

INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Checklist and Evaluation for Santa Clara County

File Number:	N/A	Date: 11/8/2012
Project Type:	Government	APN(s): Multiple
Project Location / Address	Moffett Field Federal Airfield, at 158 Cody Road, Mountain View and property within the Airfield Influence Area (“AIA”) of Moffett Field Airfield.	GP Designation: Multiple
Owner’s Name	National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Various properties within the AIA within the Cities of Sunnyvale and Mountain View.	Zoning: Multiple
Applicant’s Name:	Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)	Urban Service Areas: Sunnyvale, Mountain View

Project Description

The proposed project is an amendment to the Santa Clara County ALUC’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for Areas Surrounding Santa Clara County Airports (“County CLUP”) to adopt a new Airfield-specific CLUP for Moffett Field Airfield. The ALUC is proposing this amendment pursuant to the ALUC’s authority under Public Utilities Code § 21670 et seq. The amendment includes the adoption of a new Airfield-specific CLUP for Moffett Field Airfield.

The purpose of the Moffett Field Airfield 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 the Airfield and those who use the Airfield. The purpose of adoption and implementation of the CLUP is intended to ensure the orderly expansion of the Airfield in accordance with the currently adopted Airfield Layout 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 Airfield, to the extent that those areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses.

Adoption of Moffett Field CLUP

The proposed Moffett Field Airfield CLUP is intended to be a comprehensive, self-contained CLUP for Moffett Field. It includes several new policies and modifications to the following maps:

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

The proposed amendment is designed to follow existing features and boundary lines such as city limits and major arterials roads or highways. The FAA Part 77 Surfaces Map is not an ALUC map. It is an FAA map that is included in the CLUP as a tool to identify potential obstacles to aviation safety. Although there are textual changes in the proposed CLUP, no new policies are proposed for the FAA Part 77 Surfaces Map.

The Moffett Field CLUP proposes to maintain current safety zones while adding Turning Safety Zones and Sideline Safety Zones. In addition to the introduction of new safety polices in these zones, the existing policies in the current safety zones would also be 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 Airfield operations in terms of noise and safety. The purpose of each of these maps is described below:

Moffett Field referral boundary (AIA) – The AIA defines the referral boundary for the jurisdictions of Sunnyvale and Mountain View. When the Cities 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 been designed to encompass the traffic patterns for aircraft using the Airfield. 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 boundary.

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 Airfield operations. 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 proposed CLUP includes these maps.

FAA, FAR Part 77 Surfaces Map - Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77, *Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace*, establishes imaginary surfaces for Airfields 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 Airfields 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 Airfield 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 – Airfield safety zones are established to minimize the amount of people exposed to potential airplane hazards. The safety zones defined for the Airfield are based on the guidance for General Aviation Airfields and Air Carrier Airfields in the *California Airfield 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 Moffett Field. The following describes these safety zones and (Figure 7 of the Moffett Field CLUP) 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 Airfield Layout Plan for NUQ, which is a drawing found in the Master Plan for the Airfield. The RPZ’s should be clear of all objects, structures and activities. These safety zones are “object free zones.”

➤ ***Inner Safety Zones (ISZ)***

The ISZ is 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 proposed CLUP allows for very low-density development within these zones and includes 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 TSZ, are located at the corners of each runway. 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.

➤ ***Outer Safety Zone (OSZ)***

The OSZ is the next safety zone outside of the inner safety zone. The proposed CLUP also allows residential uses if they are infill development, or non-residential if not feasible. However, high-density commercial development is discouraged, as well as hazardous materials.

➤ ***Sideline Safety Zone (SSZ)***

The SSZ's 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 CLUP, this safety zone is intended for 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 of the runway. Hazardous materials are also discouraged in this safety zone.

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

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology / Soils
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Population / Housing
- Public Services
- Resources / Recreation
- Transportation / Traffic
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- 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

David M. Rader _____
Printed name

For

Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

Moffett Federal Airfield is geographically located in the north-central area of Santa Clara County, at the southwest end of San Francisco Bay, adjacent to the cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale. The Airfield is located on 952 acres of land, at an elevation of 32 feet above mean sea level (at the FAA Airport Reference Point). The Airfield is owned by the U.S. Government and operated by NASA Ames Research Center. The Airfield is surrounded by San Francisco Bay on the north, the City of Sunnyvale on the east and south, and the City of Mountain View on the south and west. The location of the Airfield with respect to nearby communities and other airports is illustrated on Figure 1 in the Moffett Airfield CLUP.

The Airport/Airfield Influence Area (Figure 8 in the Moffett Airfield CLUP) is defined as the area bounded by Evelyn Avenue on the south, west to Mathilda Ave., south to Washington Ave., west to Pastoria Ave., south to Iowa Ave., west to Bernardo Ave., south to El Camino Real, west to Highway 85, north to Dana Street, west to Calderon Ave., north to Villa Street, west to Castro Street, north to Moffett Blvd, north to Central Ave, west to Stierlin Road, north to Montecito Ave., west to San Pierre Way, north to Middlefield Road, west to Permanente Creek, north to the Mountain View City boundary, west and north to the Santa Clara County boundary, east to the San Jose City boundary, south to Moffett Channel, south to North Mathilda Ave, east to East Caribbean Ave., east to Crossman Ave., south to East Java Drive, east to Fair Oaks Ave., south to Arques Ave., west to Morse Ave., south to California Ave., west to Sunnyvale Ave., south to Evelyn Ave.

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

There are no responsible agencies for this project. The Airfield is located on unincorporated land, and is owned and operated by the Federal government. The Airfield Influence Area overlaps with portions of the Cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale jurisdictions, these jurisdictions may need to amend their General Plans to be consistent with the proposed Moffett Airfield CLUP. CalTrans Division of Aeronautics has an advisory role.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This discussion summarizes the potentially significant impacts evaluated 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 what the potentially significant environmental impacts are.

The CLUP is intended to safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of Moffett Airfield (Airfield) and the aircraft occupants. It is also intended to ensure that surrounding new land uses do not affect the Airfield's continued operation.

Specifically, the CLUP seeks to protect the public from the adverse effects of aircraft noise, 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 adoption of this CLUP amendment is intended to prevent future incompatible development from encroaching on the Airfield. Being a Federal Airfield as opposed to other public use Airports, there is no Airport Master Plan. However, there is an Airport Layout Plan (ALP), (see Figure 2 in the Moffett Airfield CLUP). The aviation activity forecast for the Airfield was updated to reflect the existing

aviation activity and provide a forecast of activity. The updated aviation activity forecast formed the basis for preparation of the CLUP and its policies.

Section 21675 (b) of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California, grants authority to the ALUC to formulate and maintain a CLUP for the area surrounding each Military Airport within Santa Clara County. The CLUP is an Airfield-Specific Land Use Plan that provides safety, height and noise policies, specific to the surrounding environs.

The Comprehensive Land Use Plan contains the following major elements:

- The existing and planned-for facilities at the Airfield 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 City General Plans, Specific Plans, Master Plans and/or Zoning Ordinances consistent with the CLUP.

The CLUP does not affect existing development. The plans and policies in the CLUP address new development within the AIA of the Airfield. 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, Sunnyvale and Mountain View, have land-use authority within the area of the AIA, which is the limit of influence of the proposed CLUP policies.

County Planning Staff and the ALUC 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: The proposed policies contained in the CLUP could displace development, and that the displacement of development could result in secondary adverse environmental impacts, such as those related to Air Quality and Traffic. As previously stated, the intention of the CLUP is not to displace development, but to provide the best protection for the users of the Airfield, as well as those who occupy land surrounding the Airfield.

Pursuant to State Law, the reasonably foreseeable actions after approval of the ALUC CLUP by the Cities of Sunnyvale and Mountain View may be the need to amend their General Plans or otherwise adopt regulations pertaining to the following:

1. Requiring aviation easements throughout the AIA (policy G-5 of the CLUP)
2. Requiring rental tenant notification of the proximity of the property to the Airfield (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).

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

IMPACT: None

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 Airfield is located along the Baylands located outside the cities of Sunnyvale and Mountain View. Although there are a densely populated urban areas north, south and west of the Airfield, the area to east is a wildlife preserve, with no development potential, including agriculture. However, there is a small portion of land designated for Agriculture in the City of Sunnyvale. The use of land within the Airfield AIA for agricultural purposes is not inconsistent with the CLUP. Therefore, approval of the project would not have any negative potential impacts to agricultural resources.

IMPACT: None

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 would 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 Sections K (Population and Housing) below, adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly generate criteria pollutants from increases in vehicle miles traveled or operation of buildings that would result in cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.

IMPACT: Less Than Significant

MITIGATION: None Required

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

DISCUSSION: Adoption of the proposed amendment would not foster development or other activities, such as tree removal, that could adversely affect species or their habitat. The area subject to the CLUP is not subject to local, regional, or state habitat plans. As discussed in Sections K (Population and Housing) below, adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly affect habitat or species outside of the AIA.

IMPACT: None

MITIGATION: None Required

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES					
WOULD THE PROJECT	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Cause 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:

The proposed amendment would not foster development or other activities would affect existing structures or involve ground disturbance. As discussed in Sections K (Population and Housing) below, adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly lead to construction that would cause impacts to Therefore, approval of the proposed project would not have potential impacts to historical or cultural resources.

IMPACT: None

MITIGATION: None Required

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

DISCUSSION:

The proposed amendment would not foster development or other activities that would involve grading or construction of new buildings. As discussed in Sections K (Population and Housing) below, adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly cause impacts related to geology and soils outside of the AIA.

IMPACT: None

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>	No Impact	
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:

The proposed project is an amendment to a CLUP that includes measures intended to minimize the public’s exposure to noise and safety hazards by preventing incompatible land uses in and around Moffett Airfield. The project would not directly generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. As discussed in Sections K (Population and Housing) below, adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly generate new GHG emissions.

IMPACT: None

MITIGATION: None Required

G. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS					
WOULD THE PROJECT	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	No Impact	
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 5
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	46
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	47

	environment?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
e)	For a project located within an Airfield land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public Airfield or public use Airfield, 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 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 Airfield. Thus, CLUP adoption should reduce hazards within the vicinity of the Airfield. For example, safety policies of the CLUP identify that above-ground storage of fuel or other hazardous materials are inconsistent with the CLUP in the areas that have the highest risk of aviation incidents. The Runway Protection Zones, Inner Safety Zone, and Turning Safety Zones are also designed to reduce aviation-related safety hazards for people residing or working in the vicinity of the Airfield. Therefore, adoption of the proposed project would not cause Hazard and Hazardous Materials impacts. Implementation of the CLUP amendment would have a beneficial impact by reducing existing hazards.

IMPACT: None

MITIGATION: None Required

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	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 been granted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 4
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 17n
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Note policy regarding flood retention in watercourse and restoration of riparian vegetation for West Branch of the Llagas.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
e) Create or contribute increased impervious surfaces and associated runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 36, 21a
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 18b, 18d
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 18b, 18d
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 4
j) Be located in an area of special water quality concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4, 6a,
k) Be located in an area known to have high levels of nitrates in well water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4
l) Result in a septic field being constructed on soil where a high water table extends close to the natural land surface?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3

m) Result in a septic field being located within 50 feet of a drainage swale; 100 feet of any well, water course or water body or 200 feet of a reservoir at capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	------

DISCUSSION: Approval of the project 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. As discussed in Sections K (Population and Housing) below, adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly cause impacts related to hydrology and water quality outside of the AIA.

IMPACT: None

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: In developing the CLUP, the ALUC and County staff have consulted with the Cities of Sunnyvale and Mountain View to ensure that the policies included in the CLUP would not create undue difficulties in allowing the Cities to amend their General Plans to be consistent with the CLUP. The CLUP includes the Cities' General Plan Land Use and Zoning maps for reference to current Land Use designations and Zoning around the Airfield. 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 may need to amend their General Plans or otherwise adopt regulations pertaining to the following:

1. Requiring aviation easements throughout the AIA (Policy G-5 of the CLUP)
2. Requiring rental tenant notification of the proximity of the property to the Airfield (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 also would not significantly displace growth or otherwise directly or indirectly result in any other adverse land use impacts. Items 1-3 above would require City Council approval from the jurisdictions to implement, but would not conflict with any applicable land use plan. Item number four above would involve inclusion of the following safety policies within the respective safety zones, which can be found on Table 4-2 of the NUQ 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 bulk fuel storage.
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.

The City of Mountain View has a relatively small amount of land within the AIA and has already incorporated the Moffett Field CLUP into its General Plan through an Amendment completed in mid-2012. The City of Sunnyvale is currently preparing amendments to its General Plan. Amendment of these General Plans to include the CLUP policies above would 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 project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 5
e) For a project located within an Airfield land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public Airfield or public use Airfield, 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: 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 Federal Government establishes noise standards for aircraft. Likewise, the Federal Government prepares special noise studies for each specific Airport / Airfield. Jurisdictions can establish their own noise compatibility programs to respond to specific noise receptors surrounding Airfields. There are three jurisdictions with land use authority, either on or surrounding the Airfield, which have adopted Land Use Compatibility Standards:

- **Santa Clara County.** In the Noise Element of the 1994 Santa Clara County General Plan, the County identified 55 dB DNL as the normally acceptable standard for residential uses. Above 55 dB DNL, residential uses are conditionally acceptable, however the noise exposure is great enough to be of some concern.
- **City of Sunnyvale.** The Noise Sub-Element of the Sunnyvale General Plan recommends a maximum exterior noise level limit of 50 Ldn (day night average sound level) or CNEL for auditoriums, concert halls and amphitheaters, a maximum exterior noise level limit of 60 Ldn or CNEL for residences, hotels, motels, schools, libraries, hospitals, personal care facilities, meeting halls and churches, and a maximum exterior noise level limit of 65 Ldn or CNEL for outdoor sports, and recreation, neighborhood parks and playgrounds, and a maximum exterior noise level limit of 70 Ldn or CNEL for office buildings, commercial, professional businesses,

industrial, manufacturing, utilities and agriculture. Specified land uses in areas above these noise levels may be permitted only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements and the needed noise insulation features included in the design.

- **City of Mountain View.** The City of Mountain View uses Ldn as the measure of noise. The Noise Element of the Mountain View 1992 General Plan specifies a maximum exterior noise level limit of 55 Ldn for residential, public and passive open spaces, 60 Ldn for commercial and intensive open spaces, and a maximum exterior noise level limit of 65 Ldn for industrial environments. As a consequence, land uses for a particular parcel may be restricted to those uses having a maximum noise limit greater than the existing noise level in the immediate vicinity of the parcel.

Moffett Federal Airfield Noise Contours

An analysis of annual aircraft operations and related noise levels for Moffett Federal Airfield was made by P&D Technologies to prepare CNEL noise exposure maps for the base year 1992 aircraft operations based on the existing runway configuration and use. These noise contours are assumed to be representative of the noise contours that may exist in the vicinity of the Airport and on which land use planning decisions should be made.

The Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Integrated Noise Model (INM) Version 3.9 was used to prepare CNEL noise exposure maps based on the FAA aircraft noise level database and airport operational factors described below. The INM was developed by the FAA and represents the Federally sanctioned and preferred method for analyzing aircraft noise exposure. Version 3.9 was the currently available version of the INM, which incorporated an updated database of aircraft performance parameters and noise levels.

In addition to the 65 dBA CNEL Noise Contour, the Moffett Field CLUP includes the adoption of the 70 and 75 dBA CNEL Noise Contour maps to allow identification of sensitive noise receptors closer to the runways. If a project is referred to the ALUC and is within the 60, 65, 70 or 75 dBA CNEL Noise Contours, the applicable noise policies would apply.

The objective of noise compatibility criteria is to minimize the number of people exposed to frequent and/or high levels of aircraft noise. The highest number of people exposed to aircraft noise are those located within the 60, and 65 dBA CNEL, which covers the largest land area, as can be seen in Figure 5 of the proposed CLUP. CLUP policy N-4 establishes the following impact and mitigation:

“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.)”

Figure 5 and Table 4-1 in the Moffett Airfield CLUP illustrate how aircraft noise impacts are identified for specific development and how the associated policies are applied. Table 4-1 (reproduced below) contains criteria to determine the extent to which specific land uses are consistent with the CLUP depending on where they are located in relation to CNEL noise contours. For example, residential land uses are generally acceptable between 55-60 dBA CNEL, conditionally acceptable between 60-65 dBA, but unacceptable in the 65-85 dBA CNEL contours.

Moffett Airfield CLUP Figure 5 (2022 CNEL Noise Contours map) can be used to identify to what extent a specific property may be adversely affected by adverse aircraft noise.

<u>LAND USE CATEGORY</u>	55-60	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85
Residential – low density Single-family, duplex, mobile homes	*	**	***	***	***	***
Residential – multi-family, condominiums, townhouses	*	**	***	***	***	***
Transient lodging - motels, hotels	*	*	**	***	***	***
Schools, libraries, indoor religious assemblies, hospitals, nursing homes	*	***	***	***	***	***
Auditoriums, concert halls, amphitheaters	*	***	***	***	***	***
Sports arena, outdoor spectator sports, parking	*	*	*	**	***	***
Playgrounds, neighborhood parks	*	*	***	***	***	***
Golf courses, riding stables, water recreation, cemeteries	*	*	*	**	***	***
Office buildings, business commercial and professional, retail	*	*	**	***	***	***
Industrial, manufacturing, utilities, agriculture	*	*	*	***	***	***
* Generally Acceptable	Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements. Mobile homes may not be acceptable in these areas. Some outdoor activities might be adversely affected.					
** Conditionally Acceptable	New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Outdoor activities may be adversely affected. Residential: Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.					
*** Generally Unacceptable	New construction or development should be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Outdoor activities are likely to be adversely affected.					
**** Unacceptable	New construction or development should not be undertaken					
Source: Moffett Airfield CLUP (2012)						

The CLUP noise compatibility policies allow certain types of infill development within the CNEL Noise Contours, but require an avigation easement with notification of 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 the following policy (4.3.8.1), which 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 discussed in Sections K (Population and Housing) below, adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly generate construction outside the CLUP area that would result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise or other changes in the noise environment.

The new noise contours and policies would have a beneficial impact by discouraging new residential and other noise-sensitive uses such as churches, schools, libraries and auditoriums in areas with high noise levels. The existing AICUZ Noise contours, by comparison, are larger in total area than the proposed CNEL Contours. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards.

IMPACT: None

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 CLUP policy could displace development and induce growth and secondary impacts in the surrounding environment if it would create barriers to population growth in certain areas in the vicinity of an airfield that currently allow new development.

The ALUC serves as a policy making body for lands around Moffett Field, and makes land use consistency determinations for certain types of land use approvals, which occur within its referral area, also known as the AIA. This includes the review of modifications to 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 might otherwise occur within the affected zones. Thus, theoretically, this development might then occur elsewhere, perhaps on the fringes of Cities or non-urban areas, if there is not sufficient urban land available or infrastructure to serve it. This chain of events could result in potential secondary environmental impacts, such as traffic and air quality impacts due to longer commute distances.

In order to evaluate the possibility for this occurrence in association with the Airfield CLUP adoption, GIS maps were prepared to identify the potentially affected areas, and compare the amount of land that could be affected by the adoption of the AIA, CNEL, FAA FAR Part 77 and Safety Zone maps and associated CLUP policies. The AIA and FAA FAR Part 77 Surfaces map do not have associated

policies that have the ability to displace development. The AIA just identifies the ALUC's area of influence, and the Part 77 Surfaces map is simply used by the ALUC as a height regulation tool. The General Plan Land Use and the Zoning designations of the Cities of Sunnyvale and Mountain View were used to analyze the type of development that could occur in each safety zone and within the noise contours. These maps and analysis are discussed below and are attached to this document in tabular form:

ALUC Moffett Referral Boundary (AIA): Figure 8 of the Moffett Airfield CLUP shows the AIA. The AIA is new. The inclusion of land within the AIA does not, by itself, have any potential for displacement effects because the proposed CLUP does not include any policies that would preclude or significantly discourage any land uses simply based on their location within the AIA.

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

65, 70, and 75 dBA CNEL Noise Contours: Figure 5, the Noise Contour maps in the Moffett Airfield CLUP, delineates the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) boundaries of the respective decibels as a result of Airfield operations at Moffett Airfield. The calculation reflects the projected 2022 Aircraft Noise Contours.

The Noise Sub-Element of the Sunnyvale General Plan recommends a maximum exterior noise level limit of 50 Ldn (day night average sound level) or CNEL for auditoriums, concert halls and amphitheatres, a maximum exterior noise level limit of 60 Ldn or CNEL for residences, hotels, motels, schools, libraries, hospitals, personal care facilities, meeting halls and churches, and a maximum exterior noise level limit of 65 Ldn or CNEL for outdoor sports, and recreation, neighborhood parks and playgrounds, and a maximum exterior noise level limit of 70 Ldn or CNEL for office buildings, commercial, professional businesses, industrial, manufacturing, utilities and agriculture. Specified land uses in areas above these noise levels may be permitted only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements and the needed noise insulation features included in the design.

The City of Mountain View uses Ldn as the measure of noise. The Noise Element of the Mountain View 1992 General Plan specifies a maximum exterior noise level limit of 55 Ldn for residential, public and passive open spaces, 60 Ldn for commercial and intensive open spaces, and a maximum exterior noise level limit of 65 Ldn for industrial environments. As a consequence, land uses for a particular parcel may be restricted to those uses having a maximum noise limit greater than the existing noise level in the immediate vicinity of the parcel.

The CLUP policies state that the "Generally Unacceptable" land uses between the 65-70 CNEL Noise Contours are: residential, auditoriums, concert halls / amphitheatres, playgrounds and neighborhood parks. However, in keeping with the Cities General Plan policies, the CLUP acknowledges that if new development is allowed to proceed, a detailed acoustical analysis must be made to identify acoustical mitigation. The CLUP discloses that outdoor activities will be adversely affected and finds them "Generally Unacceptable" in the residential portion of any mixed-use development.

The effect of all three-noise contours on new residential and other types of land uses, as well as any potential to displace development, is described below. The analysis is organized by existing CNEL contour total acreage, proposed total CNEL contour acreage, delta of total acreage, the Land Use

designation within the proposed CNEL contours for both jurisdictions, and the amount of vacant land that could be displaced within the 65, 70 and 75 dBA CNEL contour within both jurisdictions.

65 dBA CNEL Noise Contour

The new 65 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is 3,033 total acres. The 65-dBA CNEL contour is the largest noise contour and provides a scale of how aircraft noise affects the properties surrounding the Airfield.

City of Mountain View: As can be seen in the attached Land Use and Noise Figures, as well as the displacement tables, the City of Mountain View only has 60 acres of General Industrial designated land. According to the proposed CLUP policies, General Industrial uses are Generally Acceptable within the 65 dBA CNEL. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise attenuation features included in the design. Outdoor activities are likely to be adversely affected.

City of Sunnyvale: As can be seen in the attached Land Use and Noise Figures, as well as the displacement tables, the types of land uses within the 65 dBA CNEL Noise Contour are parks, Agriculture, Apartments, General Industrial, Industrial Warehouse, Light Rail, Shopping Center, Parking lot, Duplex, Single-Family, religious institutions and unknown or vacant. The City General Plan identifies residential, public / educational, recreational and commercial uses as *incompatible* land uses that require design and insulation to reduce the noise levels. This is consistent with the proposed CLUP policies, with the exception of Schools, libraries, indoor religious assemblies, hospitals and nursing homes, which are definitively “Unacceptable.”

There is only 11.85 acres of vacant property within the entire Moffett Field AIA, with approximately 8 of these acres within the 65dBA CNEL contour and not designated for uses that would be incompatible with the proposed CLUP. The Safety Zone impacts on these lands and potential displacement impacts are discussed in the Safety Zone section below.

70 dBA CNEL Noise Contour

The new 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contour is 2,350 total acres. According to the proposed CLUP policies, the only types of land uses “Conditionally Acceptable” with the CLUP policies are: Sports Arenas, outdoor spectator sports, parking, Golf course, riding stables, water recreation and cemeteries. The commercial and industrial development already exists, so it would not be affected by the new CLUP policies. However, if new uses were proposed in these land use designations, they would be discouraged through the proposed CLUP policies. The area within the incompatible land use designations also lies within safety zones as well, which further inhibits the ability to redevelop them. The Safety Zone impacts on these lands and potential displacement impacts are discussed in the Safety Zone section below.

City of Mountain View: The City of Mountain View only has 15 acres of land within the 70 dBA CNEL Noise Contour, which is designated General Industrial. The CLUP would consider this area “Generally Unacceptable” for new construction or development. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise attenuation features included in the design. Outdoor activities are likely to be adversely affected.

City of Sunnyvale: As can be seen in the attached Land Use and Noise Figures, the types of land uses within the 70dBA CNEL Noise Contour within the City of Sunnyvale are: Parks, General Industrial,

Industrial Warehouse, Unknown, and Vacant. None of these uses would be inconsistent with the CLUP noise policies, and therefore no displacement of future development would occur.

75 dBA CNEL Noise Contour

The proposed new maps will include a 75 dBA CNEL, which will encompass 684 acres. However, the contour is mostly located on Airfield property or Airfield-owned property. The exception to this occurs in two places. One is to the west over land designated as Parks. The other is into the Baylands. The land designated as Parks is a golf course. In either case, no displaced development could occur.

Infill Development

If infill development occurs, the infill development would be evaluated pursuant to proposed CLUP policy 4.3.8.1 (I-2 b, c), which 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 can be seen by the relatively small amount of acreage, the amount of potential development displaced would be minimal and would likely be absorbed within other urbanized areas. As will be discussed below, most of the primary land uses that could potentially be displaced are also in safety zones.

Safety Zones

As shown in Figure 7 of the Moffett Airfield CLUP, the proposed Safety Zones are physically very different than the existing safety zones in the AICUZ. This is the result of the 2002 Caltrans Handbook and Caltrans-Aeronautics guidelines that encourage CLUPs to provide more detailed safety zones. An example of how the expanded safety zones affect physical building proposals is outlined in Table 4-2 of the Moffett Airfield CLUP. The table provides maximum density and open space requirements for land uses within the safety zones, rather than prohibiting specific uses within the safety zones, with the exception of the Runway Protection Zone, which is a “no-build zone.” A graphic of the vacant land located within each jurisdiction is included in the attached exhibits.

Summary of Total Proposed Safety Zones

Safety Zones	Total Acreage
Runway Protection Zone	90.5 acres
Inner Safety Zones (westerly only)	212 acres
Outer Safety Zones (westerly only)	132.5 acres
Sideline Safety Zones (westerly only)	91 acres

Turning Safety Zones (Both Westerly zones)	215 acres
Total	739 acres

Although depicted in the CLUP figures, the easterly safety zones go out into the Baylands where no development can occur. For ease of analysis, only safety zones that encroach over developable land are analyzed.

There is 11.85 acres of vacant land within all safety zones. The following analyzes the land uses within each of the proposed safety zones and in conjunction with the displaced development tables, provides a summary of the potential displaced development.

Runway Protection Zone (RPZ): The parcels within the RPZ are designated Parks, which in this particular case, make up a Golf Course. Only in the case of any buildings that might be proposed for the golf course within the RPZ could there be any potential for displacement. However, it should be noted that the RPZ's are required by the FAA to be "no-build zones," and forecasting the existing uses that could be removed, is highly speculative. Beyond that, the total amount of acreage in these parcels is approximately 42 acres. Therefore, it is unreasonable to speculate that park and golf course uses could not go elsewhere in the area.

Inner Safety Zone (ISZ): The only potentially affected land uses would be Professional or Medical Office. However, these uses are allowed with a maximum of 120 people per acre, 30 percent of gross acreage open, and no structures within 100 feet of the runway. These uses could only be displaced if they were not developed within the prescribed density stated above. It is likely that some form of office space could be accommodated within the 4 acres, and displacement would only be considered partial. Also, some of these lands are partially within the safety zones. As is true in all of these safety zones that split parcels, the proposed policies would not displace development, rather regulate the orientation of the development footprint within the zones.

Outer Safety Zone (OSZ): Two General Plan land use designations within this safety zone—Apartments (19 acres) and Duplexes (3 acres)—have a combined acreage of 22 acres. Under the CLUP policies, population density is limited to 300 persons per acre, and new residential uses are not allowed. Therefore, displacement of any new housing in these designations could occur.

Turning Safety Zone (TSZ): Residential uses within this zone may be allowed. Therefore, there are only two uses with the potential to be displaced: Public Service and Hotel / Motel. The new policies would not allow new development or redevelopment if it exceeded 200 people per acre. However, only a small portion of the 4 acres of these uses is located in the TSZ; therefore, any displacement would be partial.

Sideline Safety Zones (SSZ): The sideline safety zones, which are intended for non-residential uses unless infill or non-residential use is not feasible, are entirely located on Airfield property. Therefore, there is no potential for displacement.

Conclusion

The displacement analysis above has identified 22 acres of land in the OSZ that is designated for housing. The proposed CLUP would prohibit new development or redevelopment of housing in these areas. However, because these acres are already developed as housing and CLUP would not affect existing development, the adoption of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of

existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Displacement of other uses, such as commercial or industrial uses, would only be partial in that density would be restricted. Therefore, because there would be no displacement of housing and no significant displacement of other uses, growth would not be induced outside of the AIA.

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: The proposed project is a CLUP for Moffett Airfield. Implementation of the project would not result in development affecting public services. As discussed in Sections K (Population and Housing), adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly affect public services outside of the AIA.

IMPACT: None

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: The proposed project is a CLUP for Moffett Airfield. Implementation of the project would not result in development affecting recreational facilities or mineral resources. As discussed in Sections K (Population and Housing), adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly affect resources and recreation outside of the AIA.

IMPACT: None

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 transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 49, 53
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:

The proposed project is a CLUP for Moffett Airfield. Implementation of the project would not result in development that would directly cause transportation or traffic related impacts. As discussed in Sections K (Population and Housing), adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly affect transportation and traffic outside of the AIA.

IMPACT: None

MITIGATION: None Required

O. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5,
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 21a, 38
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
d) Require new or expanded entitlements in order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 21,
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing 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: The proposed project is a CLUP for Moffett Airfield. Implementation of the project would not result in development that would affect utilities or service systems. As discussed in Sections K (Population and Housing), adoption of the CLUP would not result in significant displacement of residential or other uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly affect utilities and service systems outside of the AIA.

IMPACT: None

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) <i>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)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 to 53
c) <i>Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 to 53

DISCUSSION:

a) **No Impact.** As discussed in the Biological Resources section, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of any 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 of, 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.

b) **No Impact.** No past, current, or probable future projects were identified in the project vicinity that, when added to project-related impacts, would result in cumulatively considerable impacts. No cumulatively considerable impacts would occur with development of the proposed project. As discussed in the analyses provided in this Initial Study, project impacts were found to be less than significant. The incremental effects of the proposed project are not cumulatively significant when viewed in context of the past, current, and/or probable future projects. No cumulative impacts would occur.

c) **No Impact.** The proposed project is a CLUP for Moffett Airfield. As described in the environmental topic sections of this Initial Study, it would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

ATTACHMENTS: DISPLACEMENT ANALYSIS TABLES AND VACANT LANDS MAP

Initial Study Source List*

1. Environmental Information Form
2. Field Inspection
3. Project Plans
4. Planner's Knowledge of Area
5. Experience With Other Projects of This Size and Nature
6. County Expert Sources: Geologist, Fire Marshal, Roads & Airfields, 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)
 - a. Paper Maps
 - a. SCC Zoning
 - b. Barclay's Santa Clara County Locaide Street Atlas
 - c. Color Air Photos (MPSI)
 - d. Santa Clara Valley Water District - Maps of Flood Control Facilities & Limits of 1% Flooding
 - e. Soils Overlay Air Photos
 - f. "Future Width Line" map set
 - g. Cities of Sunnyvale or Mountain View 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 Airfields [1992 version]
- 22b. Los Gatos Hillside Specific Area Plan
- 22c. County Lexington Basin Ordinance Relating to Sewage Disposal

Soils

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

Agricultural Resources/Open Space

- 25. Right to Farm Ordinance
- 26. State Dept. of Conservation, "CA Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model"
- 27. Open Space Preservation, Report of the Preservation 2020 Task Force, April 1987 [Chapter IV]

Air Quality

- 28. BAAQMD Clean Air Plan (1997)
- 29. BAAQMD Annual Summary of Contaminant Excesses & BAAQMD, "Air Quality & Urban Development - Guidelines for Assessing Impacts of Projects & Plans" [1999]

Biological Resources/
Water Quality & Hydrological Resources/
Utilities & Service Systems"

- 30. Site-Specific Biological Report
- 31. Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance Section C16
- 32. Clean Water Act, Section 404
- 33. Riparian Inventory of Santa Clara County, Greenbelt Coalition, November 1988
- 34. CA Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan, San Francisco Bay Region [1995]
- 35. Santa Clara Valley Water District, Private Well Water Testing Program [12-98]
- 36. SCC Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program, Urban Runoff Management Plan [1997]
- 37. County Environmental Health / Septic Tank Sewage Disposal System - Bulletin "A"

Initial Study Source List*

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.

SJ	CNEL (dBs)			Safety Zone						
	65	70	75	Inner Safety Zone	Outer Safety Zone	Runway Protection Zone	Sideline Safety Zone	Traffic Pattern Zone	Turning Safety Zone	
Light Industrial	66.05	1.42		6.73	7.92		0.04		50.69	57.38
Heavy Industrial	6.08	5.30		7.93			0.24		23.26	18.72
Combined Industrial/Commercial	133.96	23.76	0.25	21.18	78.93				44.38	51.38
Public Parks and Open Space	197.16	136.28	11.36	145.94	51.03		1.56		1.10	25.89
Public/Quasi-Public	254.30	209.82	547.61	71.25	0.22	188.99		125.46	57.69	68.50
Residential	134.86	1.00							201.94	8.89
Education	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Downtown Core	112.62				6.36					
SC										
Light Industrial	342.91	192.96	4.39	159.12	32.13		4.00		340.99	91.35
Heavy Industrial	104.67	124.36	0.11	34.81	50.17		3.75		381.18	103.41
Combined Industrial/Commercial	329.55	25.92	82	15.57	16.17	37.46		0.21	136.33	12.78
Public Parks and Open Space	56.55				0.59				8.79	3.51
Public/Quasi-Public	0	0	0	0	0		0	0.00	0	0
Residential	261.08	28.69		9.71	52				266.98	9.62
Education	6.09								115.99	3.42
Downtown Core	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0

LANDUSE

Community & Regional Shopping

Education

Education

Gateway Thoroughfare

Heavy Industrial

Heavy Industrial

Heavy Industrial

Heavy Industrial

Heavy Industrial

Industrial Transition

Industrial Transition

Industrial Transition

Institutional

Light Industrial

Light Industrial

Light Industrial

Light Industrial

Light Industrial

Mixed Use

Moderate Density Residential (25 DU/Acre Max)

Moderate Density Residential (25 DU/Acre Max)

Moderate Density Residential (25 DU/Acre Max)

None

Office/Research & Development

Parks & Recreation

Parks & Recreation

Parks & Recreation

Single Family Attached (16 DU/Acre Max)

Single Family Attached (16 DU/Acre Max)

Single Family Detached (8 DU/Acre Max)

Transit-Oriented Mixed Use

Transit/Station/Airport

Transit/Station/Airport

Transit/Station/Airport

Transit/Station/Airport

Transit/Station/Airport

Transit/Station/Airport

Zone	ACRES
Turning Safety Zone	5.42
Traffic Pattern Zone	115.99
Turning Safety Zone	3.42
Traffic Pattern Zone	82.69
Inner Safety Zone	34.81
Outer Safety Zone	50.17
Runway Protection Zone	3.75
Traffic Pattern Zone	381.18
Turning Safety Zone	103.41
Inner Safety Zone	10.35
Outer Safety Zone	13.87
Turning Safety Zone	6.70
Traffic Pattern Zone	32.38
Inner Safety Zone	159.12
Outer Safety Zone	32.13
Runway Protection Zone	4.00
Traffic Pattern Zone	340.99
Turning Safety Zone	91.35
Traffic Pattern Zone	47.47
Inner Safety Zone	1.78
Outer Safety Zone	12.89
Traffic Pattern Zone	41.41
Outer Safety Zone	5.70
Outer Safety Zone	2.30
Outer Safety Zone	0.59
Traffic Pattern Zone	8.79
Turning Safety Zone	3.51
Outer Safety Zone	0.19
Traffic Pattern Zone	8.72
Inner Safety Zone	7.93
Outer Safety Zone	38.88
Traffic Pattern Zone	216.85
Turning Safety Zone	9.62
Traffic Pattern Zone	6.17
Inner Safety Zone	5.22
Runway	5.18
Runway Extension	5.72
Runway Protection Zone	37.46
Sideline Safety Zone	0.21
Turning Safety Zone	0.66

Public/Quasi-Public

Zone	ACRES
Inner Safety Zone	21.18
Outer Safety Zone	78.93
Runway Protection Zone	0.00
Traffic Pattern Zone	44.38
Turning Safety Zone	51.38
Outer Safety Zone	6.36
Inner Safety Zone	0.12
Traffic Pattern Zone	26.56
Turning Safety Zone	0.69
Inner Safety Zone	7.93
Runway Protection Zone	0.24
Traffic Pattern Zone	23.26
Turning Safety Zone	18.72
Traffic Pattern Zone	8.19
Turning Safety Zone	6.40
Inner Safety Zone	8.30
Runway Protection Zone	5.34
Turning Safety Zone	17.60
Inner Safety Zone	6.73
Outer Safety Zone	7.92
Runway Protection Zone	0.04
Traffic Pattern Zone	50.69
Turning Safety Zone	57.38
Traffic Pattern Zone	8.70
Turning Safety Zone	1.16
Traffic Pattern Zone	57.37
Traffic Pattern Zone	127.68
Turning Safety Zone	1.33
Inner Safety Zone	31.27
Outer Safety Zone	6.50
Runway Protection Zone	1.09
Outer Safety Zone	5.51
Traffic Pattern Zone	39.54
Turning Safety Zone	18.48
Inner Safety Zone	145.94
Outer Safety Zone	51.03
Runway Protection Zone	1.56
Traffic Pattern Zone	1.10
Turning Safety Zone	25.89
Inner Safety Zone	71.25
Outer Safety Zone	0.22
Runway	59.28
Runway Extension	19.54
Runway Protection Zone	188.99
Sideline Safety Zone	125.46
Traffic Pattern Zone	57.69

LANDUSE	dBs	ACRES
Community & Regional Shopping	65	3.65
Community & Regional Shopping	70	1.77
Education	65	6.09
Heavy Industrial	65	104.67
Heavy Industrial	70	124.36
Heavy Industrial	75	0.11
Industrial Transition	65	12.50
Industrial Transition	70	18.42
Institutional	65	10.78
Light Industrial	65	342.91
Light Industrial	70	192.96
Light Industrial	75	4.39
Mixed Use	65	11.14
Moderate Density Residential (25 DU/Acre Max)	65	19.43
Moderate Density Residential (25 DU/Acre Max)	70	12.67
None	65	13.83
None	70	1.21
Office/Research & Development	65	63.42
Open Space	65	26.32
Parks & Recreation	65	30.23
Single Family Attached (16 DU/Acre Max)	65	80.68
Single Family Detached (8 DU/Acre Max)	65	160.97
Single Family Detached (8 DU/Acre Max)	70	16.02
Tourist Commercial	65	238.03
Transit/Station/Airport	65	0.81
Transit/Station/Airport	70	5.73
Transit/Station/Airport	75	82.10

DESIGNATIO	dBs
Combined Industrial/Commercial	65
Combined Industrial/Commercial	70
Combined Industrial/Commercial	75
Core Area	65
General Commercial	65
Heavy Industrial	65
Heavy Industrial	70
Heavy Industrial	75
High Density Residential (25-50 DU/AC)	65
Industrial Core Area	65
Industrial Park	65
Industrial Park	70
Industrial Park	75
Light Industrial	65
Light Industrial	70
Medium Density Residential (8-16 DU/AC)	65
Medium High Density Residential (12-25 DU/AC)	65
Medium Low Density Residential (8.0 DU/AC)	65
Medium Low Density Residential (8.0 DU/AC)	70
No Underlying Designation	65
No Underlying Designation	70
No Underlying Designation	75
Office	65
Public Park and Open Space	65
Public Park and Open Space	70
Public Park and Open Space	75
Public/Quasi-Public	65
Public/Quasi-Public	70
Public/Quasi-Public	75
Residential Support for the Core Area (25+ DU/AC)	65

ACRES

133.96
23.76
0.25
112.62
11.92
6.08
5.30
0.00
1.79
6.53
39.81
32.39
2.18
66.05
1.42
13.98
66.96
45.63
1.00
13.08
22.02
4.83
5.98
197.16
136.28
11.36
254.30
209.82
547.61
6.50

65 dBA CNEL Coutour - Displacemnt Analysis

General Plan Designation	Total Acreage Affected	Existing CLUP Policies	Proposed CLUP Policies	Discussion	Potential for Displacement	
Combined Industrial/Commercial	463.51	Commercial: Caution, Review Noise Insulation needs carefully. Industrial: Satisfactory.	Commercial: Conditionally Acceptable. Industrial: Generally Acceptable	Policies regarding Commercial and Industrial Development do not substantially change with adoption of new CLUP. Uses are either acceptable (Industrial) or require evaluation for noise insulation (Commercial)	None	
Public Parks and Open Space	253.71	Public Parks: Caution, Review Noise Insulation needs carefully.	Public Parks: Generally Unacceptable. New Construction or development should be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Outdoor activities are likely to be adversely affected.	Existing CLUP Noise Policies for this zone require noise insulation. The new CLUP discourages parks within the 65 CNEL contour, requiring noise analysis and insulation, acknowledging outdoor activiteis will be adversely impacted. While the new CLUP has stronger language discouraging neighborhood parks, both Land Use Plans acknowledge noise impacts within this zone. In summary, while neighborhood parks and playgrounds are strongly discouraged under the new CLUP, the acknowledgement of noise impacts has not substantially changed.	Low	
Public/Quasi-Public	254.3	Avoid Land Use Unless related to Airport Service	Unacceptable. New Construction or development shall not be undertaken.	Under both existing and proposed CLUP policies, land uses within this Genral Plan designation are not allowed	None	

Residential	395.94	Avoid Land Use Unless related to Airport Serviced	Generally Unacceptable. New construction or development should be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise attenuation features included in the design. Outdoor activities are likely to be adversely affected.	Under the existing CLUP, Residential uses are not allowed. Under the new CLUP, residential uses are discouraged however could be allowed with noise analysis and attenuation.	None	
Education	6.09	Avoid Land Use Unless related to Airport Service	Unacceptable. New Construction or development shall not be undertaken.	Educational uses cannot be established in the existing CLUP and cannot be established in the proposed CLUP.	None	
Downtown Core	112.62	Commercial: Caution, Review Noise Insulation Carefully. Residential: Avoid Land Use Unless related to Airport Service	Commercial: Generally Acceptable. Residential: Generally Unacceptable.	The Downtown Core General Plan Designation allows several types of land uses. Noise policies affecting typical uses within this zone (Commercial, Residential) are less stringent under the proposed CLUP.	None	
Displacement Analysis - 70 dBA CNEL Contour						
Land use	Total Acreage	Existing CLUP	Proposed CLUP	Narrative	Potential for Displacement	

Light Industrial	194.38	Caution, Review noise insulation needs carefully	Generally Unacceptable. New construction or development should be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise attenuation features included in the design. Outdoor activities are likely to be adversely affected.	Both the Existing CLUP and the Proposed CLUP require a review of noise insulation for industrial uses within this zone. Although the new CLUP policies are more specific in discouraging Industrial uses, they could still be allowed with noise insulation features incorporated into the design.	Low	
Heavy Industrial	129.66	Caution, Review noise insulation needs carefully	Generally Unacceptable. New construction or development should be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise attenuation features included in the design. Outdoor activities are likely to be adversely affected.	Both the Existing CLUP and the Proposed CLUP require a review of noise insulation for industrial uses within this zone. Although the new CLUP policies are more specific in discouraging Industrial uses, they could still be allowed with noise insulation features incorporated into the design.	Low	

Combined Industrial/Commercial	49.68	Industrial / Commercial: Caution, Review noise insulation needs carefully	Industrial /Most Commercial: Generally Unacceptable. Transient lodging: Unacceptable.	Both the Existing CLUP and the Proposed CLUP require a review of noise insulation for industrial and most commercial uses within this zone. Although the new CLUP policies are more specific in discouraging these uses, they could still be allowed with noise insulation features incorporated into the design. Some types of uses within the Commercial Zone, such as Transient lodging and Auditoriums would not be allowed.	Certain Uses (Lodging): Yes Other Uses: Low	
Public Parks and Open Space	136.28	Caution, Review noise insulation needs carefully	Unacceptable. New Construction or development shall not be undertaken.	Policies preventing recreation uses (neighborhood parks, playgrounds) are much stronger under the proposed CLUP. Portions of land within this Parks designation are within Guadalupe Creek and thus not subject to development. Majority of lands are in Guadalupe Gardens and were acquired with intent to serve as buffer zone for the Airport. Nevertheless, As recreation uses would likely not be allowed under the existing CLUP, the prohibition of these uses under the new CLUP is more definitive.	Yes	
Public/Quasi-Public	209.82	Avoid Land Use unless related to airport service	Unacceptable. New Construction or development shall not be undertaken.	Under both existing and proposed CLUP policies, land uses within this General Plan designation are not allowed	None	
Residential	29.69	Avoid Land Use unless related to airport service	Unacceptable. New Construction or development shall not be undertaken.	Under both existing and proposed CLUP policies, Residential uses within this General Plan designation are not allowed	None	
Displacement Analysis - 75 dBA CNEL Contour						

Land use	Total Acreage	Existing CLUP	Proposed CLUP	Narrative	Potential for Displacement	
Light Industrial	4.39	Caution, Review noise insulation needs carefully	Generally Unacceptable. New construction or development should be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise attenuation features included in the design. Outdoor activities are likely to be adversely affected.	Both the Existing CLUP and the Proposed CLUP require a review of noise insulation for industrial uses within this zone. Although the new CLUP policies are more specific in discouraging Industrial uses, they could still be allowed with noise insulation features incorporated into the design.	Low	
Heavy Industrial	0.11	Caution, Review noise insulation needs carefully	Generally Unacceptable. New construction or development should be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise attenuation features included in the design. Outdoor activities are likely to be adversely affected.	Both the Existing CLUP and the Proposed CLUP require a review of noise insulation for industrial uses within this zone. Although the new CLUP policies are more specific in discouraging Industrial uses, they could still be allowed with noise insulation features incorporated into the design.	Low	

Combined Industrial/Commercial	82.35	Industrial: Caution, Review noise insulation needs carefully. Commercial: Avoid Land Use unless related to airport service	Industrial: Generally Unacceptable. Commercial: Unacceptable. New Construction or development shall not be undertaken.	Policies regarding Industrial Uses are discussed above under Heavy and Light Industrial. Commercial development cannot be established in the both the existing and proposed CLUP.	Industrial: Low Commercial: None	
Public Parks and Open Space	11.36	Avoid Land Use unless related to airport service	Unacceptable. New Construction or development shall not be undertaken.	New Public Parks cannot be established in the existing and proposed CLUP.	None	
Public/Quasi-Public	547.61	Avoid Land Use unless related to airport service	Unacceptable. New Construction or development shall not be undertaken.	The acreage within the 75 CNEL noise contour is all Airport property.	None	

CLUP Safety Zones - Displacement Analysis

Safety Zone	General Plan Designation	Proposed SJC CLUP Policies	Acreage Affected	Narrative	Potential For Displacement
Runway Protection Zone (RPZ)	Parks	100% No People Allowed		No development allowed in both the current and proposed CLUP.	none
Inner Safety Zone (ISZ) (Equal to the area of the Outer Safety Zone in the existing CLUP)	Public Park and Open Space	Allowed with a maximum of 120 people per acre and 30 percent of gross acreage open. No structures within 100 feet of the runway	145 acres	Safety Policies regarding population density under the new CLUP are not more stringent than the existing CLUP.	none
	Public / Quasi Public	Allowed with a maximum of 120 people per acre and 30 percent of gross acreage open. No structures within 100 feet of the runway	71.25 acres	Most of the 71.25 acres is owned by the Airport in close proximity to the runways. Safety Policies regarding population density under the new CLUP are not more stringent than the existing CLUP.	none
	Light Industrial	Allowed with a maximum of 120 people per acre and 30 percent of gross acreage open. No structures within 100 feet of the runway	165.85 acres	Safety Policies regarding population density under the new CLUP are not more stringent than the existing CLUP.	none
	Heavy Industrial	Allowed with a maximum of 120 people per acre and 30 percent of gross acreage open. No structures within 100 feet of the runway	42.74 acres	Safety Policies regarding population density under the new CLUP are not more stringent than the existing CLUP.	none
	Combined Industrial / Commercial	Allowed with a maximum of 120 people per acre and 30 percent of gross acreage open. No structures within 100 feet of the runway. No shopping centers, restaurants, theaters, stadiums, multi-story office buildings, educational facilities, daycare facilities, nursing homes and hospitals are allowed.	36.75 acres	Some commercial uses (shopping centers, restaurants, etc.) would not be allowed. However, other industrial and commercial uses could be established within the 120 people per acre cap.	Partial
	Residential	Not allowed	9.71 acres	No residential development is allowed under the existing and the proposed CLUP.	none
	* The 10/25 requires that no more than 10 persons on an annual average and no more than 25 people at any one time on each net acre.				
Safety Zone	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed CLUP	Acreage	Discussion	Potential for Displacement

Turning Safety Zone(TPZ)	Public Parks and Open Space	Non-residential, maximum 200 people per acre, with 20 percent open space and minimum dimensions of 300 feet by 75 feet parallel to the runways	29.40	Public Parks are allowed within this safety zone subject to meeting the density and open space requirements.	none
	Public/Quasi-Public	Non-residential, maximum 200 people per acre, with 20 percent open space and minimum dimensions of 300 feet by 75 feet parallel to the runways	68.50	Public Uses are allowed in this safety zone, subject to meeting the density and open space requirement.	none
	Light Industrial	Non-residential, maximum 200 people per acre, with 20 percent open space and minimum dimensions of 300 feet by 75 feet parallel to the runways	148.73	Industrial uses are allowed in this safety zone, subject to meeting the density and open space requirement.	None
	Heavy Industrial	Non-residential, maximum 200 people per acre, with 20 percent open space and minimum dimensions of 300 feet by 75 feet parallel to the runways	122.13	Industrial uses are allowed in this safety zone, subject to meeting the density and open space requirement.	None
	Industrial Park	Non-residential, maximum 200 people per acre, with 20 percent open space and minimum dimensions of 300 feet by 75 feet parallel to the runways	9.62	Industrial uses are allowed in this safety zone, subject to meeting the density and open space requirement.	None
	Combined Industrial/Commercial	Non-residential, maximum 200 people per acre, with 20 percent open space and minimum dimensions of 300 feet by 75 feet parallel to the runways. No regional shopping centers, theaters, gas stations or similar activities.	64.16	Some commercial uses (shopping centers, gas stations, etc,) would not be allowed. However, other industrial and commercial uses could be established within the safety zone subject to meeting the density and open space requirements.	Partial
	Single Family Residential	Nonresidential. Maximum 200 people per acre. If non-residential uses are not feasible, allow residential infill to existing density.	18.51	Affected areas consist of existing single family development (8 du/acre) . The proposed CLUP policies allow for residential infill development on parcels less than a quarter acre in size.	None
	High Density Residential	Nonresidential. Maximum 200 people per acre. If non-residential uses are not feasible, allow residential infill to existing density	6.40	Although lands with this General Plan designation are currently developed. Redevelopment of these areas would be prohibited under the new CLUP	Yes

	Education	Non-residential, maximum 200 people per acre, with 20 percent open space and minimum dimensions of 300 feet by 75 feet parallel to the runways No schools or day care centers allowed.	3.42	Schools would not be allowed in this safety zone. Although only a portion of this General Plan designation is within this safety zone, the new CLUP policies would not allow new development or redevelopment.	Yes
	Office	Non-residential, maximum 200 people per acre, with 20 percent open space and minimum dimensions of 300 feet by 75 feet parallel to the runways	10.8	Office uses are allowed in the proposed CLUP, subject to meeting the density and open space requirements.	None
Safety Zone	General Plan Land Use	Proposed CLUP	Acreage	Narrative	Displacement
Outer Safety Zone(OSZ)	Public Parks and Open Space	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 20% of the gross area open	51.62	Parks are allowed subject to meeting the density requirements.	None
	Public/Quasi-Public	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 20% of the gross area open	22	Public / Quasi Public uses are allowed in the proposed CLUP, subject to meeting the density and open space requirements.	None
	Light Industrial	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 20% of the gross area open	40.05	Industrial uses are allowed in this safety zone, subject to meeting the density and open space requirement.	None
	Heavy Industrial	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 20% of the gross area open	50.17	Industrial uses are allowed in this safety zone, subject to meeting the density and open space requirement.	None
	Combined Industrial/Commercial	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 20% of the gross area open. No Regional Shopping Centers, theaters, or meeting halls.	95.10	Some Commercial uses such as regional shopping centers and theaters are not allowed within this safety zone, however other industrial and commercial uses could be developed subject to the density and open space requirements.	Partial
	Single Family Residential	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 20% of the gross area open. Residential - if non-residential uses are not feasible, allow residential infill to existing density	52	Affected areas consist of existing single family development (8 du/acre) . The proposed CLUP policies allow for residential infill development on parcels less than a quarter acre in size.	None
	Medium Density Residential	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 20% of the gross area open. Residential - if non-residential uses are not feasible, allow residential infill to existing density	13	Although lands with this General Plan designation are currently developed (type of development unknown), Redevelopment of these areas would be prohibited under the new CLUP	Yes

	Downtown Core	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 20% of the gross area open	6.36	This General Plan designation is intended for high density commercial and residential development. Under the new CLUP policies, population density is limited to 300 persons per acres and certain uses (new residential) are not allowed. As such, development could occur in this zone, abet at lower densities than perscribed under the General Plan	Partial
	Office Research and Development	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 20% of the gross area open	5.98	Although large-scale Office R&D development would be inconsistent with the proposed CLUP, smaller scale Office R&D development could occur within this safety zone per the population density requierements.	None
Safety Zone	General Plan Land Use	Proposed CLUP	Acreage	Narrative	Displacement
Sideline Safety Zone(SSZ)	Public/Quasi-Public	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 30% of the gross area open	125.46	All the land located within this safety zone is on Airport property.	None
	Combined Industrial/Commercial	Nonresidential, Maximum of 300 people per acre with 30% of the gross area open	,21 acres	Combined Industrial / Commercial uses could be allowed subject to meeting the density and open space requirements within this zone.	None
Traffic Pattern Zone	Numerous	No Limit on population density and 10 percent of the gross area every half mile must remain open. No sports stadiums or similar uses with very high concentrations of people.	Numerous	The only uses with very high concentrations of people would not be allowed within this zone. All other types of development could occur.	Very limited



