

INITIAL STUDY
Environmental Checklist and Evaluation for Santa Clara County

File Number:	N/A	Date: 10/31/2008
Project Type:	Land Use Plan / Public	APN(s): Multiple
Project Location / Address	Property located within Airport Influence Area of South County (San Martin) and Palo Alto Airports. Map Amendment for County CLUP for SJC Runway 11-29 Safety Zone definition	GP Designation: Multiple
Owner's Name	County of Santa Clara. Various within Airport A.I.A's.	Zoning: Multiple
Applicant's Name:	Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission	Urban Service Areas: PALO ALTO

Project Description

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) and is undertaken pursuant to the ALUC's authority under Public Utilities Code § 21670 et seq. The amendments include: (1) The adoption of two new airport-specific Comprehensive Land Use Plans ("CLUPs"), for South County (San Martin) Airport and Palo Alto Airport; and (2) a Map amendment of the County-wide CLUP to correct the South Safety Zone Map for runway 11-29 at San Jose International Airport to reflect a reduction in width and length in the south Safety Zone.

(1) Adoption of the South County /San Martin Airport and Palo Alto Airport CLUPs-

The new South County and Palo Alto Airport CLUPs (hereafter referred to as "CLUPs") are intended to be comprehensive, self-contained CLUPs for each Airport. They include several new policies that are associated with the following map modifications:

- ALUC referral boundaries ("Airport Influence Areas" or "AIAs")
- 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours
- FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Map
- Airport Safety Zones

The purpose of the CLUPs is to safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airports and those who use the airports. The CLUPs are established to protect the public from the adverse effects of small aircraft. Specifically, the CLUPs policies ensure that development adjacent to public-use airports in Santa Clara County is not concentrated in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, and ensure that no structures or activities adversely affect navigable airspace. The implementation of the CLUPs is intended to prevent future incompatible development from encroaching on the Airports and to allow for development in accordance with the current Airport Master Plan for each Airport.

In formulating the CLUPs, the ALUC establishes policies for the regulation of land use, building height, safety, and noise exposure 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 that have new associated policies are described in the following:

South County (San Martin) Airport referral boundary (AIA) – The Airport Influence Area (AIA) defines the area in which the ALUC policies and procedures apply in South County. When the County of Santa Clara chooses to amend its General Plan, adopt or amend any specific plans, zoning ordinances, or building regulations, that would affect property within the AIA, the County 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, such as Building Site Approval, Use Permits or Subdivisions. The new AIA area has been reduced in size by 90.5 acres, from 6118.1 to 6027.6 total acres. The new AIA has been mapped to follow property line boundaries at the northwest and southwest corner of the AIA to eliminate uncertainty in determining if a property will fall within the zone.

Palo Alto Airport referral boundary (AIA) – The Airport Influence Area (AIA), defines the area in which the ALUC policies and procedures apply in the Palo Alto Area. The proposed Palo Alto Airport CLUP does not change the area of the AIA.

South County (San Martin) Airport 55, 60, 65, and 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours – These maps delineate the predicted Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) in decibels as a result of airport operations at South County Airport. If a project is referred to the ALUC and is within the 55, 60, 65, or 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours, the applicable noise policies from the CLUP would be used to review the application. The principal source for calculation of the proposed Noise Contours is the FAA modeling software, which forecasts the annual airport operations. Also, the 2002 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, which is published by the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics, incorporates established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) guidelines for noise standards. The new adopted maps will include a 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contour, which was not previously used. The existing CLUP only uses a 55 and 60 dBA CNEL Noise Contour. The existing 55 dBA CNEL is approximately 400 acres. The existing 60 dBA CNEL is approximately 153 acres. The new 55 dBA CNEL includes 1085.7 total acres, which is a net increase of approximately 685 acres. The new 60 dBA CNEL is 402.6 acres for an approximate increase of 240 acres. The new 65 dBA CNEL is 153 acres and the new 70 dBA CNEL is 59.4 acres, which only encompasses airport property and highway 101.

Palo Alto Airport 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours – Like the South County noise contours, these maps delineate the predicted Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) boundary in decibels as a result of airport operations at Palo Alto Airport. If a project is referred to the ALUC and is within the 55, 60, 65, or 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contours, the applicable noise policies would apply. Like the South County Airport, the principal source for the proposed Noise Contours is the 2002 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. The existing Noise Contours are based on 1995/1996-forecast conditions and use 55, 60, 65, 70 and 75 dBA CNEL Noise Contours. The new adopted maps will only include up to a 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contour, because the 75 dBA CNEL is entirely located on airport property. Therefore, no development other than projects on airport property would be affected by the 75 dBA CNEL. According to County ALUC files, there are no calculated areas within the existing Noise Contours for Palo Alto Airport. This is likely due to the small size of those contours and their location within the Baylands Conservation lands as well as airport property. The new 55 dBA CNEL is 2851.78 acres (including the “bubble” area west of the airport). The new 60 dBA CNEL is 750.7 acres. The new 65 dBA CNEL is 211.0 acres and the 70 dBA CNEL is 107.4 acres.

South County and Palo Alto Airport 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 CLUPs are using an outdated version of the FAA maps. In 2007, the ALUC adopted a CLUP amendment to incorporate by reference, the FAA maps currently in effect for each Airport in the County to avoid the necessity of County-wide CLUP amendments each time the FAA updates the map as a result of changes to the runways.

Palo Alto and South County Airport Safety Zones – Airport safety zones are established to minimize exposure to potential airplane hazards. Both the Palo Alto and South County CLUPs use the threshold adopted by the FAA for positioning the Runway Protection Zones. These areas are depicted on the FAA approved Airport Layout Plans for each airport. Furthermore, the safety zones defined for the Airports 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, which are the same for both CLUPs, and represented by Figure 7 in both CLUPs:

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. The RPZ as adopted by the airport and the FAA and begins 200 feet from the ends of the runways. 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 by 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 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.

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 both airports, 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 the runways 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.

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 CLUPs.

In summary, the Safety Zones for South County and Palo Alto Airports have increased in area as a consequence of applying the recommendations contained in the Caltrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. The Noise Contours for South County and Palo Alto Airports have increased in area to reflect the forecast number of aircraft operating at each airport as stated in the current Airport Master Plans for each Airport. The AIA has been reduced at South County Airport, but has remained unchanged at Palo Alto Airport.

Also, incorporated into the Amendments is a non-airport-specific CLUP amendment. This amendment is as follows:

(2) Map Amendment for the South Safety Zone dimensions for runway 11-29 at San Jose International Airport: -

The ALUC amended the County-wide CLUP in 2005 to include map updates as a result of the lengthening of runways at San Jose International Airport. In that update, the ALUC approved the original 5,000-foot by 1,500-foot south safety zone for Runway 11-29. However, the text, which describes the dimensions of the Safety Zones remained unchanged stating a dimension of 990 feet wide by 3,960 feet long.

The ALUC finds that the larger Safety Zone map should not have been re-adopted in the CLUP mapping update in 2005 and is proposing an amendment of the County-wide CLUP to revise the map of the San Jose International Airport for the south Safety Zone of runway 11-29 back to 3,960 feet long by 990 feet wide.

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 three of the public use airports in Santa Clara County (Palo Alto, San Jose International, South County Airport), and areas surrounding these airports. With respect to Palo Alto Airport, the surrounding land uses are the Baylands Conservation Area and a small area developed with commercial properties immediately east of Highway 101 on Embarcadero Road. With respect to South County Airport, the surrounding area includes residential property with small areas of publicly owned property, with Highway 101 bordering the Airport to the east. Land Uses surrounding the Southern area of San Jose International Airport are mostly commercial properties immediately southwest and a mixture of medium density residential and commercial properties to the south across Interstate 880/17.

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

There are no responsible agencies for this project. The affected airports are within the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Clara, the City of San Jose and the City of Palo Alto. These jurisdictions may need to amend their General Plans to be consistent with the proposed CLUPs (if inconsistent). 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-wide CLUP and the Palo Alto and South County CLUPs.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

A. AESTHETICS					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCES
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	No Impact	
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 Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 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. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES					
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.					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	No Impact	
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 significant impacts to agricultural resources. There are numerous Agricultural properties surrounding South County Airport, including many Williamson Act parcels within the Airport Influence Area. There are no agricultural properties within the Palo Alto Airport Influence Area. Overall, use of land within the Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA's for agricultural purposes is not inconsistent with the CLUP.

MITIGATION: None Required

C. AIR QUALITY					
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	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
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 Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any potentially significant air quality impacts, because it will have no direct or indirect impact on emission sources.

MITIGATION: None Required

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCES
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 7, 17b, 17o,
b) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,7, 8a, 17b, 17e, 33
c) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) 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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 7, 17n, 32
d) <i>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,7, 17b, 17o
e) <i>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,4
f) <i>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources:</i>					
i) <i>Tree Preservation Ordinance [Section C16]?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,31
ii) <i>Wetland Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 25-30]?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 8a
iii) <i>Riparian Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 31-41]?</i>	<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 Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any potential impacts on 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					
WOULD THE PROJECT	IMPACT				SOURCE
	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 interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 40,41
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 Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any 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 Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any potential impacts to geology and soils because it does not foster development or other land disturbance activities.

MITIGATION: None Required

G. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS						
WOULD THE PROJECT	IMPACT				SOURCE	
	YES			NO		
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	No Impact		
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 22a

	the project area?					
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 CLUPs 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. Adoption of the CLUPs reduces the risk of airport related hazards within vicinity of the airport. Therefore, approval of the project, including the modifications to the Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any potentially significant impacts on Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

MITIGATION: None Required

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 36, 21a
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 Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8a, 9, 18a

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?

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 the modifications to the Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any potentially significant land use impacts

In developing the CLUPs, the ALUC and County staff have worked closely with the City of Palo Alto and reviewed County policies. The policies included in the CLUP will not be in conflict with any policies or regulations after the City of Palo Alto and County of Santa Clara amend their General Plans, if necessary and in accordance with the State law, Public Utilities Code Section 21679.5. Each of the two CLUPs include the City of Palo Alto and the County of Santa Clara 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 and County General Plans, State law requires that within 180 days upon receipt of an ALUC plan amendment; the City and County shall amend their General Plan to be consistent with the CLUP. The areas in which it is reasonably foreseeable that the City or the County may need to make amendments after approval of the ALUC CLUPs 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 throughout the AIA. (Policy N-4 of the CLUP)
3. Ordinance requiring max 45 dB interior for residential reconstruction within the CNEL Noise Contours. (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*).

As discussed below under Section K (Population and Housing), the project will not displace growth or otherwise directly or indirectly result in any other adverse land use impacts. Items 1-3 above will not conflict with any applicable land use plans. Item number four above will involve inclusion of the following safety policies within the respective safety zones:

Safety Zone	Maximum Population Density	Open Area Requirements	Land Use
Runway Protection Zone – RPZ	-0- (No people 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 Palo Alto, 40 people for South County) 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 stations, etc.).
Turning Safety Zone - TSZ	Nonresidential, maximum (100 people in Palo Alto, 80 people for South County), 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 for Palo Alto, 80 people for South County) 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 for Palo Alto, 100 for South County) 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 Palo Alto and Santa Clara County General Plans to include these safety policies will bring the respective General Plans into consistency with the ALUC CLUPs. Therefore, approval of the project, including the modifications to the Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any potential land use impacts.

MITIGATION: None Required

J. NOISE					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACTS				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<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: One of the primary purposes of the CLUPs is to avoid locating noise-sensitive receptors near airports and reduce noise impacts for persons occupying areas surrounding the Airports.

In January 1992, the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors approved an FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) for Palo Alto Airport and forwarded it to the FAA for review. South County Airport has never had an FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program (NCP), due to the limited potential for adverse noise impacts in the rural area surrounding the Airport.

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 Caltrans Division of Aeronautics 2002 Handbook, the proposed Palo Alto CLUP uses more conservative NCP 2007 noise contour information, while the South County CLUP uses the noise contours calculated from the number of aircraft operations included in the last adopted Airport Master Plan for South County Airport.

SOUTH COUNTY NOISE EXPOSURE

The 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL noise contours based on the 2022 forecast aircraft operations are illustrated on Figure 5 of the South County CLUP (attached) and discussed below:

The 70 dBA aircraft noise contour is completely contained within the Airport boundaries and doesn't affect privately owned land.

The 65 dB CNEL aircraft noise contour is completely contained within the Airport boundaries except to the northwest where it extends into the County Maintenance Yard and to the east side of the airport, where it extends east of the freeway by about 400 feet to the on ramp from the CHP inspection station.

The 60 dBA CNEL aircraft noise contour is mostly on airport or public property and extends from the CHP inspection station toward Masten Avenue, past Church Avenue, then to the northern hangars along Murphy Avenue. This contour then continues northwest just east of Llagas Creek, north to just north of where the creek turns west, then crosses Murphy Avenue to the intersection of Sycamore and San Martin Avenues, then south along Sycamore Avenue to just northwest of the CHP inspection station. The land east of Highway 101 is generally commercial and rural residential properties and the land northwest of the airport is generally rural residential.

The 55 dBA CNEL aircraft noise contour is generally bounded by Llagas Avenue on the east, northwest to about 1000 feet northwest of the Middle Avenue, Highway 101 intersection, then southeast along Sycamore Avenue to the west bend in the Little Llagas Creek then to the end of Mammini Court, crossing San Martin Avenue midway between Mammini Court and Columbet Avenue, then to Little Llagas Creek at Moreno Court, then along the creek to the intersection with Llagas Creek up Llagas creek to along Llagas Avenue. The majority of the land between the 60 dB and the 55 dB contours is rural residential.

PALO ALTO NOISE EXPOSURE

The 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL noise contours based on the 2022 forecast aircraft operations are illustrated on Figure 5 (attached) of the Palo Alto CLUP and discussed below.

The 70 dBA CNEL aircraft noise contour is generally contained within the Airport boundaries except for the northwest end of the airport, where it extends about 1900 feet beyond the airport boundary on the extended runway centerline over into the Palo Alto Baylands Nature Preserve in San Mateo County.

The 65-dBA CNEL aircraft noise contour extends beyond the airport boundaries in all directions and covers the Palo Alto Municipal Golf Course, and the Palo Alto Baylands Nature Preserve in San Mateo County.

The 60-dBA CNEL aircraft noise contour extends beyond the airport boundaries in all directions and covers the Palo Alto Baylands Nature Preserve and the Palo Alto Municipal Golf Course, except for a portion to the west and northwest that extends about 500 feet west of the Grant Boundary and out along the extended runway center line to about 2300 feet northwest of Bay Road in East Palo Alto in San Mateo County.

The 55-dBA extends beyond the airport boundaries and includes a secondary contour east of the airport, where the 55 dBA CNEL is bounded between both 60 dBA CNEL contours over the Baylands (see figure 5). The contour extends west into the Cities of East Palo Alto and Palo Alto, the north into Menlo Park and unincorporated San Mateo County. Then as the contour moves east it is entirely located over the Baylands, and South the contour extends into unincorporated Santa Clara County Baylands area. The northern area of the contour remains in unincorporated Santa Clara County Baylands area, until it connects back to the City of Palo Alto along the Palo Alto Municipal Golf Course.

It should be noted that where exposed to noise at or above the 60-dB CNEL level, the California Building Code, Section 1208A.8.3 requires an acoustical analysis of proposed residential structures, other than detached single-family dwellings, to achieve an indoor noise level of 45-dB CNEL. Therefore, the 55-dBA CNEL aircraft noise contour is inconsequential and is included in the CLUPs as a reference. Although the City of Palo Alto and the County of Santa Clara have outdoor noise standards, exterior noise levels at 55-dBA are not a significant noise impact.

Projects referred to the ALUC that are within the noise contours of these CLUPs would be reviewed for consistency with the noise policies in the respective CLUP. If the adopted thresholds are exceeded, projects located within the respective CNEL Noise Contours receive recommended mitigation for noise attenuation to reduce the affect of airplane noise on the subject properties.

Policy N-4 for the proposed Palo Alto and South County CLUP 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.

Policy N-5 for the proposed Palo Alto and South County CLUP 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 Contour boundaries, but noise attenuation is suggested. High-occupancy uses such as churches, libraries, schools and auditoriums are generally unacceptable. There are no existing high occupancy uses such as schools or libraries that partially lie within the 60 dBA CNEL Noise Contour around Palo Alto Airport. The closest use may be the instance of the Palo Alto Golf Course Driving range being used at full capacity. Intermittent noise from aircraft could possibly disrupt some golf school or lesson activities. However, given the intensity of that use, the noise disruption would be a less than significant impact because it is a recreational use.

At South County Airport the predominant uses are rural residential and agricultural. However, churches may be allowed with a Use Permit within the area of the 55, 60 and 65 dBA CNEL noise contours. There are also commercial stables that host a variety of animals and agricultural

events as well as animal kennels with medium to high occupancy. However, the CLUP would only affect new uses within these noise contours and any subsequent development or redevelopment would include a recommendation for noise insulation.

Overall, the adoption of the CLUPs and associated maps do not create noise; rather reflect on-going noise exposure for areas surrounding the airports and act to protect the receptors from that noise exposure. Also, the new noise contours serve as a beneficial impact to the communities by discouraging new residential and other noise-sensitive uses such as churches, schools, libraries and auditoriums, in areas with high noise levels adjacent to public use airports.

Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL 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	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
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 County Airports, 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 project if it overrides the ALUC's determination by a 2/3 vote of the entire legislative body. Theoretically, if an ALUC referral boundary (AIA) was to significantly expand in size, or the policies within the existing AIA were to become significantly more restrictive, it could affect a substantial portion of land and 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. However, in the case of both proposed CLUPs, no expansion of the AIAs is proposed. In fact, the AIA for South County Airport is being reduced in size.

In order to evaluate the possibility for this occurrence in association with the proposed project, GIS maps were prepared to identify the affected areas and compared the amount of land that could be affected by the adoption of the CLUPs. Specifically, the amount of vacant land within the Airport AIAs was obtained to determine the reasonably foreseeable land that could be developed to determine if development could be displaced. As previously stated, the CLUPs do not affect existing development. These maps and analysis are discussed below:

ALUC Referral Boundaries (AIA): Figure 8 of the CLUPs shows the AIA with the City and County Zoning designations within the AIA. The total amount of land affected by the new ALUC Referral boundary for South County Airport is 6027.6 acres, which has a reduction of 90.5 acres in the area from 6118.1 acres within the AIA. At Palo Alto Airport, there is no change to the area of the AIA. The inclusion of the AIA in the CLUPs 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.

55, 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 forecast operations at the Airports. The calculation is reflective of the 2022 Aircraft Noise Contours for both of the proposed CLUPs. The proposed new maps will include 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contour for both CLUPs. The following is an analysis of the areas covered at each Airport by the proposed Noise Contours:

South County Airport:

At South County Airport, the 70 dBA aircraft noise contour is completely contained within the Airport boundaries. Similarly, the 65 dBA CNEL aircraft noise contour is completely contained within the Airport boundaries except to the northwest where it extends into the County Maintenance Yard and to the east side of the airport, where it extends east of the freeway by about 400 feet to the on ramp from the CHP inspection station. The proposed 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contour encompasses 59.4 Acres. The new 65 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is 153.0 Acres. Because both of these noise contours are located either on Airport property, County property or Freeway right-of-ways, there is no ability for noise policies for these noise contours to displace development.

The 55, 60 and part of the 65-dBA CNEL contours are located outside the Airport property. If a project is referred to the ALUC and is within the 55, 60 or 65 dBA CNEL Noise Contours, the applicable noise policies would apply to protect citizens from the impacts of aircraft noise.

With regard to the 55 and 60 dBA Noise Contours, the new 55 dBA CNEL includes 1,085.7 acres. The old 55dBA CNEL encompasses approximately 410 acres for a net increase of 675 acres. However, since the California Building Code, Section 1208A.8.3 requires an acoustical analysis of proposed residential structures, other than detached single-family dwellings, to achieve an indoor noise level of 45 dB, the ability for the any noise policies for the 55dBA CNEL contour to displace housing and cause secondary impacts is a less than significant impact.

The new 60 dBA CNEL Noise Contour encompasses 402.6 acres. The old 60 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is approximately 160 acres, for a net increase of 242 acres.

Analysis of the Santa Clara County General Plan designations in place at the time of the South County CLUP adoption shows that a majority of the properties located within the area of the noise contours are already developed with Medium/Low density residential uses. 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 a total of approximately 301 acres of vacant land that could be developed within the noise contours, which could potentially be affected by the modification of the ALUC maps. The majority of which is Santa Clara Valley Water District land, State owned land or Airport owned property. An example of how the expanded noise contours affect physical building proposals is outlined in table 4-1 of the South County Airport CLUP. Although the area of the noise contours increases, the noise contours by themselves do not displace development, they just require noise mitigation.

Palo Alto Airport:

At Palo Alto, the 70 dBA CNEL aircraft noise contour is generally contained within the Airport boundaries except for the northwest end of the airport, where it extends about 1900 feet beyond the airport boundary on the extended runway centerline over into the Palo Alto Baylands Nature Preserve in San Mateo County, and encompasses 108 acres. However, the 65-dBA CNEL aircraft noise contour extends beyond the airport boundaries in all directions but is over the Palo Alto Municipal Golf Course, and the Palo Alto Baylands Nature Preserve in San Mateo County.

The 60 and 65 dBA CNEL contours are located outside the Airport properties. 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 65 dBA CNEL noise contour encompasses 211 acres, for a net increase of 51 acres. The new 60 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is 750.7 acres, for a net increase of approximately 230 acres.

Both of the 55-dBA CNEL noise contours encompass 2851.78 (secondary contour between the 60 dBA contour). Analysis of the City of Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan designations in place at the time of the CLUP adoption shows that almost all of the properties in the expanded Noise contours are located within the Baylands Conservation area, which is a Nature Preserve area. The exception being a small area on Embarcadero Road to the west of the airport between highway 101, which is designated Commercial and Research / Office Park, which is already developed. However, a very slight corner of the 55 dBA CNEL encroaches within area. The remainders of the noise contours are located within San Mateo County to the north or Santa Clara County Baylands areas to the south. Similar to the South County CLUP, policies for the 55 dBA CNEL do not affect Commercial areas.

An analysis was prepared by the County of Santa Clara to calculate the amount of vacant land that would be affected by the new CNEL contours surrounding Palo Alto Airport. The definition of “vacant” land, as indicated by Assessor’s records, is that land which has a land value and improvement value of \$0. Based on the analysis, there is no vacant land that can be developed within the expanded area that could be affected by the modification of the ALUC maps, because all the vacant land is Baylands Conservation land. Although the area of the noise contours increases, the noise contours by themselves do not displace development, they just require noise mitigation.

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 Caltrans-Division of Aeronautics 2002 Handbook, and 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 both of the CLUPs. 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.

Pages 3-13 to 3-14 of the CLUPs outline the definitions of the safety zones. The safety zones use symmetrical areas and are exclusive in their coverage. In other words the land in the Turning Safety Zone does not include land within the Inner Safety Zone. 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:

South County Airport:

Traffic Pattern = 2,514.5 Acres excluding other safety areas. (Total of all other safety zones except Traffic Pattern Zone 283.2 Acres). Overall, there is a total of 2,797.7 acres of Safety Zone area.

Total of Existing Safety Zone is approximately 240 acres

(Note that approximately 18 acres of new Safety Zone area is located on airport property).

Palo Alto Airport:

The Traffic Pattern Zones and the Sideline Safety Zones are smaller than South County Airport because the runway is shorter. However, all other safety zones are the same size.

Traffic Pattern = 2,048 Acres (Total of all other safety Zones except Traffic Pattern Zone 117 Acres), for an overall total of 2,165 acres.

Total Existing Safety Zones = 120.5 ac*.

(* Note there is no North Safety Zone in the existing Palo Alto CLUP because the area is within the Jurisdiction of the County of San Mateo, where the Santa Clara County ALUC policies do not apply).

Although for Palo Alto, some of the safety zone area is located within San Mateo County, there is a total of 360.5 acres of existing safety zone area between both airports, whereas, the combined area of the new safety zone area for both airports is 5,595.4 acres.

San Jose International Airport runway 11-29

At San Jose International Airport, the reduction in the area of the south safety zone for runway 11-29 from 5000 feet long by 1,500 feet wide to 3,960 feet long to 990 feet wide has no population displacement impacts.

Summary & Analysis:

Airport Influence Areas (AIAs)

The intent of the adoption of the CLUPs is not to displace development, but to develop policies for compatible development in areas surrounding the airports. The north portion of the AIA for the Palo Alto Airport follows San Francisco Creek and the Santa Clara/ San Mateo County line. The majority of land surrounding the Palo Alto Airport cannot be developed, because most of the land is located within the Palo Alto Baylands conservation area. The proposed CLUP has no proposed change to the size of the AIA. In the case of South County Airport, there is a mixture of developed and undeveloped land. The total amount of land affected by the new ALUC AIA for South County Airport is 6027.6 acres, which is a reduction of 90.5 acres in the area from 6118.1 acres in the current County-wide CLUP. The inclusion the AIA in the CLUPs 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. Since existing development is not be affected by the implementation of the CLUPs, residential infill development within the AIAs 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.

There are no new lands that could be potentially affected by the adoption of the new CLUPs, as there could be if the ALUC was proposing to increase the size of the AIAs. In the case of both of the proposed CLUPs for South County and Palo Alto, a majority of the vacant land that can be developed within the AIA's 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.

There is no increase to the size of the AIA for South County and Palo Alto Airports. The amount of new lands within the ALUC AIA as a percentage of total acreage within the City of Palo Alto and the County of Santa Clara is minimal. As such, the influence of ALUC policies on land use development and population growth in general in these jurisdictions would not be significant.

CNELs

All of the CNEL Noise Contours have increased in size from what is in the current County-wide CLUP for both Airports. The increase in the size of the CNEL noise contours is a result of two possible factors; One is due to a more precise modeling of the average noise measurements than was previously available. The other is use of more recent forecast of aircraft operations.

There is 301 acres of vacant land within all four Noise Contours that encompass 1,700 acres at South County Airport. However, all of the vacant land within these Noise Contours is owned by the Santa Clara Valley Water District, State or by the Airport itself. Therefore, the increase in Noise Contour area for both Airports has no negative affects on land that can be developed. There is a total of 3,921.5 new acres of Noise contours at Palo Alto Airport, with no technical vacant land due to the Baylands conservation area. Overall, the potential to displace development in the areas is less than significant. This is because the CLUP policies only affect noise mitigation for new development. Also, the increase in area of the CNEL Noise Contours as a percentage of total acreage within the City of Palo Alto and the County of Santa Clara is minimal.

SAFETY ZONES

South County Airport:

There are four new Turning Safety Zones (TSZ), two new Runway Protection Zones (RPZ), two new Inner Safety Zones (ISZ), two new Outer Safety Zones (OSZ) and two new Sideline Safety Zones (SSZ) that have a total of 231 acres of vacant land within them. When including the Traffic Pattern Zone, there is a total of 473 acres of vacant land that includes all of the CLUP safety Zones. The current South County Airport Safety Zones are approximately 120 acres at the end of each runway for a total of approximately 240 acres and are only comprised of an Inner and Outer Safety Zone area.

The Turning Safety Zones CLUP policies allow for 80 people per acre for non-residential development, and very low-density residential development of five dwelling units per acre. The County of Santa Clara General Plan designations in this area is entirely Rural Residential, with the exception of the south west corner which is designated Other open Public Lands. This is land owned by the Santa Clara Valley Water District and used for drainage or percolation ponds. All of the vacant land within the TSZs is public, or Airport owned property. Overall, the County General Plan and Zoning designations are more restrictive than the CLUP policies with respect to height, with the exception of the area, which is designated Transportation on Airport property. The area of land designated Transportation extends well beyond the airport boundaries beyond San Martin Avenue to the north and down to Church Avenue to the south. The Land Use designation of Transportation includes policies for the affordace of future vehicle and aircraft transportation needs. However, this area has a County Zoning designation of A-20 (Agriculture, with a 20 acre minimum). Within the A-20 Zoning District, single family homes could be built, where the South County CLUP would not allow this on the Airport, within the Sideline Safety Zones or Runway Protection Zones.

The Runway Protection Zones, located to the north and south of the runway currently have no structural encroachments. The proposed CLUP policies state that this is a “No Build Zone. The Airport owns this land. Therefore, there is no potential for housing to be displaced in this area and is a less than significant impact to Population and housing.

In the Inner Safety Zones all of the vacant land is owned by either by the Airport or the County. Although the CLUP policies are more restrictive than the General Plan and Zoning designations, the land cannot be developed because it is also under ownership of the airport or the County. Therefore, the potential of the project to displace development on the area is a less-than-significant impact.

In the Sideline Safety Zones, very low density residential uses are allowed at 5 acres or more per dwelling unit according to the CLUP. However, 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 are allowed. Also, no above ground bulk fuel storage is allowed. In the Case of South County, all of the land within the SSZ is either owned by the airport, or located on Highway 101. Therefore, there is no functional ability for development in this area. Thus, the potential to displace development in this area is less than significant.

Within the Traffic Pattern Safety Zone Boundary, there is 242 acres of vacant land. There are six separate County General Plan designations within this zone including Major Public Facilities where a County Government Center is located west of Monterey Road between Church and San Martin Avenue, which has three to four sports fields. Also, at the corner of Highland Avenue and Monterey Road there is a South Valley Medical Center. The South County CLUP states that No sports stadiums or similar uses with very high concentration of people are allowed. Although the proposed CLUP may be more restrictive than the County General Plan, these developments exist and are not affected by the new CLUP policies. All of the other County General Plan designations are more restrictive in terms of density and allowed uses than the proposed South County CLUP policies. Therefore, the potential to displace development in this area is less than significant.

Palo Alto Airport:

For the Palo Alto Airport, there are also four new Turning Safety Zones (TSZ), two new Runway Protection Zones (RPZ), two new Inner Safety Zones (ISZ), two new Outer Safety Zones (OSZ) and two new Sideline Safety Zones (SSZ). The land within the Santa Clara County portion of the AIA for Palo Alto Airport is either developed in a commercial / office park area on Embarcadero Road to the west of the airport, or is within the Baylands Conservation area and cannot be developed.

Only a small portion of the southwest Turning Safety Zones (TSZ) encroached into the commercial / office park area on Embarcadero Road. The rest of the area is located within the Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ), which has no limit on Residential population density and does not allow sports stadiums or similar uses with very high concentration of people. CLUP policies for the TSZ allow for 100 people per acre for non-residential development, and very low-density residential development of five dwelling units per acre (in the event of mixed-use development). If a large mixed-use project was proposed in this isolated area, the project could be in conflict with the Palo Alto Airport CLUP, but that cannot be predicted. Overall, the City of Palo Alto General Plan and Zoning are more restrictive than the CLUP policies. Therefore, the potential to displace development in this area is less than significant.

San Jose International Airport:

The ALUC is proposing a map amendment for the South Safety Zone dimensions for runway 11-29 at San Jose International Airport. This amendment will reduce the size of the safety zone map, so there will be no potential displacement impacts.

MITIGATION: None Required

L. PUBLIC SERVICES					
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 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 Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 4, 5

	regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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 Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any potential impacts on recreational facilities or mineral resources.

MITIGATION: None Required

N. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC						
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE	
	YES			NO		
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>		
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 a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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: Approval of the project, including the modifications to the Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any potential transportation or traffic related impacts.

MITIGATION: None Required

O. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	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 commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
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 Palo Alto and South County (San Martin) Airport AIA, 55, 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL contours, FAR Part 77, and Safety Zones maps, will not have any potential impacts to utilities or service systems.

MITIGATION: None Required

P. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
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:

In looking at cumulative impacts on other jurisdictions, the Palo Alto CLUP “influences“ San Mateo County in terms of the FAA FAR Part 77 Surfaces map and the 55 and 60 dBA Noise Contour. However, the ALUC has no influence in neighboring Counties. Therefore, adoption of the project does not create any cumulatively considerable impacts in San Mateo County. Overall, the 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 Local 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.
