the ALUC is proposing the following CLUP amendments:

### **1) Page 20, last paragraph**

FAA’s “runway protection zones,” which are trapezoidal in shape and encompass the “object free area.” Again, the size of these zones varies depending on the length and use of the runways. An example of the relationship between the object free area and the runway protection zone can be seen at San Jose International. At the ends of the primary runway, 30L/12R, the FAA has established rectangular object free areas which are 1,000 ft. long by 800 ft. wide. The runway protection zone established for this runway begins 200 feet beyond the end of the runway, and extends 2,500 feet. The width of the trapezoidal area varies from 1,000 feet nearest the end of the runway to 2,000 feet at the opposite end. ~~Maps for San Jose International, contained in the appendix, clearly show the relationship between the object free zone, the runway protection zone, and the ALUC safety zone.~~

(2) Page 25, first full paragraph

Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 sets standards for obstructions to airspace. In general, the FAA is responsible for administering these regulations. The ALUC sets height restrictions around each of the county's airports based on the approach and departure surfaces outlined in the Part 77 regulations. ~~Maps contained in the Appendix show the height restriction boundaries for each of the county's airports.~~ New construction is subject to FAA review in terms of airspace requirements as well as ALUC review. ~~The jurisdiction approving any proposed project is ultimately responsible for enforcement of the FAA regulations and recommendations.~~ Any object that penetrates the surfaces established pursuant to the Part 77 regulations is inconsistent with this plan, even if the FAA determines that the object would not pose a hazard.

(3) Page 31, Policy G-3

G-3 The Airport Land Use Commission shall require dedication of an aviation easement to the jurisdiction owning the airport as a condition of approval on any project located within an adopted referral area. All such easements shall restrict development height so that no object penetrates the Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 surfaces in effect when the first building permit is issued for the project according to the provisions of FAR Part 77, or an alternate elevation approved by the FAA.

4) Page 37 (Glossary)

~~FAR Part 77~~—Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 – The regulations established by the Federal Aviation Administration and contained in Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 77, pursuant to which ~~contains~~ the various imaginary surfaces around airports that control the height of structures are established. For purposes of determining whether a project is consistent with this plan, the Airport Land Use Commission will evaluate the project in relation to the imaginary surfaces in effect for each county airport when the Commission makes its (in)consistency determination for the project.

**(3) Adoption of definition and review process for “Minor Projects”-**

The ALUC reviews projects from jurisdictions in Santa Clara County when the projects are located within the referral boundaries or AIA's of County Airports. General Plan Amendments, Rezoning, Specific Plans, or changes in building regulations for affected properties within the AIA's, are mandated by State law to be referred to the ALUC, and are reviewed for consistency with the Land Use Plan by the full Commission.

It is also common for the ALUC staff coordinator to refer applications to the ALUC for non-mandatory projects, such as Subdivisions, Use Permits, Commercial projects, or projects that are significant enough to warrant full Commission review, if a jurisdiction chooses to voluntarily refer projects to the ALUC.

Often, there are projects that fall within the AIA for County Airports that are appropriate for ALUC review, but do not meet the definition of the aforementioned mandatory referrals. For example, a new 150-foot tall cellular antenna, the construction of a new house and second living unit that increases density on a parcel, or a Lot Line Adjustment. Rather than have these applications reviewed by the full Commission, the ALUC staff coordinator reviews these “Minor Projects” for consistency with the policies in the Land Use Plan, and reports the Minor Projects to the Commission at the next public hearing. The purpose of having the ALUC Staff Coordinator review these Minor Projects rather than to have all projects reviewed by the full Commission is twofold. One, the ALUC only meets every other month to take action on items. As a result, projects could be unreasonably delayed up to two months waiting for review. Two,

there would be a significant increase in staff time in preparing staff reports and agendas, as well as an increase in Commission responsibility to review the projects as well as hold longer meetings.

Therefore, the ALUC is proposing a “Minor Project” definition for projects that fall within the AIA’s County Airports that are not mandatory referrals. In adopting this definition, the Staff Coordinator may still refer a project up to the full Commission if the review is found to be inconsistent or if the project is controversial.

“ Minor Projects” are generally limited to residential, commercial and industrial projects that are a) located within the AIA’s of County Airports, b) not located within the airport Safety Zone, as designated in the plan, and c) do not exceed 200 feet in height above finished grade or penetrate the FAA, FAR Part 77 Imaginary Surfaces. Any project found to be inconsistent with the Policies in the Land Use Plan, or controversial, may be called up to the full Commission

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources           | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources / Recreation             | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic        | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |  | <input type="checkbox"/> None                        |

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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 although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately 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.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

**Mark J Connolly**\_\_\_\_\_

**Printed name**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**For**

### **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses**

The environmental setting consists of all of the public use airports in Santa Clara County (Palo Alto, San Jose International, South County, Reid-Hillview Airport, and areas surrounding these airports. With respect to Reid Hillview Airport, the surrounding area includes Eastridge Shopping Mall to the south, which was constructed in 1970, prior to the ALUC's establishment. Other surrounding land uses are medium density residential areas, small areas of commercial and light industrial uses, recreational, an educational facility and some park/greenbelt. U.S. Highway 101 borders the new AIA to the west, Highway 680 to the north, Capitol Expressway to the east and Aborn Road to the south. Lands within the Safety Zones mainly include residential, commercial and some industrial properties.

**Other public agencies whose approval is required:** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

There are no responsible agencies for this project. CalTrans Division of Aeronautics has an advisory role. Pursuant to federal regulations, the FAA adopts maps that are incorporated by reference in both the County CLUP and Reid Hillview CLUP.



## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

<b>A. AESTHETICS</b>					
	<b>IMPACT</b>				<b>SOURCES</b>
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT:</b>	<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2,3,4, 6a,17f
b) Substantially damage scenic resources along a designated scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 6a, 17f
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2,3
d) 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"/>	3,4
e) If subject to ASA, be generally in non-compliance with the Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11
f) If subject to Design Review, be generally in non-compliance with the Guidelines for Design Review Approval?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,4,12
g) Be located on or near a ridgeline visible from the valley floor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2,17n

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any potential impacts to aesthetic resources.

**MITIGATION:** None Required.

<b>B. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</b>					
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.					
	<b>IMPACT</b>				<b>SOURCE</b>
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT:</b>	<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Convert 10 or more acres of farmland classified as prime in the report <i>Soils of Santa Clara County</i> to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,23,24,26
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9,21a
c) Conflict with an existing Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,4,26

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the project will not have any potential impacts to agricultural resources. Use of land within the Reid Hillview AIA for agricultural purposes is not inconsistent with the CLUP.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

<b>C. AIR QUALITY</b>					
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,28
b) 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"/>	5,29
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,29
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,29
e) Create objectionable odors or dust affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,21, 29, 47

**DISCUSSION:**

Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have potential air quality impacts, because it will have no direct or indirect impact on emission sources..

**MITIGATION:** None Required

<b>D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCES
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 7, 17b, 17o,

	regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,7, 8a, 17b, 17e, 33
c)	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.) or tributary to an already impaired water body, as defined by section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 7, 17n, 32
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,7, 17b, 17o
e)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,4
f)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources:					
i)	Tree Preservation Ordinance [Section C16]?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,31
ii)	Wetland Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 25-30]?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 8a
iii)	Riparian Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 31-41]?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 8a,

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not impact any biological resources. The project does not foster development or other activities that could impact species or their habitat.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES					
	IMPACT				SOURCE
WOULD THE PROJECT	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 16, 19, 40, 41
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 19, 40, 41,
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2,3,4,,40,41
d) Disturb any human remains, including those	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 40,41

interred outside of formal cemeteries?					
e) Change or affect any resource listed in the County Historic Resources Database?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16

### DISCUSSION:

Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have potential impacts to cultural resources. The project does not foster development or other activities that would impact cultural resources.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 17L, 43
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 17c, 18b
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 17c, 17n, 18b
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 17L, 118b
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 2, 3
c) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 17c, 23, 24, 42
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the report, <i>Soils of Santa Clara County</i> , creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14, 23, 24,
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 6, 23, 24,
f) Cause substantial compaction or over-covering of soil either on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 6
g) Cause substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 6, 42

**DISCUSSION:**

Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have potential impacts to geology and soils because it does not foster development or other land disturbance activities.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

<b>G. HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>					
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT</b>	<b>IMPACT</b>				<b>SOURCE</b>
	<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) 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"/>	1, 3, 4, 5
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 5
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	46
d) 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"/>	47
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in 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"/>	3, 22a
f) 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"/>	5, 48
g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4
h) Provide breeding grounds for vectors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
i) Proposed site plan result in a safety hazard (i.e., parking layout, access, closed community, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
j) Involve construction of a building, road or septic system on a slope of 30% or greater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 17n
k) Involve construction of a roadway greater than 20% slope for a distance of 300' or more?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 17n

**DISCUSSION:**

One of the main purposes of the Reid-Hillview CLUP is to help decision makers avoid making land-use decisions that could possibly increase safety hazards for people residing or working in or around the airport. In fact, reducing the risk of airport related hazards within vicinity of the airport should result from the adoption of the CLUP. Therefore, approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps will not have a negative impact on Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

<b>H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>					
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT:</b>	<b>IMPACT</b>				<b>SOURCE</b>
	<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	34, 36
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 4
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 17n
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Note policy regarding flood retention in watercourse and restoration of riparian vegetation for West Branch of the Llagas.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
e) Create or contribute increased impervious surfaces and associated runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 36, 21a
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 18b, 18d
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 18b, 18d

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 4
j) Be located in an area of special water quality concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4, 6a,
k) Be located in an area known to have high levels of nitrates in well water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4
l) Result in a septic field being constructed on soil where a high water table extends close to the natural land surface?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
m) Result in a septic field being located within 50 feet of a drainage swale; 100 feet of any well, water course or water body or 200 feet of a reservoir at capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps will not have potential impacts to hydrology and water quality, because it does not foster development or other activities that would affect ground water or drainage/runoff.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

I. LAND USE					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 4
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8a, 9, 18a
c) Conflict with special policies:					
i) San Martin &/or South County?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 8a, 20
ii) Los Gatos Specific Plan or Lexington Watershed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 8a, 22c
iii) New Almaden Historical Area/Guadalupe Watershed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 8a
iv) Stanford?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 21
v) City of Morgan Hill Urban Growth Boundary Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 17a
vi) West Valley Hillside Preservation Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 8a

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the project, including adoption of the Reid Hillview CLUP, will not have any adverse land use impacts. In developing the Reid Hillview CLUP, the ALUC and County staff have worked closely with the City of San Jose to ensure that the policies included in the CLUP will not be in conflict with any policies or regulations after the City of San Jose amends its General Plan. The Reid-Hillview CLUP includes the City of San Jose General Plan Land Use and Zoning maps for reference to current Land Use designations and Zoning around

the Airport. In order to maintain consistent land use between the CLUP policies and the City of San Jose General Plan, State law requires that within 180 days upon receipt of an ALUC plan amendment; the City of San Jose shall amend their General Plan. As discussed below under Section K. Population and Housing, the project also will not displace growth or otherwise directly or indirectly result in any other adverse land use impacts.

Therefore, approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps will not have potential land use impacts.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

<b>J. NOISE</b>					
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT:</b>	<b>IMPACTS</b>				<b>SOURCE</b>
	<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 13, 22a, 45
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13
c) Result in a substantial permanent 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"/>	1, 2, 5
d) Result in a substantial temporary 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"/>	1, 2, 5
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or private airstrip would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 5, 22a

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the project, including the adoption of the Reid Hillview CLUP, would not have any adverse impact related to noise. In fact, one of the primary purposes of the CLUP is to reduce noise impacts.

In October 2002, the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors approved an FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) for Reid Hillview Airport and forwarded it to the FAA for review. The NCP forecasts a reduction in the CNEL noise contours if the policies recommended in the NCP are implemented. However, following the recommendations in the 2002 Handbook, this CLUP is using the more conservative NCP 2007 noise contour information.



The Reid-Hillview CLUP includes the adoption of the 60, 65, and 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contour maps. These maps delineate the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) boundary of the respective decibels as a result of airport operations at Reid-Hillview. If a project is referred to the ALUC and is within the 60, 65, or 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours, the applicable noise policies would apply. Although the adopted maps will include a 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contour, the contour is entirely located on airport property. Therefore, no development other than projects on airport property is potentially affected by the 70 dBA CNEL. The new 60 dBA CNEL Noise Contour encompasses 356.3 acres. The old 60 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is 366.6 acres, for a net decrease of 10.28 acres. The new 65 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is 145 acres. The old 65 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is 127.1 acres, for a net increase of 17.87 acres.

Projects referred to the ALUC that are within the noise contours of Reid-Hillview Airport would be reviewed for consistency with the noise policies in the CLUP. Projects located within the respective CNEL Noise Contours receive recommended mitigation for noise attenuation if the adopted thresholds are exceeded to reduce the affect of airplane noise on the subject properties. The proposed Reid-Hillview CLUP Policy N-4 states:

*No residential construction shall be permitted within the 65 dBA CNEL contour boundary unless it can be demonstrated that the resulting interior sound levels will be less than 45 dBA CNEL and there are no outdoor patios or outdoor activity areas associated with the residential project. All property owners within the 65 dBA CNEL contour boundary who rent or lease their property for residential use shall include in their rental/lease agreement with the tenant, a statement advising that they (the tenants) are living within a high noise area and the exterior noise level is predicted to be greater than 65 dBA CNEL.*

Proposed Reid-Hillview CLUP policy N-5 states:

*Residential construction will not be permitted in the area between the 60 dB CNEL contour boundary and the 65 dB CNEL contour boundary unless it can be demonstrated that the resulting interior sound level will be no greater than 45 dB CNEL.*

Commercial or industrial uses are deemed generally acceptable in the 60-65dBA CNEL, but noise attenuation is suggested. High-occupancy uses such as churches, libraries, schools and auditoriums are generally unacceptable. There is one existing school that partially lies within the 60 dBA CNEL Noise Contour to the west of the airport. Therefore, intermittent noise from aircraft could possibly disrupt some school activities. The only affect that the new 60dBA CNEL Noise Contour has on the school is that any future additions or redevelopment would include a recommendation for noise insulation.

Overall, the new noise contours serve as a beneficial impact in terms of noise by discouraging new residential and other noise-sensitive uses such as churches, schools, libraries and auditoriums in areas with high noise levels.

Approval of the project, including the modification to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps will not have any negative noise impacts.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

K. POPULATION AND HOUSING					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Induce substantial 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 54, 55
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the project would not induce growth, nor would it displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people.

This discussion concerns possible direct and indirect “growth inducing impacts” or secondary effects associated with potentially displacing new development within the new AIA, CNEL and Safety Zones to other areas, which could thus result in secondary environmental impacts (air quality, transportation, agriculture).

A project could displace development and induce growth in the surrounding environment if it would create barriers to population growth in a certain areas that currently allow new development to occur.

The Airport Land Use Commission serves as a policy making body for lands around Reid-Hillview Airport, and makes land use consistency determinations for certain types of land use approvals which occur within its referral area, also known as the Airport Influence Area (AIA). This includes the review of modifications to a local agency’s general plan, any specific plans, zoning ordinances, or building regulations, which would affect property within the AIA. If the ALUC determines that a project or policy under its review is inconsistent with the policies contained in its Land Use Plan, including policies applicable to noise and safety, the referring agency may only approve the policy if it overrides the ALUC’s determination by a 2/3 vote of the entire legislative body. Theoretically, if an ALUC referral boundary was to significantly expand in size and affect a substantial portion of land, subsequent determinations of inconsistency by the ALUC on new projects or policies could potentially displace new development that would otherwise occur within the affected zones. For example, future residential development could be affected by ALUC noise and safety policies. Thus, theoretically, this development might then occur elsewhere, perhaps on the fringes of cities or non-urban areas, if there is not sufficient urban land available or infrastructure to serve it. This chain of events could result in potential secondary environmental impacts, such as traffic and air quality impacts due to longer commute distances.

In order to evaluate the possibility for this occurrence in association with the proposed project, particularly, Reid Hillview CLUP and associated map modifications, GIS maps were prepared to

identify the affected areas and compare the amount of land that could be affected by the adoption of the modified AIA, CNEL FAR Part 77 and Safety Zone maps for Reid-Hillview Airport. These maps and analysis are discussed below:

**ALUC Referral Boundary (AIA):** Figure 8 of the Reid-Hillview CLUP shows the AIA with the City of San Jose Zoning designations within the AIA. The total amount of additional lands affected by the new ALUC Referral boundary would be 1,059 acres, from 2,937 acres to 3,997 acres. The inclusion of additional land within the AIA does not, by itself, have any potential for displacement effects because the proposed CLUP does not include any policies that would preclude or significantly discourage any land uses simply based on their location within the AIA.

**60, 65, and 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours**—Figure 5, the Noise Contour maps, delineate the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) boundary of the respective decibels as a result of airport operations at Reid-Hillview. The calculation is reflective of the 2022 Aircraft Noise Contours. The proposed new maps will include a 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contour. However, the contour is entirely located on airport property. Therefore, no development other than projects on airport property can be affected by the 70 dBA CNEL.

The 60 and 65 dBA CNEL contours are located outside the Reid Hillview Airport property and provide a scale of how aircraft noise affects the properties surrounding the Airport. If a project is referred to the ALUC and is within the 60 or 65 dBA CNEL Noise Contours, the applicable noise policies would apply to protect citizens from the impacts of aircraft noise. The new 60 dBA CNEL Noise Contour encompasses 356.3 acres. The old 60 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is 366.6 acres, for a net decrease of 10.28 acres. The new 65 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is 145 acres. The old 65 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is 127.1 acres, for a net increase of 17.87 acres. The increase in both of these noise contours is the result of more accurate modeling of aircraft noise than previously available.

Analysis of the San Jose General Plan designations in place at the time of the Reid-Hillview CLUP adoption shows that a majority of the properties in the expanded AIA are already developed with Medium/Low density residential uses at a density of 8.0 dwelling units per acre. An analysis was prepared by the County of Santa Clara to calculate the amount of vacant land, which would be affected by the new CNEL contours. Based on the analysis, there is no vacant land that can be developed within the expanded area, which would be affected by the modification of the ALUC maps. There is a large parcel to the north of the Airport that is proposed to become a park and open space in the City of San Jose Evergreen-East Hills Vision Plan. Outdoor activities are the only activities potentially impacted by noise at this location.

**FAR Part 77:** The FAR Part 77 map is a Federal Aviation Administration map that identifies objects that are potential obstructions to navigation. The ALUC uses the map to establish guidelines for the height of structures around the airport. The FAR Part 77 map itself has no impacts on population and housing.

**Safety Zones:** As shown in figure 7, the proposed Safety Zones are physically very different than the existing safety zones in the County-wide CLUP. This is the result of the 2002 Handbook, and Caltrans-Aeronautics guidelines that encourage CLUPs to provide more detailed safety zones. An example of how the expanded safety zones affect physical building proposals is outlined in table 4-2 of the Reid-Hillview CLUP. The table provides maximum density and open space requirements for land uses within the safety zones, rather than prohibiting specific uses

within the safety zones, with the exception of the Runway Protection Zone. The land area in the expanded north inner safety zone is proposed to become a park and open space in the City of San Jose Evergreen-East Hills Vision Plan. Because the population density of park is less than residential or commercial development, the proposed CLUP simply encourages structures such as light standards and backstops to be built to a modest height and avoidance of events that draw large crowds in the event that a plane had to make an emergency landing there. This is an example of how the CLUP seeks to encourage compatible development, rather than displacing development and uses.

The total amount of land affected by the proposed safety zones compared to the area of the existing safety zones is outlined in the analysis below:

(Note that approximately 17 acres of new Safety Zone area is located on airport property).

Existing Safety Zone South = 139.94 ac.

Existing Safety Zone North = 143.66 ac.

=====

Total Existing Safety Zones = 283.60 ac.

New Safety Zones:

Turning Safety Zones = 97.5 acres

Runway Protection Zones = 36 acres

Inner Safety Zones = 182.1 acres

Sideline Safety Zone = 29.8 acres

Outer Safety Zone = 43.5 acres

Traffic Pattern Safety Zone Boundary = 2,852.1 acres

=====

Total New Safety Zones = 3,241 acres

Overall, there are 283.6 acres of existing safety zone area, whereas, the combined area of the new safety zone area is 3,241 acres, for a net increase of 2,957 acres. Existing development is not affected by the project.

### **Summary & Analysis:**

As previously stated, the implementation of the CLUP does not affect existing development and will only affect proposed new development.

### **AIA**

The intent of the adoption of the Reid-Hillview CLUP is not to displace development, but to develop policies for compatible development in areas surrounding the airport. In fact, the majority of land surrounding the Airport is already developed, which will not be affected by the CLUP. Therefore, residential infill development within the AIA in the form of additions or new dwellings will only trigger an Avigation Easement on the property, not restrictions on development. An Avigation Easement is simply an easement to convey to property owners that airplanes will be flying overhead.

The largest area that would be potentially affected by the adoption of the new maps would be the additional lands within the ALUC referral boundary for Reid Hillview Airport (A.I.A.), which is

1,059 acres larger in size. However, a majority of this new area falls outside of the CNEL noise contours and Safety Zones where no development prohibitions apply. Within these areas (the majority of lands affected through the map modifications), ALUC policies are limited to height restrictions consistent with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) FAR Part 77 Imaginary Surfaces, and the recordation of Avigation Easements. As such, the possibility of influencing development and the displacement of new growth in this area is minimal.

The amount of new lands within the new ALUC Referral Area (AIA) as a percentage of total acreage within the City of San Jose is minimal. As such, the influence of ALUC policies on land use development and population growth in general in the City of San Jose would not be significant.

### **CNEL**

The 60-dBA CNEL has decreased by 10.28 acres and the 65 dBA CNEL has increased 17.87 acres. The decrease in the 60-dBA CNEL contour and the increase in the 65 dBA CNEL is due to a more precise modeling of the average noise measurements than was previously available. The potential to displace development in the area of the increased 65 dBA CNEL contour is less than significant, because the CLUP policies only affect noise mitigation for new development. Also, the increase in area of 17.87 acres as a percentage of total acreage within the City of San Jose is minimal.

### **SAFETY ZONES**

The new Turning Safety Zone has 5.21 acres of vacant land within it. The proposed CLUP policies for this zone allow for 100 people per acre for non-residential development, and very low-density residential development of five dwelling units per acre. The City of San Jose General Plan designations are numerous within this zone. Overall, the City of San Jose General Plan designations are more restrictive than the CLUP policies with the exception of the single-family residential area, which is designated Medium Low Density, Eight Dwelling Units per acre. Since the Reid Hillview CLUP policies are more restrictive on land within the Turning Safety Zone, analysis was done to determine if there would be any parcels large enough to subdivided, which might be affected by the CLUP policies. Eight dwelling units per acre equates to parcels of 5,445 square feet in a Single-Family Residential Zoning District. To be conservative, analysis was done on properties within the Turning Safety Zone that were 10,000 square feet or larger. There are no Medium Low Density Residential parcels over 10,000 square feet located within either south Turning Safety Zones. There are three Medium Low Density Residential parcels over 10,000 square feet located within the two north Turning Safety Zones.

However, one parcel is a cul-de-sac lot that would likely not be sub-dividable due to not meeting the minimum lot frontage requirements of the City of San Jose. Another parcel is partially on the Airport property along the western boundary and is owned by the City of San Jose. Therefore, the possibility of being subdivided is unlikely. The last parcel is near the corner of Story Road and Capitol Expressway, and is owned by PG&E and likely cannot be developed because high voltage power lines exist on the parcel. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that it is unlikely that further subdivision could take place within the Turning Safety Zone area. Therefore, the potential to displace development in this area is less than significant.

There is 4.51 acres of vacant land within the Runway Protection Zones, located to the south of the runway and encroaches into the Eastridge Shopping Center property. The proposed CLUP policies state that this is a “No Build Zone”. The City of San Jose General Plan designation for

this area is Industrial Park and Regional Commercial on the Eastridge Shopping Center property. The Industrial and Commercial allowed density for the Evergreen area is 35 people per acre. Also, compared to the total land area within the City of San Jose, 4.51 acres is a very small amount of land. Therefore, the potential to displace development in this area is less than significant.

In the Inner Safety Zone there is 13.83 acres of vacant land. This area is contained within one property, which is at the southwest corner of Capitol Expressway and Quimby Road, referred to as the Arcadia property. The property is south of the Airport and is partially located within the south Inner Safety Zone. The property is zoned R1-8, with a mixed General Plan designation of Agriculture and Office and Industrial Park. The CLUP policies for the Inner Safety Zone allow for a maximum population density of 60 people per acre for non-residential development and 10 or more acres per dwelling unit for residential uses. According to the City of San Jose General Plan, the highest density allowed on the property allows for 50 people per acre. Therefore, the potential of the project to displace development on the area is a less-than-significant impact.

In the Traffic Pattern Safety Zone Boundary, there is 80.67 acres of vacant land exclusive of the previous Safety Zones. The City of San Jose General Plan designations are numerous within this zone including eight dwelling units per acre for single-family residential development. All of the City of San Jose General Plan designations are more restrictive than the proposed Reid Hillview CLUP policies. Therefore, the potential to displace development in this area is less than significant.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

L. PUBLIC SERVICES					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
i) Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
ii) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
iii) School facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps will not have potential impacts to public services.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

M. RESOURCES AND RECREATION					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 6, 44
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site as delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 6, 8a
c) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 4, 5
d) 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"/>	1, 3, 4, 5
e) Be on, within or near a public or private park, wildlife reserve, or trail or affect existing or future recreational opportunities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17h, 21a
f) Result in loss of open space rated as high priority for acquisition in the "Preservation 20/20" report?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	27

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps will not have potential impacts related to recreational facilities or mineral resources.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

N. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 49, 53
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 49, 50, 53
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5, 6, 7, 53

	a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 5, 6, 7, 53
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 5, 6, 7, 53
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 48, 53
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	52, 53
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 21a
h)	Not provide safe access, obstruct access to nearby uses or fail to provide for future street right of way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 6, 7, 53

**DISCUSSION:** The Valley Transportation Agency (VTA), is in the final stages of approval for the Capital Corridor Light Rail Extension, which is located partially within two of the Reid Hillview Airport Safety Zones. The VTA is working with the City of San Jose and the County of Santa Clara ALUC to ensure compatibility in construction of the transportation improvements and avoid design hazards at Reid Hillview Airport.

Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps will not have potential transportation or traffic related impacts.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

O. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS						
		IMPACT				SOURCE
WOULD THE PROJECT:		YES			NO	
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a)	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"/>	1, 3, 5,
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 21a, 38
c)	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
d)	Require new or expanded entitlements in order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 21,
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5



commitments?					
f)	Not be able to 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"/> 1, 3, 5
g)	Be in non-compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5, 6
h)	Employ equipment which could interfere with existing communications or broadcast systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1, 3, 5

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 65 dBA CNEL contour, and Safety Zones for San Jose International Airport within the Airport Land Commission's (ALUC) Land Use Plan for Areas Surrounding Santa Clara County Airports will not have potential impacts to utilities or service systems.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

P. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) <i>Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 to 53
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 to 53
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 to 53

**DISCUSSION:**

Implementation of the project will not trigger any mandatory findings of significance.

**EARLIER ANALYSIS**

- 1) Earlier Analysis Used: n/a
- 2) Impacts Adequately Addressed: n/a
- 3) Mitigation Measures: n/a

# Initial Study Source List\*

1. Environmental Information Form
2. Field Inspection
3. Project Plans
4. Planner's Knowledge of Area
5. Experience With Other Projects of This Size and Nature
6. County Expert Sources: Geologist, Fire Marshal, Roads & Airports, Environmental Health, Land Development Engineering, Parks & Recreation, Zoning Administration, Comprehensive Planning, Architectural & Site Approval Committee Secretary
7. Agency Sources: Santa Clara Valley Water District, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Midpeninsula OpenSpace Regional District, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, CA Dept. of Fish & Game, Caltrans, U.S. Army Core of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Public Works Depts. of individual cities, Planning Depts. of individual cities,
- 8a. Santa Clara County (SCC) General Plan
- 8b. The South County Joint Area Plan
9. SCC Zoning Regulations (Ordinance)
10. County Grading Ordinance
11. SCC Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval
12. SCC Development Guidelines for Design Review
13. County Standards and Policies Manual (Vol. I - Land Development)
14. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code [1994 version]
15. Land Use Database
16. Santa Clara County Heritage Resource (including Trees) Inventory [computer database]
17. GIS Database
  - a. SCC General Plan Land Use, and Zoning
  - b. Natural Habitat Areas & Riparian Plants
  - c. Relative Seismic Stability
  - d. Archaeological Resources
  - e. Water Resources & Water Problems
  - f. Viewshed and Scenic Roads
  - g. Fire Hazard
  - h. Parks, Public Open Space, and Trails
  - i. Heritage Resources
  - j. Slope Constraint
  - k. Serpentine soils
  - l. State of California, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, and County landslide & fault zones
  - m. Water Problem/Resource
  - n. USGS Topo Quad, and Liquefaction
  - o. Dept. of Fish & Game, Natural Diversity Data
  - p. FEMA Flood Zones
18. Base Map Overlays & Textual Reports (GIS)
  - Paper Maps
    - a. SCC Zoning
    - b. Barclay's Santa Clara County Locaide Street Atlas
    - c. Color Air Photos (MPSI)
    - d. Santa Clara Valley Water District - Maps of Flood Control Facilities & Limits of 1% Flooding
    - e. Soils Overlay Air Photos
    - f. "Future Width Line" map set

## 19. CEQA Guidelines [Current Edition]

Area Specific: San Martin, Stanford, and Other Areas

### San Martin

#### 20a. San Martin Integrated Design Guidelines

20b. San Martin Water Quality Study

20c. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Santa Clara County & Santa Clara Valley Water District

### Stanford

#### 21a. Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP), Community Plan (CP), Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

21b. Stanford Protocol and Land Use Policy Agreement

### Other Areas

#### 22a. ALUC Land Use Plan for Areas Surrounding Airports [1992 version]

22b. Los Gatos Hillside Specific Area Plan

22c. County Lexington Basin Ordinance Relating to Sewage Disposal

### Soils

#### 23. USDA, SCS, "Soils of Santa Clara County

24. USDA, SCS, "Soil Survey of Eastern Santa Clara County"

### Agricultural Resources/Open Space

#### 25. Right to Farm Ordinance

#### 26. State Dept. of Conservation, "CA Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model"

27. Open Space Preservation, Report of the Preservation 2020 Task Force, April 1987 [Chapter IV]

### Air Quality

28. BAAQMD Clean Air Plan (1997)

#### 29. BAAQMD Annual Summary of Contaminant Excesses & BAAQMD, "Air Quality & Urban Development - Guidelines for Assessing Impacts of Projects & Plans" [1999]

### Biological Resources/

### Water Quality & Hydrological Resources/

### Utilities & Service Systems"

#### 30. Site-Specific Biological Report

#### 31. Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance Section C16

32. Clean Water Act, Section 404

33. Riparian Inventory of Santa Clara County, Greenbelt Coalition, November 1988

34. CA Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan, San Francisco Bay Region [1995]

35. Santa Clara Valley Water District, Private Well Water Testing Program [12-98]

36. SCC Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program, Urban Runoff Management Plan [1997]

37. County Environmental Health / Septic Tank Sewage Disposal System - Bulletin "A"

#### 38. County Environmental Health Department Tests and Reports

## Initial Study Source List\*

39. Calphotos website:  
<http://www.elib.cs.berkeley.edu/photos>

### Archaeological Resources

40. State Archaeological Clearinghouse, Sonoma State University

**41. Site Specific Archaeological Reconnaissance Report**

### Geological Resources

**42. Site Specific Geologic Report**

43. State Department of Mines and Geology, Special Report #42

44. State Department of Mines and Geology, Special Report #146

### Noise

45. County Noise Ordinance

### Hazards & Hazardous Materials

46. Section 21151.4 of California Public Resources Code

47. State Department of Toxic Substances, Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List

**48. County Office of Emergency Services Emergency Response Plan [1994 version]**

### Transportation/Traffic

49. Transportation Research Board, "Highway Capacity Manual", Special Report 209, 1995.

50. SCC Congestion Management Agency, "2000 Monitoring and Conformance report"

**51. Official County Road Book**

**52. County Off-Street Parking Standards**

**53. Site-specific Traffic Impact Analysis Report**

**54. San Jose General Plan**

**55. San Jose Vacant Land Inventory, July 2004**

---

\*Items listed in bold are the most important sources and should be referred to during the first review of the project, when they are available. The planner should refer to the other sources for a particular environmental factor if the former indicate a potential environmental impact.

---

## AMENDMENT TO AN INITIAL STUDY

### Environmental Checklist and Evaluation for Santa Clara County

<b>File Number:</b>	N/A	<b>Date:</b> 10/17/2007
<b>Project Type:</b>	Government	<b>APN(s):</b> Multiple
<b>Project Location / Address</b>	2500 Cunningham Avenue and property immediately surrounding Reid Hillview Airport	<b>GP Designation:</b> Multiple/San Jose
<b>Owner's Name</b>	County of Santa Clara at airport, and various around the airport	<b>Zoning:</b> Multiple/San Jose
<b>Applicant's Name:</b>	Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission	<b>Urban Service Area:</b> SAN JOSE

**This document is an amendment to the Initial Study that was circulated for 20-days on 9/7/2007 and contains the deletion of analysis and clarification of analysis in the following areas:**

At the meeting of September 26, 2007 the ALUC continued the item to address specific concerns raised by the City of San Jose. The concerns were as follows:

1-Omit the reference to the FAA FAR Part 77 Elevation Map as a height restriction boundary.

2-Amend the CEQA document( Negative Declaration) to include analysis of the actions that the City of San Jose needs to take that they believe are reasonably foreseeable following approval of the ALUC RHV CLUP. These are the actions required by State Law that the San Jose City Council will have to take to bring the San Jose General Plan/Zoning Ordinance into conformance with the CLUP. They are the following:

- a) Ordinance requiring avigation easements throughout the AIA (Policy G-5)
- b) Ordinance requiring rental tenant notification of the proximity to the airport (policy N-4)
- c) Ordinance requiring max 45 dB interior for residential reconstruction (Policy R-2)
- d) Specific General Plan land use restrictions to reflect the RPZ, ISZ and TSZ requirements (Table 4-2 from the Reid Hillview CLUP)

Staff has amended the Environmental Initial Study to reflect both of these changes and provided it to the City of San Jose seven days prior to the meeting. There were no changes in the environmental significance of these actions and the Negative Declaration remained as a determination.

**The following deletions are amended in the analysis:**

Page 5 item (2) referring to Page 25, first full paragraph of the RHV CLUP:

~~Any object that penetrates the surfaces established pursuant to the Part 77 regulations is inconsistent with this plan, even if the FAA determines that the object would not pose a hazard.~~

Page 5 item (3) referring to Page 31, Policy G-3 of the RHV CLUP:

~~height so that no object penetrates the Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 surfaces in effect when the first building permit is issued for the project~~

**The following additions are included in response to the action that the City of San Jose must take after adoption of the Project.**

Page 8 Other public Agencies whose approval is required:

The airport is within the City of San Jose's jurisdiction, and they will need to amend their General Plan and include City Council approved Ordinances in order to be consistent with the proposed Reid Hillview CLUP.

Page 15 Section I. LAND USE

The areas in which it is reasonably foreseeable that the City of San Jose needs to make amendments after approval of the ALUC CLUP are the following:

1. Ordinance requiring aviation easements throughout the AIA (Policy G-5 of the CLUP)
2. Ordinance requiring rental tenant notification of the proximity to the airport (Policy N-4 of the CLUP)
3. Ordinance requiring max 45 dB interior for residential reconstruction (Policy R-2 of the CLUP)
4. Specific General Plan land use restrictions to reflect the RPZ, ISZ and TSZ requirements (Table 4-2 of the CLUP, *safety compatibility guidelines*).

Items 1-3 above will require City Council approval to implement, but will not conflict with any applicable land use plan. Item number four above will involve inclusion of the following safety policies from table 4-2 of the RHV CLUP within the respective safety zones into the City of San Jose General Plan:

<b>Safety Zone</b>	<b>Maximum Population Density</b>	<b>Open Area Requirements</b>	<b>Land Use</b>
Runway Protection Zone – RPZ	-0- people (No allowed)	100 percent (No structures allowed)	Agricultural activities, roads, open low-landscaped areas. No trees, telephone poles or similar obstacles. Occasional short-term transient vehicle parking is permitted.
Inner Safety Zone – ISZ	Nonresidential, maximum 60 people per acre (includes open area and parking area required for the building's occupants)	30 percent of gross area open. No structures or concentrations of people between or within 100 feet of the extended runway centerlines.	Very low-density residential. 10 acres or more per dwelling unit - Nonresidential uses should be activities that attract relatively few people. No shopping centers, restaurants, theaters, meeting halls, stadiums, multi-story office buildings, labor-intensive manufacturing plants, educational facilities, day care facilities, hospitals, nursing homes or similar activities. No hazardous material facilities (gasoline

<b>Safety Zone</b>	<b>Maximum Population Density</b>	<b>Open Area Requirements</b>	<b>Land Use</b>
			stations, etc.).
Turning Safety Zone - TSZ	Nonresidential, maximum 100 people per acre (includes open area and parking area required for the building's occupants)	20 percent of gross area  Minimum dimensions: 300 ft by 75 ft parallel to the runway(s).	Very low-density residential, 5 acres or more per dwelling unit. No regional shopping centers, theaters, meeting halls, stadiums, buildings with more than three above ground habitable floors, schools, day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes or similar activities. No hazardous material facilities (gasoline stations, etc.).
Outer Safety Zone – OSZ	Nonresidential, maximum 100 people per acre (includes open area and parking area required for the building's occupants)	20 percent of gross area	Rural areas - allow residential, 2 acres or more per dwelling unit. Urban areas - allow residential infill to existing density. No regional shopping centers, theaters, meeting halls, stadiums, buildings with more than three above ground habitable floors, schools, large day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes or similar activities. No above ground bulk fuel storage.
Sideline Safety Zone - SSZ	Nonresidential, maximum 150 people per acre (includes open area and parking area required for the building's occupants)	30 percent of gross area	Residential - 5 acres or more per dwelling unit. No regional shopping centers, theaters, meeting halls, stadiums, buildings with more than three above ground habitable floors, schools, large day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes or similar activities. No above ground bulk fuel storage.
Traffic Pattern Zone – TPZ	No Limit	10 percent of gross area every one-half mile	Residential – No Limit. No sports stadiums or similar uses with very high concentration of people.

Amendment of the City of San Jose General Plan to include these safety policies will not displace housing because of the reasons described in Section K (Population and Housing), which includes analysis of the small amount of vacant land affected. The lands that would be affected by the City of San Jose amendments are the same lands affected by the implementation of the RHV CLUP. Furthermore, the areas affected by the City of San Jose amendments currently have more restrictive General Plan designations than proposed by the RHV CLUP. Therefore, the amendments necessary for the City of San Jose to implement will, in almost every case, not further restrict development beyond existing restrictions. Therefore, approval of the project, including the modifications to the Reid Hillview AIA, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps will not have any potentially significant land use or population and housing impacts.