



## INITIAL STUDY

(Minor revisions to page 5 shown with underlines and strike-throughs)

**PROJECT FILE NO.: PDC09-008**

**Project Description:** Planned Development Rezoning from the R-1-8 Residential Zoning District to the A(PD) Planned Development Zoning District to allow up to 19 single-family detached residences or up to 14 single-family detached residences adjacent to a possible future new fire station on a 3.21 gross acres site. (Note: This site is one of several locations being considered for a possible new fire station. Any potential new fire station will undergo a separate environmental review.)

**PROJECT LOCATION:** North White Road, approximately 200 feet south of Cunningham Court

**EXISTING GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Medium Low Density Residential (8.0 DU/AC)

**EXISTING ZONING:** R-1-8 Single-Family Residential

**SURROUNDING LAND USES / GENERAL PLAN / ZONING:**

North: Single-family residences / MLDR (8.0 DU/AC) / R-1-8 Single-Family Residence

South: Golf course / Private Recreation / A(PD) Planned Development

East: Single-family residences / MLDR (8.0 DU/AC) / R-1-8 Single-Family Residence

West: Public park / Public Park & Open Space / R-1-8 Single-Family Residence

**PROJECT APPLICANT’S NAME AND ADDRESS:** Reyad Katwan c/o Hawkstone LLC, 3750-B Charter Park Drive, San Jose, CA

**DETERMINATION**

**On the basis of this initial study:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 the project proponent has agreed to revise the project to avoid any significant effect. A <b>MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and an <b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT(EIR)</b> is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but at least one effect has been (1) adequately analyzed in a previous document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) addressed by mitigation measures based on the previous analysis as described in the attached initial study. An EIR is required that analyzes only the effects that were not adequately addressed in a previous document.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, no further environmental analysis is required because all potentially significant effects have been (1) adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> , including revisions or mitigation measures that are included in the project, and further analysis is not required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

Date

Signature

Name of Preparer: Avril Baty

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

**I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:**

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
e) Increase the amount of shading on public open space (e.g. parks, plazas, and/or school yards)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**FINDINGS:**

The proposed project would alter the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings through various means including the construction of either: a) up to 14 single-family detached residences and a potential future fire station or b) up to 19 single-family detached residences. This site is one of several locations being considered for a new fire station. Any potential new fire station will undergo a separate environmental review. The proposed project would not significantly degrade the existing visual character of the site in that the project would be required to undergo architectural and site design review by Planning Staff to ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

Exterior building and parking lot lighting associated with the new development would likely create a minor increase in the amount of nighttime lighting over the existing land use on the site, however it would not adversely affect views in the area. The project would be required to conform to the City’s Residential Design Guidelines and to the standards of the City’s Outdoor Lighting Policy. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur as a result of the project.

**STANDARD MEASURES:** The project shall implement the following standard measure(s):

- Design of the project shall conform to the City’s *Residential Design Guidelines*.
- Lighting on the site shall conform to the City’s Outdoor Lighting Policy (4-3).

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None required.

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the project:**

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
c) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4

**FINDINGS:**

The project site is not located in an area identified as prime farmland, nor is the site being used for or zoned for agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in a significant impact on the City’s or Region’s agricultural resources.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None Required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

**AIR QUALITY - Would the project:**

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,14
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,14
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,14
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,14
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,14

**FINDINGS:**

The City of San Jose uses the threshold of significance established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to assess air quality impacts. Based on the BAAQMD threshold of significance, projects that generate fewer than 2,000 vehicle trips per day are not considered major air pollutant contributors and do not require a technical air quality study. As this project will generate at most approximately 190 vehicle trips per day, no air quality study was prepared for this project.

Temporary Air Quality impacts may result from demolition of the existing structure(s), excavation of soil, and other construction activities on the subject site. Implementation of the mitigation measures listed below will reduce the temporary construction impacts to a less than significant level.

**STANDARD MEASURES:** The following construction practices shall be implemented during all phases of construction for the proposed project to prevent visible dust emissions from leaving the site.

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods to prevent visible dust from leaving the site; active areas adjacent to windy periods; active areas adjacent to existing land uses shall be kept damp at all times, or shall be treated with non-toxic stabilizers or dust palliatives.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard;
- Pave, apply water at least three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep daily (or more often if necessary) to prevent visible dust from leaving the site (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites; water sweepers shall vacuum up excess water to avoid runoff-related impacts to water quality; and
- Sweep streets daily, or more often if necessary (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None required.

**III. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:**

a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,10
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	------

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any aquatic, wetland, or 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,6,10
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,6
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,10
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,11
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**FINDINGS:**

The Santa Clara Valley Water District has a right to a 50-foot wide easement that is approximately 500 feet long, along the southern portion of the subject property. Flint Creek, a tributary of Silver Creek, is located in a culvert beneath this easement. There is an an underground 96-inch diameter cast-in-place pipe (CIPP) and twin 72-inch diameter reinforced concrete pipes as the creek approaches White Road. SCVWD access is important to ensure operation and maintenance of these pipes. The Public Works Department regularly works with the City Arborist to ensure that deep-rooted trees are not planted in park strips located over easements. Requirements will also be imposed at the Planned Development (PD) permit stage of this project to ensure that structures are not built and deep rooted large trees and shrubs are not planted in the 50-foot wide SCVWD easement to allow for adequate maintenance of the underground pipes within this easement. A Homeowners' Association will also be required at the PD Permit stage of the project to enforce these requirements.

The SCVWD will require a permit for the construction of improvements in the District's easement. They may also stipulate other related requirements as necessary.

The City of San José has established regulations for removal of landscape trees at least 56 inches in circumference measured two feet above grade. However, there are currently no trees on the site. There is a small grove of trees on the adjacent southern property in close proximity to the common property line. The proposed project will not conflict with any provisions of the Draft Habitat Conservation Plan since there are not any rare, threatened, endangered or special status species of flora or fauna are known to inhabit the site. To ensure protection to the Water District's pipes these requirements should be placed on the General Development Plan.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

~~None required.~~ The General Development Plan shall include requirements to ensure that structures shall not be built on, deep rooted shrubs and trees shall not be planted within the SCVWD easement, and that a Homeowner's Association shall be required to enforce these requirements. At the Grading Permit stage the applicant's engineer shall verify that there is adequate protection to the pipes within the District's easement.

**IV. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,7
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,8
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,8
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,8

**FINDINGS:**

The project site and adjacent closed golf course (Pleasant Hills Golf Course property) were once part of the 4,454-acre Rancho Pala that was owned by Juan Higuera, followed by Charles White. In 1871, the property became part of a 520-acre ranch owned by J.H.Flickinger, followed by Fred Marten. The property remained in the Marten family until it was sold in the 1960’s. There are no existing structures on the site.

There are no recorded prehistoric or historic archeological sites on or immediately adjacent to the project site. However, based on the known locations of archeological sites in the area, subsurface testing was completed in late 2004 on the golf course property along the White Road and Tully Road borders of the golf course.

According to the City’s Archaeological Sensitivity Map, the project site has potential for the discovery of archaeological resources and is considered archaeologically sensitive. According to a previously prepared archeological report, AC085-11, several archeological surveys have been carried out in the vicinity. This report concludes that no prehistoric sites are known to lay within the environmental setting and that it is not likely that a surface survey would reveal the presence of prehistoric resources within the area. Staff also concludes that an archeological site is not likely to be located on the site because of the extensive grading and trenching that would have occurred on the site as part of the process to underground Flint Creek in the 96-inch, below-grade culvert. The project is not anticipated to impact archaeological resources. However, in the event any resources are found during grading, their disturbance would be a significant impact.

**STANDARD MEASURES:**

Should evidence of prehistoric cultural resources be discovered during construction, work within 50 feet of the find shall be stopped to allow adequate time for evaluation and mitigation by a qualified professional archaeologist. The material shall be evaluated and if significant, a mitigation program including collection and analysis of the materials at a recognized storage facility shall be developed and implemented under the direction of the City’s Environmental Principal Planner.

As required by County ordinance, this project has incorporated the following guidelines. - Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The Santa Clara County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the land owner shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

**V. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
4) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
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 wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24

**FINDINGS:**

The site is not located within a Geologic Hazard Zone or Liquefaction Zone. However, the project site is located within the seismically active San Francisco region, which requires that the building be designed and built in conformance with the requirements of the 1997 Uniform Building Code for Seismic Zone 4. The potential for geologic and soils impacts resulting from conditions on the site can be mitigated by utilizing standard engineering and construction techniques. As the project includes these required measures, the potential for seismic impacts will be less than significant.

**STANDARD MEASURES:**

- A Grading Permit is required prior to the issuance of a Public Works clearance.
- The proposed structures on the site would be designed and constructed in conformance with the Uniform Building Code Guidelines for Seismic Zone 4 to avoid or minimize potential damage from seismic shaking on the site.
- A soil investigation report addressing the potential hazard of liquefaction must be submitted to, reviewed and approved by the City Geologist prior to issuance of a grading permit or Public Works Clearance. The investigation should be consistent with the guidelines published by the State of California (CDMG Special Publication 117) and the Southern California Earthquake Center ("SCEC" report). A recommended depth of 50 feet should be explored and evaluated in the investigation.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

**VI. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:**

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,12
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
f) For a project within 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
h) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**FINDINGS:**

A Phase I Report was prepared for the site by AEI Consultants. A copy of the report, entitled Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, dated December 31, 2008, is attached to this Initial Study. The following discussion presents a summary of the findings and conclusions of the report.

The project is not included on the State DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), or on other federal, state or local databases. Historical uses of the site include agricultural uses and seasonal sales (pumpkins and Christmas trees). The report concludes that further investigation of the property is not warranted. The only identified concern regarding hazardous materials use was due to the historic agricultural use of the land. However, soil sampling and testing showed no residual pesticides above the environmental screening levels.

The Municipal Environmental Compliance Officer reviewed the Phase I environmental site assessment report and soils report, and stated that the Environmental Services Department has no objections to the proposed development and no further investigation is recommended.

STANDARD MEASURES: None required

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

**VII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:**

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,15
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
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 that would result in flooding on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
e) Create or contribute 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,17
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,9
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,9
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
j) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

#### FINDINGS:

The subject site is located within the 100-year flood hazard area. It is located within Flood Zone AH. The project would not expose people or structures to flooding because the developer must (1) elevate the lowest floor above the flood level, and (2) obtain the Elevation Certificate (FEMA Form 81-31) for each proposed structure, based on construction drawings, prior to the issuance of a building permit. An Elevation Certificate based on finished construction is required for each built structure prior to issuance of an occupancy permit. Building support utility systems such as HVAC, electrical, plumbing, air conditioning equipment, including ductwork, and other service facilities must be elevated above the base flood elevation level or otherwise protected from flood damage. The proposed mitigation requiring the FEMA Flood Elevation Certificate would reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level.

The site is not subject to a seiche or a tsunami.

- Water Quality – During and Post-Construction

The discharge of stormwater from the City's municipal storm sewer system is regulated primarily under the federal Clean Water Act and California's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) implements these regulations at the regional level. New construction in San Jose is subject to the conditions of the City's NPDES Permit, which was reissued by the RWQCB in February 2001. Additional water quality control measures were approved in October 2001 (revised in 2005), when the RWQCB adopted an amendment to the NPDES permit for Santa Clara County. This amendment, which is commonly referred to as "C3" requires all new and redevelopment projects that result in the addition or replacement of impervious surfaces totaling 10,000 sq ft or more to 1) include storm water treatment measures; 2) ensure that the treatment measures be designed to treat an optimal volume or flow of storm water runoff from the project site; and 3) ensure that storm water treatment measures are properly installed, operated and maintained.

The City has developed a policy that implements Provision C.3 of the NPDES Permit, requiring new development projects to include specific construction and post-construction measures for improving the water quality of urban runoff to the maximum extent feasible. The City's Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy (6-29) established general guidelines and minimum Best Management Practices (BMPs) for specified land uses, and includes the requirement of regular maintenance to ensure their effectiveness. Later, the City adopted the Post-

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

Construction Hydromodification Management Policy (8-14) to manage development related increases in peak runoff flow, volume and duration, where such hydromodification is likely to cause increased erosion, silt pollutant generation or other impacts to local rivers, streams and creeks. Implementation of these Policies will reduce potential water quality impacts to less than significant levels.

The proposed project is 3.21 acres in size. The site is currently undeveloped and the entire 139,828 sq. ft. of the site is impervious surface. The proposed project will result in 72,310 sq. ft. of impervious surface (for 14 residences and a potential future fire station) or 69,806 (for 19 residences).

The project shall comply with the City of San Jose’s Grading Ordinance, including erosion and dust controls during site preparation, and with the City of San Jose’s Zoning Ordinance requirement of keeping adjacent streets free of dirt and mud during construction.

<b>PERVIOUS AND IMPERVIOUS SURFACES COMPARISON (14 Residences &amp; Possible Future Fire Station - Alternative A)</b>						
	<b>Existing Condition (sqft)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Proposed Condition (sqft)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Difference (sqft)</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Site:</b>	139,828	100%	139,828	100%	0	0%
Building Footprint(s)	0	0%	33,541	24%	33,541	24%
Parking	0	0%	6,970	5%	6,970	5%
Sidewalks, Patios, Paths, etc.	0	0%	4,356	3%	4,356	3%
Landscaping	139,828	100%	67,518	48%	-72,310	-52%
<b>Total</b>	139,828	100%	139,828	100%	0	0%
Impervious Surfaces	0	0%	72,310	52%	72,310	52%
Pervious Surfaces	139,828	100%	67,518	48%	-72, 310	-52%
<b>Total</b>	139,828	100%	139,828	100%	0	0%

<b>PERVIOUS AND IMPERVIOUS SURFACES COMPARISON (19 Residences – Alternative B)</b>						
	<b>Existing Condition (sqft)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Proposed Condition (sqft)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Difference (sqft)</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Site:</b>	139,828	100%	139,828	100%	0	0%
Building Footprint(s)	0	0%	27,443	24%	33,541	24%
Parking	0	0%	6,970	5%	6,970	5%
Sidewalks, Patios, Paths, etc.	0	0%	1,900	3%	4,356	3%
Landscaping	139,828	100%	70,179	50%	-72,310	-52%
<b>Total</b>	139,828	100%	139,828	100%	0	0%
Impervious Surfaces	0	0%	69,806	50%	69,806	50%
Pervious Surfaces	139,828	100%	70,179	50%	-69,806	-50%
<b>Total</b>	139,828	100%	139,828	100%	0	0%

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

STANDARD MEASURES: Implementation of the following measures, consistent with NPDES Permit and City Policy requirements, will reduce potential construction impacts to surface water quality to less than significant levels:

**Construction Measures**

- Prior to the commencement of any clearing, grading or excavation, the project shall comply with the State Water Resources Control Board’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Activities Permit, to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works, as follows:
  1. The applicant shall develop, implement and maintain a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to control the discharge of stormwater pollutants including sediments associated with construction activities;
  2. The applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).
- The project shall incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) into the project to control the discharge of stormwater pollutants including sediments associated with construction activities. Examples of BMPs are contained in the publication *Blueprint for a Clean Bay*. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant may be required to submit an Erosion Control Plan to the City Project Engineer, Department of Public Works, 200 E. Santa Clara Street, San Jose, California 95113. The Erosion Control Plan may include BMPs as specified in ABAG’s *Manual of Standards Erosion & Sediment Control Measures* for reducing impacts on the City’s storm drainage system from construction activities. For additional information about the Erosion Control Plan, the NPDES Permit requirements or the documents mentioned above, please call the Department of Public Works at (408) 535-8300.
- The project applicant shall comply with the City of San Jose Grading Ordinance, including erosion and dust control during site preparation and with the City of San Jose Zoning Ordinance requirements for keeping adjacent streets free of dirt and mud during construction. The following specific BMPs will be implemented to prevent stormwater pollution and minimize potential sedimentation during construction:
  1. Restriction of grading to the dry season (April 15 through October 15) or meet City requirements for grading during the rainy season.
  2. Utilize on-site sediment control BMPs to retain sediment on the project site;
  3. Utilize stabilized construction entrances and/or wash racks;
  4. Implement damp street sweeping;
  5. Provide temporary cover of disturbed surfaces to help control erosion during construction;
  6. Provide permanent cover to stabilize the disturbed surfaces after construction has been completed.

**Post-Construction**

- Prior to the issuance of a Planned Development Permit, the applicant must provide details of specific Best Management Practices (BMPs), including, but not limited to, bioswales, disconnected downspouts, landscaping to reduce impervious surface area, and inlets stenciled “No Dumping – Flows to Bay” to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement.
- The project shall comply with Provision C.3 of NPDES permit Number CAS0299718, which provides enhanced performance standards for the management of stormwater of new development.
- The project shall comply with applicable provisions of the following City Policies – 1) Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy (6-29) which establishes guidelines and minimum BMPs for all projects and 2) Post-Construction Hydromodification Management Policy (8-14) which provides for numerically sized (or hydraulically sized) TCMs.
- Drainage swales and other bio-mechanical stormwater filtration systems may require the creation of a Homeowners Association for maintenance.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

- Prior to the issuance of a Building Permits, the applicant shall obtain an Elevation Certificate (FEMA Form 81-31) for each proposed structure, based on construction drawings, prior to issuance of building permits; and an

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

Elevation Certificate based on finished construction is required for each built structure prior to issuance of an occupancy permit

- Elevate the lowest floor above 134.00’ NAVD88 or 133.00’ NGVD29.
- Building support utility systems such as HVAC, electrical, plumbing, air conditioning equipment, including ductwork, and other service facilities must be elevated above the base flood elevation or otherwise protected from flood damage.

**VIII. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:**

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
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, local coastal program, 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"/>	1,2
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**FINDINGS:** Projects that have the potential to physically divide an established community include new freeways and highways, major arterials streets, and railroad lines. The proposed project will not physically divide an established community, and the project is consistent with the site’s General Plan Land Use designation.

Projects that have the potential to physically divide an established community include new freeways and highways, major arterials streets, and railroad lines. The proposed (up to) 14 unit single family detached residential project (Alternative A) with a potential new fire station would also provide infill housing within an existing residential neighborhood, and would therefore not physically divide an established neighborhood. The proposed (up to) 19 unit single family detached residential project (Alternative B) would provide infill housing within an existing residential neighborhood, and would therefore not physically divide an established community but rather provide a completion of that community. With either alternative site plan, the proposed project will be subject to architectural and site design review by the City at the Planned Development Permit stage. Such review will include conformance with the City’s adopted Residential Design Guidelines. The Guidelines are intended to ensure that new development is compatible with existing neighborhood character and does not adversely impact neighboring residential uses. A less than significant impact would occur as a result of the project.

The proposed project complies with setbacks required by the City of San José Residential Design Guidelines in order to avoid possible impacts to surrounding land uses.

The subject site is located in an area that is protected by an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan. However, no impacts would occur as a result of the new project.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None Required.

**IX. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:**

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,23
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,23

**FINDINGS:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

Extractive resources known to exist in and near the Santa Clara Valley include cement, sand, gravel, crushed rock, clay, and limestone. Santa Clara County has also supplied a significant portion of the nation's mercury over the past century. Pursuant to the mandate of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA), the State Mining and Geology Board has designated: the Communications Hill Area (Sector EE), bounded generally by the Southern Pacific Railroad, Curtner Avenue, State Route 87, and Hillsdale Avenue, as containing mineral deposits which are of regional significance as a source of construction aggregate materials.

Neither the State Geologist nor the State Mining and Geology Board has classified any other areas in San José as containing mineral deposits which are either of statewide significance or the significance of which requires further evaluation. Therefore, other than the Communications Hill area cited above, San José does not have mineral deposits subject to SMARA.

The project site is outside of the Communications Hill area, and will therefore not result in a significant impact from the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required.

**X. NOISE - Would the project result in:**

a) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,13,18
b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
c) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
d) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
f) For a project within the vicinity of a 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**FINDINGS:**

The San Jose 2020 General Plan states that the City's acceptable exterior noise level is 55 DNL long term, and 60 DNL short term. The acceptable interior noise level is 45 DNL. The plan recognizes that the noise levels may not be achieved in the Downtown, and in the vicinity of major roadways and the Mineta San Jose International Airport.

**1. Noise Impacts from the Project**

*a) Project-Generated Traffic / Noise Impacts*

As described in the Transportation section, the proposed project would generate up to approximately 190 net new average daily trips. As traffic would normally have to double to create a significant noise impact, traffic generated by this project is not expected to substantially increase noise levels in the project area.

*b) Short-Term Construction Impacts*

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

Noise from the construction of the proposed project could potentially pose a significant impact to the surrounding residential properties. To limit the construction noise impacts on nearby properties, various mitigation measures have been incorporated into the proposal.

**2. Noise Impacts to the Project.** The future exterior noise level at the site is not expected to exceed 60 DNL, therefore no mitigation is required.

**STANDARD MEASURES:**

- Construction will be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday for any on-site or off-site work within 500 feet of any residential unit. Construction outside of these hours may be approved through a development permit based on a site-specific construction noise mitigation plan and a finding by the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement that the construction noise mitigation plan is adequate to prevent noise disturbance of affected residential uses.
- The contractor shall use “new technology” power construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. All internal combustion engines used on the project site shall be equipped with adequate mufflers and shall be in good mechanical condition to minimize noise created by faulty or poor maintained engines or other components.
- Locate stationary noise generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors. Staging areas shall be located a minimum of 200 feet from noise sensitive receptors, such as residential uses.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

**XI. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:**

a) Induce substantial population 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**FINDINGS:**

The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth because it has a net density of 8.0 DU/AC which is consistent with the General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation of Medium Low Density Residential (8.0 DU/AC).

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

**XII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the 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:					
Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**FINDINGS:**

The project site is located in an urbanized area of San Jose, and well served by existing Fire, Police, School, Park and other Public Facilities. The site is served by two fire stations within five minutes response time. No additional Fire or Police personnel or equipment are necessary to serve the proposed project.

As required by California Government Code Section 53080, the project will be required to pay a school impact fee for residential development to offset the increased demands on school facilities caused by the project. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on school facilities.

There are two developed parks within walking distance (3/4 mile) of the project site. Lake Cunningham Park is located across the street from the subject site and contains jogging trails, boating pier, volleyball courts, horseshoe pits, water amusement park, picnic areas, concession stand, and boat rentals.

**STANDARD MEASURES:**

- In accordance with California Government Code Section 65996, the developer shall pay a school impact fee, to the School District, to offset the increased demands on school facilities caused by the proposed project.
- The project shall conform to the City’s *Park Impact Ordinance (PIO)* and *Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PDO)* (Municipal Code Chapter 19.38).

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** None required.

**XIII. RECREATION**

a) Would the project 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**FINDINGS:**

The City of San José has adopted the Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PDO) (Chapter 19.38) and Park Impact Ordinance (PIO) requiring residential developers to dedicate public parkland or pay in-lieu fees, or both, to offset the demand for neighborhood parkland created by their housing developments. Each new residential project is required to conform to the PDO and PIO. The acreage of parkland required is based upon the Acreage Dedication Formula outlined in the Parkland Dedication Ordinance.

The proposed project would increase the number of residents on the site. Although the project includes recreational space for new residents in the form of private rear yards, the project would add to the residential population using nearby recreational facilities. However, the project is not expected to increase the use of existing parks such that substantial deterioration would occur or be accelerated.

The proposed project will not increase the number of residents on the site, and therefore is not expected to impact the use of existing parks or recreation centers such that deterioration would occur or be accelerated.

**STANDARD MEASURES:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

- The project shall conform to the City’s *Park Impact Ordinance (PIO)* and *Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PDO)* (Municipal Code Chapter 19.38). Park impact and dedication fees will be required to be paid at the Building Permit stage.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

**XIV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project:**

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio of roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,19
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,19
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,19
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,19
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,20
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,18
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,18

**FINDINGS:**

The City’s Department of Public Works has analyzed the proposed project and determined that it would be in conformance with the City’s Transportation Level of Service Policy (Council Policy 5-3) and would not create a significant traffic impact. The proposed project would at the most generate up to 190 daily average trips per day (Alternative B).

The project site is located in the Evergreen-East Hills Development Policy Area and has no existing traffic allocation. The Traffic Impact Fee is based upon a fair-share contribution towards the cost of provided transportation improvements that directly mitigate the traffic impacts associated with the development authorized by this policy. The traffic impact fee shall be paid to the City prior to the issuance of Building Permits for new development. Payment of the Evergreen traffic impact fee will reduce the potential traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

The proposed project is providing two covered parking spaces and two driveway apron per unit, which is in conformance with City’s Residential Design Guidelines.

MITIGATION MEASURES: A Traffic Impact Fee payment shall be required for the proposed residential units. The 2008 residential Traffic Impact fee is \$13,214 for each proposed unit. This fee is subject to annual increase per the Construction Cost Index published by the Engineering News Record (ENR).

**XV. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:**

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,15
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	------

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,21
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,17
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,22
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,21
f) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,21
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,21

**FINDINGS:**

The proposed project would not require construction of new facilities for wastewater treatment, storm drainage, water, or waste disposal because the subject site is located within the City of San Jose Urban Service Area where such facilities exist, and have the capacity to serve the proposed project.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

**XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

a) Does the project have the potential to (1) degrade the quality of the environment, (2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, (3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, (4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, (5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or (6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,10
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,16
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**FINDINGS:**

As discussed in the previous sections, the proposed project will not have significant environmental effects. Mitigation is required to reduce the impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level in regards to flooding and traffic.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

## CHECKLIST REFERENCES

1. Environmental Clearance Application – File No.
2. San Jose 2020 General Plan
3. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of SC County, August 1968
4. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Important Farmlands of SC County map, June 1979
5. State of California’s Geo-Hazard maps / Alquist Priolo Fault maps
6. Riparian Corridor Policy Study 1994
7. San Jose Historic Resources Inventory
8. City of San Jose Archeological Sensitivity Maps
9. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Santa Clara County, 1986
10. California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, 2001
11. City of San Jose Heritage Tree Survey Report
12. California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, 1998
13. City of San Jose Noise Exposure Map for the 2020 General Plan
14. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. April 1996, revised 1999.
15. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board 1995 Basin Plan
16. Final Environmental Impact Report, City of San Jose, SJ 2020 General Plan
17. Santa Clara Valley Water District
18. City of San Jose Title 20 Zoning Ordinance
19. San Jose Department of Public Works
20. San Jose Fire Department
21. San Jose Environmental Services Department
22. San Jose Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company
23. California Division of Mines and Geology
24. Cooper Clark, San Jose Geotechnical Information Maps, July 1974