

INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Checklist and Evaluation for Santa Clara County

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| File Number: | N/A | Date: 7/23/2010 |
| Project Type: | Government | APN(s): Multiple |
| Project Location / Address | Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport, at Airport Pkwy & State Hwy 87 San Jose, CA 95101 and property within the Airport Influence Area (“AIA”) of San Jose International Airport. | GP Designation: Multiple |
| Owner’s Name | City of San Jose. Various properties within the AIA within the Cities of San Jose and Santa Clara | Zoning: Multiple |
| Applicant’s Name: | Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission | Urban Service Areas: SAN JOSE, SANTA CLARA |

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) (“County CLUP”) and is undertaken pursuant to the ALUC’s authority under Public Utilities Code § 21670 et seq. The amendment includes the adoption of a new Airport-specific Comprehensive Land Use Plan for San Jose International Airport (“SJC CLUP”). The purpose of the San Jose Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) is to implement State law (Public Utilities Code Section 21670 et seq.) and safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of SJC and those who use the Airport. The purpose of adoption and implementation of the CLUP is intended to ensure the orderly expansion of the Airport in accordance with the currently adopted Airport Master Plan as well as the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public’s exposure to noise and safety hazards within areas around the Airport, to the extent that those areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses. There are three runways at San Jose International. Two are used for Air Carrier (i.e. Southwest and United airlines), and Air Cargo (i.e. UPS and Fed Ex), and one is used for General Aviation (i.e. private single and twin engine aircraft, as well as private corporate aircraft). The Project also includes the repeal of the policies in the County CLUP with respect to their applicability to San Jose International Airport.

Adoption of SJC CLUP-

The new San Jose CLUP is intended to be a comprehensive, self-contained CLUP for San Jose International Airport (SJC or Airport). It includes several new policies and modifications to the following maps:

- ALUC referral boundary ("Airport Influence Area" or "AIA")
- 65, 70 and 75 dBA CNEL Noise Contours
- Incorporation of the Federal Aviation Administration, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Map
- Airport Safety Zones

In the proposed CLUP, the size of the AIA only changes to include the proposed Traffic Pattern Zone for General Aviation runway 11-29. The size of the 65-dBA CNEL Noise contour does not change. However, the policies for these contours are updated. New 70 and 75 dBA CNEL contours, with associated policies are proposed. The FAA Part 77 Surfaces Map is not an ALUC map. It is an FAA map, included into the CLUP as a tool to identify potential obstacles to aviation safety. While there are text changes in the proposed CLUP, no new policies are proposed for the FAA Part 77 Surfaces Map.

With respect to the safety zones, the current County-wide CLUP only includes the Runway Protection Zones and an Inner and Outer Safety zone. The new CLUP proposes maintaining those safety zones, as well as proposing Turning Safety Zones, Sideline Safety Zones and a Traffic Pattern Zone for the General Aviation Runway 11-29. In addition to the introduction of new safety polices in these zones, the existing policies in the current safety zones are also updated.

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.

SJC referral boundary (AIA) – The Airport Influence Area (AIA) defines the referral boundary for San Jose International Airport. When the Cities of San Jose or Santa Clara choose to amend their General Plan, or adopt or amend any specific plans, zoning ordinances, or building regulations, that would affect property within the AIA, the City must first refer the proposed action to the ALUC for a consistency determination. The AIA has only changed to encompass the new Traffic Pattern Zone for runway 11-29. The AIA has been mapped to follow major existing roads and identified property boundaries to eliminate uncertainty in determining if a property will fall within the zone.

65, 70, and 75 dBA CNEL Noise Contours – These maps delineate the predicted Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) boundary of the respective noise exposure levels in decibels, as a result of Airport operations at San Jose International Airport. If a project is referred to the ALUC and is within the 65, 70, or 75 dBA CNEL Noise Contours, the applicable noise policies would apply. The size and shape of the 65 dBA CNEL contour does not change. However, updates to the policies are proposed. The 70 and 75 dBA CNEL maps are new maps with new associated policies.

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 potential obstructions to air navigation. The functions of FAR Part 77 include: Identifying structures around Airports that may affect operating procedures; Determining the need for an FAA Aeronautical Study; Charting new man-made or natural objects; and Identifying mitigation measures such as marking and lighting to enhance the safety of air navigation. Each surface is defined as either 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.

Safety Zones – Airport safety zones are established to minimize the amount of people exposed to potential airplane hazards. The safety zones defined for the Airport are based on the guidance for General Aviation Airports and Air Carrier Airports 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 dimensions for all safety zones can be found in the CLUP document and the accompanying compatibility policies can be found in Table 4-2 (page 4-8) of the SJC CLUP. The following describes these safety zones and Figure 7 (attached) shows their location on a street grid:

➤ ***Runway Protection Zones (RPZ)***

The RPZ is the most restrictive of all safety zones and is located immediately at the ends of the runways. The RPZs are depicted on the FAA approved Airport Layout Plan for SJC, which is a drawing found in the Master Plan for the Airport. The RPZ’s should be clear of all objects, structures and activities. There are no proposed changes to the dimensions of these safety zones and they remain “object free zones”. The current County-wide CLUP policies refer to this area as the “Inner Safety Zone”. In both cases, this area is an object free zone.

➤ ***Inner Safety Zones (ISZ)***

The Inner Safety Zones (ISZ) are located at the ends of the runways, immediately after the RPZ. The ISZ have the second highest level of exposure to potential aircraft accidents. The new policies within the ISZ are significantly less restrictive than the policies in the current County-wide CLUP. In the County-wide CLUP, the ISZ is synonymous in location with the Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) and uses a “10-25 rule” for development compatibility, which means 10 people per acre and no more than 25 people at any given time. The proposed SJC CLUP allows for very low-density development within these zones and includes minimum open space requirements. Residential development is not allowed and high-density commercial uses are not allowed in these zones. Also, hazardous materials and gas stations are not allowed in these zones.

➤ ***Turning Safety Zones (TSZ)***

The Turning Safety Zones (TSZ), are located at the corners of each runway and are not currently in the County-wide CLUP. These safety zones are new and represent the approach and departure areas that have the third highest exposure to potential aircraft accidents. These zones allow slightly more development density than the Inner Safety Zones, with slightly less open space requirements. Residential uses are allowed if they are infill development and when non-residential uses are not feasible. Hazardous materials facilities (e.g., gas stations) are also not allowed in these zones.

➤ ***Outer Safety Zone (OSZ)***

The Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) is the next safety zone outside of the inner safety zone. The current County-wide CLUP has an Outer Safety Zone, but its limits terminate where the proposed Inner Safety Zone is currently located. The inclusion of this safety zone is new in this proposed location. The proposed SJC CLUP allows residential uses within the OSZ if they are infill development, or if non-residential use is not feasible. The population densities are slightly less restrictive than the current County-wide CLUP. However, high-density commercial development is still discouraged, as well as hazardous materials.

➤ ***Sideline Safety Zone (SSZ)***

The Sideline Safety Zones (SSZ) are new safety zones. They are located along the length of the outside of the runways. Aircraft do not normally over fly this area, except aircraft losing directional control on takeoff (especially twin-engine aircraft). In the proposed SJC CLUP, this safety zone is restricted to allow only non-residential uses unless infill or non-residential use is not feasible. This safety zone has a slightly more restrictive open space requirement due to proximity to the runway. Hazardous materials are also discouraged in this safety zone.

➤ ***Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)***

The Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) is a new safety zone. It is only designated for the General Aviation runway 11-29. This safety zone is located to the west of Runway 11-29 and encompasses an area around the Airport that is routinely over flown by General Aviation aircraft operating in the Airport traffic pattern. The potential for aircraft accidents is relatively low and the need for land use restrictions is minimal. There is no limit to residential development and only uses with very high concentrations of people, such as stadiums, are discouraged.

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 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

San Jose International Airport is a City-owned public use Airport, located two nautical miles north of Downtown San Jose. The environmental setting consists of all of San Jose International Airport and the areas surrounding the Airport within the AIA in the Cities of San Jose and Santa Clara. Figures 4a and 4b in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan represent the land use designations within the Airport environs based on the current City of San Jose and the City of Santa Clara General Plans. The predominant land uses in the Airport environs are residential, industrial and commercial. The residential uses range from low density, single-family detached, to high density residential with commercial mixed use. There are also public /quasi-public, religious, recreational, and educational facilities.

The Airport Influence Area for San Jose International Airport, Figure 8, (attached) is generally bounded by South First St. at Floyd St. to the southeast corner, to Highway 237 at the Guadalupe River, to the northeast corner, to San Tomas Aquino Creek at Highway 237, to the northwest corner, to Homestead and Monroe to the West (to accommodate for the TPZ for runway 11-29), back down to Floyd and Vine Street at the southwest corner.

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

There are no responsible agencies for this project. The Airport AIA is located within the City of San Jose and City of Santa Clara jurisdictions. These jurisdictions may need to amend their General Plans to be consistent with the proposed San Jose International Airport CLUP. CalTrans Division of Aeronautics has an advisory role.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This discussion is a summary of the potential impacts that are analyzed in the Noise, Safety and Population and Housing sections of this document. The intention is to provide the reader with a clear, concise overview of what the CLUP is and the potential environmental impacts associated with its adoption.

The CLUP is intended to safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport (Airport) and the aircraft occupants. It is also intended to ensure that surrounding new land uses do not affect the Airport's continued operation.

Specifically, the CLUP seeks to protect the public from the adverse effects of aircraft noise, to ensure that people and facilities are not concentrated in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, and to ensure that no structures or activities adversely affect navigable airspace. The implementation of this CLUP is intended to prevent future incompatible development from encroaching on the Airport and allow for its development in accordance with the current Airport master plan. The CLUP must be based upon the Airport Master Plan (AMP) for SJC. The aviation activity forecast for the Airport was updated to reflect the existing aviation activity and provide at least a 20-year forecast of activity. The updated aviation activity forecast formed the basis for preparation of the CLUP and its policies. Section 21675 of the Public Utilities Code of

the State of California, requires the ALUC to formulate and maintain a comprehensive land use plan (CLUP) for the area surrounding each public-use Airport within Santa Clara County. The SJC CLUP is an Airport-Specific Land Use Plan that provides safety, height and noise policies, specific to SJC, rather than more general policies found in a County-Wide Land Use Plan.

The Comprehensive Land Use Plan contains the following major elements:

- The existing and planned-for facilities at the Airport that are relevant to preparing the CLUP;
- Appropriate noise, height, and safety restriction policies and land use compatibility standards;
- Specific findings of compatibility or incompatibility with respect to existing land uses, proposed General Plan land uses, or existing zoning controls; and
- Specific actions that need to be taken to make the Cities' General Plans, Specific Plans, Master Plans and/or Zoning Ordinances consistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

The San Jose International Comprehensive Land Use Plan does *not* affect existing development. The plans and policies in the SJC CLUP address new development within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) of SJC. The CLUP also includes new policies for infill development of vacant parcels that are under-utilized and surrounded by existing development, which otherwise may be precluded by the noise and safety policies contained in the CLUP. Two jurisdictions have land-use authority within the area of the AIA, which is the limit of influence of the proposed CLUP policies. These are the Cities of San Jose and Santa Clara.

The ALUC and its staff have worked closely with these jurisdictions and the members of their communities most affected by the proposed CLUP. Given that State Law requires these jurisdictions to amend their General Plans to be consistent with the CLUP within 180 days (if necessary), two primary areas of concern have been raised. One, that the proposed policies contained in the CLUP could displace future development. Two, that the displacement of development could result in secondary adverse environmental impacts, such as Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Traffic. As previously stated, the intention of the SJC CLUP is not to displace development, but to provide the best protection for the users of the Airport as well as those who occupy land surrounding the Airport. The analysis contained in this document will focus on the potential for the proposed CLUP, as a policy document, to displace development and if any significant impacts could result.

Pursuant to State Law, the reasonably foreseeable actions after ALUC approval of the SJC CLUP by the Cities of San Jose and Santa Clara may be the need for these jurisdictions to amend their General Plans or otherwise adopt regulations pertaining to the following:

-
1. Requiring avigation easements throughout the AIA (policy G-5 of the CLUP)
 2. Requiring rental tenant notification of the proximity of the property to the Airport (policy N-5 of the CLUP)
 3. Requiring max 45 dB interior noise for residential reconstruction within the noise contours. (policy N-4 of the CLUP)

4. Adopting General Plan land use restrictions to reflect the RPZ, ISZ and TSZ requirements (Table 4-2 of the CLUP, safety compatibility guidelines).

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> | <u>No Impact</u> | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2,3,4, 6a,17f |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources along a designated scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3, 6a, 17f |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2,3 |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3,4 |
| e) If subject to ASA, be generally in non-compliance with the Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 11 |
| f) If subject to Design Review, be generally in non-compliance with the Guidelines for Design Review Approval? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3,4,12 |
| g) Be located on or near a ridgeline visible from the valley floor? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2,17n |

DISCUSSION: The project will not have any potential impacts to aesthetic resources. There is nothing in the proposed CLUP that fosters development or could otherwise affect aesthetic resources. Therefore, the adoption of the proposed CLUP would not have any adverse significant impacts on aesthetic resources.

IMPACT: No Impact

MITIGATION: None Required.

B. AGRICULTURE / FOREST 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 | |
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | 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, or the County's Williamson Act Ordinance (Section C13 of the County Ordinance Code)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| d) Conflict with the existing zone for, or cause rezoning of, Forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), Timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or areas zones for Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| e) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| f) 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: The San Jose International Airport is located adjacent to downtown San Jose, in a densely populated urban area, with little agricultural potential anywhere within the AIA. Therefore, approval of the project will not have any negative potential impacts to agricultural resources. However, although there is no land designated for Agriculture, the use of land within the San Jose International Airport AIA for agricultural purposes is not inconsistent with the CLUP.

IMPACT: No Impact

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 | |
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5,28 |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5,29 |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5,29 |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5,29 |
| e) Create objectionable odors or dust affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5,21, 29, 47 |

DISCUSSION:

Adoption of the CLUP will not result in the introduction of new long-term pollution sources. The proposed CLUP is a policy document that does not propose to construct anything that could create adverse air quality impacts. As discussed in the Population and Housing section of this document, adoption of the CLUP will not result in substantial displacement of development that could result in secondary air quality impacts (e.g., traffic emissions).

IMPACT: No Impact

MITIGATION: None Required

| D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 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 | | | | SOURCES |
| | YES | | | NO | |
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | |
| a) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or 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) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3,7, 8a, 17b, 17e, 33 |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or tributary to an already impaired water body, as defined by section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3, 7, 17n, 32 |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1,7, 17b, 17o |
| e) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3,4 |
| f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources: | | | | | |
| i) Tree Preservation Ordinance [Section C16]? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1,3,31 |
| ii) Wetland Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 25-30]? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3, 8a |
| iii) Riparian Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 31-41]? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3, 8a, |

DISCUSSION: Approval of the project will not impact any biological resources. The project does not foster development or other activities that could impact species or their habitat. One of the safety goals included in the proposed CLUP is to adopt policies that avoid land uses that attract raptors to areas immediately adjacent to runways that could cause a hazard to aviation safety, such as landfills and composting facilities. As discussed in the Population and Housing section of this document, adoption of the CLUP will not result in substantial displacement of development that could result in secondary biological impacts (relocation of urban development to areas with sensitive biological habitat). Therefore, adoption of the CLUP will not have any adverse biological impacts.

IMPACT: No Impact

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 will not have potential impacts to cultural resources. The project does not foster development or other activities that would impact cultural resources.

IMPACT: No Impact

MITIGATION: None Required

| F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 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) | 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 will not have potential impacts to geology and soils because it does not foster development or other land disturbance activities.

IMPACT: No Impact

MITIGATION: None Required

| G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|
| 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) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

DISCUSSION:

Approval of the project will not have potential air quality impacts, because it will have no direct or indirect impact on emission sources. As discussed in sections I (Land Use) and K (Population and Housing) below, adoption of the CLUP will not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses that could lead to increased vehicle miles traveled.

Climate Change Discussion:

In 2006, California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill No. 32; California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, Sections 38500, et seq.), which limits statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) to 1990 levels and establishes a goal of achieving these emissions reductions by 2020 (representing a 25 percent reduction in emissions). AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt a comprehensive blueprint for limiting greenhouse gas emissions by the end of 2008 and complete the necessary rulemaking to implement that plan by the end of 2011.

In addition, the adoption of SB 97 in 2007 mandates that the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) prepare CEQA Guidelines which establish standards for evaluating greenhouse gas emissions including the creation feasible mitigation measures. The California Resource Agencies adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions on December 30, 2009, which became effective on March 18, 2010. The modified CEQA Guidelines require that public agencies in California evaluate greenhouse gas emissions within their CEQA documents, using either qualitative or quantitative methods. Although the modified

CEQA guidelines prescribe that CEQA documents must evaluate Greenhouse Gas emissions and determine if emissions will be significant, they do not establish a clear methodology or quantitative thresholds for making this determination.

In October, 2008, CARB staff published a preliminary proposal of a methodology for interim CEQA greenhouse gas emission thresholds. No additional action has been taken by CARB since publication of this preliminary proposal.

In November 2009, The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) published proposed revisions to its CEQA Guidelines for addressing Air Quality impacts. These updated Guidelines included proposed quantitative thresholds for Greenhouse Gas Emissions, establishing both a “bright line” threshold of significance for GHG emissions and also an efficiency threshold. Using a methodology that models how new land use development in the San Francisco Bay area can meet AB 32 GHG reduction goals, the BAAQMD Guidelines establish a significance threshold of 1,100 meter metric tons of CO² per year. In addition to this bright line threshold, the Guidelines include an “efficiency” threshold to be used for urban high density, transit oriented development projects that are intended to reduce vehicle trips but may still result in overall emissions greater than 1,100 meter metric tons per year. The BAAQMD Board of Directors adopted the proposed GHG thresholds on June 2, 2010.

As will be discussed in the Population and Housing section, the adoption of the CLUP will not result in significant displaced development that could have secondary impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions. Thus, the proposed project will not result in any cumulatively considerable greenhouse gas emissions.

IMPACT: Less Than Significant

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> | <u>No Impact</u> | |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5 |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2, 3, 5 |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 46 |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 47 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| e) | For a project located within an Airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public Airport or public use Airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3, 22a |
| f) | Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5, 48 |
| g) | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4 |
| h) | Provide breeding grounds for vectors? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 5 |
| i) | Proposed site plan result in a safety hazard (i.e., parking layout, access, closed community, etc.)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| j) | Involve construction of a building, road or septic system on a slope of 30% or greater? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 17n |
| k) | Involve construction of a roadway greater than 20% slope for a distance of 300' or more? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 17n |

DISCUSSION:

One of the main purposes of the SJC CLUP is to help decision makers avoid making land-use decisions that could possibly increase safety hazards for people residing or working in or around the Airport. Thus, reducing Airport related hazards within the vicinity of the Airport is a significant consequence of the CLUP adoption. An example of this is found in the safety policies of the CLUP that identify aboveground storage of fuel or other hazardous materials as inconsistent with the CLUP in the areas that have the highest risk of aviation incidents. These areas are Runway Protection Zones, Inner Safety Zone and Turning Safety Zones. Therefore, approval of the project will not have any significant Hazard and Hazardous Materials impact.

IMPACT: No Impact

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> | No Impact | | |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3, 4 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| | been granted? | | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| c) | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3, 17n |
| d) | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Note policy regarding flood retention in watercourse and restoration of riparian vegetation for West Branch of the Llagas.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| e) | Create or contribute increased impervious surfaces and associated runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 5, 36, 21a |
| f) | Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 5 |
| g) | Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3, 18b, 18d |
| h) | Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3, 18b, 18d |
| i) | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2, 3, 4 |
| j) | Be located in an area of special water quality concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4, 6a, |
| k) | Be located in an area known to have high levels of nitrates in well water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4 |
| l) | Result in a septic field being constructed on soil where a high water table extends close to the natural land surface? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| m) | Result in a septic field being located within 50 feet of a drainage swale; 100 feet of any well, water course or water body or 200 feet of a reservoir at capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3 |

DISCUSSION: Approval of the project will not have potential impacts to hydrology and water quality, because it does not foster development or other activities that would affect ground water or drainage/runoff.

IMPACT: No Impact

MITIGATION: None Required

| I. LAND USE | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| WOULD THE PROJECT: | IMPACT | | | | SOURCE |
| | YES | | | NO | |
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2, 4 |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 8a, 9, 18a, g |
| 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: The CLUP includes the Cities' 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 policies between the CLUP policies and the Cities, state law requires that within 180 days upon receipt of an ALUC plan amendment, the affected Cities shall amend their General Plans. (Government Code § 65302.3.)

After approval of the ALUC CLUP, the Cities of San Jose and Santa Clara may need to amend their General Plans or otherwise adopt regulations pertaining to the following:

1. Requiring avigation easements throughout the AIA (policy G-5 of the CLUP)
2. Requiring rental tenant notification of the proximity of the property to the Airport (policy N-5 of the CLUP)
3. Requiring max 45 dB interior for residential reconstruction within the noise contours. (policy N-4 of the CLUP)
4. Adopting 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 significantly displace development or otherwise directly or indirectly result in any other adverse land use impacts. Items 1-3 above will require City Council approval from the jurisdictions to implement, but will not conflict with any applicable land use plan. Item number four above will involve

consistency with the following safety policies within the respective safety zones, which can be found on Table 4-2 of the SJC CLUP:

| 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 120 people per acre (includes open area and parking area required for the building’s occupants and one-half of the adjacent street area) | 30 percent of gross area open. No structures or concentrations of people between or within 100 feet of the extended runway centerlines. | No residential. 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 200 people per acre (includes open area and parking area required for the building’s occupants and one-half of the adjacent street area) | 20 percent of gross area Minimum dimensions: 300 ft by 75 ft parallel to the runway(s). | Residential - if non-residential uses are not feasible, allow residential infill to existing density. No regional shopping centers, theaters, meeting halls, stadiums, schools, day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes or similar activities. No hazardous material facilities (gasoline stations, etc.). |
| Outer Safety Zone –OSZ | Nonresidential, maximum 300 people per acre (includes open area and parking area required for the building’s occupants and one-half of the adjacent street area) | 20 percent of gross area | Residential - if non-residential uses are not feasible, allow residential infill to existing density. No regional shopping centers, theaters, meeting halls, stadiums, schools, large day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes or similar activities. No above ground storage of fuel or other hazardous materials. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Sideline Safety Zone - SSZ | Nonresidential, maximum 300 people per acre (includes open area and parking area required for the building's occupants and one-half of the adjacent street area) | 30 percent of gross area | Residential - if non-residential uses are not feasible, allow residential infill to existing density. No regional shopping centers, theaters, meeting halls, stadiums, 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. Note that this applies only to those areas inside the Airport Influence Area. (See Paragraph 3.5.7, Pg 3-15) |
| Source: Based on 2002 <i>Airport Land Use Planning Handbook</i> prepared by the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics | | | |

The Cities of San Jose and Santa Clara are currently preparing amendments to their General Plans. Although the exact timelines for the completion of these amendments are yet to be determined, both cities must conform their General Plans to be consistent with the proposed SJC CLUP.

Amendment of the San Jose and Santa Clara General Plans to include these safety policies will ensure there are no conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation

IMPACT: Less Than Significant

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> | No Impact | |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 5 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| project? | | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 5, 22a,45.1 |
| 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,45.1 |

DISCUSSION: Adoption of the San Jose CLUP will result in the application of safety and noise policies to new development near San Jose International Airport. The intention of the CLUP noise policies is to protect those around the Airport from noise associated with airport operations (namely aircraft approach, landing, and departure).

Discussion of noise impacts included here does not focus on the CLUP noise policies, which would be considered a beneficial impact, but instead on the potential for changes in CLUP policies to allow exposure of additional people to existing aircraft noise. If the CLUP policies are modified to facilitate new residential development within areas that have significant ambient noise (from aircraft operations), this could constitute a significant impact.

Tables included within the Population and Housing section discuss the changes in CLUP policies within the Noise and Safety zones and evaluate if the policy changes could displace development. In tandem, the discussion within these tables shows instances where changes in CLUP policies result in less stringent requirements, allowing certain types of development within the different noise and safety zones.

One of the primary purposes of the CLUP is to reduce noise impacts for sensitive receptors, exposed to excessive noise levels caused by aviation activity.

The proposed CLUP uses the static modeled Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) boundary. These modeled CNEL’s allow for consistent noise policies to be established.

In addition to the 65 CNEL Noise Contour, the SJC CLUP includes the adoption of the 70 and 75 dBA CNEL Noise Contour maps that delineate areas of higher noise exposure in close proximity to the Airport. If a project is referred to the ALUC and is within the 65, 70 or 75 dBA CNEL Noise Contours, the applicable noise policies would apply.

The highest number of people exposed to aircraft noise are those located within the 65 CNEL, which covers the largest land area. CLUP policy N-4 establishes the following:

“No residential or transient lodging construction shall be permitted within the 65 dB CNEL contour boundary unless it can be demonstrated that the resulting interior sound levels will be less than 45 dB CNEL and there are no outdoor patios or outdoor activity areas associated with the residential portion of a mixed use residential project or a multi-unit residential project. (Sound wall noise mitigation measures are not effective in reducing noise generated by aircraft flying overhead.)”

Table 4-1 is used to relate the Noise Compatibility Policies contained in the CLUP to specific land uses to determine if a specific land use is consistent with the CLUP.

Figure 5 (2022 CNEL Noise Contours) is the map used to identify if a specific property may be adversely affected by adverse aircraft noise. Both Figure 5 and Table 4-1 are shown to illustrate how aircraft noise impacts are identified for specific development and how the associated policies are applied.

The CLUP policies allow infill development within the CNEL Noise Contours, but would ensure an avigation easement was granted to acknowledge to the occupants of the properties that aircraft flying overhead may cause noise disruption. The CLUP acknowledges that outdoor activities are likely to be adversely affected and includes associated policies.

The infill development policy (4.3.8.1), states that infill projects may be approved if all of the following conditions are met:

- a) The total contiguous undeveloped land area at this location is less than 0.25 acres in size. Note that this means the total contiguous undeveloped land area, not just the land area being proposed for development. Lots larger than 0.25 acres shall not be considered for infill.
- b) The site is already surrounded on three sides and a street, or two sides and two streets, by the same land use as that being proposed.
- c) The local agency determines that the project will create no adverse impacts beyond those that already exist due to the existing incompatible land uses.

As compared to the Countywide CLUP, the new CLUP does not substantially alter the types of uses allowed within the 70 and 75 dba CNELs. The new CLUP policies would allow new residential development in areas where residential development was prohibited under the Countywide CLUP. However, as discussed above, such residential development is discouraged and only allowed where a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements is conducted and noise insulation features are included in the project design. The CLUP acknowledges that outdoor activities in these areas may be adversely affected by noise. This potential impact would not be significant because outdoor activities generally occur on a more limited basis and are not as noise-sensitive as indoor residential uses (e.g., sleeping).

The new noise contours and policies will have a beneficial impact by discouraging new residential and other noise-sensitive uses such as churches, schools, libraries and auditoriums in areas with existing high noise levels. Thus approval of the project will not have any potentially significant noise impacts.

IMPACT: No Impact

MITIGATION: None Required

| K. POPULATION AND HOUSING | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| WOULD THE PROJECT: | IMPACT | | | | SOURCE |
| | YES | | | NO | |
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | |
| a) Induce substantial growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 18g, 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:

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

The Airport Land Use Commission serves as a policy making body for lands around San Jose International Airport, and makes land use consistency determinations for certain types of land use approvals, which occur within its referral area, also known as the Airport Influence Area (AIA). This includes the review of the adoption or amendment of a local agency’s general plan, specific plans, zoning ordinances, or building regulations that 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 the CLUP, including policies applicable to noise and safety, the referring agency may only approve the project or policy if it overrides the ALUC’s determination by a 2/3 vote of the entire legislative body and makes certain findings.

Theoretically, if an Airport’s referral boundary was to significantly expand in size and affect a substantial portion of land and/or a CLUP’s policies were made significantly more restrictive, subsequent determinations of inconsistency by the ALUC regarding new projects or policies could potentially displace new development that may otherwise occur within the affected zones. Thus, in theory, this development might then occur elsewhere, perhaps on the fringes of cities or non-urban areas.

This chain of events could result in potential secondary environmental impacts, such as traffic and air quality impacts due to longer commute distances.

In order to evaluate the possibility for this occurrence in association with the San Jose Airport CLUP adoption, GIS maps were prepared to identify the areas potentially affected by the new CLUP zones and policies.

As the AIA Referral zone by itself does not contain policies that could prohibit development and adoption of the new CLUP will not entail changes to the FAA FAR Part 77 Surfaces map, only the Safety and Noise zones and policies were evaluated for the potential to cause displacement.

The General Plan Land Use maps of the Cities of San Jose and Santa Clara were used to analyze the type and density of development that could occur in each safety and noise contour zone. A vacant land analysis was also prepared in order to determine if vacant lands designated for development could be displaced by the CLUP zones and policies.

Changes to the Noise and Safety zones under the CLUP were discussed in detail in the Project Description section. The table below summarizes the change in safety and noise zones associated with the new CLUP.

| SJIA CLUP Noise (CNEL) Zones | Comparison with existing CLUP |
|---|---|
| 75 dBA CNEL | New Zone. Existing CLUP contains noise policies but no defined Zone |
| 70 dBA CNEL | New Zone. Existing CLUP contains noise policies but no defined zone. |
| 65 dBA CNEL | Existing Zone. No Change in size or alignment |
| SJIA CLUP Safety Zones | Comparison with existing CLUP |
| Runway Protection Zone | New Zone. Affected area is currently within the Inner Safety Zone |
| Inner Safety Zone | Existing Zone. Affected area is currently within the Outer Safety Zone |
| Outer Safety Zone | Existing Zone. Modified to encompass new Geographic area |
| Turning Safety Zone | New Zone |
| Sideline Safety Zone | New Zone |
| Traffic Pattern Zone | New Zone |

The potential for displacement from the changes in the Noise and Safety Zones is discussed within **Tables 1 and 2** below. The tables summarize the different types of General Plan designations within these zones, the total acreage affected (within the zones), and the effect of the Noise and Safety policies on the types of development that could occur in these areas. Accompanying the tables are the GIS maps showing the Safety and Noise Zones compared with the respective General Plan designations of each city affected (San Jose and Santa Clara).

The potential for displacement from the Noise and Safety Zones is summarized below:

65, 70, and 75 dBA CNEL Noise Contours – Under the new CLUP Noise policies, there are only a few types of uses where the new noise policies would completely prohibit development that could otherwise occur today under the existing CLUP. These uses consist of lodging (within the Commercial / Industrial areas) and playgrounds and neighborhood parks (within the Public Parks and Open Space areas) within the 70 dBA CNEL zones. While lodging would be prohibited within the 70 dBA CNEL zone, other uses consistent with the relevant cities' current General Plan designation of Commercial/Industrial could be developed. Similarly, while playgrounds and neighborhood parks would be prohibited in the 70 dBA CNEL zone, other recreational uses such as golf courses or riding stables (within the Parks and Open Space area) could be developed. Under the CLUP Noise policies, industrial uses within the 70 dBA and 75 dBA CNEL zones would be more strongly discouraged but could still be developed by incorporating noise attenuation into building design.

Safety Zones – Under the new CLUP Safety zones and policies, some areas currently designated by the relevant cities' general plans for medium to high density residential and educational uses would be prohibited from development. Per the Safety Zone policies, lands designated as High Density Residential within the Turning Safety Zone and Medium Density Residential within the Outer Safety Zones could not be developed (or redeveloped) for these purposes at the density prescribed under the General Plan. In addition, a portion of an area designated for Educational Use could also not be developed for this purpose per the Turning Safety Zone policies.

Within other areas, only a few types of uses that fall within the respective cities' General Plan designations could not be developed under the new CLUP Safety Policies. These uses include shopping centers, restaurants, and gas stations within the Inner Safety Zone and Turning Safety Zones, and high density residential uses within the Outer Safety Zone. However, many other uses allowed under the respective cities' General Plan designations (such as Industrial within the Commercial / Industrial area) could develop. Therefore, development in the affected areas would not be completely displaced.

In summary, application of the new noise and safety policies under the proposed SJIA CLUP could result in the displacement of up to 22.82 acres of land currently designated for medium-high density residential and educational uses within the new safety zones. While some types of development within other zones (Commercial-Industrial and Parks) would be prohibited by the new CLUP policies, other types of uses within these zones (as allowed under the existing General Plan designation) would not be displaced.

While up to 22.82 acres of land could be displaced from development through application of the new CLUP policies, the secondary environmental impacts resulting from this displacement would not be significant. In comparison with the total urban area (125,000 acres) within the cities of San Jose and Santa Clara, the subject 23 acres of displacement area encompasses less than 0.02% of land. According to the 2007 Vacant Land Inventory published by the City of San Jose, there are up to 4,900 acres of vacant land in the City that is currently designated for urban development. This includes approximately 182 acres of land designated for multi-family residential development, including 22 acres within the Central area surrounding the Airport. A review of the vacant lands near the San Jose Airport within the attached maps shows that there are up to 55 acres of land within less restrictive CLUP zones (Traffic Pattern Safety Zone) that

could accommodate development, consistent with CLUP policies. Many other underutilized areas within these cities could also be “upzoned” or designated for higher density development to accommodate for any displaced development.

As there are many vacant lands designated for urban development both in the immediate vicinity of the Airport and also within the broader surrounding urban fabric that could absorb the displaced 23 acres of development the potential for any secondary environmental impacts from application of the CLUP policies are minimal. Significant secondary environmental impacts associated with displacement would only likely occur if development was ‘forced’ to occur outside of the existing urban fabric. This could result in significant environmental impacts such as farmland conversion, loss of sensitive biological habitat, or traffic impacts. Longstanding County of Santa Clara General Plan land use policies for the unincorporated rural areas outside the urban fabric prohibit the development of any medium or high density development. Therefore, any development that could be displaced due to the Safety and Noise Zones or policies in the new CLUP would not be allowed to locate in rural areas.

In summary, while there is the potential for minimal displacement of some uses within the proposed SJIA CLUP Noise and Safety Zones, any resulting secondary environmental impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT: Less Than Significant

MITIGATION: None Required

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

DISCUSSION: Approval of the project will not have potential impacts to public services.

IMPACT: No Impact

MITIGATION: None Required

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

DISCUSSION: Approval of the project will not have potential impacts related to recreational facilities or mineral resources.

IMPACT: No Impact

MITIGATION: None Required

| N. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| WOULD THE PROJECT: | IMPACT | | | | SOURCE |
| | YES | | | NO | |
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 49, 53 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| transit? | | | | | |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 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 will not have potential transportation or traffic related impacts. As discussed under the Land Use and Population and Housing sections, adoption of the CLUP would not result in any significant displacement of development; thus, no significant traffic impacts would occur.

IMPACT: No Impact

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> | <u>No Impact</u> | |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 5, 21, |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------|
| | order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project? | | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 5 |
| 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 will not have potential impacts to utilities or service systems.

IMPACT: No Impact

MITIGATION: None Required

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

DISCUSSION:

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

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
 - g. Cities of San Jose or Santa Clara General Plan.
 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"

Initial Study Source List*

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**
- 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
- 45.1 California Land Use Planning Information Network (LUPIN), www.ceres.ca.gov/planning

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.
