CITY OF SAN JOSE
CAPITAL OF SILICON VALLEY

Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
STEPHEN M. HAASE, AICP, DIRECTOR

INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT FILE NO.: GP03-03-03/GPT03-03-03

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: General Plan amendment to change the Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation for a 3.2-acre site from Mixed Use (25-150 DU/AC) (Tamien Station Area Planned Community) to Transit Corridor Residential (25+ DU/AC) and an associated text amendment to reflect the proposed land use changes in the Tamien Station Area Specific Plan and to allow the residential structures built along Lick Avenue to maintain a set back of no less than 5 feet (Tamien Station Area Planned Community).

PROJECT LOCATION: North side of Alma Avenue between Lick Avenue to the east and Highway 87 to the west.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Mixed Use (25-150 DU/AC) (Tamien Station Area Planned Community)

ZONING: Light Industrial (LI)

SURROUNDING LAND USES: Light Industrial and Residential

PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS: The Schoennauer Company, Gary Schoennauer
2066 Clarmar Way, San Jose, CA 95128

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

☐	I find 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 the project proponent has agreed to revise the project to avoid any significant effect. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
☐	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT(EIR) is required.
☐	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.
☐	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 NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are included in the project, and further analysis is not required.

_____
Date

_____
Signature
Name of Preparer: Lesley Xavier
Phone No.: (408) 277-4576

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☒	☐	☐	1,2
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2
e) Increase the amount of shade in public and private open space on adjacent sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
The proposed change in land use to Transit Corridor Residential could alter the existing visual character of the subject site. The existing use of the site is a bowling alley and single story office building and parking lot, if the site were to be developed as residential, the existing use would be demolished and new housing built, which would change the visual character of the site.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
Implementing the following General Plan policies would mitigate the impact described above:

- Urban Conservation Policy #2: The City should encourage new development which enhances the desirable qualities of the community and existing neighborhoods.
- Urban Design Policy #1: The City should continue to apply strong architectural and site design controls on all types of development for the protection and development of neighborhood character and for the proper transition between areas with different types of land uses.
- Urban Design Policy #8: Design solutions should be considered in the development review process which addresses security, aesthetics, and public safety.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,3,4
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,3,4

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: Any project developed on the site would be infill development. So, the proposed land use change to residential will not impact agriculture resources.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
None Required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
III. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,14
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,14
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,14
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,14

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
The proposed land use change to Transit Corridor Residential (this designation allows for ground floor retail, but it is not required) is on an infill site and will not have an impact on air quality. 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. BAAQMD manages air quality issues and concerns in the Bay Area. Based on the threshold of significance, projects that are less than, or equal to, 510 multi-family dwelling units and 24,000 square feet of retail are not considered major air pollutant contributors. The potential units and retail square footage under the proposed land use designation are less than the established threshold of significance; therefore the change in land use will not have an impact on air quality.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
None Required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
IV. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,10
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,10
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☒	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
The change in land use to Transit Corridor Residential uses on the developed site will not have an impact on biological resources. The site is currently developed with a bowling alley office building, paved parking lot, and perimeter landscaping. The project is not proposing the removal of any trees at this time. However, future development of the site will be required to conform to General Plan Goals and Policies.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
Implementing the following General Plan policies would mitigate any impact of future development:

- Urban Forest Policy #2: Development projects should include the preservation of ordinance-sized and other significant trees. Any adverse affect on the health and longevity of native oaks, ordinance sized or other significant trees should be avoided through appropriate design measures and construction practices. When tree preservation is not feasible, the project should include appropriate tree replacement.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,7,24
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐	1,8
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,8
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,8

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
The subject site is not listed on the San Jose Historic Resources Inventory. An historical report on the site indicated that the project should not have any significant impact on historic resources. The subject site is located within an area of archeological sensitivity. In the event that an archeological resource is discovered during development of the property the City's Historic, Archeological, and Cultural Resources Goals and policies would mitigate any impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
Implementing the following General Plan policies would mitigate the impact described above:

- Historic, Archeological, and Cultural Resources Policy #1: Because historically or archeologically significant sites, structures, and districts are irreplaceable resources, their preservation should be a key consideration in the development review process.
- Historic, Archeological, and Cultural Resources Policy #8: For proposed development sites which have been identified as archaeologically sensitive, the City should require investigation during the planning process in order to determine whether valuable archaeological remains may be affected by the project and should also require that appropriate mitigation measures be incorporated into the project design.
- Historic, Archeological, and Cultural Resources Policy #9: Recognizing that Native American burials may be encountered at unexpected locations, the City should impose a requirement on all development permits and tentative subdivision maps that upon discovery of such burials during construction, development activity will cease until professional archaeological examination and reburial in an appropriate manner is accomplished.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:					
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.)	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,5
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐	1,5
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☒	☐	☒	1,5
4) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,5
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,5
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,5
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,5
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,5

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
The site is currently graded flat with an asphalt parking lot serving the two buildings on the site, a bowling alley and an office building. Changing the land use on the site to Transit Corridor Residential will not impact the geology and soils of the site. The closest known fault to the site is the Hayward Fault Line. In the event that strong seismic ground shaking should occur, General Plan policies would mitigate the impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
Implementing the following General Plan policies would mitigate the impact described above:

- Hazards Policy #1: Development should only be permitted in those areas where potential to the health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the community can be mitigated to an acceptable level.
- Soils and Geologic Conditions Policy #1: The City should require soils and geologic review of development proposals to asses such hazards as potential seismic hazards, surface ruptures, liquefaction, landsliding, mudsliding, erosion, and sedimentation in order to determine if these hazards can be adequately mitigated.
- Earthquakes Policy #1: The City should require that all new buildings be designed and constructed to resist stresses produced by earthquakes.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
VII. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
The subject site is not listed on the California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List. The proposed change in land use to Transit Corridor Residential will not create any hazards or hazardous materials.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
None required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,17
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,9
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1
j) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
The site is not subject to the one-percent flood. Future development of the site will be required to conform to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) to reduce impacts on storm water quality. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) may be required at the time of future development, in compliance with State regulations, to control the discharge of storm water pollutants.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
None required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
The proposed change in land use to the Transit Corridor Residential (25+ DU/AC) designation is not inherently incompatible with any applicable City plans or policies. The subject site has an existing General Plan and Tamien Station Area Specific Plan land use designation of Mixed Use (25-150 DU/AC). This designation allows a combination of high density residential, and commercial uses in a vertical configuration. The proposed land use designation for the site is Transit Corridor Residential (25+ DU/AC), which allows for wholly residential projects or for residential with ground floor retail. This designation is essentially the same as the existing Mixed Use designation in that high density residential and commercial uses are permitted under both designations.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
- None required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
X. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2,23

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
A change in land use to residential will not result in the loss of mineral resources. The proposed project is a change in the land use designation on the subject site, which is not a physical change to the site.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
None required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
XI. 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐	1,2,13,18 26
b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
A change in land use to Transit Corridor Residential uses will not create a noise impact. The site is located adjacent to VTA Light Rail Transit, railroad tracks used by freight trains, Caltrain, and Amtrak, and Highway 87 (Guadalupe Parkway) therefore, future commercial and residential development could be exposed to noise in excess of General Plan noise guidelines. According to the Noise Report prepared by Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc. the site had anticipated future DNLs between 64 and 75 DNL. Development on the site will be required to conform to the applicable San Jose 2020 General Plan noise policies. Mitigation measures were proposed in the Noise Report.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
Implementing the following General Plan policies would mitigate the impact described above:

- Noise Policy #1: The City's acceptable noise level objectives are 55 DNL as the long-range exterior noise quality level, 60 DNL as the short-range exterior noise quality level, 45 DNL as the interior noise quality level, and 76 DNL as the maximum exterior noise level necessary to avoid significant adverse health effects. These objectives are established for the City, recognizing that the attainment of exterior noise quality levels in the environs of the San José International Airport the Downtown Core Area, and along

major roadways may not be achieved in the time frame of this Plan. To achieve the noise objectives, the City should require appropriate site and building design, building construction and noise attenuation techniques in new residential development.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
XII. 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐	1,2
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1

DISCUSSION IMPACTS:
The current land use designation on the subject property is Mixed Use (25-150 DU/AC). The proposed change to the subject site's land use designation to Transit Corridor Residential (25+ DU/AC) will potentially add approximately 224. This increase in density will not induce substantial growth because the site is located within an urbanized area on a site that is already designated for residential use.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
None required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:					
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	1,2
Police Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐	1,2
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐	1,2
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐	1,2
Other Public Facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
Adequate municipal services are available to serve the site because it is located within an already urbanized area and any development on the site would be infill development.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
None required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*

XIV. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
Adequate recreational services are available to serve the site because it is located within an already urbanized area and any development on the site would be infill development.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
None required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*

XV. 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,19
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,20
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,18
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2,18

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
In the context of the San Jose 2020 General Plan horizon year, this project would have a less than significant traffic impact. The City of San Jose Department of Transportation analyzed the subject General Plan amendment and determined that the estimated number of p.m. peak hour trips did not exceed the exemption threshold established for the area; therefore, the change in land use would not have a traffic impact. In addition, prior to development, this project will conform to all adopted City level of service and traffic policies in order to ensure adequate traffic capacity for existing and approved development.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
None required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,15
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,2,21
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,17
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,21
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,21
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒	1,21

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:
Adequate utilities and service systems are available to serve the site because it is located within an already urbanized area and any development on the site would be infill development.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
None required.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
XIV. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	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 and the effects of other current projects.	☐	☐	☒	☐	1,16
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐	1

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:

The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment in terms of mandatory findings of significance in that the site does not contain any fish, wildlife, or endangered species and habitat. The site is located within an area of archeological sensitivity. Any development proposal on the site will be required to conform to the City's Historic, Archeological, and Cultural Resources Goals and policies. Conformance with the San Jose 2020 General Plan Policies will reduce the identified environmental impacts to a less than significant level.

EARLIER ANALYSIS

1. Earlier Analysis Used:

2. Impacts Adequately Addressed:

3. Mitigation Measures:

CHECKLIST REFERENCES

1. Environmental Clearance Application – File No. GP03-03-03/GPT03-03-03
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. Historical Evaluation of the Alma Bowl Structure, Archaeological Resource Management, May 2001
25. Preliminary Aesthetics and Shade/Shadow Study, Barry Swenson Builder, April 2001
26. Alma Avenue Noise Study, Charles M. Salter Associates. Inc., April 2001