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1. **Introduction**

This document is an Initial Study for the Cambrian School District General Plan Amendment Project (proposed project) prepared by the City of San José (City) to determine if the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment as defined in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Pursuant to Sections 15050 and 15051 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City is the lead agency for the proposed project.

The project site is on a 10-acre parcel located at 1975 Cambrianna Drive in San José. The project site is assigned Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 414-21-062.

1.1 **INITIAL STUDY**

Pursuant to Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study is a preliminary environmental analysis that is used by the lead agency as a basis for determining what form of environmental review is required for a project. The CEQA Guidelines require that an Initial Study contain a project description of the project, identification of environmental setting, identification of environmental effects by checklist or other similar form, explanation of the agency’s conclusions about environmental effects, discussion of mitigation for any significant environmental effects, evaluation of the project’s consistency with applicable plans and land use controls, and the name of persons who prepared the study.

1.2 **REPORT ORGANIZATION**

This Initial Study is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1: Introduction.** This chapter provides an introduction and overview of the Initial Study document.

- **Chapter 2: Initial Study Checklist – Project Information.** This chapter summarizes pertinent details of the proposed project, including lead agency contact information, proposed project location, project applicant contact information, and General Plan and Zoning designations.

- **Chapter 3: Project Description.** This chapter describes the location and setting of the proposed project, along with its principal components, as well as a description of the required permits and approvals for the proposed project.

---

1 The CEQA Guidelines are found in California Code of Regulations, Title, 14, Sections 15000 et seq.
\[ \text{Chapter 4: Environmental Analysis}, \text{ Making use of the 2019 CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Environmental Checklist, this chapter identifies and discusses anticipated impacts of the proposed project on the environment and provides substantiation for the findings made.} \]

\[ \text{Chapter 5: Organizations and Persons Consulted. This chapter presents a list of City and other agencies and consultant team members that contributed to the preparation of the Initial Study.} \]
## 2. Initial Study Checklist – Project Information

1. **Project Title:** Cambrian School District General Plan Amendment  
2. **Project File No.:** GP20-003  
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of San José  
   Department of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement  
   200 East Santa Clara Street  
   San José, CA 95113  
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**  
   Environmental Project Manager: Thai-Chau Le  
   Thai-Chau.Le@sanjoseca.gov  
   (408) 535-5658  
   Planning Project Manager: Jessica Setiawan  
   Jessica.Setiawan@sanjoseca.gov  
   (408) 535-7804  
5. **Project Location:** The project site is located at 1975 Cambrianna Drive, and assigned Assessor’s Parcel Number 414-21-062  
6. **Project Applicant’s Name and Address:** Cambrian School District (CSD)  
   4115 Jacksol Drive  
   San José, CA 95124  
   Dr. Carrie Andrews, Superintendent  
   (408) 377-2103  
7. **General Plan Land Use Designation:** Public/Quasi-Public (PQP)  
8. **Zoning:** R-1-8 Zoning District (8 dwelling units per acre)  
9. **Description of Project:** General Plan Amendment: PQP to Residential Neighborhood (RN) on 2.5 acres of the parcel.  
10. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** North: Single-family homes off Geneva Avenue, Elaine Drive, and Browning Avenue  
    East: Single-family homes off Taper Avenue  
    South: Single-family homes off Cambrianna Drive, Elaine Drive, and Browning Avenue  
    West: California Sports Center and the 7 Magic Flowers and ATLC (A Tyson Loving Care) preschools  
    Please see Figure 3-2, Project Site, surrounding land uses and setting.
11. Other Public Agencies whose Approval is Required: N/A

INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

All documents cited in this report and used in its preparation are hereby incorporated by reference into this Initial Study. Copies of documents referenced herein are available for review at City of San José Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, 200 East Santa Clara Street, San José, CA 95113, during normal business hours.
3. **Project Description**

This chapter describes the Cambrian School District General Plan Amendment Project, referred to in this Initial Study as the “proposed project.” The proposed project constitutes an amendment to the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* (General Plan) Land Use/Transportation Diagram to facilitate potential future development on the project site. This chapter describes the existing conditions of the project site and surrounding area, the project goals and the components of the proposed project, and also provides a description of required approvals.

3.1 **PROJECT LOCATION AND SITE CHARACTERISTICS**

3.1.1 **REGIONAL AND LOCAL LOCATION**

The project site is located in San José. As shown on Figure 3-1, San José is located in Santa Clara County, California, which is situated along the southernmost point of the San Francisco Bay. San José is bordered by the cities of Sunnyvale, Campbell, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Morgan Hill, and Cupertino. San José is accessed through the regional roadway network, including Interstates 280, 680, and 880, US Highway 101 (Highway 101), and State Routes (SR) 17, 85, 87 (Guadalupe Parkway), and 237. SR 87 runs north to south through the western portion of San José just east of the project site, connecting Interstate 280 (I-280), which runs roughly northwest to southeast through San José, and Highway 101, which runs roughly northwest to southeast through San José.

The project site is located at 1975 Cambrianna Drive. As shown on Figure 3-2, the project site is located in an urbanized and built-out area in San José consisting of mostly single-family homes neighborhoods and associated amenities. The project site was historically the Metzler Elementary School campus and that school building is currently occupied with the California Sports Center and the 7 Magic Flowers and ATLC (A Tyson Loving Care) preschools. The project site is bounded by single-family homes to the north, east, and south, and Union Avenue on the west. Further west across Union Avenue is the Campbell Union High School District administrative facilities, a church, the Camden Community Center, and commercial land uses. Figure 3-1 shows the portion of the project site in its local context. The project site is located on land owned by the CSD and is assigned Accessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 414-21-062.
Figure 3-1
Regional and Vicinity Map

Source: ESRI, 2018; City of San José, 2018; PlaceWorks, 2020.
CAMBRIAN SCHOOL DISTRICT GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT INITIAL STUDY
CITY OF SAN JOSÉ

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Figure 3-2

Project Site

Source: Google Earth Pro, 2018; PlaceWorks, 2020.
3.1.2 EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING DESIGNATION

3.1.2.1 GENERAL PLAN

The project site is currently designated Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) in the General Plan. The PQP designation includes public land uses, such as schools, colleges, corporation yards, homeless shelters, libraries, fire stations, water treatment facilities, convention centers and auditoriums, museums, governmental offices and airports. Joint development projects which include public and private participation—such as a jointly administered public/private research institute or an integrated convention center/hotel/restaurant complex—are allowed. This category is also used to designate lands used by some private entities, including private schools, daycare centers, hospitals, public utilities, and the facilities of any organization involved in the provision of public services such as gas, water, electricity, and telecommunications facilities that are consistent in character with established public land uses. Private community gathering facilities, including those used for religious assembly or other comparable assembly activity, are also appropriate on lands with this designation. Additionally, the PQP designation also allows residential development for only transitional and supportive housing for the formerly homeless.

The appropriate intensity of development can vary considerably depending on potential impacts on surrounding uses and the particular type of PQP development on the site. A common measure of commercial or industrial building intensity is Floor Area Ratio (FAR), which is determined by dividing the amount of floor space in a building by the total area of the parcel it occupies. For example, a 10,000-square-foot building on a 20,000-square-foot parcel has a FAR of 0.5. The measure for residential building density is dwelling units per acre (DU/AC), which is determined by dividing the number of planned units by the site acreage. For example, a development with 300 units on a 3-acre lot would have a 100 DU/AC intensity. The PQP designation does not have a formal intensity limit for any type of development.

3.1.2.2 ZONING

The project site is within the R-1-8 Zoning District, which permits a potential 8 dwelling units per acre. Other uses that are permitted in the R-1-8 Zoning District include residential care facility with six or fewer persons, residential service facility with six or fewer persons, servants quarters attached to a one-family dwelling or attached to a garage structure, accessory buildings and structures and home occupations, child day care center located on an existing school site or as an incident to an on-site church/religious assembly use involving no building additions or changes to the site, elementary and secondary public schools, small certified farmers’ market, neighborhood agriculture, outdoor vending—fresh fruits and vegetables, wireless communication antenna, building mounted, and solar photovoltaic systems. However, development is required to conform to development standards and regulations as stated in the San José Municipal Code (SJMC) Section 20.30.200 (Development Standards).

---

2 City of San José, 2011. Envision San José 2040 General Plan, Chapter 5 (Interconnected City), page 12.
3 City of San José Municipal Code, Title 20 (Zoning), Chapter 20.30 (Residential Zoning Districts), Section 20.30.100 (Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements).
3.1.2.3  PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Plan Bay Area is the Bay Area’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy (RTP/SCS). The Plan Bay Area was originally adopted on July 18, 2013 and the updated Plan Bay Area 2040 was adopted on July 26, 2017. Plan Bay Area 2040 is currently being updated for Plan Bay Area 2050. The RTP/SCS sets a development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, would reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from transportation (excluding goods movement) beyond the per capita reduction targets identified by California Air Resources Board (CARB). Plan Bay Area 2040 remains on track to meet a 16 percent per capita reduction of GHG emissions by 2035 and a 10 percent per capita reduction by 2020 from 2005 conditions. To achieve MTC/ABAG’s sustainable vision for the Bay Area, Plan Bay Area 2040 concentrates the majority of new population and employment growth in the region in transit-oriented, infill development Priority Development Areas (PDAs) within existing communities. The project site is not located within a PDA; however, it is located within approximately 0.5 miles of the Bascom Urban Village PDA to the north and 0.2 miles from the Camden Urban Village to the south.

3.1.3  PROJECT SITE EXISTING CONDITIONS

As previously stated, and shown on Figure 3-2, the project site was the former home of an elementary school that is currently used as a private sports center and two private daycare facilities. Those uses occupy about 7.5 acres of the project site. The remaining 2.5 acres located on the eastern-most portion of the site include maintained lawn (vegetated) and paved areas, but there are no existing structures on this portion of the site. Vehicular and pedestrian access to the project site is currently provided via Cambrianna Drive on the south side of the project site.

3.1.4  EXISTING CONDITIONS OF ADJACENT PARCELS

The properties surrounding the project site to the north, east, south, and west have the Residential Neighborhood (RN) General Plan land use designation. The RN land use designation is applied broadly throughout the city to encompass most of the established, single-family residential neighborhoods, including both the suburban and traditional residential neighborhood areas which comprise the majority of its developed land.

3.2  PROJECT GOALS

Currently, public school districts rely on inadequate State funding to operate, educate, and provide capital fund and repairs to existing and future facilities. To provide high quality education to their students, the

---

4 Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2017, March. Plan Bay Area 2040.

CSD is taking a proactive approach by better utilizing their assets. The proposed project will provide a long-term stable source of revenue for CSD by obtaining fair market value on the sale of or lease of its real property assets through an open and competitive development process. The proposed land use change will create an opportunity for income and provide uses that are compatible with the existing community.

### 3.2.1 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

The proposed project would result in a General Plan Amendment to re-designate the General Plan land use designation from PQP to RN on only the 2.5-acre portion of the site. See Figure 3-3. No development project is proposed at this time.

The RN land use designation is applied broadly throughout the City to encompass most of the established, single-family residential neighborhoods, including both the suburban and traditional residential neighborhood areas which comprise the majority of its developed land. The intent of the RN land use designation is to preserve the existing character of these neighborhoods and to strictly limit new development to infill projects which closely conform to the prevailing existing neighborhood character as defined by density, lot size and shape, massing and neighborhood form and pattern. New infill development should improve and/or enhance existing neighborhood conditions by completing the existing neighborhood pattern and bringing infill properties into general conformance with the quality and character of the surrounding neighborhood. New infill development should be integrated into the existing neighborhood pattern, continuing and, where applicable, extending or completing the existing street network. The RN land use designation also could support the development of new commercial uses within established residential neighborhoods if located on busier streets or at a street intersection, provided such development does not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood. Hospitals and other healthcare facilities may potentially be located within such areas provided that any potential land use impacts can be mitigated. Commercial uses in these locations will typically be limited to home occupations or similar home-based commercial activities unlikely to create a nuisance within the established Residential Neighborhood setting. Private Community Gathering Facilities compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood are also supported under this land use designation. The allowable residential density is typically 8 dwelling units per acre and should match the existing neighborhood character. The allowable density/intensity would be determined using a FAR range of up to 0.7, which generally ranges from one to two and a half stories.6

---
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Figure 3-3

General Plan Land Use Amendment

3.2.2 POTENTIAL FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

While no development project is proposed at this time, the proposed General Plan Amendment on the 2.5-acre area could facilitate future development on the project site. The RN land use designation allows a density of 8 dwelling units per acre or the prevailing neighborhood density, whichever is lower. In this case, the prevailing neighborhood density is 8 dwelling units per acre and therefore, 20 single-family units\(^7\) is an appropriate assumption. However, this is a conservative assumption without reduction in areas for new roads or yard spaces. For the purpose of this analysis, an assumption of 20 units will be used, consistent with City of San José Traffic Demand Forecasting (TDF) modeling, and therefore, would result in approximately 64 new residents.\(^8,9\)

3.2.3 UTILITY PROVIDERS

The utility providers in San José that could serve potential future development on the project site are comprised of the following:

- The San José Water Company would supply water for potential future development on the project site.\(^10\)
- Sanitary wastewater generated by potential future development on the project site would be treated by the San José-Santa Clara Regional Wastewater Facility located north of the City of San José.\(^11\)
- The City of San José Environmental Services Department oversees multiple recycling and garbage collection service providers for the City. The city is primarily served by five landfills, nine recycling and transfer stations, five composting facilities, and eight processing facilities for construction and demolition debris.\(^12\) Solid waste generated within the County of Santa Clara is landfilled at the Guadalupe Mines, Kirby Canyon, Newby Canyon, Zanker Road Materials Processing Facility, and Zanker Road landfills.
- Default electricity would be supplied by San José Clean Energy (SJCE). Electricity infrastructure and gas would be supplied to potential future development on the project site by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E). Telephone, cable, and fiber optic lines could be provided by a number of providers (e.g., AT&T, Comcast, etc.).

---

\(^7\) 2.5 acres \(\times\) 8 dwelling units per acre = 20 dwelling units.


\(^9\) 20 dwelling units \(\times\) 3.19 persons per household = 64 total residents.


\(^12\) City of San José, 2008. Assessment of Infrastructure for the Integrated Waste Management Zero Waste Strategic Plan Development.
3.2.4 PUBLIC SERVICE PROVIDERS

Public service providers that would serve the project site include the following:

- Fire protection services are provided by the San José Fire Department (SJFD).
- Police protection services are provided by the San José Police Department (SJPD), which is headquartered at 201 West Mission Street.
- The San José Departments of Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services, and Public Works, are responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of all City park and recreational facilities. The City provides and manages regional, neighborhood and community parkland, community gardens and open space lands. Some recreation facilities available to San José residents are also provided by other public agencies, such as playgrounds and fields on public school sites, County parks, and City trails, and PG&E Company lands.13
- The project site is within the boundaries of the Campbell Union High School District (CUHSD) and the CSD.14 The closest public schools to the project site are Ida Price Charter Middle School (0.5 miles to the northeast) in the CSD, Fammatre Elementary School in the CSD (0.4 miles to the northeast), and Steindorf K-8 STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math) School in the CSD (0.5 miles to the east).
- The San José Public Library System consists of 25 libraries. The closest library to the project site is the Cambrian Branch Library, which is 0.7 miles to the west.

3.3 REQUIRED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

As previously described, the proposed project is a General Plan Amendment. General Plan Amendments are evaluated and approved by the City of San José City Council. No development is proposed, and no other permits or approvals are required.

---

This page intentionally left blank.
4. Environmental Analysis

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the existing environmental conditions on the project site and the project area and environmental impacts that could occur with implementation of the proposed project CEQA. The California Supreme Court in a December 2015 opinion [California Building Industry Association (CBIA) v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), 62 Cal. 4th 369 (No. S 213478)], here in referred to as CBIA v. BAAQMD, confirmed that CEQA, with several specific exceptions, is concerned with the impacts of a project on the environment, and not the effects the existing environment may have on a project. Therefore, the evaluation of the significance of project impacts under CEQA in the following sections focuses on impacts of the project on the environment, including whether a project may exacerbate existing environmental hazards. The City currently has policies that address existing conditions (e.g., noise) affecting a proposed project, which are also addressed below. This is consistent with one of the primary objectives of CEQA and this document, which is to provide objective information to decision makers and the public regarding a project as a whole. The CEQA Guidelines and the courts are clear that a CEQA document (e.g., Initial Study or EIR) can include information of interest even if such information is not an “environmental impact” as defined by CEQA. Therefore, where applicable, in addition to describing the impacts of the project on the environment, this chapter will discuss issues that relate to City policies pertaining to existing conditions. Such examples include, but are not limited to, locating a project near sources of air emissions that can pose a health risk or in a high noise environment.

As part of the approval process, the City requires future projects to comply with any “Potential Measures” that would lessen or avoid environmental impacts. In addition, many of the policies and actions in the General Plan have been adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts resulting from future development within the city. Because the San José Zoning Ordinance implements the General Plan by establishing comprehensive zoning rules for the city, many of the zoning regulations would also lessen or avoid environmental impacts from future development in the city. All future development facilitated by the proposed General Plan land use designations would be subject to City regulations, as well as other federal, State, and regional regulations that lessen or avoid environmental impacts. In addition, the City could require additional measures to further reduce potential impacts. The proposed project would result in changes at the policy level and does not include a specific development proposal; however, these mitigating requirements would apply to potential future development on the project site that would be facilitated by implementation of the proposed project. The applicable mitigating requirements are described under each of the following environmental checklist categories. As described in this chapter, all impacts were found to have no impact or to be either less than significant through compliance with mandatory regulations.
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

I. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views (those experienced from publicly accessible vantage points) of the site and its surroundings, or in an urbanized area, conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Regulatory Framework

State

California Scenic Highway Program

The California Scenic Highway Program, maintained by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), protects State scenic highway corridors from changes which would diminish the aesthetic value of lands adjacent to the highways. Highways are designated as “scenic” depending on visibility of natural landscape to travelers, scenic quality of the landscape, and extent of development intruding on travelers’ enjoyment of the view. The State Scenic Highway System includes those that are eligible for designation and those that are officially designated. These highways are listed in Section 263 of the Streets and Highways Code.15

---

California Building Code

The State of California provides a minimum standard for building design and outdoor lighting standards through Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The California Building Code is located in Part 2 of Title 24. The California Building Code is updated every three years, and the current 2019 California Building Code went into effect in January 2020. It is generally adopted on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis, subject to further modification based on local conditions.

California Green Building Standards Code of the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11, known as CALGreen, establishes building standards aimed at enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts that have a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices. Specifically, Section 5.106.8, Light Pollution Reduction, establishes backlight, uplight, and glare ratings to minimize the effects of light pollution for nonresidential development. The California Building Code and CALGreen have been adopted for use by the City of San José, according to SJMC Section 24.03.100 and Section 24.10.100, respectively. Commercial and residential buildings are plan-checked by City building officials for mandatory compliance with the California Building Code and CALGreen.

Local

City Council Policy 4-3, Outdoor Lighting on Private Developments

Adopted March 1, 1983 and revised June 20, 2000, City Council Policy 4-3, Outdoor Lighting on Private Developments, promotes energy-efficient lighting which furthers the goals of the Sustainable City Major Strategy. Policy 4-3 calls for private development to use energy-efficient outdoor lighting that is fully shielded and not directed skyward. Low-pressure sodium lighting is required unless a photometric study is done, and the proposed lighting referred to Lick Observatory for review and comment. One of the purposes of this policy is to provide for the continued enjoyment of the night sky and for continuing operation of Lick Observatory, by reducing light pollution and sky glow.16

General Plan

Scenic Resources

The General Plan describes Gateways as locations which announce to a visitor or resident that they are entering the city, or a unique neighborhood. San José has a number of Gateway locations. Urban Corridors designated in the General Plan are all State and Interstate Highways within the City’s Sphere of Influence. Together, Gateways and Urban Corridors contribute greatly to the overall image of San José and the image of its individual communities. When made and kept attractive and inviting, Gateways and Urban Corridors

---

16 City of San José, 2000, Council Policy 4-3, Outdoor Lighting on Private Developments. (https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showdocument?id=12835),
contribute to the lasting positive impression of a city or area, contribute to the quality of life, and can encourage private investment and economic activity.17

Goals and Policies

The Community Design (CD) and Vibrant Neighborhoods (VN) sections of the General Plan includes the following goals and policies specific to visual resources and applicable to potential future development facilitated by the proposed project.

- **Goal CD-1 Attractive City** – Create a well-designed, unique, and vibrant public realm with appropriate uses and facilities to maximize pedestrian activity; support community interaction; and attract residents, business, and visitors to San José.
  - **Policy CD-1.1:** Require the highest standards of architectural and site design, and apply strong design controls for all development projects, both public and private, for the enhancement and development of community character and for the proper transition between areas with different types of land uses.
  - **Policy CD-1.8:** Create an attractive street presence with pedestrian-scaled building and landscaping elements that provide an engaging, safe, and diverse walking environment. Encourage compact, urban design, including use of smaller building footprints, to promote pedestrian activity throughout the City.
  - **Policy CD-1.13:** Use design review to encourage creative, high-quality, innovative, and distinctive architecture that helps to create unique, vibrant places that are both desirable urban places to live, work, and play and that lead to competitive advantages over other regions.
  - **Policy CD-1.23:** Further the Community Forest Goals and Policies in this Plan by requiring new development to plant and maintain trees at appropriate locations on private property and along public street frontages. Use trees to help soften the appearance of the built environment, help provide transitions between land uses, and shade pedestrian and bicycle areas.

- **Goal CD-4 Compatibility** – Provide aesthetically pleasing streetscapes and new development that preserves and builds on the unique characteristics of the local area and contributes to a distinctive neighborhood or community identify.
  - **Policy CD-4.3:** Promote consistent development patterns along streets, particularly in how buildings relate to the street, to promote a sense of visual order, and to provide attractive streetscapes.
  - **Policy CD-4.4:** In non-growth areas, design new development and subdivisions to reflect the character of predominant existing development of the same type in the surrounding area through the regulation of lot size, street frontage, height, building scale, siting/setbacks, and building orientation.

---

Policy CD-4.9: For development subject to design review, ensure the design of new or remodeled structures is consistent or complementary with the surrounding neighborhood fabric (including but not limited to prevalent building scale, building materials, and orientation of structures to the street).

Goal H-3 Housing – High Quality Housing and Great Places – Create and maintain safe and high quality housing that contributes to the creation of great neighborhoods and great places.

Policy H-3.1: Require the development of housing that incorporates the highest possible level of amenities, fit and finish, urban design and architectural quality.

Goal VN-1 Vibrant, Attractive, and Complete Neighborhoods- Develop new and preserve and enhance existing neighborhoods to be vibrant, attractive and complete.

Policy VN-1.10: Promote the preservation of positive character-defining elements in neighborhoods, such as architecture; design elements like setbacks, heights, number of stories, or attached/detached garages; landscape features; street design; etc.

Policy VN-1.12: Design new public and private development to build upon the vital character and desirable qualities of existing neighborhoods.

Design Guidelines and Design Review Process

All new development in San José is subject to a design review process that includes a review of architecture and site planning. Design review is based upon a series of City’s guidelines and development requirements to assist those persons involved in the design, construction, review and approval of development in San José. These guidelines seek to provide a common understanding of the minimum design standards that the City expects of all new development based on development types and locations. The design review process is used to evaluate projects for conformance with the adopted design guidelines and other relevant policies and ordinances, and for the inclusion of appropriate environmental mitigation. Specific design guidelines adopted by the City Council include those for: Downtown/Historic, North San José, Residential, Non-residential, and Specific Elements.18

Existing Conditions

As shown on Figure 3-2 in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Initial Study, the proposed area of change is located in an urbanized area and bounded by single-family homes to the north, east, and south, and the California Sports Center and ATLC and 7 Magic Flowers preschools to the west. The neighborhood contains primarily single-family residential homes, with public and commercial land uses, such as grocery stores, restaurants, the Camden Community Center, and school facilities nearby to the south and west.

The project site does not contain any scenic resources. There are no State-designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site. The nearest State-designated Scenic Highway, Route 9, is located
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approximately 4 miles to the southwest of the site. The project site is not located within a City-designated Gateway. The nearest Gateways to the project site are located approximately 0.7 mile to the west of the project site where Camden Avenue meets SR 17, four miles to the northwest where Campbell Avenue meets Saratoga Avenue, and three miles to the northeast where SR 87 meets Almaden Expressway. The project site is located one mile east of SR 17, which is a designated Urban Throughway, or Urban Corridor, in the General Plan as are all State and Interstate Highways within the City’s Sphere of Influence.

The proposed area of change is currently underdeveloped. It contains some paved areas and fencing on the southern side of the project site. The majority of the site is grass-covered with some additional vegetation. The proposed area of change does not have any on-site buildings, and no direct sources of lighting. Existing light sources come from the sports facility, daycares, and parking on the project site. The topography of the site is flat and does not offer elevated views of surrounding areas.

DISCUSSION

a) Would the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

As described under the Existing Conditions discussion above, the proposed area of change is located in a flat area surrounded by urban development, which significantly limits long range views of any scenic resources surrounding San José (e.g., Coyote Valley, the Diablo Range, the Silver Creek Hills, the Santa Teresa Ridge and the Santa Cruz Mountains). Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with building heights standards in the RN land use designation and respective zoning district on the 2.5-acre portion of the parcel which can range from one to two and a half stories.

As stated in the Existing Condition section, the project site does not contain any scenic resources and there are no scenic roadways visible from the project site. Therefore, potential future development and potential height that could be added to this area is not anticipated to create an impact to any immediate scenic vista in the area. In addition, future development would be required to comply with General Plan goals and policies (listed above) which seek to preserve and enhance the character of existing neighborhoods and Urban Corridors in San José. As the project is currently proposed, a change in General Plan land use designations would not result in a substantial adverse effect on any scenic vista. For these reasons, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to scenic vistas.


20 City of San José, 2011. Envision San José 2040 General Plan, Chapter 4, Scenic Corridors Diagram, page 27. (https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showdocument?id=22565)
b) **Would the proposed project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?**

The project site is not located in proximity to a State-designated scenic highway. The nearest State-designated scenic highway, SR 9, is located approximately four miles to the southwest of the project site. Due to the developed nature of the project site and its surroundings, the project site is not visible from this State scenic highway. Therefore, there would be **no impact.**

c) **In nonurbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the proposed project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?**

The project site is currently underdeveloped and located in an urbanized area. It includes maintained lawn (vegetated) and paved areas but no buildings or scenic features. Although the proposed project would facilitate potential future development of residential buildings, proposals under the new RN General Plan Designation would typically be required to be generally consistent with existing uses and the overall residential character of the surrounding area. Furthermore, potential future development under the proposed project would be required to comply with the General Plan goals and policies (listed above) which seek to preserve and enhance the character of existing neighborhoods in San José. Future development would also be subject to separate review under the City’s design review process which includes a review of architecture and site planning. Consistency with these regulations would ensure that potential future development would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings. As the project is currently proposed, a change in General Plan land use designations would not result in degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings and therefore, the impacts would be **less than significant.**

d) **Would the proposed project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

As described above, the proposed project does not include physical redevelopment, but only the General Plan Amendment to facilitate possible redevelopment of single-family homes. With potential future development facilitated by the proposed project, new sources of light would be introduced on this portion of the project site to the extent of promoting a safe and functional environment for potential future residents. Exterior lighting provided on and around the potential future development would be required to comply with City standards for outdoor lighting that are intended to reduce light pollution and glare per City Council Policy 4-3 which requires energy-efficient outdoor lighting that is fully shielded and not directed skyward in order to reduce light pollution. In addition, potential future development would be required to undergo the City’s design review process. Consistency with these regulations would ensure that potential future development would not create substantial light and glare such that could degrade daytime or nighttime views in the area. As the project is currently proposed, a change in General Plan land use designations would not result in a substantial adverse effect on day or nighttime views in the area and therefore, the impacts would be **less than significant.**
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by PRC Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Regulatory Framework

State

Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act)

Commonly known as the Williamson Act, the State of California’s Land Conservation Act of 1965 enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive a property tax assessment based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value.

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

The California Farmland Conservancy manages the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), which produces maps and statistical data used for analyzing impacts on California’s agricultural resources. Agricultural land is rated according to soil quality and irrigation status; the best quality land is called Prime Farmland.
Local

General Plan

The Land Use (LU) section of the General Plan includes the following goals and policies specific to agricultural resources.

- **Goal LU-12 Urban Agriculture**: Expand the cultivation and sale of locally grown agriculture as an environmentally sustainable means of food production and as a source of healthy food for San José residents.

  - **Policy LU-12.3**: Protect and preserve the remaining farmlands within San José’s sphere of influence that are not planned for urbanization in the timeframe of the *Envision General Plan* through the following means:
    - Limit residential uses in agricultural areas to those which are incidental to agriculture.
    - Restrict and discourage subdivision of agricultural lands.
    - Encourage contractual protection for agricultural lands, such as Williamson Act contracts, agricultural conservation easements, and transfers of development rights.
    - Prohibit land uses within adjacent to agricultural lands that would compromise the viability of these lands for agricultural uses.
    - Strictly maintain the Urban Growth Boundary in accordance with other goals and policies in this Plan.

- **Policy LU-12.4**: Preserve agricultural lands and prime soils in non-urban areas in order to retain the aquifer recharge capacity of these lands.

- **Goal LU-20 Rural Agriculture**: Provide and protect sufficient agricultural land to facilitate local food production, to provide broad community access to healthful foods, to add to a distinct community image, and to promote environmental, fiscal, and economic benefits of rural agricultural lands.

  - **Policy LU-20.2**: Preserve agricultural lands and prime soils in non-urban areas in order to provide local and regional fresh food supplies, reduce dependence on foreign products, conserve energy, and retain the aquifer recharge capacity of these lands.

Municipal Code

The SJMC Chapter 20.20, Open Space and Agriculture Zoning Districts, sets forth the land use and development regulations applicable to the open space and agricultural zoning districts. This chapter of the SJMC includes regulations to protect and provide for a wide range of agricultural uses.

Existing Conditions

The site is designated *Urban and Built-Up Land* in the Santa Clara County Important Farmland Map, which means the site is occupied by structures with a building density of at least one unit to 1.5 acres, or
approximately six structures to a 10-acre parcel. The project site is currently developed with urban uses and is not considered *Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance* within the city. Neither the project site nor the immediately surrounding properties are subject to Williamson Act contracts. In addition, according to the current and surrounding urban land uses at the project site, the project site is not designated as woodland or forest land cover.

**DISCUSSION**

a) *Would the project 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?*

The project site is not currently in agricultural uses, and is not classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

Neither the project site nor the immediately surrounding properties are subject to Williamson Act contracts or zoned for agricultural use. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts. Accordingly, there would be no impact.

c) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by PRC Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?*

Neither the project site nor the immediately surrounding areas feature zoning designations for forest land, timberland, or timber production. Additionally, there are currently no lands within San José zoned for or currently featuring timberland or timber production. Implementation of the proposed project would therefore not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, there would be no impact.

---


d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

There is no forest land on the project site or in close proximity to the project site. Therefore, the proposed land use change would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Accordingly, there would be no impact.

e) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

As detailed above, the project site and surrounding areas do not include any zoning, land use designations, or existing development relating to agricultural, forest land or timber production. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly impact any agricultural or forest lands and would not involve changes to the existing environment that would result in the conversion of agricultural or forest lands. Accordingly, there would be no impact.

III. AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Federal, State, and local air districts have adopted laws and regulations intended to control and improve air quality. The following is a summary of the relevant regulations pertaining to air quality.

Regulatory Framework

Federal

The pollutants emitted into the ambient air by stationary and mobile sources are regulated by the National Clean Air Act. Air pollutants of concern under Federal and State regulations are described below under the State regulations.
State

California Clean Air Act

The California Clean Air Act (California CAA) is administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) at the state level under the California Environmental Protection Agency. CARB is responsible for meeting the state requirements of the Federal CAA, administering the California CAA, and establishing the California ambient air quality standards (AAQS). The California CAA requires all air districts in the state to achieve and maintain the California AAQS. CARB also regulates mobile air pollution sources such as motor vehicles. CARB is responsible for setting emission standards for vehicles sold in California and for other emission sources, such as consumer products and certain off-road equipment. CARB has established passenger vehicle fuel specifications and oversees the functions of local air pollution control districts and air quality management districts, which in turn administer air quality activities at the regional and county level. CARB also conducts or supports research into the effects of air pollution on the public and develops approaches to reduce air pollutant emissions.

Regional

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)

California is divided geographically into air basins for the purpose of managing the air resources of the State on a regional basis. An air basin generally has similar meteorological and geographic conditions throughout. The project site is in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin which comprises all of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties; the southern portion of Sonoma County; and the southwestern portion of Solano County. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the regional air quality agency for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. Air quality in this area is determined by such natural factors as topography, meteorology, and climate, in addition to the presence of existing air pollution sources and ambient conditions. Air pollutants of concern are criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants (TACs).

Air Pollutants of Concern

Criteria Air Pollutants

The pollutants emitted into the ambient air by stationary and mobile sources are regulated by federal and State law under the National and California Clean Air Act, respectively. Air pollutants are categorized as primary and/or secondary pollutants. Primary air pollutants are those that are emitted directly from sources. Carbon monoxide (CO), reactive organic gases (ROG) (also referred to as volatile organic compounds [VOC]), VOC, nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulfur dioxide (SO2), coarse inhalable particulate matter (PM10), fine inhalable particular matter (PM2.5), and lead (Pb) are considered as primary air pollutants. All of these, except for ROGs are “criteria air pollutants,” which means that ambient air quality standards (AAQS) have been established for them. The National and California AAQS are the levels of air quality.

24 Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), 2017, California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, Appendix C: Sample Air Quality Setting.
considered to provide a margin of safety in the protection of the public health and welfare. They are designed to protect those “sensitive receptors” most susceptible to further respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise. Healthy adults can tolerate occasional exposure to air pollutant concentrations considerably above these minimum standards before adverse effects are observed.

Toxic Air Contaminants

In addition to criteria air pollutants, both the State and federal government regulate the release of TACs. Common sources of TACs include mobile sources (e.g., cars, trucks, and buses) and stationary sources (e.g., factories, refineries, and power plants). The California Health and Safety Code defines a TAC as “an air pollutant which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health.” A substance that is listed as a hazardous air pollutant pursuant to Section 112(b) of the federal Clean Air Act (42 United States Code Section 7412[b]) is a TAC. Under State law, the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), acting through the California Air Resources Board (CARB), is authorized to identify a substance as a TAC if it determines that the substance is an air pollutant that may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or serious illness, or may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. The current comprehensive air quality management plan (AQMP) is the 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan that is titled *Spare the Air – Cool the Climate*, adopted by BAAQMD on April 19, 2017.

Local

General Plan

The Measurable Environmental Sustainability (MS), Community Design (CD), and Land Use and Transportation (TR) sections of the General Plan include the following goals and policies specific to air quality and applicable to potential future development facilitated by the proposed project:

- **Goal MS-10 Air Pollutant Emission Reduction** – Minimize air pollutant emissions from new and existing development.
  - **Policy MS-10.1:** Assess projected air emissions from new development in conformance with the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines and relative to State and federal standards. Identify and implement feasible air emission reduction measures.
  - **Policy MS-10.2:** Consider the cumulative air quality impacts from proposed developments for proposed land use designation changes and new development, consistent with the region’s Clean Air Plan and State law.

- **Goal MS-11 Toxic Air Contaminants** – Minimize exposure of people to air pollution and toxic air contaminants such as ozone, carbon monoxide, lead, and particulate matter.
  - **Policy MS-11.1:** Require completion of air quality modeling for sensitive land uses such as new residential developments that are located near sources of pollution such as freeways and industrial uses. Require new residential development projects and projects categorized as sensitive receptors to incorporate effective mitigation into project designs or be located an
adequate distance from sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs) to avoid significant risks to health and safety.

- **Policy MS-11.2**: For projects that emit toxic air contaminants, require project proponents to prepare health risk assessments in accordance with BAAQMD-recommended procedures as part of environmental review and employ effective mitigation to reduce possible health risks to a less than significant level. Alternatively, require new projects (such as, but not limited to, industrial, manufacturing, and processing facilities) that are sources of TACs to be located an adequate distance from residential areas and other sensitive receptors.

- **Policy MS-11.5**: Encourage the use of pollution absorbing trees and vegetation in buffer areas between substantial sources of TACs and sensitive land uses.

- **Goal MS-13 Construction Air Emissions** – Minimize air pollutant emissions during demolition and construction activities.

  - **Policy MS-13.1**: Include dust, particulate matter, and construction equipment exhaust control measures as conditions of approval for subdivision maps, site development and planned development permits, grading permits, and demolition permits. At minimum, conditions shall conform to construction mitigation measures recommended in the current BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines for the relevant project size and type.

  - **Policy MS-13.2**: Construction and/or demolition projects that have the potential to disturb asbestos (from soil or building material) shall comply with all the requirements of California Air Resources Board’s air toxic control measures (ATCMs) for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations.

- **Goal MS-14 Reduce Consumption and Increase Efficiency** – Reduce per capita energy consumption by at least 50 percent compared to 2008 levels by 2022 and maintain or reduce net aggregate energy consumption levels equivalent to the 2022 (Green Vision) level through 2040.

  - **Policy MS-14.1**: Promote job and housing growth in areas served by public transit and that have community amenities within a 20-minute walking distance.

- **Goal TR-9 Tier I Reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled** – Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by 10 percent, from 2009 levels, as an interim goal.

  - **Policy TR-9.1**: Enhance, expand and maintain facilities for walking and bicycling, particularly to connect with and ensure access to transit and to provide a safe and complete alternative transportation network that facilitates non-automobile trips.

**Existing Conditions**

The proposed 2.5-acre area of change on the project site is currently underdeveloped and contains maintained lawn (vegetated) and paved areas. Because the proposed area of change on the project site does not contain on-site structures, the maintenance of the lawn is the primary use that has the potential to directly generate criteria air pollutants or TACs. Other uses on the project site that are not subject to the proposed land use change include a sports center and two preschools, which generate air pollutants associated with energy usage and vehicular travel to and from the site.
DISCUSSION

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Regional growth projections are used by BAAQMD to forecast future emission levels in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. For the Bay Area, these regional growth projections are provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and transportation projections are provided by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and are partially based on land use designations in city and county general plans. Typically, only large, regionally significant projects have the potential to affect the regional growth projections. The proposed project would only facilitate the potential to re-develop the site with different uses in the future and the resulting proposal would be subject to additional review once submitted. The project as it is currently proposed does not have a development proposal and therefore, the proposed land use change would not be considered a regionally significant project per Section 15206(b) of the CEQA Guidelines. Thus, the proposed project would not affect regional VMT and warrant intergovernmental review by ABAG and MTC. Additionally, as discussed in Section XIII, Population and Housing, of this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially affect population projections within the region, which is the basis of the 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan projections.

Furthermore, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project on the project site would be required to fall below, or include project specific measures and conditions to ensure the compliance with, BAAQMD’s operational emissions thresholds which are included in Table 4-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4-1</th>
<th>OPERATION-RELATED CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria Air Pollutants (average pounds per day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD Average Daily Project-Level Threshold</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>PM_{10}</th>
<th>PM_{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD Annual Project-Level Threshold</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District, California Environmental Quality Act, May 2017, Air Quality Guidelines, Table 2-1, Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance, page 2-2.

These thresholds are established to identify projects that have the potential to generate a substantial amount of criteria air pollutants. Mandatory compliance with BAAQMD’s operational emissions thresholds during project operations would ensure that the project would not be considered by BAAQMD to be a
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25 CEQA Guidelines Section 15206(b), provides the criteria to determine if a project is deemed to be of Statewide, regional, or area wide significance thus potentially resulting in significant environmental impacts beyond the City of San José. Criteria under this section includes, residential development over 500 units; commercial project with 1,000 or more employees or 500,000 square feet of floor space; office projects with 1,000 or more employees or 250,000 square feet of floor space; hotel projects with over 500 rooms; or an industrial project with 1,000 or more employees occupying more than 40 acres of land, or more than 650,000 square feet of floor area.
substantial emitter of criteria air pollutants. Any future project would also be reviewed for compliance with Policy MS.10-1, requiring the implementation of air emissions reduction measures reduce the potential for impacts. Any potential future development would also be reviewed for compliance with air quality regulations and policies (including the construction emissions reduction measures in Policy MS-13.1) as part of the overall development review process. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan and impacts would be considered less than significant.

b) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is currently designated as a nonattainment area for California and National AAQS for ozone (O$_3$) and PM$_{2.5}$, and a nonattainment area under the California AAQS for PM$_{10}$. Any project that does not exceed or can be mitigated to less than the BAAQMD significance levels would not result in a significant or cumulatively considerable impact.

As discussed in Section 3.2.2, Potential Future Development, the potential future development facilitated by the proposed project may result in the addition of 20 single-family units. However, any new development would be required to comply with BAAQMD regulations to mitigate or prevent the generation of criteria pollutant emissions. Potential future construction on the site would be required to implement BAAQMD’s Best Management Practices for dust control in accordance with the City’s General Plan Policies MS-13.1 and MS-13.3. As mentioned previously, implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level and does not include a specific development proposal. Thus, the proposed project would not directly result in any criteria air pollutant emissions.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase to a criteria pollutant for which the Bay Area is classified as non-attainment and cumulative air quality impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The nearest sensitive receptors include the two preschools adjacent to and west of the proposed area of change, and the residents of the single-family homes that share a border with the project site to the north, east, and south. Potential future construction of additional housing units facilitated by the proposed project could lead to fugitive emissions and TACs affecting adjacent sensitive land uses. While potential future proposals may result in uses that could result in emission of pollutant to nearby sensitive receptors, implementation of the proposed project would result in changes to the General Plan land use designation to allow different uses in the future on this project site and does not include a specific development proposal. Thus, the proposed project would not directly result in any construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions. In accordance with regional and local air quality policies mentioned above, potential future development on the project site would be required to evaluate the impacts of construction emissions on nearby sensitive receptors to demonstrate that the incremental cancer risk would not exceed 10 in one million (10E-06) for individual sources and/or 100 in a million for cumulative sources, PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations would not exceed 0.3 µg/m$^3$ for individual sources and/or 0.8 µg/m$^3$ for
cumulative sources, or the appropriate non-cancer hazard index would not exceed 1.0 for individual sources in accordance with BAAQMD’s Thresholds of Significance. Air quality analyses would be required to be completed on a site-specific basis to determine whether emissions from potential future development would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction and operation. The project as it is currently proposed would not expose sensitive receptors to air pollutants and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to objectionable odors) affecting a substantial number of people?

The type of facilities that are considered to have objectionable odors include wastewater treatment plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. As described in Section 3.2.1, General Plan Amendment, above, the type of development that may be facilitated by the proposed project under the proposed RN land use designation are most likely residential uses, but the RN land use designation also supports commercial, healthcare, and private community gathering facilities so long as they are compatible with surrounding existing uses and are unlikely to create a nuisance within the established residential setting. These are not the kinds of uses that typically generate substantial odors that would affect a substantial number of people. Even so, potential future development would be subject to review to ensure compatibility of use with the area and that it would not subject the area to objectionable odors. However, as the project is proposed currently, it would not create objectionable odors and impacts would be less than significant.

### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 Wildlife (CDFW) or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 CDFW or USFWS?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

26 Bay Area Air Quality Management District, California Environmental Quality Act, May 2017, Air Quality Guidelines, Chapter 5, Assessing and Mitigating Local Community Risk and Hazard Impacts, page 5-13 through 5-16.
Would implementation of the proposed project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The following is a summary of the relevant federal and local regulations pertaining to biological resources. There are no separate State regulations governing this topic relevant to the project.

**Regulatory Framework**

**Federal**

**Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

The federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), 16 United States Code Section 703, prohibits killing, possessing, or trading of migratory birds except in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. The MBTA protects whole birds, parts of birds, and bird eggs and nests; and prohibits the possession of all nests of protected bird species whether they are active or inactive. An active nest is defined as having eggs or young, as described by the Department of the Interior in its April 16, 2003 Migratory Bird Permit Memorandum. Nest starts (nests that are under construction and do not yet contain eggs) are not protected from destruction. All native bird species that occur on the project site are protected under the MBTA.
Regional

Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan

The City adopted the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (Habitat Plan) on January 29, 2013. The Habitat Plan was developed through a partnership between County of Santa Clara; Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA); Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD); and cities of Gilroy, Morgan Hill, and San José (collectively referred to as the Local Partners), in cooperation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The Habitat Plan study area covers approximately 519,506 acres, primarily within southern Santa Clara County, and nine special-status plant and nine special-status animal species (called “covered species” in the Habitat Plan). The Habitat Plan is “intended to provide an effective framework to protect, enhance, and restore natural resources in specific areas of Santa Clara County, while improving and streamlining the environmental permitting process for impacts on threatened and endangered species.” Approval of impacts on covered species from project activities covered by the Habitat Plan (i.e., projects that meet a number of criteria concerning location, proponent, and type) are considerably expedited. Fees paid in accordance with the extent and nature of projects’ impacts on wetland, aquatic, and riparian habitats are used to further conservation efforts via the acquisition, creation, or enhancement, as well as the preservation and management, of habitat for these species. In addition, covered projects are subject to a number of measures concerning avoidance and minimization of impacts on covered species and habitats through project design and construction measures (such as preconstruction species surveys and seasonal restrictions on construction activities) to directly protect species. Several “no take” species also exist that, because of their rarity or regulatory status (e.g., state fully protected species), cannot be “taken” by a project that is covered by the plan.

The City is a co-permittee under the Habitat Plan, and the proposed project is a covered project under the Habitat Plan. As such, the City would be covered under the auspices of the Habitat Plan and would adhere to the conservation measures set forth therein. Further, the City would pay Habitat Plan fees for habitat impacts, in accordance with the types and acreage of habitat impacted, resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

Local

General Plan

The Environmental Resources (ER), Measurable Environmental Sustainability (MS), and Community Design (CD) sections of the General Plan include the following goals and policies specific to biological resources and applicable to potential future development facilitated by the proposed project:

- **Goal ER-4 Special-Status Plants and Animals**—Preserve, manage, and restore habitat suitable for special-status species, including threatened and endangered species.
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- **Policy ER-4.4**: Require that development projects incorporate mitigation measures to avoid and minimize impacts to individuals of special-status species.

- **Goal ER-5 Migratory Birds** — Protect migratory birds from injury or mortality.
  - **Policy ER-5.1**: Avoid implementing activities that result in the loss of active native birds’ nests, including both direct loss and indirect loss through abandonment, of native birds. Avoidance of activities that could result in impacts to nests during the breeding season or maintenance of buffers between such activities and active nests would avoid such impacts.
  - **Policy ER-5.2**: Require that development projects incorporate measures to avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds.

- **Goal MS-21 Community Forest** — Preserve and protect existing trees and increase planting of new trees within San José to create and maintain a thriving Community Forest that contributes to the City’s quality of life, its sense of community, and its economic and environmental wellbeing.
  - **Policy MS-21.4**: Encourage the maintenance of mature trees, especially natives, on public and private property as an integral part of the community forest. Prior to allowing the removal of any mature tree, pursue all reasonable measures to preserve it.
  - **Policy MS-21.5**: As part of the development review process, preserve protected trees (as defined by the Municipal Code), and other significant trees. Avoid any adverse effects on the health and longevity of protected or other significant trees through appropriate design measures and construction practices. Special priority should be given to the preservation of native oaks and native sycamores. When tree preservation is not feasible, include appropriate tree replacement, both in number and spread of canopy.
  - **Policy MS-21.6**: As a condition of new development, require, where appropriate, the planting and maintenance of both street trees and trees on private property to achieve a level of tree coverage in compliance with and that implements City laws, policies or guidelines.
  - **Policy MS-21.8**: For Capital Improvement Plan or other public development projects, or through the entitlement process for private development projects, require landscaping including the selection and planting of new trees to achieve the following goals:
    1. Avoid conflicts with nearby power lines.
    2. Avoid potential conflicts between tree roots and developed areas.
    3. Avoid use of invasive, non-native trees.
    4. Remove existing invasive, non-native trees.
    5. Incorporate native trees into urban plantings in order to provide food and cover for native wildlife species.
    6. Plant native oak trees and native sycamores on sites which have adequately sized landscape areas, and which historically supported these species.

- **Goal CD-1 Attractive City** — Create a well-designed, unique, and vibrant public realm with appropriate uses and facilities to maximize pedestrian activity; support community interaction; and attract residents, business, and visitors to San José.
  - **Policy CD-1.24**: Within new development projects, include preservation of ordinance-sized and other significant trees, particularly natives. Any adverse effect on the health and longevity
of such trees should be avoided through design measures, construction, and best maintenance practices. When tree preservation is not feasible include replacements or alternative mitigation measures in the project to maintain and enhance our Community Forest.

Municipal Code

Chapter 13.28, Street Trees, Hedges, and Shrubs

The SJMC Chapter 13.28, Street Trees, Hedges, and Shrubs, includes the definitions for trees that qualify as heritage trees in San José and regulates the planting, removal, and maintenance of the City’s community forest. This chapter sets forth the permit requirements for planting street trees, pruning or removal street trees, and overall, all tree maintenance standards.

Chapter 13.32, Tree Removal Controls

The SJMC Chapter 13.32, Tree Removal Controls, regulates the removal of trees, including any live or dead woody perennial plant, having a main stem or trunk 38 inches or more in circumference at a height of 54 inches above the natural grade slope.

Existing Conditions

As shown on Figure 4-1, the project site and surrounding areas are classified as “Developed” habitat. Existing landscaping on the project site includes maintained lawn with and some trees. While the proposed area of change does not include any buildings, it is part of a larger developed parcel historically used as an elementary school that is currently used as private sports facility and preschools. The proposed area of change is an urbanized area not suitable habitat for sensitive plant or animal species.

Developed land uses include areas that fall under urban-suburban, rural-residential, barren, landfill, golf courses/urban parks, and ornamental woodland categories. As shown on Figure 4-2, the project site is within the Habitat Plan and is characterized as Urban Development, which includes residential, industrial, commercial, institutional, public facilities, public/quasi-public, and major educational facilities land use designations. In general, the highly developed nature of the project site and surrounding area make the project site unsuitable for most special status and wildlife species. Furthermore, the project site does not contain areas designated as wetlands.

28 According to the Envision San José 2040 General Plan EIR, “Developed” habitat is defined as urban, suburban, rural residential areas, golf courses, urban parks, landfills, and the San José-Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant (SJ-RC Regional Wastewater Facility).
29 Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency, August 2012, Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan, Chapter 3 Physical and Biological Resources, page 3-98.
Figure 4-1

Biotic Habitat

Source: City of San José, 2011; PlaceWorks, 2020.
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Figure 4-2

Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Land Use Categories
DISCUSSION

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on a plant or animal population, or essential habitat, defined as a candidate, sensitive or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?*

The project site is located within a developed area of the city and has been altered by past development. The project site is classified as Developed habitat; thus, special-status species are generally not believed to occur on the project site nor is the site suitable for such species. Potential impacts from construction of potential future development on the site would most likely be related to the removal of trees and other vegetation in these habitats during the nesting season of the migratory birds protected under the MBTA.

Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with General Plan Policies ER-4.4, ER-5.1 and ER-5.2 (listed above), which call for surveys and implementation of protection measures for special-status species (particularly migratory birds). In addition, the City could require additional measures to ensure mandatory compliance with MBTA, which could include the following:

- Construction shall be scheduled between September 1st and January 31st (inclusive) to avoid the nesting season. If this is not possible, pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors and other migratory breeding birds shall be conducted by a qualified ornithologist to identify active nests that may be disturbed during project implementation on-site and within 250 feet of the site. Between February 1st and April 30th (inclusive) pre-construction surveys shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction activities or tree relocation or removal. Between May 1st and August 31st (inclusive), pre-construction surveys shall be conducted no more than thirty (30) days prior to the initiation of these activities. The surveying ornithologist shall inspect all trees in and immediately adjacent to the construction area for nests.

- If an active nest is found in or close enough to the construction area to be disturbed by these activities, the ornithologist shall, in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), designate a construction-free buffer zone (typically 250 feet for raptors) around the nest, which shall be maintained until after the breeding season has ended and/or a qualified ornithologist has determined that the young birds have fledged.

Potential future development on the project site is required to comply with the measures above and therefore, mandatory compliance with General Plan policies as well as SJMC Chapters 13.32, Tree Removal Controls, and federal laws, including the MBTA, (listed above) would ensure impacts to special-status species associated with potential future development would be *less than significant.*

b) *Would the project 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 CDFW or USFWS?*

The project site is developed with urban uses and classified as Developed habitat. Riparian habitat, native grasslands, and other sensitive natural community types are absent from the project site. Therefore, there would be *no impact* on sensitive natural communities as a result of implementing the proposed project.
c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act are absent from the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact on federally protected wetlands.

d) Would the project 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 site?

The project site is located in an urbanized area bordered primarily by single family homes. The project site does not contain any creeks or aquatic habitat that would support fish. In addition, the highly urbanized nature of the project site precludes the potential for the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species across the project site. Wildlife species common in urban habitat would continue to move through the area, both during and after construction of potential future development facilitated by the proposed project. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any habitat modifications and would not interfere 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. As discussed in Criterion (a) above, any potential future development activities would be required to comply with General Plan policies and federal law (listed above) for the purpose of protecting migratory birds. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

e) Would the project conflict with any local ordinances or policies protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

The project site is located in an urbanized area where sensitive biological and wetland resources are generally considered to be absent, and no major conflicts with relevant policies or ordinances in the General Plan or SJMC (listed above) are anticipated. Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in the removal of existing trees on-site. Per SJMC Chapter 13.32, Tree Removal Controls, it is unlawful for any person to remove, or cause to remove any live tree or dead tree without a tree removal permit, or equivalent.32 Future development permits may include tree removal proposal and may be process at the same time.

In addition, under SJMC Section 13.32.110, the Director or Planning Commission may impose as a condition on the issuance of a tree removal permit the requirement that a suitable replacement tree be provided. Furthermore, as outlined in SJMC Section 13.32.130, Safeguarding Trees During Construction, appropriate safeguards must be taken to avoid damage to remaining trees during constructions activities. All tree replacement would be removed and replaced in accordance with the requirements in Table 4-2 below.

---

32 Per SJMC Section 13.32.020, a live tree is defined as means any tree that is not a dead tree. A dead tree is defined as a tree that is no longer alive, has been removed beyond repair, or is in an advanced state of decline and has been determined to be in such a state by a certified arborist during a non-dormant or other natural stage of the tree.
### TABLE 4-2 TREE REPLACEMENT RATIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumference of Tree to be Removed</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
<th>Orchard</th>
<th>Minimum Size of Each Replacement Tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 inches or more</td>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>15-gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 up to 38 inches</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>15-gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 19 inches</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>15-gallon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- xx = tree replacement to tree loss ratio
- Trees greater than or equal to 38-inch circumference shall not be removed unless a Tree Removal Permit or equivalent has been approved for the removal of such trees. For multi-family residential, commercial, or industrial properties, a permit is required for removal of trees of any size.
- A 38-inch tree equals 12.1 inches in diameter.
- A 24-inch box tree equals two 15-gallon trees.
- Single family and two-dwelling properties may be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio.
- Source: City of San José

The species of trees to be planted would be determined in consultation with the City Arborist and the Department of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement. In the event that the project site does not have sufficient area to accommodate the required tree mitigation, one or more of the following measures would be implemented, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, at the development permit stage. The size of a 15-gallon replacement tree may be increased to 24-inch box and count as two replacement trees to be planted on the project site, at the development permit stage.

Off-Site Tree Replacement Fee(s) would be paid to the City prior to the issuance of Public Works grading permits in accordance with the City Council approved Fee Resolution. The City would use the Off-Site Tree Replacement Fees to plant trees at alternative sites.

Accordingly, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with these provisions to minimize potential impacts to on-site trees. As such, impacts would be **less than significant**.

**f) Would the project conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?**

As described above, the City is a co-permittee under the Habitat Plan. As previously shown on Figure 4-2, the project site is within the Urban Development land use category. Per the Habitat Plan, the construction of residential, commercial, industrial, and other types of development in areas designated as urban or rural development is considered a “covered activity” under the Habitat Plan. As such, future development facilitated by the proposed project would be covered under the Habitat Plan, and would adhere to the conservation measures set forth therein. The presence of sensitive species or habitat types on the project site are unlikely, and as such implementation of the proposed project would not have any direct impacts to any of the covered species in the Habitat Plan. In conformance with the Habitat Plan, potential future project proponents are subject to all applicable provisions and payment of fees prior to the start of ground disturbance activities. Accordingly, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be covered under the Habitat Plan, and would adhere to the conservation measures set forth therein. The presence of sensitive species or habitat types on the project site are unlikely, and as such implementation of the proposed project would not have any direct impacts to any of the covered species in the Habitat Plan. In conformance with the Habitat Plan, potential future project proponents are subject to all applicable provisions and payment of fees prior to the start of ground disturbance activities.

---

33 Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan, August 2012, Chapter 2 Land Use and Covered Activities, page 2-36 to 2-38.
34 Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan, August 2012, Chapter 2 Land Use and Covered Activities, page 2-106.
proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable provisions of the Habitat Plan to ensure that no substantial conflicts occur. In compliance with the Habitat Plan and General Plan policies, potential future development under the proposed land use designation would be required to implement the following measure:

**Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan.** The project is subject to applicable SCVHP conditions and fees (including the nitrogen deposition fee) prior to issuance of any grading permits. The project applicant would be required to submit the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Coverage Screening Form to the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement (PBCE) or the Director’s designee for approval and payment of the nitrogen deposition fee prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Habitat Plan and supporting materials can be viewed at [www.scv-habitatplan.org](http://www.scv-habitatplan.org).

Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan and impacts would be *less than significant.*

### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the relevant State, and local regulations pertaining to cultural resources. There are no federal regulations that are applicable to the project site. Tribal cultural resources are discussed separately under Section XIX, Utilities and Service Systems.

**State**

**Public Resources Code Section 5097.5**

California PRC Section 5097.5 prohibits “knowing and willful” excavation or removal of any “vertebrate paleontological site...or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands.” Public
lands are defined to include lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of the State or any city, county, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof.

Local

General Plan

The Environmental Resources (ER) section of the General Plan includes the following environmental goals and policies relevant to the cultural resources and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project:

- **Goal ER-10 Archaeology and Paleontology** – Preserve and conserve archaeologically significant structures, sites, districts and artifacts in order to promote a greater sense of historic awareness and community identity.

- **Policy ER-10.1:** For proposed development sites that have been identified as archaeologically or paleontologically sensitive, require investigation during the planning process in order to determine whether potentially significant archeological or paleontological information may be affected by the project and then require, if needed, that appropriate mitigation measures be incorporated into the project design.

- **Policy ER-10.3:** Ensure that City, State, and Federal historic preservation laws, regulations, and codes are enforced, including laws related to archaeological and paleontological resources, to ensure the adequate protection of historic and pre-historic resources.

Municipal Code

SJMC Chapter 13.48, Historic Preservation, outlines the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance which provides information on the general provisions, designation process, conversation areas, requirements of the Historic Preservation Permit, and financial incentives through a Mills Act Historical Property Contract.

Historic Resources Inventory

The City maintains a database of historic properties linked to the City's geographic information system (GIS) that provides a listing and mapping of historic resources that have been documented and evaluated for their significance. The Historic Resources Inventory, a product of this database, is publicly available sorted by address and by significance category. A resource may qualify as a City Landmark if it has special historical, architectural, cultural, aesthetic or engineering interest or value of an historic nature.

---

Existing Conditions

The project site is not included as a designated historic resource in the City’s Historic Resource Inventory database. Currently there are no Traditional Cultural Properties or Cultural Landscapes identified within the city.

DISCUSSION

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

Under CEQA, both prehistoric and historic-period archaeological sites may qualify as historic resources. Archaeological resources are discussed below under Criterion (b). As described above, the project site is part of a larger parcel that has been developed and is not included as a designated historic resource in the City’s Historic Resources Inventory database. The closest City-designated historic resource site is the Hamilton Residence at 2295 South Bascom Avenue, approximately 1 mile north of the project site. There are no existing structures on-site that would require demolition, and which would be subject to additional review for structures that are over a certain age. Therefore, with no historical resources on the project site, there would be no impact as a result of implementing the proposed project.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

The proposed project would result in changes at the policy level and would not result in any excavation or other forms of development that could adversely affect archaeological resources. However, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in construction activities such as site preparation, grading, and excavation that could potentially expose previously undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the project site.

In accordance with Envision San José 2040 General Plan Policies ER-10.1, ER-10.2, and ER-10.3, the following measures could be applied to future planning permits for development of the site in order to reduce or avoid impacts to subsurface cultural resources:

- Once specific plans are prepared and after the current buildings are demolished and the asphalt/concrete driveways removed, an archaeologist shall conduct mechanical presence/absence exploration to determine if there are any indications of subsurface archaeological deposits and cultural materials on the project site. If potholing for utilities must be completed prior to the archaeological survey, an archaeological monitor shall observe the

---


37 Envision San José 2040 General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse Number 2009072096), page 703.

In the event that prehistoric or historic resources are encountered during excavation and/or grading of the site, all activity within a 50-foot radius of the find shall be stopped, the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement shall be notified, and the archaeologist will examine the find and make appropriate recommendations prior to issuance of building permits. Recommendations could include collection, recording, and analysis of any significant cultural materials. A report of findings documenting any data recovery during monitoring would be submitted to the Supervising Environmental Planner and Historic Preservation Officer of the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement.

Mandatory compliance with General Plan Policies ER-10.1 and ER-10.3 listed above would ensure that implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on archaeological resources.

d) **Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?**

Similar to the discussions under Criteria (b) and (c) above, there are no known human remains, including those of Native American ancestry, on the project site. While implementation of the proposed project would not directly result in development that could adversely affect any unknown human remains, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in construction activities such as site preparation, grading, and excavating that could potentially unearth unknown human remains. Future development on the project site would be required to adhere to General Plan Policies ER-10.1, ER-10.2, and ER-10.3 (listed above) for the discovery of unknown human remains. As required under General Plan Policy ER-10.2, any human remains encountered during ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project would be subject to State regulations and the following regulations will apply to ensure no adverse impacts to human remains would occur in the unlikely event human remains are found:

- If any human remains are found during any field investigations, grading, or other construction activities, all provisions of California Health and Safety Code Sections 7054 and 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Sections 5097.9 through 5097.99, as amended per Assembly Bill 2641, shall be followed. If human remains are discovered during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The project applicant shall immediately notify the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement (PBCE) or the Director’s designee and the qualified archaeologist, who shall then notify the Santa Clara County Coroner. The Coroner will make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the remains are believed to be Native American, the Coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. The NAHC will then designate a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD will inspect the remains and make a recommendation on the treatment of the remains and associated artifacts. If one of the following conditions occurs, the landowner or his authorized representative shall work with the Coroner to reinter the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:
The NAHC is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being given access to the site. 
- The MLD identified fails to make a recommendation; or 
- The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. Compliance with these regulations would ensure that human remains are handled appropriately.

Mandatory compliance with General Plan Policies ER-10.1, ER-10.2, and ER-10.3, and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA), would ensure that implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on human remains.

VI. ENERGY

Would implementation of the proposed project: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the relevant federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to energy. Regulations pertaining to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are further described in Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Initial Study.

Regulatory Framework

Federal


Signed into law in December 2007, the Energy Independence and Security Act contains provisions designed to increase energy efficiency and availability of renewable energy. The Act contains provisions for increasing fuel economy standards for cars and light trucks, while establishing new minimum efficiency standards for lighting as well as residential and commercial appliance equipment.
Energy Policy Act of 2005

Passed by Congress in July 2005, the Energy Policy Act includes a comprehensive set of provisions to address energy issues. This Act includes tax incentives for energy conservation improvements in commercial and residential buildings, fossil fuel production and clean coal facilities, and construction and operation of nuclear power plants, among other things. Subsidies are also included for geothermal, wind energy, and other alternative energy producers.

National Energy Policy

Established in 2001 by the National Energy Policy Development Group, the National Energy Policy is designed to help the private sector and state and local governments promote dependable, affordable, and environmentally sound production and distribution of energy for the future. Key issues addressed by the energy policy are energy conservation, repair and expansion of energy infrastructure, and ways of increasing energy supplies while protecting the environment.

State

California Public Utilities Commission

In September 2008, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) adopted the Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, which provides a framework for energy efficiency in California through the year 2020 and beyond. It articulates a long-term vision, as well as goals for each economic sector, identifying specific near-term, mid-term, and long-term strategies to assist in achieving these goals. This Plan sets forth the following four goals, known as Big Bold Energy Efficiency Strategies, to achieve significant reductions in energy demand:

- All new residential construction in California will be zero net energy by 2020;
- All new commercial construction in California will be zero net energy by 2030;
- Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning, commonly referred to as HVAC, will be transformed to ensure that its energy performance is optimal for California’s climate; and
- All eligible low-income customers will be given the opportunity to participate in the low-income energy efficiency program by 2020.

California Building Code: Building Energy Efficiency Standards

The State provides a minimum standard for energy conservation through Part 6 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, commonly referred to as the “California Energy Code”. The California Energy Code was originally adopted in June 1977 and is updated on a three-year cycle. Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The 2019 California Energy Code is the most recent version and improves upon the previous 2016 standards for new construction of, and additions and alterations to, residential buildings. The 2019 standards move toward cutting energy use in new homes by more than 50 percent and will require installation of solar photovoltaic systems for single-family homes and multifamily buildings of three stories and less. The 2019 standards focus on four key areas: 1) smart residential photovoltaic systems; 2) updated thermal envelope standards (preventing
heat transfer from the interior to exterior and vice versa); 3) residential and nonresidential ventilation requirements; and 4) nonresidential lighting requirements. Under the 2019 standards single-family homes will be 7 percent more energy efficient. When accounting for the electricity generated by the solar photovoltaic system, single-family homes would use 53 percent less energy compared to homes built to the 2016 standards.

California Building Code: CALGreen

The California Building Standards Commission adopted the California Green Building Standards Code, also known as CALGreen, in Part 11 of Title 24. CALGreen establishes standards that apply to the planning, design, operation, construction, use, and occupancy of every newly constructed building or structure throughout the State, unless otherwise indicated in the California Building Standards Code. The purpose of CALGreen is to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings. CALGreen encourages sustainable construction practices in energy efficiency. Compliance with the CALGreen Code is not a substitution for meeting the certification requirements of any green building program.

2019 Appliance Efficiency Regulations

The 2019 Appliance Efficiency Regulations (Title 20, California Code of Regulations Sections 1601 through 1609) include standards for both federally regulated appliances and non-federally regulated appliances. There are 24 categories of appliances included in the scope of these regulations including such devices as washing machines, microwave ovens, dishwashers, and furnaces. The standards within these regulations apply to appliances that are sold or offered for sale in California, except those sold wholesale in California for final retail sale outside the state, and those designed and sold exclusively for use in recreational vehicles or other mobile equipment. Though these regulations are now often viewed as “business as usual,” they exceed the standards imposed by all other states and they reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by reducing energy demand.

Renewable Portfolio Standard

Established in 2002 under Senate Bill (SB) 1078 and accelerated by several laws, most recently SB 100 in 2018, California’s Renewables Portfolio Standard obligates investor-owned utilities, energy service providers, and community choice aggregators to procure 33 percent of their electricity from eligible renewable energy sources by 2020, 60 percent from eligible renewable energy sources by 2030, and 100 percent from eligible renewable energy or other carbon-free sources by 2045. SB 100 establishes a State policy that eligible renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources supply 100 percent of all retail...
sales of electricity to California end-use customers and 100 percent of electricity procured to serve all State agencies by December 31, 2045. Under SB 100, the State cannot increase carbon emissions elsewhere in the western grid or allow resource shuffling to achieve the 100 percent carbon-free electricity target.

**Senate Bill 350**

SB 350, signed into law on October 7, 2015, expands the California Renewables Portfolio Standard by establishing a renewable energy goal of 50 percent of the total electricity sold to retail customers in California per year by December 31, 2030. In addition, SB 350 includes the goal to double the energy efficiency savings in electricity and natural gas final end uses (such as heating, cooling, lighting, or class of energy uses upon which an energy efficiency program is focused) of retail customers through energy conservation and efficiency. This bill also requires the CPUC, in consultation with the CEC, to establish efficiency targets for electrical and gas corporations consistent with this goal.

**AB 1493 Pavley Regulations and Fuel Efficiency Standards**

California AB 1493, enacted on July 22, 2002, required CARB to develop and adopt regulations that reduce GHGs emitted by passenger vehicles and light duty trucks. Implementation of the regulation was delayed by lawsuits filed by automakers and by the EPA’s denial of an implementation waiver. The EPA subsequently granted the requested waiver in 2009, which was upheld by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in 2011.

The standard phases in during the 2009 through 2016 model years. When fully phased in, the near-term (2009–2012) standards resulted in about a 22 percent reduction compared with the 2002 fleet, and the mid-term (2013–2016) standards resulted in about a 30 percent reduction. Technologies providing emissions reductions at favorable costs included discrete variable valve lift or camless valve actuation to optimize valve operation rather than relying on fixed valve timing and lift as has historically been done; turbocharging to boost power and allow for engine downsizing; improved multi-speed transmissions; and improved air conditioning systems that operate optimally, leak less, and/or use an alternative refrigerant.

The second phase of the implementation for the Pavley bill was incorporated into amendments to the Low-Emission Vehicle Program referred to as LEV III or the Advanced Clean Cars program. The Advanced Clean Car program combines the control of smog-causing pollutants and GHG emissions into a single coordinated package of requirements for model years 2017 through 2025. The regulation will reduce GHGs from new cars by 34 percent from 2016 levels by 2025. The new rules will clean up gasoline and diesel-powered cars, and deliver increasing numbers of zero-emission technologies, such as full battery electric cars, newly emerging plug-in hybrid electric vehicles and hydrogen fuel cell cars. The package will also ensure adequate fueling infrastructure is available for the increasing numbers of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles planned for deployment in California.
Local

Plan Bay Area: Strategy for a Sustainable Region

Plan Bay Area 2040 describes how the San Francisco Bay Area will develop over the next two decades and the RTP/SCS integrates transportation, land use, and housing to meet GHG reduction targets set by CARB. Plan Bay Area 2040 proposed the Climate Initiatives Program, which promotes the densification of land use and a relative decrease in per capita energy consumption, in addition to a net reduction in vehicle fuel use while also allowing growth within the region.

Climate Smart San José

Climate Smart San José was adopted by the City Council in 2018 as a communitywide initiative to reduce air pollution, save water, and improve quality of life. It set the goals of reaching targets identified by the international Paris Agreement, agreed upon by parties in the United Nations in 2015 to reduce GHG emissions and combat climate change. Strategies outlined in Climate Smart San José include transition to a sustainable and climate smart city by densifying the city, making homes efficient, creating clean mobility choices, developing public transport infrastructure, creating local jobs to reduce VMT, making commercial goods movement clean and efficient, and transitioning to renewable energy. Climate Smart San José includes the following goals:

- By 2021, San José Clean Energy (SJCE) will offer 100 percent GHG-free power as a base product.
- Beyond 2020, all new homes will be zero net energy, and by 2030, 25 percent of existing homes will be energy efficient and all-electric.
- By 2030, 25 percent of existing homes will be energy efficient and all electric; 60 percent of passenger vehicles in the city will be electric; the city will create an additional 22 million square feet of commercial workspace within a half mile of transit; the city will have developed 40,000 dwelling units in urban villages and focused growth areas; and the city will reduce residential water consumption per capita by 30 percent from 2009 levels.
- By 2040, only 40 percent of commute trips will be via single-occupancy vehicles, and San José will become a one-gigawatt solar city.

General Plan

The Measurable Environmental Sustainability (MS) section of the General Plan includes the following environmental goals, policies, and actions relevant to energy and applicable to potential future development facilitated by the proposed project:

- **Goal MS-1 Green Building Policy Leadership** – Demonstrate San José’s commitment to local and global Environmental Leadership through progressive use of green building policies, practices, and technologies to achieve 100 million square feet of new or retrofitted green buildings by 2040.
  - **Policy MS-1.1:** Demonstrate leadership in the development and implementation of green building policies and practices. Ensure that all projects are consistent with or exceed the City’s Green Building Ordinance and City Council Policies as well as State and/or regional policies.
which require that projects incorporate various green building principles into their design and construction.

- **Policy MS-1.2**: Continually increase the number and proportion of buildings within San José that make use of green building practices by incorporating those practices into both new construction and retrofit of existing structures.

- **Policy MS-1.4**: Foster awareness in San José’s business and residential communities of the economic and environmental benefits of green building practices. Encourage design and construction of environmentally responsible commercial and residential buildings that are also operated and maintained to reduce waste, conserve water and meet other environmental objectives.

- **Policy MS-1.6**: Recognize the interconnected nature of green building systems, and, in the implementation of Green Building Policies, give priority to green building options that provide environmental benefit by reducing water and/or energy use and solid waste.

- **Goal MS-2 Energy Conservation and Renewable Energy Use** – Maximize the use of green building practices in new and existing development to maximize energy efficiency and conservation and to maximize the use of renewable energy sources.

  - **Policy MS-2.2**: Encourage maximized use of on-site generation of renewable energy for all new and existing buildings.

  - **Policy MS-2.3**: Utilize solar orientation (i.e., building placement), landscaping, design, and construction techniques for new construction to minimize energy consumption.

  - **Policy MS-2.6**: Promote roofing design and surface treatments that reduce the heat island effect of new and existing development and support reduced energy use, reduced air pollution, and a healthy urban forest. Connect businesses and residents with cool roof rebate programs through City outreach efforts.

  - **Action MS-2.11**: Require new development to incorporate green building practices, including those required by the Green Building Ordinance. Specifically, target reduced energy use through construction techniques (e.g., design of building envelopes and systems to maximize energy performance), through architectural design (e.g., design to maximize cross ventilation and interior daylight) and through site design techniques (e.g., orienting buildings on sites to maximize the effectiveness of passive solar design).

- **Goal MS-14 Reduce Consumption and Increase Efficiency** – Reduce per capita energy consumption by at least 50% compared to 2008 levels by 2022 and maintain or reduce net aggregate energy consumption levels equivalent to the 2022 (Green Vision) level through 2040.

  - **Policy 14.3**: Consistent with the California Public Utilities Commission’s California Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, as revised, and when technological advances make it feasible, require all new residential and commercial construction to be designed for zero net energy use.

  - **Policy 14.4**: Implement the City’s Green Building Policies (see Green Building Section) so that new construction and rehabilitation of existing buildings fully implements industry best practices, including the use of optimized energy systems, selection of materials and resources, water
efficiency, sustainable site selection, passive solar building design, and planting of trees and other landscape materials to reduce energy consumption.

- **Goal MS-15 Renewable Energy** – Receive 100% of electrical power from clean renewable sources (e.g., solar, wind, hydrogen) by 2022 and to the greatest degree feasible increase generation of clean, renewable energy within the City to meet its own energy consumption needs.

- **Policy 15.4**: Promote local innovation, research, development, and deployment of renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.

- **Goal MS-16 Energy Security** – Provide access to clean, renewable, and reliable energy for all San José residents and businesses.

- **Policy MS-16.2**: Promote neighborhood-based distributed clean/renewable energy generation to improve local energy security and to reduce the amount of energy wasted in transmitting electricity over long distances.

**Municipal Code**

**Title 15, Public Utilities**

Title 15 of the SJMC regulates public utilities within the city. Chapter 15.32 includes provisions concerning Gas and Electric Franchises. Chapter 15.38, Municipal Solar Utility Program, establishes a municipal solar utility within the city to facilitate the leasing of solar energy equipment and to establish regulatory authority over solar leasing operations.

**Title 17, Building and Construction**

Title 17 of the SJMC includes regulations for buildings and construction. This includes the following chapters related to energy and relevant to the proposed project:

- **Chapter 17.84, Green Building Regulations for Private Development**: This chapter includes provisions for minimizing the use and waste of energy, water, and other resources during design, construction, and maintenance of buildings.

- **Chapter 17.86, Solar Energy System Requirements and Expedited Building Permit Process for Small Residential Rooftop Solar Energy Systems**: This chapter includes provisions for expediting the building permit process in compliance with State for small residential rooftop solar energy systems.

- **Chapter 17.88, Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Expedited Building Permit Process for Electric Vehicle Charging Stations**: This chapter includes provisions for expediting the building permit process for electric vehicle charging stations.

- **Chapter 17.845, Prohibition of Natural Gas Infrastructure in New Single-Family, Low-Rise Residential Buildings, and Detached Accessory Dwelling Units**: This chapter prohibits natural gas infrastructure in newly constructed low-rise residential buildings and accessory units. It also prohibits the extension of natural gas infrastructure to any system or device within a building for which an equivalent electrical system can be used instead.
Title 24, Technical Codes


Title 26, Community Energy

Title 26 of the SJMC regulates Community Energy. It is based on California Public Utilities Code Section 331.1 which authorizes cities or counties in California to combine electricity loads of its municipalities, residents, and businesses into a community-wide electricity program, known as a Community Choice Aggregation. Title 26 of the SJMC establishes SJCE as the Community Choice Aggregation in the City and gives residents and businesses local control over electricity prices, resources, and quality of service.

Existing Conditions

Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) supplies electricity and natural gas to approximately 16 million people throughout a 70,000-square-mile service area encompassing much of northern and central California, including the infrastructure for the City of San José.42

SJCE launched service in February 2019 in partnership with PG&E. SJCE serves as the default electricity provider for San José, with customers having the option to opt out and obtain electricity from PG&E. All electricity infrastructure is provided by PG&E, as well as natural gas supply.

The current project site, as part of the existing parcel, is served by existing utility connections. Current energy demands are derived from the operation of the on-site sports center and preschools that occupy the existing parcel.

DISCUSSION

a) Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?

The proposed project is a policy level change in the land use designation. No specific development on the project site is proposed at this time. As such, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. However, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in approximately 20 single-family homes on the project site, or similar development compliant with the land use and zoning designations. This would result in an increase in energy demand from the use of associated electricity and on-site utilities and from vehicular travel to and from the project site. However, potential future development would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local energy and energy efficiency regulations, including those described above such as the Building Energy Efficiency Standards, the California Green Building Standards

Code, and goals and policies reducing energy consumption and increasing renewable energy as described in the General Plan and Climate Smart San José. Additionally, SJMC Chapter 17.845 prohibits natural gas in new low-rise residential development. Furthermore, SJMC Chapter 17.84, requires the minimization of the use of energy, water, and other resources during design, construction, and maintenance of buildings through the encouragement of green building practices.

Because no physical development is proposed at this time and potential future development applications would be subject to energy-related regulations, the proposed General Plan Amendment would result in less-than-significant impacts from wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

As discussed in Criterion (b) of Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the proposed project would not conflict with City's GHG Reduction Strategy and Climate Smart San José, which involve planning for use of renewable energy and energy efficiency standards. Climate Smart San José sets strategies to reduce the City’s GHG emissions and increase energy efficiency, while still anticipating a population which is expected to grow by around 319,000 by 2050. The proposed project would result in a policy level determination, and no specific development is proposed at this time. However, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with all federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to energy use and energy efficiency, as described above, and would be subject to subsequent review to ensure consistency with energy-related regulations and goals. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43 City of San José, 2018. Climate Smart San José, Section 1.1 Leveraging San José’s Strengths, page 22.
### ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the relevant State and local regulations pertaining to geology and soils. There are no federal regulations governing this topic relevant to the project.

#### Regulatory Framework

**State**

**California Building Code**

The State of California provides minimum standards for building design and construction through Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The California Building Code is located in Part 2 of Title 24. The California Building Code is updated every three years, and the most recent current version went into effect in January 2020. The California Building Code contains specific requirements for seismic safety, excavation, foundations, retaining walls, and site demolition. It also regulates grading activities, including drainage and erosion control.

**Local**

**General Plan**

The Environmental Considerations/Hazards (EC) section of the General Plan includes the following goals, policies, and implementation actions specific to geology and soils and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project:
Goal EC-3 Seismic Hazards – Minimize the risk of injury, loss of life, property damage, and community disruption from seismic shaking, fault rupture, ground failure (liquefaction and lateral spreading), earthquake-induced landslides, and other earthquake-induced ground deformation.

Policy EC-3.1: Design all new or remodeled habitable structures in accordance with the most recent California Building Code and California Fire Code as amended locally and adopted by the City of San José, including provisions regarding lateral forces.

Policy EC-3.2: Within seismic hazard zones identified under the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zoning Act, California Seismic Hazards Mapping Act and/or by the City of San José, complete geotechnical and geological investigations and approve development proposals only when the severity of seismic hazards have been evaluated and appropriate mitigation measures are provided as reviewed and approved by the City of San José Geologist. State guidelines for evaluating and mitigating seismic hazards and the City-adopted California Building Code will be followed.

Goal EC-4 Geologic and Soil Hazards – Minimize the risk of injury, loss of life, and property damage from soil and slope instability, including landslides, differential settlement, and accelerated erosion.

Policy EC-4.1: Design and build all new or remodeled habitable structures in accordance with the most recent California Building Code and Municipal Code requirements as amended and adopted by the City of San José, including provisions for expansive soil, and grading and stormwater controls.

Policy EC-4.2: Approve development in areas subject to soils and geologic hazards, including un-engineered fill and weak soils and landslide-prone areas, only when the severity of hazards has been evaluated and if shown to be required, appropriate mitigation measures are provided. New development proposed within areas of geologic hazards shall not be endangered by, nor contribute to, the hazardous conditions on the site or on adjoining properties. The City of San José Geologist will review and approve geotechnical and geological investigation reports for projects within these areas as part of the project approval process.

Policy EC-4.4: Require all new development to conform to the City of San José’s Geologic Hazard Ordinance.

Policy EC-4.5: Ensure that any development activity that requires grading does not impact adjacent properties, local creeks and storm drainage systems by designing and building the site to drain properly and minimize erosion. An Erosion Control Plan is required for all private development projects that have a soil disturbance of 1 acre or more, are adjacent to a creek/river, and/or are located in hillside areas. Erosion Control Plans are also required for any grading occurring between October 15 and April 15.

Policy EC-4.7: Consistent with the San José Geologic Hazard Ordinance, prepare geotechnical and geological investigation reports for projects in areas of known concern to address the implications of irrigated landscaping to slope stability and to determine if hazards can be adequately mitigated.

Policy EC-4.9: Permit development only in those areas where potential danger to health, safety, and welfare of the persons in that area can be mitigated to an acceptable level.
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

- **Action EC-4.11**: Require the preparation of geotechnical and geological investigation reports for projects within areas subject to soils and geologic hazards and require review and implementation of mitigation measures as part of the project approval process.

- **Action EC-4.12**: Require review and approval of grading plans and erosion control plans (if applicable) prior to issuance of a grading permit by the Director of Public Works.

- **Goal ER-10 Archaeology and Paleontology** – Preserve and conserve archaeologically significant structures, sites, districts and artifacts in order to promote a greater sense of historic awareness and community identity.

  - **Policy ER-10.1**: For proposed development sites that have been identified as archaeologically or paleontologically sensitive, require investigation during the planning process in order to determine whether potentially significant archeological or paleontological information may be affected by the project and then require, if needed, that appropriate mitigation measures be incorporated into the project design.

  - **Policy ER-10.3**: Ensure that City, State, and Federal historic preservation laws, regulations, and codes are enforced, including laws related to archaeological and paleontological resources, to ensure the adequate protection of historic and pre-historic resources.

**Municipal Code**

Title 24 of the SJMC includes the 2019 California Building, Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, Existing Building, and Historical Building Codes. Requirements for building safety and earthquake hazard reduction are also addressed in Chapter 17.40 (Dangerous Building Code) and Chapter 17.10 (Geologic Hazard Regulations) of the SJMC. Requirements for grading, excavation, and erosion control are included in Chapter 17.04 (Building Code, Part 6 Excavation and Grading). In accordance with the SJMC, the Director of Public Works must issue a Certificate of Geologic Hazard Clearance prior to the issuance of grading and building permits within defined geologic hazard zones, including State Seismic Hazard Zones for Liquefaction.

**Existing Conditions**

**Regional Seismicity**

**Faults**

The project site, like much of the San Francisco Bay area, is vulnerable to seismic activity due to the presence of active faults in the region. The best-known active faults in this region include the Hayward Fault System, Monte Vista Fault, San Andreas Fault, the Calaveras Fault, and the San Gregorio Fault. According to maps published by the California Geological Survey (CGS), no mapped earthquake faults run through or adjacent to the project site. Figure 4-3 graphically repeats these findings. Thus, surface fault rupture is not considered a significant hazard within the project area.

---

44 City of San José, Emvision San José 2040 General Plan Draft Program EIR, June 2011, Section 3 (Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation), page 499, Figure 3.6-1.
Figure 4-3
Geologic and Seismic Hazards

Source: City of San José, 2011, Envision San José General Plan EIR, page 499; PlaceWorks, 2020.
GROUND SHAKING

The severity of ground shaking depends on several variables such as earthquake magnitude, hypocenter proximity, local geology, including the properties of unconsolidated sediments, groundwater conditions, and topographic setting. In general, ground shaking hazards are most pronounced in areas that are underlain by loosely consolidated soil/sediment.

The United States Geological Survey (USGS) estimates that the probability of a magnitude (M) 6.7 or greater earthquake in the greater San Francisco Bay region prior to year 2043 to be 72 percent. The forecasted probability for each individual fault to produce an M 6.7 or greater seismic event by the year 2043 is as follows: 33 percent for the Hayward Fault, 22 percent for the San Andreas Fault, 26 percent for the Calaveras Fault, six percent for the San Gregorio Fault, and 16 percent for the Green Valley-Concord Fault. Earthquakes of this magnitude can create ground accelerations severe enough to cause major damage to structures and foundations not designed to resist the forces generated by earthquakes. Underground utility lines are also susceptible where they lack sufficient flexibility to accommodate the seismic ground motion. In the event of an M 7.9 earthquake on the San Andreas Fault, the seismic forecasts presented on ABAG’s interactive GIS website (developed by a cooperative working group that included the USGS and the CGS) suggest that the project site is expected to experience “very strong” shaking.

LIQUEFACTION

Liquefaction typically occurs in areas where moist, fine-grained, cohesionless sediment or fill materials are subjected to strong, seismically-induced ground shaking. Under certain circumstances, the ground shaking can temporarily transform an otherwise solid material to a fluid state. Liquefaction is a serious hazard because buildings in areas that experience liquefaction may subside and suffer major structural damage. Liquefaction is most often triggered by seismic shaking, but it can also be caused by improper grading, landslides, or other factors. In dry soils, seismic shaking may cause soil to consolidate rather than flow, a process known as densification. According to hazard maps published by the California Department of Conservation, the project site is not located within a designated liquefaction hazard zone. Such zones are roughly defined as areas where historical liquefaction events or local geological and hydrogeological conditions suggest the potential for permanent ground displacements during major earthquakes.

LANDSLIDES

The project site is located in the Santa Clara Valley, which is bounded by the Diablo Range to the east and the Santa Cruz Mountains to the west. The project site is relatively flat with no significant changes in

---


46 Association of Bay Area Governments, 1995, The San Francisco Bay Area on Shaky Ground, Publication Number P95001EQK, 13 maps, scale 1:1,000,000.


elevation. The California Department of Conservation has determined that the project site is not located in a designated landslide hazard zone. Figure 4-3 repeats these findings.

**Soils**

Expansive soils have a high shrink-swell potential and occur where a sufficient percentage of certain clay materials are present in the soil. These soil conditions can impact the structural integrity of buildings and other structures. Much of the soil in San José is moderately to highly expansive. Moderately to highly expansive soils are found both on the valley floor and in hillside areas. Expansive soils on sloping hillsides can be subject to soil creep, which can induce lateral forces on foundations and retaining walls. The Santa Clara Valley is underlain by sedimentary and metamorphic rocks of the Franciscan Complex. Overlying these rocks are alluvial sediments deposited by streams that drained the adjacent mountains during recent geologic times (i.e., the Holocene Age). These alluvial deposits reportedly consist of unconsolidated to semi-consolidated sand, silt, clay, and gravel. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) web-based soil database indicates that the predominant soil types at the project site belong to the so-called “Urban Land-Flaskan” complex that consists of well-drained sandy loams and gravelly loams.

Weak soils can compress, collapse, or spread laterally under the weight of buildings and fill, causing settlement relative to the thickness of the weak soil. Usually the thickness of weak soil will vary, and differential settlement will occur. Weak soils also tend to amplify shaking during an earthquake, and can be susceptible to liquefaction, as discussed further in sections below. The most hazardous weak soils in San José are younger Bay Mud and certain granular soils or fills with high water content. Bay Mud is present in the margins near San Francisco Bay; potentially collapsible soils are located in isolated areas around the City; and potentially liquefiable soils occur throughout much of the lands of San José. For reference, the project site lies roughly 17 miles south-southeast of San Francisco Bay.

**Paleontological Resources**

The project site is located on a paleontological sensitive area in the city with high sensitivity at ground surface.

**DISCUSSION**

a)  *Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving: (i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or*

---


51 Envision San José 2040 General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse Number 2009072096), Figure 3.11.1, Paleontological Sensitivity of City of San José Geologic Units, page 677.
As discussed in Section 4.1, Introduction, the California Supreme Court in a December 2015 opinion (CBIA v. BAAQMD) confirmed that CEQA, with several specific exceptions, is concerned with the impacts of a project on the environment, and not the effects the existing environment may have on a project. Therefore, the introduction of people or structures to existing seismic hazards would not be considered an impact under CEQA. Nevertheless, the City currently has policies that address existing seismic hazards and new development. The impact analysis for this criterion, presented below, is followed by an assessment of the proposed project’s mandatory compliance with relevant General Plan policies.

i. The project site is not located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No impact would occur from implementation of the proposed project.

ii. An earthquake of moderate to high magnitude generated within the San Francisco Bay region could cause considerable ground shaking at the project site. The degree of shaking is dependent on the magnitude of the event, the distance to its zone of rupture, and local geological conditions. In the event of an M 7.9 earthquake on the San Andreas Fault, the project site would be expected to experience “very strong” shaking. Because the project site is located in a seismically active region, strong ground shaking would be expected during the lifetime of the proposed project. However, the project would not exacerbate this existing hazard pursuant to the CBIA v. BAAQMD case. Therefore, no impact with respect to strong seismic ground shaking would occur from implementation of the proposed project.

iii. As previously noted, the project site is not located within a State-designated liquefaction hazard zone. In addition, liquefaction hazards are an existing environmental condition, and not the result of project implementation. The proposed project would not exacerbate this hazard pursuant to the recent CBIA v. BAAQMD case. Therefore, no impact would occur from implementation of the proposed project.

iv. The topography of the project site is generally flat, and the proposed project would not result in an erosion or landslide hazard. Accordingly, no impact would occur from implementation of the proposed project.

Future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to implement measures to avoid significant hazards from site soils and geologic conditions in compliance with the City’s General Plan policies and actions, and the SMJC (listed above), which are required of all projects in the City of San José. In addition, the City could require the following standard permit conditions to further reduce geologic and soil impacts associated with the construction of future development on the project site, which could include:

- To avoid or minimize potential damage from seismic shaking, the project shall be constructed using standard engineering and seismic safety design techniques. Building design and construction at the site shall be completed in conformance with the recommendations of an approved geotechnical investigation. The report shall be reviewed and approved by the City of San José Department of Public Works as part of the building permit review and issuance process. The buildings shall meet the requirements of applicable Building and Fire Codes as adopted or
updated by the City. The project shall be designed to withstand soil hazards identified on the site and the project shall be designed to reduce the risk to life or property on site and off site to the extent feasible and in compliance with the Building Code.

- All excavation and grading work shall be scheduled in dry weather months or construction sites shall be weatherized.
- Stockpiles and excavated soils shall be covered with secured tarps or plastic sheeting.
- Ditches shall be installed to divert runoff around excavations and graded areas if necessary.

The project shall be constructed in accordance with the standard engineering practices in the California Building Code, as adopted by the City of San José. A grading permit from the San José Department of Public Works shall be obtained prior to the issuance of a Public Works clearance. These standard practices would ensure that the future building on the site is designed to properly account for soils-related hazards on the site. Copies of these documents must be submitted to the City Project Engineer prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Implement standard grading and best management practices to prevent substantial erosion and siltation during development of the site. These measures are generally covered by measures included to protect air quality and water quality. They include, but are not limited to:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day or covered.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

Mandatory compliance with General Plan policies and actions, and the SJMC (listed above) would ensure that potential soil-related hazards do not pose significant risks to future structures built on the site. In addition, mandatory compliance with a site-specific SWPPP and best management practices to prevent erosion would also avoid significant erosion impacts. Compliance with these regulations is required of all projects in the City of San José as conditions of project approval; therefore, there would be no impact to geologically-related hazards.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any ground disturbing activities but rather would amend the land use designation on the project site. As such, the proposed project would not result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

Future development facilitated by the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the standard engineering practices of the California Building Code, as adopted by the SJMC. In addition, the City of San José Department of Public Works must issue a Public Works Clearance prior to the
commencement of ground disturbance activities. Future development would be required to implement measures to avoid significant erosion and/or loss of topsoil, such as those listed under Criterion (a). Mandatory compliance with the City’s General Plan policies and actions, as well as the SJMC (listed above) would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project 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?

As previously discussed in existing conditions, the project site is generally flat. The adjacent properties also have low topographic relief. Therefore, the risk of landslides is low. In addition, the project site is not located within a State-designated landslide hazard zone.

The project site is also not located within a State-mapped liquefaction zone. Furthermore, the USGS lists the area containing the project site as having “low susceptibility” to liquefaction.\(^5^2\) In light of this information, the potential impact of the proposed project with respect to unstable geological units or soil is considered less than significant.

d) Would the project 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?

As described above, the USDA soil survey broadly identified the major soil associations in the project site, as Urban Land-Flaskan complex, which possesses a sandy loam, or a gravelly loam profile and natural drainage class is well drained.\(^5^3\) In light of the on-site clay characteristics, the soil is considered to be potentially expansive and subject to expansion and contraction as a result of seasonal or human-made soil moisture. Expansive soils can undergo significant volume changes as a result of wetting or drying. This volume change can cause damage to foundations and pavement. While implementation of the proposed project would not result in any ground disturbing activities as a policy-level proposal, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to implement measures to reduce the risks associated with expansive soils such as those listed under Criterion (a). Mandatory compliance with City’s General Plan policies and actions, as well as the SJMC (listed above), would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project 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?

Future development of the proposed project would not require the construction or use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, because the project site would be connected to the existing municipal sewage system that is operated by San José-Santa Clara Regional Wastewater Facility (RWF). This facility treats Silicon Valley’s wastewater to very high standards, handling an average of 110 million.

---


gallons of wastewater per day (see Section XIX, Utilities and Service Systems for further discussion on wastewater). Accordingly, the proposed change in land use under the proposed project would result in no impact.

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

The site is located within a paleontological sensitive area of San José with high sensitivity at ground surface. However, the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level and would not directly result in any excavation or other forms of development that could adversely affect paleontological resources. Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in construction activities such as site preparation, grading, and excavating that could potentially expose previously undiscovered fossils of potential significance and other unique geological features that have not yet been recorded. Therefore, ground-disturbing construction associated with future development under the proposed project could cause damage to, or destruction of, paleontological resources or unique geologic features. Future development on the project site would be required to adhere to General Plan Policies ER-10.1 and ER-10.3 (listed above) for the discovery of unknown paleontological resources. In addition, prior to future development permits, the City would require standard permit conditions to further reduce potential impacts to undiscovered paleontological resources, which could include the following:

- If vertebrate fossils are discovered during construction, all work on the site shall stop immediately, Director of Planning or Director’s designee of the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement (PBCE) shall be notified, and a qualified professional paleontologist shall assess the nature and importance of the find and recommend appropriate treatment. Treatment may include, but is not limited to, preparation and recovery of fossil materials so that they can be housed in an appropriate museum or university collection and may also include preparation of a report for publication describing the finds. The project applicant shall be responsible for implementing the recommendations of the qualified paleontologist. A report of all findings shall be submitted to the Director of Planning or Director’s designee of the PBCE.

Mandatory compliance with General Plan Policies ER-10.1 and ER-10.3 listed above, would ensure that implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on any unknown unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature.

---

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would implementation of the proposed project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Global climate change may be amplified by adding large amounts of heat-trapping gases, known as greenhouse gases (GHGs), into the atmosphere. The primary source of these GHG emissions is fossil fuel use from human activities. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has identified four major GHGs—water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and O₃—that are the likely cause of an increase in global average temperatures observed within the 20th and 21st centuries. Other GHGs identified by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that contribute to global warming to a lesser extent include nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), hydro fluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons. Black carbon emissions are not included in the GHG analysis because CARB does not include this pollutant in the State’s AB 32 inventory and treats this short-lived climate pollutant separately. The following is a summary of the relevant federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to GHG emissions.

---

55 Water vapor (H₂O) is the strongest GHG and the most variable in its phases (vapor, cloud droplets, ice crystals). However, water vapor is not considered a pollutant, but part of the feedback loop rather than a primary cause of change.

56 Black carbon contributes to climate change both directly, by absorbing sunlight, and indirectly, by depositing on snow (making it melt faster) and by interacting with clouds and affecting cloud formation. Black carbon is the most strongly light-absorbing component of PM emitted from burning fuels. Reducing black carbon emissions globally can have immediate economic, climate, and public health benefits. California has been an international leader in reducing emissions of black carbon, with close to 95 percent control expected by 2020 due to existing programs that target reducing PM from diesel engines and burning activities. However, State and national GHG inventories do not yet include black carbon due to ongoing work resolving the precise global warming potential of black carbon. Guidance for CEQA documents does not yet include black carbon.

57 Particulate matter emissions, which include black carbon, are analyzed in Section 5.2, Air Quality. Black carbon emissions have sharply declined due to efforts to reduce on-road and off-road vehicle emissions, especially diesel particulate matter. The State’s existing air quality policies will virtually eliminate black carbon emissions from on-road diesel engines within 10 years.

Regulatory Framework

Federal

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) announced on December 7, 2009, that GHG emissions threaten the public health and welfare of the American people and that GHG emissions from on-road vehicles contribute to that threat. The USEPA's final findings respond to the 2007 United States Supreme Court decision that GHG emissions fit within the Clean Air Act definition of air pollutants. The findings do not in and of themselves impose any emission reduction requirements, but allow the EPA to finalize the GHG standards proposed in 2009 for new light-duty vehicles as part of the joint rulemaking with the Department of Transportation. The USEPA's endangerment finding covers emissions of six key GHGs—CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and SF₆—that have been the subject of scrutiny and intense analysis for decades by scientists in the United States and around the world. The first three are applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project because they constitute the majority of GHG emissions from the on-site land uses, and per BAAQMD guidance are the GHG emissions that should be evaluated as part of a GHG emissions inventory.

State

Assembly Bill 32 and Executive Order S-03-05

Executive Order S-03-05, signed June 1, 2005, set the following GHG reduction targets for the State: 2000 levels by 2010, 1990 levels by 2020, 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Assembly Bill (AB) 32, also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act, was passed in 2006 and follows the 2020 tier of emissions reduction targets established in Executive Order S-03-05 (i.e., 1990 levels by 2020). CARB is the state agency in charge of coordinating the GHG emissions reduction effort and establishing targets along the way. The 2008 Scoping Plan was adopted by CARB on December 11, 2008.

Senate Bill 32 and Executive Order B-03-05

Executive Order B-30-15, signed April 29, 2015, sets a goal of reducing GHG emissions within the State to 40 percent of 1990 levels by year 2030. In September 2016, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 32, making the Executive Order goal for year 2030 into a statewide mandated legislative target. Executive Order B-30-15 and SB 32 required CARB to prepare another update to the Scoping Plan to address the 2030 target for the state. The update to the 2008 Scoping Plan is the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, approved on December 14, 2017. The 2017 Scoping Plan establishes a new emissions limit of 260 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂e) for the year 2030, which corresponds to a 40 percent decrease in 1990 levels by 2030. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan includes the potential regulations and programs to achieve the 2030 target.

Senate Bill 375

SB 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, was adopted in 2005 to connect the Scoping Plan’s GHG emissions reductions targets for the transportation sector to local land use decisions that affect travel behavior. Specifically, SB 375 required CARB to establish GHG emissions reduction targets for each of the 18 regions in California managed by a metropolitan planning organization (MPO). The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the MPO for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region. MTC’s targets include a 15 percent per capita reduction from 2005 levels by 2035.

Plan Bay Area 2040 is the Bay Area’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy. Plan Bay Area 2040 lays out a development scenario for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, would reduce GHG emissions from transportation (excluding goods movement) beyond the per capita reduction targets identified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Plan Bay Area 2040 remains on track to meet a 16 percent per capita reduction of GHG emissions by 2035.\(^{60}\)

California Green Building Standards Code

New buildings associated with future developments on the project site are required to comply with the current Building Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Standards Code, known as CALGreen, at minimum, which include performance standards for energy efficiency and require installation of electric vehicle charging stations and secured bicycle parking. These standards are updated triennially, with the goal of requiring zero-net-energy residential buildings by 2020 and zero-net-energy non-residential buildings by 2030.

Regional

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)

BAAQMD adopted GHG emissions thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under CEQA. These thresholds were designed to establish the level at which BAAQMD has determined that GHG emissions would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative environmental impacts from GHG emissions. The GHG emissions thresholds identified by BAAQMD are 1,100 MT of CO\(_2\)e per year or 4.6 MTCO\(_2\)e per service population per year. A project that is in compliance with the City’s GHG Reduction Strategy is considered to have a less than significant GHG impact regardless of its emissions.

The numeric thresholds set by BAAQMD and addressed in the City’s GHG Reduction Strategy, described below, were calculated to achieve the state’s 2020 target for GHG emissions levels (and not the SB 32 specified target of 40 percent below the 1990 GHG emissions level). The proposed project, if approved, would not be approved until December 2020, and any development that may result from project approval would not occur until after that time. Because the project would not be approved until late 2020 and was

\(^{60}\) Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2017, March. Plan Bay Area 2040.
not part of the GHG inventory used to project City emissions in its GHG Reduction Strategy, the proposed project would not be covered under the City’s GHG Reduction Strategy. In addition, BAAQMD’s service population threshold is not a valid CEQA threshold until BAAQMD provides more evidence to support its appropriateness for new development in the region. CARB has completed a Scoping Plan that addresses the measures the state will implement to meet its 2030 target. For the purposes of this analysis, a bright-line threshold of 660 MTCO₂e per year has been calculated for 2030 based on BAAQMD’s 1,100 bright-line threshold, as updated to account for the GHG reduction targets of SB 32.

**Bay Area Clean Air Plan**

The 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan addresses air emissions in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. One of the key objectives in the 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan is climate protection, which includes emission control measures and performance objectives, consistent with the state’s climate protection goals under AB 32 and SB 375, designed to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2035, and to meet the State’s 2030 GHG reduction target and 2050 GHG reduction goal.

**Local General Plan**

The Housing (H) and Land Use/Transportation (TR) sections of the General Plan include the following goals and policies specific to GHG emissions and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project:

- **Goal H-4 Environmental Sustainability** – Provide housing that minimizes the consumption of natural resources and advances our City’s fiscal, climate change, and environmental goals.
  - **Policy H-4.2**: Minimize housing’s contribution to greenhouse gas emissions, and locate housing, consistent with our City’s land use and transportation goals and policies, to reduce vehicle miles traveled and auto dependency.
  - **Policy H-4.3**: Encourage the development of higher residential densities in complete, mixed-use, walkable and bikeable communities to reduce energy use and greenhouse gas emissions.

- **Goal TR-9 Tier I Reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled** – Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by 10 percent, from 2009 levels, as an interim goal.
  - **Policy TR-9.1**: Enhance, expand and maintain facilities for walking and bicycling, particularly to connect with and ensure access to transit and to provide a safe and complete alternative transportation network that facilitates non-automobile trips.

**Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy and Climate Smart San José**

The 2030 GHG Reduction Strategy, dated August 2020, is designed to help the City sustain its natural resources, grow efficiently, and meet California legal requirements for GHG emissions reduction. Multiple policies and actions in the City’s General Plan have GHG emission reduction implications including those targeting land use, housing, transportation, water usage, solid waste generation and recycling, and reuse of historic buildings. The policies also include a monitoring component that allows for adaptation and
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adjustment of City programs and initiatives related to sustainability and associated reductions in GHG emissions. The GHG Reduction Strategy is intended to meet the mandates as outlined in the CEQA Guidelines and the recent standards for “qualified plans” as set forth by BAAQMD.

Climate Smart San José is the City’s overarching plan for reducing emissions and serves as a roadmap to carbon reductions aligned with the State’s GHG targets set by AB 32, SB 32, and Executive Order S-3-05, while supporting 40 percent growth in the City’s population by 2050. This plan identifies strategies that require action from a range of stakeholders in addition to the City, such as the private sector, residents, and community groups. Climate Smart San José and the GHG Reduction Strategy have been prepared consistent with each other. The GHG Reduction Strategy is prepared specifically in accordance with BAAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines to allow future development projects that demonstrate consistency with it to streamline their GHG emissions analysis.

The previous GHG Reduction Strategy identified a target for the City to meet the plan efficiency threshold of 6.6 MTCO₂e per service population (SP) per year (MTCO₂e/SP/year) for the year 2020. Based on the current emissions trajectory in the 2030 GHG Reduction Strategy, the city has continued to demonstrate decreasing emissions intensity since 2008 and is on track to achieve its 2020 GHG target. The 2030 GHG Reduction Strategy targets further reductions to a goal of 2.94 MTCO₂e/SP by 2030. To achieve the City’s GHG reduction target, the GHG Reduction Strategy outlined energy, transportation, land use, water, solid waste, and off-road equipment GHG reduction measures that would be implemented in the city.

City of San José Private Sector Green Building Policy (6-32)

In October 2008, the City adopted the Private Sector Green Building Policy (6-32) that establishes baseline green building standards for private sector new construction and provides a framework for the implementation of these standards. This policy requires that applicable projects achieve minimum green building performance levels using the Council adopted standards. The proposed project would be subject to this policy. Any future development with residential units of 75 feet or greater height, it would be required to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, commonly known as “LEED,” Silver certification, at minimum.

Existing Conditions

The proposed 2.5-acre area of change on the project site is currently underdeveloped and contains maintained lawn (vegetated) and paved areas. The remainder of the project site includes a sports complex and two preschools. The 2.5-acre area of the project site does not contain buildings or uses directly resulting in GHG emissions other than the ongoing maintenance of the lawn. The sports center and preschools, which are not subject to the proposed land use change, produce GHG emissions from associated energy uses and vehicular travel to and from the site.
DISCUSSION

a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

A project does not generate enough GHG emissions on its own to influence global climate change; therefore, implementation of the proposed change in land use that would facilitate potential future development on the site is appropriately evaluated based on its contribution to cumulative environmental impacts. Implementation of the proposed project could facilitate single-family residential development. As the proposed area of change on the larger former school campus site is underdeveloped, the potential future infill development would represent a change from the current public uses on the site and would result in an increase in vehicle trips to and from the site as well as onsite energy use, water use, wastewater generation, and solid waste disposal.

Potential future development of the project site under the proposed land use designation would result in increases in GHGs associated with construction activities including operation of construction equipment and emissions from construction workers’ personal vehicles traveling to and from the construction site. Construction-related GHG emissions vary depending on the level of activity, length of the construction period, specific construction operations, types of equipment, and number of personnel. Neither the City of San José nor BAAQMD has established a quantitative threshold or standard for determining whether a project’s construction-related GHG emissions are significant. However, construction emissions would be temporary and short term, and would not result in ongoing GHG emissions. Operation of potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with the 2030 GHG reduction goals, Climate Smart San José, the Private Sector Green Building Policy, and the goals outlined in the General Plan, listed above, which would serve to reduce GHG emissions. Furthermore, the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level and does not include a specific development proposal. GHG emissions related to potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would vary depending on specific project characteristics. In addition, future development could include a range of potential measures to mitigate GHG emissions. As such, GHG emissions due to implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?

The proposed project would result in changes at the policy level and does not include a specific development proposal. However, implementation of the proposed project could facilitate land uses compatible with R-1-8 zoning and RN land use designation. Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to demonstrate consistency with the City’s GHG Reduction Strategy, as amended, and the goals and regulations listed above, to ensure impacts would be less than significant.

The GHG Reduction Strategy identifies a series of GHG emissions reduction measures to be implemented by development projects that would allow the City to achieve its GHG reduction goals. For example, new development projects are required to meet certain energy efficiency standards. While the proposed project involves a policy-level proposal to allow for future infill residential-compatible development, any potential future development proposed for the project site would be required to comply with all
applicable mandatory criteria in the GHG Reduction Strategy that is most recent and applicable at that time. This could include, for example, incorporation of green building measures, bicycle and pedestrian designs, compliance to the Land Use/Transportation Diagram, and more.

The targets and emission reduction requirements in an updated GHG Reduction Strategy likely will be based in part on State of California projections and 2030 targets in the CARB’s 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. In the event the City’s GHG Reduction Strategy is updated with additional requirements subsequent to approval of the general plan amendment but prior to the issuance of planning permits (e.g., Planned Development Permits or Planned Development Permit Amendments), the project would be subject to requirements of the City’s updated GHG Reduction Strategy at the time of application. Building permits also would be subject to the City’s Green Building Ordinance and Building Code requirements at the time of application. Any additional requirements for building design and operations related to energy efficiency would be incorporated in future building plans prior to building permit approval. Thus, the project impacts would be considered less than significant.

### IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people living or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following is a summary of the relevant federal, State, regional, and local regulations pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials that are relevant to the proposed project.

**Regulatory Framework**

**Federal**

The storage, use, generation, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and waste are highly regulated under federal and state laws. Key federal regulations and policies related to development include the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), commonly known as Superfund, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Laws and regulations established by the USEPA are enforced in Santa Clara County by the California Environmental Protection Agency (discussed below).

**State**

**California Environmental Protection Agency**

The CalEPA was created in 1991 by Executive Order W-5-91. Several State regulatory boards, departments, and offices were placed under the Agency’s umbrella to create a cabinet-level voice for the protection of human health and the environment and to assure the coordinated deployment of State resources. The California Environmental Protection Agency also oversees the unified hazardous waste and hazardous materials management regulatory program (Unified Program).

**California Department of Toxic Substances Control**

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), which is a department of the CalEPA, is authorized to carry out the federal hazardous waste program in California to protect people from exposure to hazardous wastes. The department regulates hazardous waste, cleans up existing contamination, and looks for ways to control and reduce the hazardous waste produced in California. Permitting, inspection, compliance, and corrective action programs ensure that people who manage hazardous waste follow federal and State requirements and other laws that affect hazardous waste specific to handling, storage, transportation, disposal, treatment, reduction, cleanup, and emergency planning.
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

California Building Code

The State of California provides minimum standards for building design and construction through Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The California Building Code is located in Part 2 of Title 24 and is adopted by reference in SMJC Chapter 24.03. The California Building Code is updated every three years. Commercial and residential buildings are plan-checked by City building officials for compliance with the typical fire safety requirements of the California Building Code.

California Fire Code

Part 2 of SJMC Chapter 17.12 adopts the California Fire Code. The California Fire Code adopts by reference the International Fire Code with necessary State amendments. Updated every three years, the California Fire Code includes provisions and standards for emergency planning and preparedness, fire service features, fire protection systems, hazardous materials, fire flow requirements, and fire hydrant locations and distribution. Typical fire safety requirements include installation of sprinklers in all high-rise buildings; the establishment of fire resistance standards for fire doors, building materials, and particular types of construction; and the clearance of debris and vegetation within a prescribed distance from occupied structures in wildlife hazard areas.

California Emergency Management Agency

The California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA) was established as part of the Governor’s Office on January 1, 2009—created by AB 38, which merged the duties, powers, purposes, and responsibilities of the former Governor’s Office of Emergency Services with those of the Governor’s Office of Homeland Security. The California Emergency Management Agency is responsible for the coordination of overall State agency response to major disasters in support of local government. The agency is responsible for assuring the State’s readiness to respond to and recover from all hazards—natural, human-made, emergencies, and disasters—and for assisting local governments in their emergency preparedness, response, recovery, and hazard mitigation efforts.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) has mapped fire threat potential throughout California. CAL FIRE ranks fire threat based on the availability of fuel and the likelihood of an area burning (based on topography, fire history, and climate). The rankings include no fire threat, moderate, high, and very high fire threat. CAL FIRE produced the 2018 Strategic Fire Plan for California, which contains goals, objectives, and policies to prepare and mitigate for the effects of fire on California’s natural and built environments. This plan provides State Responsibility Fire Safe Regulations, which
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requires that all parcels 1 acre or larger provide a minimum 30-foot setback for buildings from all property lines and/or the center of the road.

Regional

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act established the State Water Resource Board (SWRCB) and the San Francisco Bay RWQCB, which regulates water quality in the project area. The San Francisco Bay RWQCB has the authority to require groundwater investigations when the quality of groundwater or surface waters of the State is threatened, and to require remediation actions, if necessary.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District

The BAAQMD has primary responsibility for control of air pollution from sources other than motor vehicles and consumer products, which are the responsibility of California Environmental Protection Agency and CARB. The BAAQMD is responsible for preparing attainment plans for non-attainment criteria pollutants, control of stationary air pollutant sources, and the issuance of permits for demolition and renovation activities affecting asbestos containing materials (District Regulation 11, Rule 2) and lead (District Regulation 11, Rule 1).

Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans

The Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport (also referred to as San José International Airport) is intended to safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of and the aircraft occupants. The Comprehensive Land Use Plan is also intended to ensure that surrounding new land uses do not affect the airport’s continued operation. Specifically, the Comprehensive Land Use Plan seeks to ensure that people and facilities are not concentrated in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, and to ensure that no structures or activities adversely affect navigable airspace. The implementation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan is intended to prevent future incompatible development from encroaching on the airport and allow for its development in accordance with the current airport master plan. The project site is not located in the Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission Airport Influence Area.

County of Santa Clara County Department of Environmental Health

The County of Santa Clara Department of Environmental Health is the local Certified Unified Program Agency. The County of Santa Clara Department of Environmental Health conducts inspections, surveillances, or monitoring, or other purposes to protect the present and future public health and safety and the environment as provided in Chapter 6.5 and 6.8 of the California Health and Safety Code and Chapter 4 of Division 7 of the Water Code. Further, the Hazardous Materials Compliance Division was established in 1983 with the adoption of the local Hazardous Materials Storage Ordinance which regulates
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63 County of Santa Clara Department of Environmental Health, Programs and Services, https://www.sccgov.org/sites/deh/program/Pages/default.aspx, accessed on April 17, 2020.
the storage of hazardous materials both above and below ground. In addition to the Hazardous Materials Storage Ordinance, Hazardous Materials Compliance Division enforces the County’s Toxic Gas Ordinance and Non-Point Source (Urban Runoff) Ordinance.64

Local

General Plan

The Environmental Considerations/Hazards (EC) and Parks, Open Space, and Recreation (PR) sections of the General Plan include goals and policies specific to hazards and hazardous materials and applicable the proposed project:

- **Goal EC-6 Hazardous Materials** – Protect the community from the risks inherent in the transport, distribution, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials.
  - **Policy EC-6.1:** Require all users and producers of hazardous materials and wastes to clearly identify and inventory the hazardous materials that they store, use or transport in conformance with local, State and federal laws, regulations and guidelines.
  - **Policy EC-6.2:** Require proper storage and use of hazardous materials and wastes to prevent leakage, potential explosions, fires, or the escape of harmful gases, and to prevent individually innocuous materials from combining to form hazardous substances, especially at the time of disposal by businesses and residences. Require proper disposal of hazardous materials and wastes at licensed facilities.
  - **Policy EC-6.6:** Address through environmental review for all proposals for new residential, park and recreation, school, day care, hospital, church or other uses that would place a sensitive population in close proximity to sites on which hazardous materials are or are likely to be located, the likelihood of an accidental release, the risks posed to human health and for sensitive populations, and mitigation measures, if needed, to protect human health.
  - **Policy EC-6.7:** Do not approve land uses and development that use hazardous materials that could impact existing residences, schools, day care facilities, community or recreation centers, senior residences, or other sensitive receptors if accidentally released without the incorporation of adequate mitigation or separation buffers between uses.
  - **Policy EC-6.7:** The City will use information on file with the County of Santa Clara Department of Environmental Health under the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program as part of accepted Risk Management Plans to determine whether new residential, recreational, school, day care, church, hospital, seniors or medical facility developments could be exposed to substantial hazards from accidental release of airborne toxic materials from CalARP facilities.

- **Goal EC-7 Environmental Contamination** – Protect the community and environment from exposure to hazardous soil, soil vapor, groundwater, and indoor air contamination and hazardous building
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materials in existing and proposed structures and developments and on public properties, such as parks and trails.

- **Policy EC-7.1**: For development and redevelopment projects, require evaluation of the proposed site’s historical and present uses to determine if any potential environmental conditions exist that could adversely impact the community or environment.

- **Policy EC-7.2**: Identify existing soil, soil vapor, groundwater and indoor air contamination and mitigation for identified human health and environmental hazards to future users and provide as part of the environmental review process for all development and redevelopment projects. Mitigation measures for soil, soil vapor and groundwater contamination shall be designed to avoid adverse human health or environmental risk, in conformance with regional, State and federal laws, regulations, guidelines and standards.

- **Policy EC-7.4**: On redevelopment sites, determine the presence of hazardous building materials during the environmental review process or prior to project approval. Mitigation and remediation of hazardous building materials, such as lead-paint and asbestos-containing materials, shall be implemented in accordance with state and federal laws and regulations.

- **Policy EC-7.6**: The City will encourage use of green building practices to reduce exposure to volatile or other hazardous materials in new construction materials.

- **Policy EC-7.9**: Ensure coordination with the County of Santa Clara Department of Environmental Health, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Department of Toxic Substances Control or other applicable regulatory agencies, as appropriate, on projects with contaminated soil and/or groundwater or where historical or active regulatory oversight exists.

- **Policy EC-7.11**: Require sampling for residual agricultural chemicals, based on the history of land use, on sites to be used for any new development or redevelopment to account for worker and community safety during construction. Mitigation to meet appropriate end use such as residential or commercial/industrial shall be provided.

- **Goal PR-6 High Quality Facilities and Programs** – Provide park lands, trails, open space, recreation amenities, and programs, nationally recognized for their excellence, which enhance the livability of the urban and suburban environments; preserve significant natural, historic, scenic and other open space resources; and meet the parks and recreation services needs of San José’s residents, workers, and visitors.

- **Policy PR-6.5**: Design and maintain park and recreation facilities to minimize water, energy and chemical (e.g., pesticides and fertilizer) use. Incorporate native and/or drought-resistant vegetation and ground cover where appropriate.

### San José Emergency Operations Plan

An Emergency Operations Plan is required for each local government in California. The guidelines for the plan come from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and are modified by the State Office of Emergency Services for California needs and issues. The purpose of the plan is to provide a legal framework for the management of emergencies and guidance for the conduct of business in the
Emergency Operations Center. The City of San José Emergency Operations Plan was adopted by City Council in 2004. The most recently revised version is dated February 2019.

Existing Conditions

Hazardous Materials Sites

Cortese List

The term “hazardous material” is defined in different ways for different regulatory programs. The California Health and Safety Code Section 25501 definition of a hazardous material is: “any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment.” The DTSC divides hazardous material sites into three categories: clean-up sites, permitted sites, and other sites. Sites listed within these three categories can be at various stages of evaluation or clean up, from the beginning to the end of the process. California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the DTSC to compile, maintain, and update specified lists of hazardous material release sites. The CEQA Statute (PRC Section 21092.6) requires the lead agency to consult the lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 to determine whether a proposed project and any alternatives are identified as contaminated sites.

The required lists of hazardous material release sites are commonly referred to as the “Cortese List” after the legislator who authored the legislation. Those requesting a copy of the Cortese List are referred directly to the appropriate information resources contained on internet websites hosted by the boards or departments referenced in the statute, including DTSC’s online EnviroStor database and the SWRCB’s online GeoTracker database. These two databases include hazardous material release sites, along with other categories of sites or facilities were reviewed to identify known or suspected sources of contamination. In addition, the USEPA lists sites reporting to the USEPA on the database EnviroMapper.

A search of DTSC’s EnviroStor, SWRCB’s GeoTracker, and USEPA’s EnviroMapper databases on April 17, 2020 did not reveal any records for the project site. Nearby there is a permitted underground storage tank and a closed case for a Leaking Underground Storage Tank at the corner of Foxworthy Avenue and Union Avenue, approximately 600 feet to the northwest, and at 14200 Union Avenue and 1948 Camden Avenue, both within 0.25 miles of the project site to the south.\(^{65, 66, 67}\)

General Plan

Chrysotile and amphibole asbestos are minerals that occur naturally within mountainous areas or areas of shallow bedrock in the City of San José. Construction activities such as clearing, grading, and excavation,


have the potential to generate asbestos-containing dust in areas where they are known to naturally occur. Exposure to asbestos dust can result in adverse health effects including lung cancer, mesothelioma, and asbestosis. As shown on Figure 3.6-2, Naturally-Occurring Asbestos, in the General Plan EIR, the project site is not within an area known to contain naturally-occurring asbestos.68

**Historic Use**

Before 1950, much of San José had historically consisted of agricultural land with orchards and row crops, with an urban Downtown surrounded by walkable neighborhoods. During the 1960’s and 1970’s, the city’s population rapidly grew, and residential neighborhoods expanded.69 Prior to the shift from agricultural to urban uses, pesticides could have been used in the orchards, based on widespread agricultural practices at that time. Accordingly, it remains possible that pesticides were historically used or stored at the site and that pesticide residues such as organo-chlorine pesticides may be locally present in soil at the project site given the long agricultural history of the area. Areas where pesticides may have been stored, mixed, or disposed of on the project site could have resulted in localized organo-chlorine pesticides residues.

**Schools**

The nearest schools to the proposed area of change on the project site are two preschools (ATLC and 7 Magic Flowers), which are located on the western portion of the project site. No other schools are located within a 0.25-mile range of the site. Other nearby schools include the Saint Francis Cabrini Catholic School (0.5 miles southwest), Ida Price Charter Middle School (0.5 miles to the northeast), Fammatre Elementary School (0.4 miles to the northeast), and Steindorf K-8 STEAM School (0.5 miles to the east).

**Aircraft Hazards**

The Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport is located approximately 7 miles north of the project site and the Reid-Hillview airport is located approximately 8.5 miles northeast of project site. The nearest heliport, County Medical Center, is located approximately 4 miles north of the project site. The project site is not located within a designated Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission Airport Influence Area. Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77, “Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace” (referred to as FAR Part 77), would require any proposed structure at the project site at a height of 200 feet or higher above ground to be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for airspace safety review. Such a building height is not contemplated under the proposed General Plan Amendment.70

**Wildland Fires**

The severity of the wildfire hazard is determined by the relationship between three factors: fuel classification, topography, and critical fire weather frequency. The project site is not located within an area
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68 City of San José, *Envision San José 2040 General Plan Draft Program EIR*, June 2011, Section 3 (Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation), page 501, Figure 3.6-2.  
of moderate, high, or very high fire hazard severity for the Local Responsibility Area, nor does it contain any areas of moderate, high, or very high fire hazard severity for the State Responsibility Area. 71,72

DISCUSSION

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?

The proposed project constitutes an amendment to the land use designation on a 2.5-acre portion of the former elementary school campus and would not directly involve the routine transport or disposal of hazardous materials. However, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in the use of small amounts of potentially hazardous materials associated with heavy mechanical equipment during construction or during routine maintenance. Due to the type of use and small scale of the potential future development (20 single-family homes), such uses would not be of a large enough quantity to create a hazard to the public or the environment. Under RN zoning, the type of uses allowed would not include uses that would encourage routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials such as a waste facility.

Standard precautions and best management practices to prevent spills would minimize exposure of hazardous materials to people and the environment. Future potential project operation may involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials for cleaning and maintenance purposes, such as cleansers, degreasers, pesticides, and fertilizers. These potentially hazardous materials would not be of a type or be present in sufficient quantities to pose a significant hazard to public health and safety or the environment. Also, any proposed development would be required to comply with existing federal, State, and local regulations. In addition, the project would be required to be consistent with General Plan Policy EC-6.2, which requires proper storage and use of hazardous materials. Therefore, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would not create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and would not create a hazardous condition that would lead to the reasonably foreseeable upset that could release hazardous materials into the environment. Accordingly, the impact would be a less than significant.

b) Would the project 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?

As discussed under Criterion (d) below, the project site does not contain any known hazardous materials spills or storage. Although the project site is currently developed with urban uses, the project site has a potential history of being used for agricultural purposes due to historical land use of the region, which during construction of potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could release hazardous materials into the environment. Any proposed future development would be required to

comply with existing federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to hazardous materials, including General Plan Policy EC-7.11, which requires sampling for residual agricultural chemicals for sites to be used for new development to account for worker and community safety during construction.

In addition, as described in Criterion (a), potential future development on the project site may involve the routine usage of small amounts of hazardous materials during future project construction and operation, but these materials would not be of a quantity or type to be susceptible to an accidental spill or release that would affect the environment or surrounding uses. Also, any proposed future development would be required to comply with existing federal, State, and local regulations, including adherence to General Plan Policy EC-6.2, which requires proper storage and use of hazardous materials. Mandatory compliance with General Plan policies and existing federal, State, and local regulations would ensure that implementation of the proposed project would have a 

\textit{less-than-significant} impact with respect to the release of hazardous materials.

c) \textit{Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or waste within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school?}

As discussed above, two preschools are located adjacent to the proposed are of change on the project site to the west. Other nearby schools are further than 0.25 miles from the project site.

The RN land use designation would allow for residential development, types of uses which would not result in hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials or substances such as large industrial type of uses. Potential future development facilitated by the project site may involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials for cleaning and maintenance purposes, such as cleansers, degreasers, pesticides, and fertilizers. These potentially hazardous materials would not be of a type or be present in sufficient quantities to pose a significant hazard to public health and safety or the environment. Also, any proposed future development would be required to comply with existing federal, State, and local regulations, including the General Plan policies described above. Further, as previously discussed in Criterion (c) in Section III, Air Quality, the proposed General Plan land use amendment would not directly result in any construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions. In accordance with regional and local air quality policies, specifically General Plan Policy MS-11.2 requiring the preparation of a health risk assessment, potential future development on the proposed area of change would be required to evaluate the impacts of construction emissions on nearby sensitive receptors to demonstrate that the incremental cancer risk would not exceed 10 in one million (10E-06) for individual sources and/or 100 in a million for cumulative sources, PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations would not exceed 0.3 \(\mu\text{g/m}^3\) for individual sources and/or 0.8 \(\mu\text{g/m}^3\) for cumulative sources, or the appropriate non-cancer hazard index would not exceed 1.0 for individual sources in accordance with BAAQMD’s Thresholds of Significance.\textsuperscript{73} Air quality analyses (i.e., a health risk assessment), would be required to be completed on a site-specific basis to determine whether emissions from potential future development would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction. Therefore, potential future development facilitated by the proposed

\textsuperscript{73} Bay Area Air Quality Management District, California Environmental Quality Act, May 2017, Air Quality Guidelines, Chapter 5, Assessing and Mitigating Local Community Risk and Hazard Impacts, page 5-13 through 5-16.
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The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or waste within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Based on information gathered from a review of the applicable regulatory databases, including EnviroStor, GeoTracker, and EnviroMapper, to identify known or suspected sources of contamination, it was determined that the project site does not contain any known hazardous materials spills or storage sites. Additionally, as previously stated, the project site is not within an area known to contain naturally occurring asbestos. However, as San José has a previous history of agricultural uses, there is a potential that past uses of hazardous materials on the subject properties have led to releases that have yet to be discovered. Per the General Policies, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment following ASTM (American Society for Testing and Materials) standards should be performed prior to development to determine if there is any potential contamination that should be investigated. Implementation of the proposed project, a change in land use designation, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment by virtue of its location in proximity to a known hazardous materials site. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

e) For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people living or working in the project area?

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan area. The proposed project is a policy level change and would not result in specific development of the project site. In addition, potential future development on the site at a height requiring airspace safety review pursuant to Federal Aviation Regulations is not anticipated based on zoning restrictions. Therefore, the proposed project would not create hazards related to air traffic and no impact would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people living or working in the project area?

Given the distance from any airports, implementation of the proposed project would not create any safety hazards related to private airstrips. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impact.

g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The proposed project would not adversely impact access points for emergency vehicles and would not alter the existing roadway system that could potentially change or obstruct any routes identified in the City of San José Emergency Operations Plan. The SJMC Chapter 17.12, Fire Code, adopts the California Fire Code. The California Fire Code regulates permit processes, emergency access, hazardous material handling, and fire protection systems. In addition, potential future development facilitated the proposed
The project site is located in a highly urbanized area in San José and is not located within an area of moderate, high, or very high Fire Hazard Severity for the Local Responsibility Area, nor does it contain any areas of moderate, high, or very high Fire Hazard Severity for the State Responsibility Area. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impact related to wildfires.

### X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) 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?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ENVIROMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to hydrology and water quality that are relevant to the project.

Regulatory Framework

Federal

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1977, as administered by the USEPA, seeks to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation’s waters. The CWA employs a variety of regulatory and non-regulatory tools to reduce direct pollutant discharges into waterways, finance municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and manage polluted runoff. The CWA authorizes the USEPA to implement water-quality regulations. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program under Section 402(p) of the CWA controls water pollution by regulating stormwater discharges into the waters of the United States. California has an approved State NPDES program. The USEPA has delegated authority for water permitting to the SWRCB and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Section 303(d) of the CWA requires that each state identify water bodies or segments of water bodies that are “impaired” (i.e., not meeting one or more of the water-quality standards established by the state). These waters are identified in the Section 303(d) list as waters that are polluted and need further attention to support their beneficial uses. Once the water body or segment is listed, the state is required to establish Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for the pollutant causing the conditions of impairment. TMDL is the maximum amount of a pollutant that a water body can receive and still meet water-quality standards. Typically, TMDL is the sum of the allowable loads of a single pollutant from all contributing point and non-point sources. The intent of the 303(d) list is to identify water bodies that require future development of a TMDL to maintain water quality. In accordance with Section 303(d), the RWQCB has identified impaired water bodies within its jurisdiction, and the pollutants or stressors responsible for impairing the water quality. Stormwater from the project site drains into the City’s catch basins along Cambrianna Drive and Browning Avenue, which connect to the City’s storm drain, with eventual discharge into the Guadalupe River and South San Francisco Bay. The Guadalupe River and South San Francisco Bay are listed on the SWRCB’s 303(d) list.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

The CWA-established NPDES permit program regulates municipal and industrial discharges to surface waters of the United States from their municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s). Under the NPDES

program, all facilities that discharge pollutants into waters of the United States are required to obtain a NPDES permit. Requirements for stormwater discharges are also regulated under this program.

The proposed project is subject to the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) of the Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) Order Number R2-2015-0049 and NPDES Permit Number CAS612008, issued on November 19, 2015. The MRP is effective as of January 1, 2016 and expires on December 31, 2020. The City of San José, Santa Clara County, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) are three of the Santa Clara permittees under the MS4 permit. The C.3 provisions for new development and redevelopment allow the permittees to use their planning authorities to include appropriate source control, site design, and stormwater treatment measures in new projects and redevelopment projects to address both soluble and insoluble stormwater runoff pollutant discharges and prevent increases in runoff flows from these projects. The goal is accomplished primarily through the implementation of low impact development techniques. Low impact development techniques reduce water quality impacts by preserving and recreating natural landscape features, minimizing imperviousness, and then infiltrating, storing, detaining, evaportranspiring, and/or biotreating stormwater runoff.

**National Flood Insurance Program**

The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 mandates the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to evaluate flood hazards. FEMA provides Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for local and regional planners to promote sound land use and floodplain development and identify potential flood areas based on current conditions. To delineate a FIRM, FEMA conducts engineering studies called Flood Insurance Studies (FISs). Using information gathered in these studies, FEMA engineers and cartographers delineate Special Flood Hazard Areas on FIRMs. The most recent FIRM that includes the project site is 06085C0234H dated May 18, 2009.

**State**

**Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act**

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act is the basic water-quality control law for California and under this Act the SWRCB has ultimate control over State water rights and water quality policy. In California, the California Environmental Protection Agency has delegated authority to issue NPDES permits to the SWRCB. The SWRCB, through its nine RWQCBs, carries out the regulation, protection, and administration of water quality in each region. Each regional board is required to adopt a Water Quality Control Plan, or Basin Plan, that recognizes and reflects the regional differences in existing water quality, the beneficial uses of the region’s ground and surface water, and local water-quality conditions and problems. The City is within the Santa Clara Basin and is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay RWQCB (Region 2). The San Francisco RWQCB monitors surface water quality through implementation of the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin (Basin Plan) and designates beneficial uses for surface water
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bodies and groundwater within the Santa Clara Valley. The Basin Plan for the San Francisco Bay Watershed was last updated in 2017 and will continue to be updated as deemed necessary to maintain pace with technological, hydrological, political, and physical changes in the region. This Basin Plan describes the water quality that must be maintained to support the designated beneficial uses and provides programs, projects, and other actions necessary to achieve the standards established in the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan also contains water quality criteria for groundwater.

Statewide General Construction Permit

Construction projects of 1 acre or more are regulated under the General Construction Permit, Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, issued by the SWRCB. Under the terms of the permit, applicants must file Permit Registration Documents with the SWRCB prior to the start of construction. The Permit Registration Documents include a Notice of Intent, risk assessment, site map, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), annual fee, and a signed certification statement. The Permit Registration Documents are submitted electronically to the SWRCB via the Stormwater Multiple Application and Report Tracking System (SMARTS) website.

Applicants must also demonstrate conformance with applicable best management practices and prepare a SWPPP, containing a site map that shows the construction site perimeter, existing and proposed buildings, lots, roadways, stormwater collection and discharge points, general topography both before and after construction, and drainage patterns across the project locations. The SWPPP must list best management practices that would be implemented to prevent soil erosion and discharge of other construction-related pollutants that could contaminate nearby water resources. Additionally, the SWPPP must contain a visual monitoring program, a chemical monitoring program for nonvisible pollutants if there is a failure of the best management practices, and a sediment-monitoring plan if the site discharges directly to a water body listed on the 303(d) list for sediment. Some sites also require implementation of a Rain Event Action Plan. The General Construction Permit also requires applicants to comply with post-construction runoff reduction requirements. Since the project would disturb more than 1 acre, it would be subject to these requirements.

Regional

Santa Clara Valley Water District

The Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) is the flood control agency for the County. Their responsibilities include creek restoration, pollution prevention efforts, and groundwater recharge. The SCVWD requires permits for all well construction and destruction activities and projects occurring on any SCVWD property or easement. Permits are required under the SCVWD’s Water Resources Protection Ordinance and the District Well Ordinance. The SCVWD along with 15 cities (including San José), Santa Clara County, business, agriculture, streamside property owners, and environmental interests have

established the Water Resources Protection Collaborative, which has prepared and adopted *Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams: A Manual of Tools, Standards, and Procedures to Protect Streams and Streamside Resources in Santa Clara County*.79

**Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program**

The Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPPP) is an association of 13 cities and towns in the Santa Clara Valley, together with the County of Santa Clara and the SCVWD. The RWQCB has conveyed responsibility for implementation of stormwater regulations to the member agencies of SCVURPPP. The SCVURPPP incorporates regulatory, monitoring, and outreach measures aimed at improving the water quality of South San Francisco Bay and the streams of the Santa Clara Valley to reduce pollution in urban runoff to the “maximum extent practicable.” The SCVURPPP maintains mandatory compliance with the MS4 Permit and promotes stormwater pollution prevention within that context. Participating agencies (including the City) must meet the provisions of the Santa Clara County permit by ensuring that new development and redevelopment mitigate water quality impacts to stormwater runoff both during the construction and operation of projects.80

The SCVURPPP has successively implemented a series of comprehensive stormwater management plans for urban runoff management meeting RWQCB standards. When the MRP was reissued in 2009, new design standards for runoff treatment control measures from new development and significant redevelopment were required, such as low impact development. The MRP also requires development of a Hydrograph Modification Management Plan (HMP) to manage increased peak runoff flows and volumes (hydromodification) and avoid erosion of stream channels and degradation of water quality caused by new and redevelopment projects in areas subject to hydromodification impacts. The MRP was issued to cover “surface runoff generated from various land uses in all the hydrologic sub basins in the basin which discharge into watercourses, which in turn flow into South San Francisco Bay.” The Santa Clara Basin Stormwater Resource Plan describes the current and future stormwater runoff goals of the SCVURPPP.

San José is a member of the SCVURPPP and follows the guidelines for stormwater runoff control and treatment specified in the *C.3 Stormwater Handbook*.81 In addition, the project must comply with the City’s Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy (6-20) and the City’s Post-Construction Hydromodification Management Policy (8-14), as described below.

---


**Local**

**Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy**

The City’s Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy (Policy 6-29) requires all new development and redevelopment projects to implement post-construction best management practices and treatment control measures (TCMs). The policy also establishes specific design standards for post-construction TCMs for projects that create, add, or replace 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surfaces. Policy 6-29 is updated as changes to the MRP are made. This policy also sets limitations on the use of infiltration treatment measures for the purpose of groundwater protection from contaminants. A Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) must be prepared for new development and redevelopment projects that create and/or replace 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface. The SCP must be submitted and approved by the City prior to the issuance of grading permits. Because potential future development on the project site could create or replace more than 10,000 square feet of impervious surface, it is subject to this policy.

**Post-Construction Hydromodification Policy**

The City’s Post-Construction Hydromodification Policy 8-14 requires all new development and redevelopment projects that create or replace 1 acre or more of impervious surface 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 beneficial uses of local rivers, streams, and creeks. The policy requires these projects to be designed to control project-related hydromodification through preparation and submittal of an Hydromodification Management Plan. New development and redevelopment projects that create and/or replace 1 acre or more of impervious surface and are located in subwatersheds or catchment areas that are less than 65 percent impervious are subject to these requirements. Policy 8-14 is updated periodically to reflect the latest MRP requirements. According to the City’s Hydromodification Map, the project site is within a catchment and subwatershed that is greater than or equal to 65 percent impervious and therefore the project would not be subject to hydromodification requirements.\(^{82}\)

**Riparian Corridor Policy**

The City has adopted a Riparian Corridor Policy that addresses how development of all types should be designed to protect and preserve riparian corridors. Riparian Corridor Policy Guidelines 6A, 6F, 6G, 7A, 7B, 7D, and 7D promote water quality and flood protection.

**General Plan**

The Measurable Environmental Sustainability (MS), Environmental Resources (ER), Environmental Considerations/Hazards (EC), and Infrastructure (IN) sections of the General Plan includes the following goals, policies, and implementation actions relevant to the water quality and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project:

---

Goal MS-3 Water Conservation and Quality – Maximize the use of green building practices in new and existing development to minimize the use of potable water and to reduce water pollution.

- **Policy MS-3.1:** Require water-efficient landscaping, which conforms to the State’s Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, for all new commercial, institutional, industrial, and developer-installed residential development unless for recreational needs or other area functions.

- **Policy MS-3.2:** Promote use of green building technology or techniques that can help reduce the depletion of the City’s potable water supply, as building codes permit. For example, promote the use of captured rainwater, graywater, or recycled water as the preferred source for non-potable water needs such as irrigation and building cooling, consistent with Building Codes or other regulations.

- **Policy MS-3.3:** Promote the use of drought tolerant plants and landscaping materials for non-residential and residential uses.

- **Policy MS-3.4:** Promote the use of green roofs (i.e., roofs with vegetated cover), landscape-based treatment measures, pervious materials for hardscape, and other stormwater management practices to reduce water pollution.

- **Policy MS-3.5:** Minimize areas dedicated to surface parking to reduce rainwater that comes into contact with pollutants.

Goal MS-18 Water Conservation – Continuously improve water conservation efforts in order to achieve best in class performance. Double the City’s annual water conservation savings by 2040 and achieve half of the Water District’s goal for Santa Clara County on an annual basis.

- **Policy MS-18.12:** Encourage stormwater capture and encourage, when feasible and cost-effective, on-site rainwater catchment for new and existing development.

- **Policy MS-18.13:** Encourage graywater use whenever appropriate and in areas that do not impact groundwater quality as determined through coordination with local agencies.

Goal MS-20 Water Quality – Ensure that all water in San José is of the highest quality appropriate for its intended use.

- **Policy MS-20.2:** Avoid locating new development or authorizing activities with the potential to negatively impact groundwater quality in areas that have been identified as having a high degree of aquifer vulnerability by the Santa Clara Valley Water District or other authoritative public agency.

- **Policy MS-20.3:** Protect groundwater as a water supply source through flood protection measures and the use of stormwater infiltration practices that protect groundwater quality. In the event percolation facilities are modified for infrastructure projects, replacement percolation capacity will be provided.

Goal ER-8 Stormwater – Minimize the adverse effects on ground and surface water quality and protect property and natural resources from stormwater generated in the City of San José.

- **Policy ER-8.1:** Manage stormwater runoff in compliance with the City’s Post-Construction Urban Runoff (6-29) and Hydromodification Management (8-14) Policies.
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- **Policy ER-8.5:** Ensure that all development projects in San José maximize opportunities to filter, infiltrate, store and reuse or evaporate stormwater runoff on-site.

- **Policy ER-8.6:** Eliminate barriers to and enact policies in support of the reuse of stormwater runoff for beneficial uses in existing infrastructure and future development in San José.

- **Policy ER-8.7:** Encourage stormwater reuse for beneficial uses in existing infrastructure and future development through the installation of rain barrels, cisterns, or other water storage and reuse facilities.

- **Goal ER-9 Water Resources** - Protect water resources because they are vital to the ecological and economic health of the region and its residents.

  - **Policy ER-9.2:** In consultation with the SCVWD restrict or carefully regulate public and private development in upland areas to prevent uncontrolled runoff that could impact the health and stability of streams.

  - **Policy ER-9.3:** Utilize water resources in a manner that does not deplete the supply of surface or groundwater or cause overdrafting of the underground water basin.

- **Goal EC-3 Seismic Hazards** – Minimize the risk of injury, loss of life, property damage, and community disruption from seismic shaking, fault rupture, ground failure (liquefaction and lateral spreading), earthquake-induced landslides, and other earthquake-induced ground deformation.

  - **Policy EC-3.6:** Restrict development in close proximity to water retention levees or dams unless it is demonstrated that such facilities will be stable and remain intact during and following an earthquake.

- **Goal EC-4 Geologic and Soil Hazards** – Minimize the risk of injury, loss of life, property damage from slope instability, including landslides, differential settlement, and accelerated erosion.

  - **Policy EC-4.1:** Design and build all new or remodeled habitable structures in accordance with the most recent California Building Code and Municipal Code requirements as amended and adopted by the City of San José, including provisions for expansive soil, and grading and stormwater controls.

  - **Policy EC-4.5:** Ensure that any development activity that requires grading does not impact adjacent properties, local creeks and storm drainage systems by designing and building the site to drain properly and minimize erosion. An Erosion Control Plan is required for all private development projects that have a soil disturbance of 1 acre or more, are adjacent to a creek/river, and/or are located in hillside areas. Erosion Control Plans are also required for any grading occurring between October 1st and April 15th.

    - **Action EC-4.12:** Require review and approval of grading plans and erosion control plans (if applicable) prior to issuance of a grading permit by the Director of Public Works.

- **Goal EC-5 Flooding Hazards** – Protect the community from flooding and inundation and preserve the natural attributes of local floodplains and floodways.

  - **Policy EC-5.1:** The City shall require evaluation of flood hazards prior to approval of development projects within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated floodplain. Review
new development and substantial improvements to existing structures to ensure it is designed to provide protection from flooding with a 1 percent annual chance of occurrence, commonly referred to as the “100-year” flood or whatever designated benchmark FEMA may adopt in the future. New development should also provide protection for less frequent flood events when required by the State.

- **Policy EC-5.2:** Allow development only when adequate mitigation measures are incorporated into the project design to prevent or minimize siltation of streams, flood protection ponds, and reservoirs.

- **Policy EC-5.3:** Preserve designated floodway areas for non-urban uses.

- **Policy EC-5.4:** Develop flood control facilities in cooperation with the Santa Clara Valley Water District to protect areas from the occurrence of the “1%” or “100-year” flood or less frequent flood events when required by the State.

- **Policy EC-5.5:** Prepare and periodically update appropriate emergency plans for the safe evacuation of occupants of areas subject to possible inundation from dam and levee failure and natural flooding. Include maps with pre-established evacuation routes in dam failure plans.

- **Policy EC-5.7:** Allow new urban development only when mitigation measures are incorporated into the project design to ensure that new urban runoff does not increase flood risks elsewhere.

- **Policy EC-5.8:** Cooperate with the Santa Clara Valley Water District to develop and maintain additional flood protection retention facilities in areas where they are needed or where the design capacity of existing retention facilities cannot be restored.

- **Policy EC-5.9:** Work with local, regional, state, and federal agencies to ensure new and existing levees provide adequate flood protection and actively partner with the Santa Clara Valley Water District and other levee owners with respect to National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) levee recertification.

- **Policy EC-5.10:** Encourage the preservation and restoration of urban creeks and rivers to maintain existing floodplain storage. When in-channel work is proposed, engineering techniques which include the use of plant materials (bio-engineering) are encouraged.

- **Policy EC-5.11:** Where possible, reduce the amount of impervious surfaces as a part of redevelopment or roadway improvements through the selection of materials, site planning, and street design.

- **Action EC-5.14:** Implement the requirements of FEMA relating to construction in Special Flood Hazard Areas as illustrated on Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Periodically update the City’s Flood Hazard Regulations to implement FEMA requirements.

- **Action EC-5.15:** San José will participate in the NFIP CRS. The CRS is a voluntary incentive program that recognizes and encourages community floodplain management activities that exceed minimum NFIP requirements. Flood insurance premium rates for property owners within the City may be discounted to reflect the reduced flood risk resulting from community actions meeting the three goals of the CRS, which are to reduce flood damage to insurable
property; strengthen and support the insurance aspects of the NFIP; and encourage a comprehensive approach to floodplain management.

- **Action EC-5.16**: Implement the Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management requirements of the City’s Municipal NPDES Permit to manage runoff flow and volume from project sites.

- **Action EC-5.17**: Implement the Hydromodification Management requirements of the City’s Municipal NPDES Permit to manage runoff flow and volume from project sites.

- **Action EC-5.18**: Maintain City storm drain infrastructure in a manner that reduces flood hazards. As the storm drainage system is extended or modified, provide capacity to adequately convey the 10-year storm event.

- **Action EC-5.19**: Develop and maintain a Storm Drainage Master plan and work with other agencies to develop broader Watershed Management Plans to model the City’s hydrology.

- **Goal IN-3 Water Supply, Sanitary Sewer, and Storm Drainage** – Provide water supply, sanitary sewer, and storm drainage infrastructure facilities to meet future growth planned within the City, to assure high-quality service to existing and future residents, and to fulfill all applicable local, State and Federal regulatory requirements.

- **Policy IN-3.1**: Achieve minimal level of services: for storm drainage, to minimize flooding on public streets and to minimize the potential for property damage from stormwater, implement a 10-year return storm design standard throughout the City and in compliance with all local, State, and Federal regulatory requirements.

- **Policy IN-3.7**: Design new projects to minimize potential damage due to stormwater and flooding to the site and other properties.

- **Policy IN-3.9**: Require developers to prepare drainage plans that define needed drainage improvements for proposed developments per City standards.

- **Policy IN-3.10**: Incorporate appropriate stormwater treatment measures in development projects to achieve stormwater quality and quantity standards and objectives in compliance with the City’s NPDES permit.

- **Policy IN-3.12**: Coordinate efforts with other agencies in the development of regional stormwater facilities.

- **Policy IN-3.13**: Encourage the use of flood protection guidelines in development, such as those recommended by the SCVWD, FEMA, and DWR.

- **Action IN-3.16**: Develop a Storm Drainage Infrastructure Master Plan to: identify facilities needed to prevent “10-year” event street flooding and “100-year” event structure flooding; ensure that public facilities and infrastructure are designed pursuant to approved State, regional and local regulatory requirements; ensure that adequate land area and any other elements are provided for facilities subject to incremental sizing (e.g., detention basins and pump stations); and identify opportunities to meet water quality protection needs in a cost-effective manner.
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Chapter 15.11, Water Efficient Landscape Standards for New and Rehabilitated Landscaping

This chapter promotes the conservation and efficient use of water by regulating landscape design, installation, and maintenance in accordance with the Water Conservation in Landscaping Act. The chapter requires new construction projects with a total landscape area of 500 square feet or more that require a building permit or rehabilitated landscape projects with a total landscape area of 2,500 square feet or more that require a building permit to demonstrate that the project meets the water efficiency criteria required by this chapter, including restrictions on turf area, irrigation sensors that use evapotranspiration or soil moisture sensor data, water budget calculations and recycled water options. A landscape documentation package must be submitted to the City as part of the development permit application that includes project information, water efficient landscape worksheet, soil management report, landscape design plan, irrigation design plan, and grading design plan.

Chapter 15.16, Sewer Connection and Storm Drainage

This chapter requires the payment by project developers of storm drainage fees to the City to construct, reconstruct, and maintain the City’s storm drainage system. In addition, storm drainage service charges are collected from each property owner to derive adequate revenue for the acquisition, repair, rehabilitation, construction, and maintenance of the City’s storm drainage system.

Chapter 17.04, Part 6, Excavation and Grading

This chapter establishes uniform engineering standards and procedures for grading, excavation, and earthwork construction, including fills and embankments. A grading permit or Notice of Exemption must be obtained from the Director of Public Works prior to construction. The purpose of the grading program is to ensure that private property is graded so that it will drain properly, not impact adjacent properties and not create erosion problems. Improper grading can result in localized flooding, landslides, and differential settlement.

Chapter 17.08, Special Flood Hazard Area Regulations

This chapter, also known as the Floodplain Ordinance, establishes flood damage prevention measures, which apply to all areas of special flood hazard (i.e., the 100-year floodplain). It is designed to minimize loss of life and property, health and safety hazards, disruption of commerce and governmental services, extraordinary expenditures for flood protection and relief, and impairment of the tax base. It requires that buildings and development projects vulnerable to floods be protected against flood damage at the time of construction by implementing construction standards that must be applied within the 100-year floodplain.

Chapter 20.95, Storm Water Management

The purpose of this chapter is to promote adequate stormwater management and promote the proper siting of stormwater runoff treatment to mitigate potential adverse impacts on adjacent land uses. It also encourages the use of alternative modes of stormwater runoff treatment. The provisions in this chapter
are in accordance with the requirements of the NPDES permit and are consistent with the City Council Policy 6-29, Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management. It applies to new development or redevelopment projects that create and/or replace 10,000 square feet of impervious surfaces, or special land use category projects, such as restaurants, auto service facilities, gas stations, or uncovered parking lots, that create and/or replace 5,000 square feet of impervious surfaces. These projects are required to implement stormwater treatment measures and must also maintain these measures for perpetuity.

Existing Conditions

The project site lies within the Guadalupe River Watershed, which encompasses a large portion of south and western San José. The watershed consists of natural creek channels, engineered channels or conduits, water transfer canals, artificial bodies of water, mudflats, Baylands, and tidal marshes.83

The City of San José Public Works Department is responsible for the design, construction, and maintenance of the City-owned storm drain system, which includes a network of 1,150 miles of storm drains and drainage channels, and 29 stormwater pump stations. Stormwater runoff is collected from City streets and properties via catch basins and storm drain pipes and is then discharged into local creeks that eventually flow into San Francisco Bay. The SCVWD and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) are responsible for the design and construction of flood control facilities and the maintenance of stream channels within the city and Santa Clara County.

The project site is within the Santa Clara Subbasin of the Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin. The San José Water Company (SJWC) is the water purveyor for the project site. San José Water Company obtains its water from three major sources: 1) groundwater from local wells, 2) imported surface water provided by Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) and 3) local mountain surface water collected from the Santa Cruz Mountains.84 The project site is located in South San José and water in this area is supplied by the SCVWD and comes from surface water sources. Additional details on water usage and water supply are provided in Section XIX, Utilities and Service Systems. Groundwater quality in the Santa Clara Subbasin is generally considered to be good and water quality objectives are met in at least 95 percent of the County water supply wells without the use of treatment methods.85

According to the FIRM, the project site is located in Flood Zone D, which is an area with undetermined flood hazards, but flooding is possible.86 The project site is not located Special Flood Hazard Area and therefore, would not be subject to the FEMA regulations and San José regulations (SJMC Chapter 17.08, Special Flood Hazard Area Regulations).

---

The project site is located within the Leroy Anderson Dam flood inundation zone. The Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit project that is currently in the design phase and construction is planned for 2021. The seismic retrofit would cover earthquake retrofitting of Anderson Dam to improve reliability and safety and returns the reservoir to its original storage capacity. The Anderson Reservoir is located approximately 20 miles southwest of the project site. The project site is not within an area of possible flooding as a result of failure of dikes in the area.

The project site is approximately 15 miles from San Francisco Bay and 25 miles from the Pacific Ocean and is not within a tsunami inundation zone, as indicated on the California Emergency Management Agency tsunami inundation maps. Seiches are standing waves oscillating in an enclosed or semi-enclosed body of water, similar to water sloshing in a bathtub. The site is not located proximate to aboveground water tanks or reservoirs and therefore would not be subject to a seiche in the event of a large magnitude earthquake. The project site and the surrounding area is relatively flat and is not in an area subject to debris flows, landslides, or mud flows, as per ABAG landslide maps.

DISCUSSION

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

Increasing the total area of impervious surfaces can result in a greater potential to introduce pollutants to receiving waters. Urban runoff can carry a variety of pollutants, such as oil and grease, metals, sediments, and pesticide residues from roadways, parking lots, rooftops, and landscaped areas, and deposit them into an adjacent waterway via the storm drain system. The proposed project is a request to amend the land use designation on the project site. As such, the proposed project would not directly increase the area of impervious surface on the project site.

Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in clearing, grading, excavation, and construction activities that have the potential to impact water quality through soil erosion and increased silt and debris discharged into runoff. Additionally, the use of construction materials such as fuels, solvents, and paints may present a risk to surface water quality. The refueling and parking of construction vehicles and other equipment on-site during construction may result in oil, grease, or related pollutant leaks and spills that may discharge into the storm drain system. Future development would be

---
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required to comply with the NPDES General Construction Permit, given the potential to disturb more than 1 acre of soil on the project site.

The General Construction Permit requires the submittal of Permit Registration Documents to the State Water Resource Board (SWRCB) prior to the start of construction. The Permit Registration Documents include a Notice of Intent (NOI), risk assessment, site map, annual fee, signed certification statement, SWPPP, and post-construction water balance calculations. The SWPPP describes the incorporation of best management practices to control sedimentation, erosion, and the potential for hazardous materials contamination of runoff during construction. New requirements by the SWRCB also require the SWPPP to include post-construction treatment measures aimed at minimizing stormwater runoff.

All development projects in San José must also comply with the City’s Grading Ordinance, specified in Chapter 17.04, Part 6 – Excavation and Grading. The City Grading Ordinance requires the use of erosion and sediment controls to protect water quality while a site is under construction. Prior to issuance of a permit for grading activity occurring during the rainy season (October 1 to April 15), the applicant is required to submit an Erosion Control Plan to the Director of Public Works for review and approval. Future development must detail the best management practices that would be implemented to minimize the potential for stormwater pollutants.

In addition to the aforementioned requirements, future development on the project site would be required to implement RWQCB best management practices, required of all construction projects in San José, to prevent stormwater pollution and minimize potential sedimentation during construction. The following standard permit conditions, which include, but are not limited to the following, would be required to be implemented prior to and during earthmoving and demolition activities, and continue until any potential future construction is complete:

- Burlap bags filled with drain rock shall be installed around storm drains to route sediment and other debris away from the drains.
- Earthmoving or other dust-producing activities shall be suspended during periods of high winds.
- All exposed or disturbed soil surfaces shall be watered at least twice daily to control dust as necessary.
- Stockpiles of soil or other materials that can be blown by the wind shall be watered or covered.
- All trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered and all trucks shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- All paved access roads, parking areas, staging areas and residential streets adjacent to the construction sites shall be swept daily (with water sweepers).
- Vegetation in disturbed areas shall be replanted as quickly as possible.
- All unpaved entrances to the site shall be filled with rock to remove mud from tires prior to entering City streets. A tire wash system shall be installed if requested by the City.
- The project applicant shall comply with the City of San José Grading Ordinance, including implementing erosion and dust control during site preparation and with the City of San José Zoning Ordinance requirements for keeping adjacent streets free of dirt and mud during construction.

Water quality in stormwater runoff is regulated locally by the SCVURPPP, which includes the C.3 provisions of the MRP adopted by the San Francisco Bay RWQCB. Under the C.3 provisions, all new and
redevelopment projects that create or replace 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface must incorporate site design, source control, and treatment measures to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with the stormwater management C.3 provisions of the MRP. Details of site design, source control, and stormwater treatment control measures demonstrating compliance with C.3 provisions of the MRP, shall be included in the future project design to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement. In addition, the future development would be required to comply with the City’s Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy 6-20. All treatment measures would be required to be designed in accordance with Provision C.3.d of the MRP and the feasibility of low impact development features will be determined in accordance with the procedures set forth in the SCVURPPP C.3 Stormwater Handbook. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) would be required to be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval. Potential future development would be required to comply with the NPDES permit and C.3 provisions of the MRP and the City’s Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy, and therefore would not violate any water quality or waste discharge standards. Compliance with these regulations would render any potential construction and operational surface water or groundwater quality impacts from future development facilitated by the proposed project less than significant.

b) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Potential future development would be connected to municipal water supplies and would not include any groundwater wells on the property. Water is supplied to the site by the SJWC, which obtains its water from groundwater production (40 percent), purchases of surface water from the SCVWD (50 percent), and local mountain surface water (10 percent). The project site is located in South San José and water in this area is supplied by the SCVWD and comes from surface water sources. Therefore, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

Potential future development on the site could result in a reduction in groundwater recharge if there is an increase in impervious surfaces and/or construction dewatering. According to the Department of Conservation/California Geological Survey’s map of depth to historically highest groundwater, groundwater in the vicinity of the site is approximately 20 feet below ground surface (bgs). Therefore, construction dewatering would most likely not be necessary unless subterranean parking is proposed. If dewatering is necessary, future development facilitated by the proposed project shall meet the following C.15 provision of the MRP which include regulations for discharges of uncontaminated groundwater with flows of less than 10,000 gallons per day:

- Discharge to a landscaped area or bioretention unit that is properly designed to accommodate the volume of pumped groundwater; or

---

93 California Department of Conservation (CDC), California Geological Survey (CGS), 2002. Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the San José West 7.5 Minute Quadrangle, Santa Clara County, California.
Discharge to the sanitary sewer. Discharges to the sanitary sewer system shall be subject to all wastewater permitting requirements and fees; or

If the two discharge options described above are not feasible, as determined by the authority having jurisdiction, and these discharges must enter the storm drain system, pre-discharge sampling shall be done in accordance with Provision C.15.b.i.(2)(c) through (e) of the MRP to verify that the discharge is not contaminated. The project shall provide to the City a record of the pre-discharge sampling data collected for verification that the pumped groundwater is not contaminated.

Any proposed new discharges of uncontaminated groundwater with flows equal to or more than 10,000 gallons per day, and all new discharges of potentially contaminated groundwater, shall obtain a permit from the San Francisco Bay RWQCB. Future projects designed to address or triggering the discharge threshold shall provide a copy of the approved permit from the San Francisco Bay RWQCB to with its Building Permit application submittal.

In addition, each new development site in San José must be evaluated for compliance with the City’s Policy 6-29 that sets limitations on the use of infiltration treatment measures for the purpose of groundwater protection from contaminants. Mandatory compliance with the General Plan Policy 6-29 and C.15 provisions of the MRP would ensure that impacts from potential future development on the site would be less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; iii) 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; or iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

The project site does not contain any waterways and therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river. The project site is located with FEMA flood zone D, which is not a special flood hazard area, and therefore there is no potential for future structures on the project site to impede or redirect flood flows. The existing project site is primarily covered by non-native grassland with impervious cement paving on the southern portion of the project site. Given the nature of the proposed land use change to Residential Neighborhood and the location of the project site (i.e., infill), would add impervious surfaces to the project site. Potential future development on the site would be required to incorporate landscaping that could reduce the total percentage of impervious surface. Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would also require grading or soil exposure during construction. If not controlled, the transport of these materials into local waterways could temporarily increase suspended sediment concentrations.

The City’s Grading Ordinance requires the use of erosion and sediment controls to protect water quality while a site is under construction. Potential future development would also be required to prepare an Erosion Control Plan that details the best management practices that would be implemented to minimize potential for erosion and/or siltation during construction. The applicant for any potential future
development would be required to submit an Erosion Control Plan to the Director of Public Works for review and approval prior to the issuance of any grading permits.

To minimize the impacts to erosion, sedimentation, and flooding, potential future development would be required to comply with all of the requirements of the State General Construction Permit, including preparation of Permit Registration Documents and submittal of a SWPPP to the SWRCB prior to the start of construction activities. Furthermore, the C.3 requirements of the MRP include site design, source control, and stormwater treatment measures that would reduce the amount of stormwater runoff that and would not only reduce the potential for erosion or siltation and minimizing potential for on- or off-site flooding. Potential future development would also be required to comply with the San José’s Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy 6-20, which are required for projects that create or replace 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant of the potential future development would be required to prepare a Stormwater Control Plan, in compliance SJMC Chapter 20.95, Storm Water Management, that describes the best management practices and low impact development treatment measures that would reduce the amount of stormwater runoff from the site.

Potential future development would also be required to comply with the San José Hydromodification Management Policy (Policy 8-14), which requires stormwater runoff from the site to match pre-project conditions. Any future project resulting from implementation of the proposed project would be required to comply with the hydromodification requirements that would ensure that stormwater flow rates and volumes do not exceed existing conditions, and therefore, the impacts on the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems would be less than significant.

With implementation of these erosion and sediment control measures and regulatory provisions to limit runoff for potential future development, the proposed project would not result in significant increases in erosion and sedimentation or contribute to flooding on-site or off-site and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Is the project in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone, and would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

The project site is more than 25 miles from San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean and is not within a tsunami inundation zone. There are no large bodies of water in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, there would be no potential for seiches to impact the project site. A seiche is a surface wave generated in a closed or partially enclosed body of water, similar to the sloshing back-and-forth in a bathtub and can occur on lakes, reservoirs, swimming pools, bays, harbors, and seas. Seiches typically are created by winds, earthquakes, or tsunamis. The site is not located in close proximity to a body of water or aboveground storage tanks and would not be subject to a seiche in the event of a large magnitude earthquake. According to the ABAG interactive debris flow and landslide maps, the project site is not within an area susceptible to mudflows.

The project site is located with FEMA flood zone D, which is not a special flood hazard area and is not within the 100-year floodplain. The project site is not within an area of possible flooding as a result of failure of dikes in the area.

According to maps compiled by the SCVWD, the project site is located within the Anderson Reservoir dam inundation zone. Dam inundation zones are based on the highly unlikely scenario of a catastrophic dam failure occurring in a very short period of time. Dam failure could result in the release of water held behind the dams and result in flooding in parts of the city, including the project site. A major seismic event, if sufficiently intense, would be the most likely cause of dam failure. The Anderson Dam is owned and operated by the SCVWD. The dam inundation zone for Anderson Reservoir is based on the reservoir being completely full (i.e., at 100 percent storage capacity). Anderson Dam is currently under storage restrictions while seismic upgrades and fault studies are being completed. Therefore, Anderson Reservoir is currently restricted to 58 percent capacity.95 As a result, the mapped dam inundation zone would be much smaller than the mapped area. Additionally, the arrival time of a flood wave at the project site would be approximately 1.5 to 2 hours with peak arrival times of 4 to 4.5 hours for Anderson Reservoir at full capacity, which would be sufficient time for the City to coordinate evacuation procedures.

The probability of dam failure is extremely low and there is no historic record of dam failure in Santa Clara County or San José.96 Dams in California are continually monitored by various governmental agencies, including the California Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD), which conducts inspections twice a year and reviews all aspects of dam safety. The SCVWD also maintains Emergency Action Plans (EAPs) that include procedures for damage assessment and emergency warnings. Additionally, the City in conjunction with Santa Clara County, addresses the possibility of dam failure in the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), which also provides emergency response actions.

Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur with respect to the release of pollutants from these types of natural hazard events.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

The project site is not within the purview of a sustainable groundwater management plan. The San Francisco Bay RWQCB monitors surface water quality through implementation of the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin, also referred to as the “Basin Plan,” and designates beneficial uses for surface water bodies and groundwater within the Santa Clara Valley. The Basin Plan also contains water quality criteria for groundwater.

As required by stormwater management guidelines discussed under Criterions (a) and (c), best management practices and low impact development measures would be implemented across the project site during both construction and operation of potential future development. These measures would control and prevent the release of sediment, debris, and other pollutants into the storm drain system.

---

96 Santa Clara County, 2011, Santa Clara County Hazard Mitigation Plan.
Implementation of best management practices during construction would be in accordance with the provisions of the SWPPP and the erosion and sediment control plan, which would minimize the release of sediment, soil, and other pollutants. Operational best management practices would be required to meet the C.3 provisions of the MRP. These best management practices, along with compliance with the San José Hydromodification Management Policy (Policy 8-14), San José Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy 6-20, and SJMC 20.95, Storm Water Management, include the incorporation of site design, source control, and treatment control measures to treat and control runoff before it enters the storm drain system. Potential future development would be required to comply with these regulations prior to issuance of construction permits. Additionally, as discussed in Criterion (b), the potential future development would be connected to municipal water supplies and does not propose any groundwater wells on the property.

With implementation of these best management practices and low impact development measures in accordance with City and MRP requirements, potential future development would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the Basin Plan, and potential impacts on water quality would be less than significant.

### XI. LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the relevant regional and local regulations pertaining to Land Use. There are no federal or State regulations governing this topic relevant to the project.

### Regulatory Framework

#### Regional

**Plan Bay Area**

The MTC/ABAG Plan Bay Area is the Bay Area’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Plan Bay Area was adopted on July 18, 2013, with an update, Plan Bay Area 2040, adopted on July 26, 2017. Note that Plan Bay Area is currently being updated to extend to the year 2050. Plan Bay Area was prepared by MTC in partnership with the ABAG, BAAQMD, and the Bay Conservation
and Development Commission (BCDC). Each of the agencies involved in the RTP/SCS has a different role in regional governance. The RTP/SCS sets a development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, would reduce GHG emissions from transportation (excluding goods movement) beyond the per capita reduction targets identified by CARB. Implementation of Plan Bay Area 2040 would achieve a 16 percent per capita reduction of GHG emissions by 2040.97

In 2008, MTC/ABAG initiated a regional effort (FOCUS) to link local planned development with regional land use and transportation planning objectives. Through this initiative, local governments identified Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Transit Priority Areas (TPAs). The PDAs and TPAs form the implementing framework for Plan Bay Area. PDAs are areas along transportation corridors which are served by public transit that allow opportunities for development of transit-oriented, infill development within existing communities that are expected to host the majority of future development. TPAs are similar in that they are formed around one-half mile of a major transit stop such as a transit center or rail line. Overall, over two-thirds of all regional growth by 2040 is allocated within PDAs and TPAs. The project site is not located within a PDA; however, it is located within approximately 0.5 miles of the Bascom Urban Village PDA to the north and 0.2 miles from the Camden Urban Village to the south.98

Local

General Plan

Chapter 6, Land Use and Transportation, of the General Plan includes the following goals and policies specific to land use factors and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project.

- **Goal LU-9 High Quality Living Environments** – Provide high quality living environments for San José’s residents.

- **Policy LU-9.3**: Integrate housing development with our City’s transportation system, including transit, roads, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Municipal Code

Chapter 20.10, General Provisions

The San José Zoning Ordinance implements the land use designations by establishing comprehensive zoning rules for the city. Chapter 20.10, General Provisions, states that the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance is to guide, control, and regulate future growth and development in the city in a sound and orderly manner, and to promote the achievement of the goals and purposes of the General Plan; protect the character and economic and social stability of agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, and other areas in the city; provide light, air, and privacy to property; preserve and provide open space and

---


prevent overcrowding of the land; appropriately regulate the concentration of population; provide access to property and prevent undue interference with and hazards to traffic on public rights-of-way; and prevent unwarranted deterioration of the environment and to promote a balanced ecology.

**Existing Conditions**

The proposed area of change on the project site is currently underdeveloped with maintained lawn (vegetated) and paved areas. The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Public/Quasi-Public (PQP), which includes public land uses, such as schools, colleges, corporation yards, homeless shelters, libraries, fire stations, water treatment facilities, convention centers and auditoriums, museums, governmental offices and airports. The project site is zoned R-1-8 Zoning District, which allows for 8 dwelling units per acre and a wide variety of residentially compatible uses, including, but not limited to, residential care facilities, service facilities, and childcare. As shown in Figure 3-2, the proposed area of change on the project site is a rectangular-shaped site with no existing buildings, bounded by single-family homes to the north, east, and south, and the remainder of the project site occupied with a sports center and two preschools to the west. The surrounding parcels have a General Plan Designation of Residential Neighborhood (RN) and a zoning designation of R-1-8. See Figures 4-4 and 4-5, respectively.

**DISCUSSION**

a) **Would the project physically divide an established community?**

Examples of projects that have the potential to physically divide and established community include new freeways and highways, major arterial streets, and railroad lines. The current proposed project would only change the General Plan designation of this project site and would not change the physical environment. As discussed in Section 3.3.2, based on the re-designation of the General Plan land use of PQP to the proposed RN on 2.5 acres could introduce potentially 20 new single-family homes that is similar to the surrounding existing residential development. Implementation of the proposed project would facilitate infill development that would retain relatively the same roadway patterns, while providing access to the new residential neighborhood. However, the introduction of a new public road on the proposed area of change for access to future residents would not physically divide the existing community. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not facilitate potential future development that would physically divide an established community and the impact would be less than significant.

b) **Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

Implementation of the proposed project would change the current General Plan land use designation from PQP to RN on the approximately 2.5-acre project site. The RN land use designation is applied broadly throughout the city to encompass most of the established, single-family residential neighborhoods, including both the suburban and traditional residential neighborhood areas which comprise the majority of its developed land. The allowable residential density is typically 8 dwelling units per acre and should match the existing neighborhood character. The allowable density/intensity would be determined using a FAR range of 0.7, which generally ranges from one to one and a half stories.
Figure 4-4
Existing General Plan Land Use Map

Figure 4-5
Existing Zoning Map

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Potential future development on the project site would most likely be infill residential use. If the proposed General Plan Amendment is approved, potential future development would be required to comply with all applicable land use plans, policies, and zoning regulations for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Additionally, potential future development would be required to comply with all applicable policies, standards, and code requirements such as setbacks, parking, height, and floor area ratio. Furthermore, future development would also need to comply with surrounding land use character, which could be achieved with the proposed land use amendments. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur as a result of implementing the proposed project.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would implementation of the proposed project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the relevant regional and local regulations pertaining to Mineral Resources. There are no federal regulations governing this topic relevant to the project.

Regulatory Framework

State

Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1974

The California Department of Conservation, Geological Survey (CGS) classifies lands into Aggregate and Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) based on guidelines adopted by the California State Mining and Geology Board, as mandated by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1974. The MRZs identify whether known or inferred significant mineral resources are present in areas. Lead agencies are required to incorporate identified MRZs resource areas delineated by the State into their General Plans.99

---

99 Public Resources Code Section 2762(a)(1).
Local

General Plan

The Environmental Leadership (ER) section of the General Plan includes the following goals and policies specific to mineral resources and applicable to potential future development facilitated by the proposed project.

- **Goal ER-11 Extractive Resources** – Conserve and make prudent use of commercially usable extractive resources.
- **Policy ER-11.2**: Encourage the conservation and development of SMARA-designated mineral deposits wherever economically feasible.

Existing Conditions

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, bounded generally by the Southern Pacific Railroad, Curtner Avenue, SR 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 that are either of statewide significance or the significance of which requires further evaluation. The project site is approximately 4 miles southwest from the Communications Hill area; therefore, the project site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ). The City has no General Plan land use designation for mineral resources.

**DISCUSSION**

a) *Would the project 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?*

Lead agencies are required to incorporate identified MRZs resource areas delineated by the State into their General Plans. The General Plan identified the Communications Hill Area as containing mineral deposits of regional significance. The project site is not identified as containing any mineral deposits and is located approximately 3.6 miles southwest of the Communications Hill Area. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in **no impact**.

b) *Would the project 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?*

As described under Criterion (a) above, the project site is not identified as containing any mineral deposits. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in **no impact**.
XIII. NOISE

Would implementation of the proposed project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Noise is defined as unwanted sound and is known to have several adverse effects on people, including hearing loss, speech and sleep interference, physiological responses, and annoyance. Based on these known adverse effects of noise, the federal government, State of California, and the City have established criteria to protect public health and safety and to prevent disruption of certain human activities. Noise is most often defined as unwanted sound. Although sound can be easily measured, the perception of noise and the physical response to sound complicate the analysis of its impact on people. People judge the relative magnitude of sound sensation in subjective terms such as “noisiness” or “loudness.”

The following are brief definitions of terminology used in this section:

- **Sound.** A disturbance created by a vibrating object, which, when transmitted by pressure waves through a medium such as air, is capable of being detected by a receiving mechanism, such as the human ear or a microphone.

- **Noise.** Sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or otherwise undesirable.

- **Decibel (dB).** A unit-less measure of sound on a logarithmic scale.

- **Peak Particle Velocity (PPV).** The peak rate of speed at which soil particles move (e.g., inches per second) due to ground vibration.

- **A-Weighted Decibel (dBA).** An overall frequency-weighted sound level in decibels that approximates the frequency response of the human ear.

- **Equivalent Continuous Noise Level (Leq); also called the Energy-Equivalent Noise Level.** The value of an equivalent, steady sound level which, in a stated time period (often over an hour) and at a stated location, has the same A-weighted sound energy as the time-varying sound. Thus, the $L_{eq}$ metric is a
single numerical value that represents the equivalent amount of variable sound energy received by a receptor over the specified duration.

- **Statistical Sound Level** (\(L_n\)). The sound level that is exceeded “n” percent of time during a given sample period. For example, the \(L_{50}\) level is the statistical indicator of the time-varying noise signal that is exceeded 50 percent of the time (during each sampling period); that is, half of the sampling time, the changing noise levels are above this value and half of the time they are below it. This is called the “median sound level.” The \(L_{10}\) level, likewise, is the value that is exceeded 10 percent of the time (i.e., near the maximum) and this is often known as the “intrusive sound level.” The \(L_{90}\) is the sound level exceeded 90 percent of the time and is often considered the “effective background level” or “residual noise level.”

- **Day-Night Level** (\(L_{dn}\) or DNL). The energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period, with 10 dB added to the A-weighted sound levels occurring during the period from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. This is a measure of the cumulative noise exposure in a community.

- **Community Noise Equivalent Level** (CNEL). The energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period, with 5 dB added to the A-weighted sound levels occurring during the period from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 10 dB added to the A-weighted sound levels occurring during the period from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. For general community/environmental noise, CNEL and \(L_{dn}\) values rarely differ by more than 1 dB. As a matter of practice, \(L_{dn}\) and CNEL values are interchangeable and are treated as being equivalent in this assessment.

- **Sensitive Receptor.** Noise- and vibration-sensitive receptors include land uses where quiet environments are necessary for enjoyment and public health and safety. Residences, schools, motels and hotels, libraries, religious institutions, hospitals, and nursing homes are examples.

The following is a summary of the relevant local regulations pertaining to noise. There are no federal or State regulations governing this topic relevant to future development facilitated by the proposed project.

**Regulatory Framework**

**Regional**

**Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans**

The *Comprehensive Land Use Plan* for the Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport (also referred to as San José International Airport) is intended to safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of and the aircraft occupants. The *Comprehensive Land Use Plan* includes noise restriction areas and noise compatibility policies. Specifically, the *Comprehensive Land Use Plan* seeks to protect the public from the adverse effects of aircraft noise. The project is not located within the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Airport Influence Area.
Local

General Plan

The Environmental Considerations/Hazards (EC) section of the General Plan includes the following goals and policies relevant to the noise and vibration and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project:

- **Goal EC-1 Community Noise Levels and Land Use Compatibility** – Minimize the impact of noise on people through noise reduction and suppression techniques, and through appropriate land use policies.

- **Policy EC-1.1**: Locate new development in areas where noise levels are appropriate for the proposed uses. Consider federal, state and City noise standards and guidelines as a part of new development review. Applicable standards and guidelines for land uses in San José include:
  - **Interior Noise Levels**: The City’s standard for interior noise levels in residences, hotels, motels, residential care facilities, and hospitals is 45 dBA DNL. Include appropriate site and building design, building construction and noise attenuation techniques in new development to meet this standard. For sites with exterior noise levels of 60 dBA DNL or more, an acoustical analysis following protocols in the City-adopted California Building Code is required to demonstrate that development projects can meet this standard. The acoustical analysis shall base required noise attenuation techniques on expected Envision General Plan traffic volumes to ensure land use compatibility and General Plan consistency over the life of this plan.

- **Policy EC-1.2**: Minimize the noise impacts of new development on land uses sensitive to increased noise levels (Categories 1, 2, 3 and 6) by limiting noise generation and by requiring use of noise attenuation measures such as acoustical enclosures and sound barriers, where feasible. The City considers significant noise impacts to occur if a project would:
  - Cause the DNL at noise sensitive receptors to increase by 5 dBA DNL or more where the noise levels would remain “Normally Acceptable;” or
  - Cause the DNL at noise sensitive receptors to increase by 3 dBA DNL or more where noise levels would equal or exceed the “Normally Acceptable” level.

- **Policy EC-1.3**: Mitigate noise generation of new nonresidential land uses to 55 dBA DNL at the property line when located adjacent to existing or planned noise sensitive residential and public/quasi-public land uses.

- **Policy EC-1.6**: Regulate the effects of operational noise from existing and new industrial and commercial development on adjacent uses through noise standards in the City’s Municipal Code.

- **Policy EC-1.7**: Require construction operations within San José to use best available noise suppression devices and techniques and limit construction hours near residential uses per the City’s Municipal Code. The City considers significant construction noise impacts to occur if a project located within 500 feet of residential uses or 200 feet of commercial or office uses would:
- Involve substantial noise generating activities (such as building demolition, grading, excavation, pile driving, use of impact equipment, or building framing) continuing for more than 12 months.

For such large or complex projects, a construction noise logistics plan that specifies hours of construction, noise and vibration minimization measures, posting or notification of construction schedules, and designation of a noise disturbance coordinator who would respond to neighborhood complaints will be required to be in place prior to the start of construction and implemented during construction to reduce noise impacts on neighboring residents and other uses.

- **Policy EC-1.9:** Require noise studies for land use proposals where known or suspected loud intermittent noise sources occur which may impact adjacent existing or planned land uses. For new residential development affected by noise from heavy rail, light rail, BART or other single-event noise sources, implement mitigation so that recurring maximum instantaneous noise levels do not exceed 50 dBA $L_{max}$ in bedrooms and 55 dBA $L_{max}$ in other rooms.

- **Goal EC-2 Vibration** – Minimize vibration impacts on people, residences, and business operations.

- **Policy EC-2.1:** Near light and heavy rail lines or other sources of ground-borne vibration, minimize vibration impacts on people, residences, and businesses through the use of setbacks and/or structural design features that reduce vibration to levels at or below the guidelines of the Federal Transit Administration. Require new development within 100 feet of rail lines to demonstrate prior to project approval that vibration experienced by residents and vibration sensitive uses would not exceed these guidelines.

- **Policy EC-2.3:** Require new development to minimize continuous vibration impacts to adjacent uses during demolition and construction. For sensitive historic structures, including ruins and ancient monuments or buildings that are documented to be structurally weakened, a continuous vibration limit of 0.08 in/sec PPV (peak particle velocity) will be used to minimize the potential for cosmetic damage to a building. A continuous vibration limit of 0.20 in/sec PPV will be used to minimize the potential for cosmetic damage at buildings of normal conventional construction. Equipment or activities typical of generating continuous vibration include but are not limited to: excavation equipment; static compaction equipment; vibratory pile drivers; pile-extraction equipment; and vibratory compaction equipment. Avoid use of impact pile drivers within 125 feet of any buildings, and within 300 feet of historical buildings, or buildings in poor condition. On a project-specific basis, this distance of 300 feet may be reduced where warranted by a technical study by a qualified professional that verifies that there will be virtually no risk of cosmetic damage to sensitive buildings from the new development during demolition and construction. Transient vibration impacts may exceed a vibration limit of 0.08 in/sec PPV only when and where warranted by a technical study by a qualified professional that verifies that there will be virtually no risk of cosmetic damage to sensitive buildings from the new development during demolition and construction.
Municipal Code

The SJMC Section 20.100.450, Hours of Construction within 500 Feet of a Residential Unit, prohibits construction activities within 500 feet of residences, unless they take place between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday.

Vibration

General Plan Policy EC-2.3 sets a vibration limit of 0.20 inches per second (in/sec) peak particle velocity (PPV) for cosmetic architectural damage, which is the same as the threshold set by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) pertaining to non-engineered timber and masonry buildings (which is taken to include the vast majority of single-family and multi-family residences with lumber framing).

Existing Conditions

The proposed area of change on the project site is currently underdeveloped with maintained lawn (vegetated) and paved areas, and therefore does not directly contribute to ambient noise in the surrounding area other than when the property is being maintained. The nearest sensitive receptors are the residents of the single-family homes that share a border with the project site to the north, east, and south. Existing noise sources in the area include roadway noise from Union Avenue, Cambrianna Drive, the on-site sports center and two preschools. Given these dominant noise sources, noise resulting from the residential uses to the north, east, and south (i.e., people talking, heating, ventilation and air conditioning noise, and property maintenance,) is not expected to contribute substantially to the overall noise environment experienced at the project site.

The Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport is located approximately 6 miles north of the project site and the Reid-Hillview airport is located approximately 7.5 miles northeast of project site. The nearest heliport, County Medical Center, is located approximately 3.5 miles north of the project site. The project site is not located within the airport land use compatibility zones established by the Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan.100

DISCUSSION

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

The proposed project results in a policy level change with no specific development proposed. Therefore, it would not result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels. However, potential future development on the project site facilitated by the proposed project could result

---

100 Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission, 2016, San José International Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Figure 8, Airport Influence Area, https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/ALUC_SIC_CLUP_maps_082010.pdf, accessed on April 23, 2020.
in the generation of a temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels and is further analyzed below.

**Construction**

Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with the SJMC Section 20.100.450, which prohibits construction within 500 feet of residences, except between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday to limit noise disturbance from construction activities. In addition, the future redevelopment would be required to comply with standard permit conditions such as those below to further reduce potential impacts from construction noise, could include the following:

- Limit construction hours to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, unless permission is granted with a development permit or other planning approval. No construction activities are permitted on the weekends at sites within 500 feet of a residence.
- Construct solid plywood fences around ground level construction sites adjacent to operational businesses, residences, or other noise-sensitive land uses.
- Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.
- Locate stationary noise-generating equipment such as air compressors or portable power generators as far as possible from sensitive receptors. Construct temporary noise barriers to screen stationary noise-generating equipment when located near adjoining sensitive land uses.
- Utilize “quiet” air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- Control noise from construction workers’ radios to a point where they are not audible at existing residences bordering the project site.
- Notify all adjacent business, residences, and other noise-sensitive land uses of the construction schedule, in writing, and provide a written schedule of “noisy” construction activities to the adjacent land uses and nearby residences.
- If complaints are received or excessive noise levels cannot be reduced using the measures above, erect a temporary noise control blanket barrier along surrounding building facades that face the construction sites.
- Designate a “disturbance coordinator” who shall be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., bad muffler, etc.) and shall require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.
- Limit construction 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.

Potential future construction activities would be limited to standard construction equipment (i.e., dozers, graders, pavers, and rollers) and would be required to conform to the time-of-day restrictions of the SJMC.
(during the daytime when people are least sensitive to construction noise). Furthermore, potential future development would be required by the General Plan Policy EC-1.7 to limit construction noise with typical best management practices. For these reasons, potential future construction noise impacts would be less than significant.

Operational

The proposed General Plan land use designation amendment could allow approximately 20 new single-family homes. As discussed further under Section XVII, Transportation, this could result in noise generation from 12 AM (morning) and 13 PM (evening) peak-hour trips, which is determined to result in less-than-significant transportation-related impacts. The site is surrounded by single-family homes and Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) uses. Since the land use change from PQP to RN would be compatible with surrounding land uses and subject to the applicable zoning regulations, potential future development of the project site is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in additional noise above existing ambient noise levels.

As previously discussed in Section 4.1, Introduction, the Supreme Court decision in “CBIA vs. BAAQMD” determined that CEQA is primarily concerned with the impacts of a project on the environment and not the reverse unless the project risks exacerbating those environmental hazards or risks that already exist. In light of this ruling, the effect of existing ambient noise on future users or residents of the project would not be considered an impact under CEQA. However, General Plan polices under Goal EC-1(EC-1.1-1.7) (listed above) require that existing ambient noise levels be analyzed for the proposed type of uses and that noise attenuation be incorporated into the project in order to meet the interior and exterior acceptable noise levels. Depending on specific development proposed for potential future projects on the project site, a project-specific acoustical analysis, if necessary, would determine acceptable exterior-to-interior noise reduction potential measures. Specifically, General Plan Policy EC-1.1 requires the preparation of an acoustical analysis to determine appropriate noise attenuation measures to ensure interior noise levels of 45 dBA DNL for residential uses. Implementation of General Plan policies at the planning permit and building permit phases will ensure future residents on the project site would not be exposed to excessive interior noise levels. Therefore, potential future operational impacts would also be less than significant.

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Potential vibration impacts associated with development projects are usually related to the use of heavy construction equipment during demolition, grading, and building phases of construction and/or project operations that would involve large sources of vibration such as heavy, out-of-balance rotating machinery, metal-forming presses/punches/shears, and impact devices. Most of these types of vibration sources are almost always associated with heavy industrial land uses.

Operational

As previously stated, potential future development could include of approximately 20 single-family residential units. Properties with RN land use designation would facilitate residential development and the
operations of residential would not allow for heavy machinery or devices that would create substantial noise or vibration. Additionally, potential future residential development would further be limited to the R-1-8 zoning district. Therefore, future residential development would not result in operations that involve substantial operational vibration sources, and this impact would be less than significant.

**Construction**

Construction activities can generate groundborne vibration that varies depending on the construction procedures, equipment used, and proximity to vibration-sensitive uses. The threshold at which there is a risk of architectural damage to normal houses with plastered walls and ceilings is 0.2 in/sec, as set by both the FTA and Policy EC-2.3 of the General Plan. Under normal construction activities, at a distance of 90 feet, which is significantly less than the nearest receptors, the vibration level generated by a vibratory roller is 0.031 PPV, and the level generated by a large bulldozer is 0.013 PPV. These vibration levels are well below the architectural damage threshold of 0.200 PPV at a distance of 90 feet, and smaller equipment or more distant activity would result in still-lower construction-generated vibration levels.

The currently proposed project would only result in changes to the Land Use/Transportation Diagram that could facilitate future potential development and would not result in any construction activities. Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would result in construction activities. The nearest sensitive uses to the site are the two preschools that share a portion of the previous elementary school campus and residential housing that share a common border with the project site (i.e., less than 25 feet from the proposed area of change on the project site). Impacts to these sensitive receptors related to construction vibration would be dependent on specific development and construction activities proposed, and potential future development would be required to undergo analysis for related noise impacts at that time. Therefore, as the project currently stands as a land use amendment, impacts relating to groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels would remain less than significant.

c) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?

The Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport is located approximately 6 miles north of the project site and the Reid-Hillview airport is located approximately 7.5 miles northeast of project site. The nearest heliport, County Medical Center, is located approximately 3.5 miles north of the project site. The project site is not located within the airport land use compatibility zones established by the Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the project site is not located within a current or projected aircraft noise impact area (65 dB DNL or higher) for any of these airports. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impact.
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would implementation of the proposed project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the relevant regional and local regulations pertaining to population and housing. There are no federal or State regulations governing this topic relevant to the project.

Regulatory Framework

Regional

Association of Bay Area Governments Projections 2040

ABAG is the regional planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area region, which is composed of the nine Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma, and contains 101 cities. ABAG produces growth forecast on four-year cycles so that the other regional agencies, including the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), can use the forecasts to make project funding and regulatory decisions. General Plans, zoning regulations, and growth management programs of local jurisdictions inform the ABAG projections. The ABAG projections are also developed to reflect the impact of “smart growth” policies and incentives that could be used to shift development patterns from historical trends toward a better jobs-housing balance, increased preservation of open space, and greater development and redevelopment in urban core and transit-accessible areas throughout the ABAG region.

Plan Bay Area

As previously discussed in Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, an overarching goal of the Plan Bay Area 2040, the Bay Area’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy, is to concentrate development in areas where there are existing services and infrastructure rather than allocate new growth to outlying areas where substantial transportation investments would be necessary to achieve the per capita passenger vehicle, VMT, and associated GHG emissions reductions. Accordingly, the majority of new population and employment growth in the region projected under Plan Bay Area 2040 is located in transit-oriented, infill development PDAs within existing communities. The project site is not located...
within a PDA; however, it is located within approximately 0.5 miles from the Bascom Urban Village PDA to the north and 0.2 miles from the Camden Urban Village to the south.\textsuperscript{101} Furthermore, the project site is currently zoned (R-1-8) for residential and residential compatible uses.

Local

General Plan

The Housing (H) section of the General Plan includes the following goals and policies specific to population and housing factors and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project:

- **Goal H-1 Social Equity and Diversity** – Provide housing throughout our City in a range of residential densities, especially at higher densities, and product types, including rental and for-sale housing, to address the needs of an economically, demographically, and culturally diverse population.

  - **Policy H-1.1:** Through the development of new housing and the rehabilitation of existing housing, facilitate the creation of economically, culturally, and demographically diverse and integrated communities.

- **Goal H-3 High Quality Housing and Great Places** – Create and maintain safe and high quality housing that contributes to the creation of great neighborhoods and great places.

  - **Policy H-3.2:** Design high density residential and mixed residential/commercial development, particularly development located in identified Growth Areas, to:

    1. Create and maintain safe and pleasant walking environments to encourage pedestrian activity, particularly to the nearest transit stop and to retail, services, and amenities.
    2. Maximize transit usage.
    3. Allow residents to conduct routine errands close to their residence, especially by walking, biking, or transit.
    4. Integrate with surrounding uses to become a part of the neighborhood rather than being an isolated project.
    5. Use architectural elements or themes from the surrounding neighborhood when appropriate.
    6. Provide residents with access to adequate on- or off-site open space.
    7. Create a building scale that does not overwhelm the neighborhood.
    8. Be usable by people of all ages, abilities, and needs to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design.

- **Goal H-4 Environmental Sustainability** – Provide housing that minimizes the consumption of natural resources and advances our City’s fiscal, climate change, and environmental goals.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

- **Policy H-4.2:** Minimize housing’s contribution to greenhouse gas emissions, and locate housing, consistent with our City’s land use and transportation goals and policies, to reduce vehicle miles traveled and auto dependency.

- **Policy H-4.3:** Encourage the development of higher residential densities in complete, mixed-use, walkable and bikeable communities to reduce energy use and greenhouse gas emissions.

Existing Conditions

According to the State of California Department of Finance, the City of San José had approximately 1,049,187 residents and 336,507 housing units in 2020. The estimated vacancy rate in 2020 is 3.5 percent and the average number of persons per household is estimated at roughly 3.2. Based on the Plan Bay Area 2040, the projected population in 2040 would be approximately 1,377,145 million persons occupying 448,310 households.

The jobs-to-housing balance is the relationship between the number of housing units required as a result of local jobs and the number of residential units available in the city. This relationship is often quantified by the jobs-to-employed resident ratio. When the ratio is below 1.0, the number of employed residents is higher than the number of jobs in the city meaning that people must commute outside of the city for work. In 2015, San José had a jobs-to-employed resident ratio of 0.93; however, employment growth is one of the central strategies of the General Plan, which includes a goal of adding 470,000 jobs by the buildout year of 2040. This would establish a jobs-to-employed-resident ratio of 1.3 to 1.

The proposed area of change on the project site is currently underdeveloped and includes maintained lawn (vegetated) and paved areas. This portion of the project site does not directly generate existing employees or population requiring housing.

DISCUSSION

a) *Would the project induce substantial unplanned 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)?*

The proposed General Plan Amendment to re-designate a portion of the project site from Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) to Residential Neighborhood (RN) on an approximately 2.5-acres of the site. Potential future

---


105 City of San José Four-Year General Plan Review, San José Market Overview and Employment Lands Analysis, January 20, 2016, page 18.

106 City of San José, 2011. Envision San José 2040 General Plan, Chapter 1, General Purpose and Use, page 17.
development on the proposed area of change could result in the development of approximately 20 multi-family units. Assuming the average household size of roughly 3.2 persons per household, approximately 64 new residents.\(^{107}\)

The project site is well served by utility and transportation infrastructure and is currently occupied with underdeveloped land that does not directly generate employees. Future development under the proposed project would be infill residential and would not directly induce substantial growth through the extension of roads or other new infrastructure that would lead to additional growth outside the project site. Accordingly, indirect impacts related to substantial population growth would be *less than significant*.

As described above, the project site is within the zoned Residence District R-1-8, which is intended to support concentrated residential and residential-serving land use. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with these growth projections and the estimated 64 residents would not induce substantial regional population growth. In addition, the City’s General Plan includes goals and policies that support housing that increases other mobility options such as walking, biking and using transit and in turn reduces GHG emissions, VMT, and auto dependency (See Goal H-4 and Policies H-4.2 and H-4.3 listed above). The proposed project would be consistent General Plan Policies H-4.2 and H-4.3, as it would facilitate an infill residential development within approximately 0.5 miles from the Bascom Urban Village PDA to the north and 0.2 miles from the Camden Urban Village to the south.\(^{108}\) Due to the close proximity to existing residential and residential-serving land uses, potential future infill development would contribute in efforts to reduce vehicle trips, VMT, and mobile sources of GHG emissions.

As discussed in the other sections of this Initial Study, potential future development caused by the proposed project would not result in physical impacts to the environment as a result introducing new housing and population on the project site. While implementation of the proposed project would facilitate new housing and population, it would be infill residential that would not substantially directly or indirectly induce new population growth because this growth has been accounted for regionally and is supported by the City’s General Plan and current Zoning. Accordingly, impacts related to substantial population growth would be *less than significant*.

*b) Would the project displace substantial numbers people of housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The project site currently does not contain any residential units and implementation of the proposed project would not displace housing or people. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

\(^{107}\) 20 dwelling units x 3.19 persons per household = 64 total residents.

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Would implementation of the proposed project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The following is a summary of the relevant State, and local regulations pertaining to public services. There are no federal regulations governing this topic relevant to the project.

**Regulatory Framework**

**State**

**California Fire Code**

Part 9 of the California Building Code contains the California Fire Code, which includes provisions and standards for emergency planning and preparedness, fire service features, fire protection systems, hazardous materials, fire flow requirements, and fire hydrant locations and distribution. Typical fire safety requirements include installation of sprinklers in all high-rise buildings; the establishment of fire resistance standards for fire doors, building materials, and particular types of construction; and the clearance of debris and vegetation within a prescribed distance from occupied structures in wildlife hazard areas.

**California Government Code Section 65995 to 65998 (School Facilities)**

The California Government Code Section 65996 specifies that an acceptable method of offsetting a project’s effect on the adequacy of school facilities is the payment of a school impact fee prior to issuance of a building permit. Sections 65995 to 65998 set forth provisions for the payment of school impact fees by new development by “mitigating impacts on school facilities that occur (as a result of) the planning, use, or development of real property” [Section 65996(a)]. The legislation goes on to say that the payment of school impact fees “are hereby deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation” under
CEQA [Section 65996(b)]. The school district is responsible for implementing the specific methods for mitigating school impacts under the Government Code. In accordance with California Government Code Section 65996, developers pay a school impact fee to the school district to offset the increased demands on school facilities caused by their proposed residential development project.

Local

General Plan

The Education and Services (ES) section of the General Plan includes goals, policies, and programs relevant to the public services factors and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project:

- **Goal ES-2 Libraries** – Maintain and expand Library Information Services within the City to:
  - Enrich lives by fostering lifelong learning and providing every member of the San José community access to a vast array of ideas and information
  - Give all members of the community opportunities for educational and personal growth throughout their lives
  - Develop partnerships to further the educational, cultural and community missions of organizations in San José
  - Support San José State University Library’s educational mission in expanding the base of knowledge through research and scholarship.
  - Locate branch libraries in central commercial areas of neighborhoods for essential public access to library resources, events, and community meeting spaces, and to stimulate economic development.
  - Maximize branch library hours of operation to facilitate daily patronage.

- **Policy 2.2:** Construct and maintain architecturally attractive, durable, resource-efficient, and environmentally healthful library facilities to minimize operating costs, foster learning, and express in built form the significant civic functions and spaces that libraries provide for the San José community. Library design should anticipate and build in flexibility to accommodate evolving community needs and evolving methods for providing the community with access to information sources. Provide at least 0.59 square feet of space per capita in library facilities.

- **Goal ES-3 Law Enforcement and Fire Protection** – Provide high-quality law enforcement and fire protection services to the San José community to protect life, property and the environment through fire and crime prevention and response. Utilize land use planning, urban design and site development measures and partnerships with the community and other public agencies to support long-term community health, safety and well-being.

  - **Policy ES-3.1:** Provide rapid and timely Level of Service response time to all emergencies:
    1. For police protection, use as a goal a response time of six minutes or less for 60 percent of all Priority 1 calls, and of eleven minutes or less for 60 percent of all Priority 2 calls.
    2. For fire protection, use as a goal a total response time (reflex) of eight minutes and a total travel time of four minutes for 80 percent of emergency incidents.
3. Enhance service delivery through the adoption and effective use of innovative, emerging techniques, technologies and operating models.

4. Measure service delivery to identify the degree to which services are meeting the needs of San José’s community.

5. Ensure that development of police and fire service facilities and delivery of services keeps pace with development and growth in the city.

- **Policy ES-3.2:** Strive to ensure that equipment and facilities are provided and maintained to meet reasonable standards of safety, dependability, and compatibility with law enforcement and fire service operations.

- **Policy ES-3.3:** Locate police and fire service facilities so that essential services can most efficiently be provided, and level of service goals met. Ensure that the development of police and fire facilities and delivery of services keeps pace with development and growth of the city.

**Municipal Code**

**Title 17, Buildings and Construction**

The SJMC includes Title 17, Buildings and Construction, which is relevant to the provision of public services and relevant public services factors. The SJMC Chapter 17.12 adopts the California Fire Code described above as part of the SJMC to regulate permit processes, emergency access, hazardous material handling, and fire protection systems, including automatic sprinkler systems, fire extinguishers, and fire alarms. Project applications for development in San José are plan-checked by SJFD for mandatory compliance with the California Fire Code.

**Existing Conditions**

**Fire Protection Services**

Fire protection services for the project site are provided by the San José Fire Department (SJFD). The SJFD responds to all fires, hazardous materials spills, and medical emergencies (including injury accidents) in the City. The closest station to the project site is Fire Station Number 9, which is located at 3410 Ross Ave approximately 1 mile by road from the project site. For fire protection services, the General Plan identifies as a goal a total response time of eight minutes and a total travel time of four minutes for 80 percent of emergency incidents.109

**Police Protection Services**

Police protection services for the project site are provided by the San José Police Department (SJPD), which is headquartered at 201 West Mission Street, approximately 9 miles by road north of the project site. Field operations for the SJPD are divided into geographic divisions: Central, Western, Foothill, and Southern. A fifth division, the Airport Division, provides police services to the Norman Y. Mineta San José

---

109 Envision San José 2040 General Plan, November 2011, Chapter 4 (Quality of Life), Goal ES-3, Policy ES-3.1, page 37.
International Airport. The project site is served by the SJPD Southern Division, which includes six patrol officers. For the last several years, the most frequent calls for service in the City have dealt with larceny, burglary, vehicle theft, and assault. For police protection services, the General Plan identifies a service goal of six minutes or less for 60 percent of all Priority 1 (emergency) calls and 11 minutes or less for 60 percent of all Priority 2 (nonemergency) calls.

School Services

The project site is located within the CSD service boundaries. The closest elementary school to the project site is Fammatre Elementary School, which serves approximately 600 students and is located 0.4 miles to the northeast. The closest middle school to the project site is Ida Price Charter Middle School and is located 0.5 miles to the northeast. The project site is located within the Branham High School service district boundary. Branham High School is located 1.7 miles to the southeast from the project site, and currently serves approximately 1,800 students. Developer fees are collected per state law and in coordination with the City to mitigate the impact of property development within each district’s boundaries.

Library Services

The San José Public Library System includes 25 libraries. The nearest library to the project site is the Cambrian Branch Library located at 1780 Hillsdale Avenue (0.7 miles west of the project site).

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of a public services impact analysis is to examine the impacts associated with physical improvements to public service facilities required to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. Public service facilities need improvements (i.e., construction, renovation or expansion) as demand for services increase. Increased demand is typically driven by increases in population. The proposed project would have a significant environmental impact if it would exceed the ability of public service providers to adequately serve residents, thereby requiring construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities.

As included in Section XIV, Population and Housing, the most recent California Department of Finance data lists the population of San José in 2020, as 1,049,187 residents. As discussed in Section 3.3.2, Potential Future Development, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in approximately 20 single-family homes supporting approximately 64 residents. This represents a 0.0006 percent growth increase to the population in San José.

---
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a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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, police protection, schools, parks, and other facilities?

Fire Protection Services

As previously discussed, the proposed project is a policy level change with no specific development proposed. However, potential future development could result in a 0.00006 percent increase in the City’s population. This represents a relatively small increase of the total population for the City of San José. Since the site is located within a developed urban area, the SJFD would not have to expand its service area to meet fire service demands from the future residents of the site. The proposed project, by itself, would not preclude the SJFD from meeting its service goals. As a result, the future development under the proposed project would be adequately served by existing facilities. Furthermore, mandatory compliance with current building codes and City policies and actions (listed above) to avoid unsafe building conditions, promote public safety and maintain adequate fire protection services for the San José area would ensure implementation of the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to the fire protection services.

Police Protection Services

While potential future development would increase the number of residents and level of activity on the project site, given the project site is within an urbanized area already serviced by the SJPD and surrounded by the types of uses associated with residential and public land uses, it is reasonable to expect that future development would not result in a substantial increase in the amount of crime in the proposed project area. Accordingly, the construction and operation of future development facilitated by the proposed project would not prevent the SJPD from maintaining acceptable service ratio, response times, or other performance objectives that would require the new construction of or modifications to an existing police station. Mandatory compliance with current building codes and City policies (listed above) to promote public and property safety and maintain the SJPD facilities would ensure implementation of the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to the police services.

School Services

Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could increase the demand on local school facilities. As provided in Section 65996 of the California Government Code, the payment of Developer Impact Fees is deemed to fully mitigate the impacts of new development on school services. As discussed above, CSD collect developer fees on residential and non-residential projects. Under Section 65996 of the California Government Code, the payment of such fees is deemed to fully mitigate the impacts of new development on school facilities. Therefore, the impacts to schools would be less than significant.
Library Services

In 2000, San José voters approved the Branch Library Bond Measure to provide funding over 10 years to construct six new branch libraries and expand 14 existing libraries in the City. As of April 2010, work on 15 branch libraries was completed, four branch libraries were undergoing construction or expansion, and an additional library was in the planning stages, with the understanding that when construction under the Bond Measure is complete, the City would have over 950,000 square feet of library space.\(^{115}\) As of April 2019, 15 expanded branch libraries were opened, and seven new libraries were constructed.\(^{116}\) As the City has recently dramatically expanded its library facilities to support the growing population of San José, while future development facilitated by the proposed project could increase the demand for library facilities by an estimated 64 residents, it is not anticipated that there will be a need to construct additional facilities to maintain current service objectives. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

### XVI. PARKS AND RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public parks facilities, or the need for new or physically altered public parks facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for public parks facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the relevant local regulations pertaining to parks and recreation. There are no federal or State regulations governing this topic relevant to the project.


Regulatory Framework

Local

General Plan

The Parks, Open Space, and Recreation (PR) and Vibrant Neighborhoods (VN) sections of the General Plan include the following goals and policies relevant to parks and recreation factors and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project:

- **Goal PR-1 High Quality Facilities and Programs** — Provide park lands, trails, open space, recreation amenities, and programs, nationally recognized for their excellence, which enhance the livability of the urban and suburban environments; preserve significant natural, historic, scenic and other open space resources; and meet the parks and recreation services needs of San José’s residents, workers, and visitors.
  - **Policy PR-1.1**: Provide 3.5 acres per 1,000 population of neighborhood/community serving parkland through a combination of 1.5 acres of public park and 2.0 acres of recreational school grounds open to the public per 1,000 San José residents.
  - **Policy PR-1.8**: Enhance existing parks and recreation facilities in built-out areas through new amenities and other improvements to ensure that residents’ needs are being met.

- **Goal PR-3 Provide and equitable Park System** — Create a balanced park system that provides all residents access to parks, trails, open space, community centers, dog parks, skate parks, aquatics facilities, sports fields, community gardens, and other amenities.
  - **Policy PR-3.2**: Provide access to an existing or future neighborhood park, a community park, recreational school grounds, a regional park, open space lands, and/or a major City trail within a ⅓-mile radius of all San José residents by either acquiring lands within ⅓-mile or providing safe connections to existing recreation facilities outside of the ⅓-mile radius. This is consistent with the United Nation’s Urban Environmental Accords, as adopted by the City for recreation open space.

- **Goal VN-1 Vibrant, Attractive, and Complete Neighborhoods** — Develop new and preserve and enhance existing neighborhoods to be vibrant, attractive and complete.
  - **Policy VN-1.1**: Include services and facilities within each neighborhood to meet the daily needs of neighborhood residents with the goal that all San José residents be provided with the opportunity to live within a ½-mile walking distance of schools, parks, and retail services.

Municipal Code

Chapter 19.38, Parkland Dedication Ordinance and Park Impact Ordinance

The SJMC includes Chapter 19.38, Parkland Dedication, which includes the Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PDO) and Park Impact Ordinance (PIO) that requires residential developers to dedicate public parkland or pay in-lieu fees, or both, to offset the demand for neighborhood parkland when creating residential
projects. Per SJMC Section 19.38.310, parkland dedication is based on the number of dwelling units and the average number of persons per household that will reside in the proposed residential development.

**Greenprint 2009 Update Plan for Parks, Recreation Facilities, and Trails**

In December 2009, the City Council adopted the *City Greenprint 2009 Update Plan for Parks, Recreation Facilities, and Trails* (Greenprint 2009 Update) The Greenprint 2009 Update is the City’s 20-year strategic plan for parks, recreational facilities, and programs. The Greenprint 2009 Update is a guide for City staff and policy makers in the day to day decision making process, which provides opportunities to improve resident health and wellness through parks, recreational programs and facilities.

**Existing Conditions**

The City provides and manages regional, neighborhood and community parkland, community gardens and open space lands. Some recreation facilities available to San José residents are also provided by other public agencies, such as playgrounds and fields on public school sites, County parks, and City trails on SCVWD and PG&E Company lands. The City Departments of Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services, General Services and Public Works are responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of all City parks and recreational facilities.117

The City has over 200 facilities for social services, outdoor space, and recreation opportunities.118 As of 2010, the City included approximately 3,520 acres of regional, city, neighborhood, and community parks, community gardens, and open spaces.119 Amenities can include basketball courts, barbeques, exercise (par) courses, picnic tables, playgrounds, restrooms, soccer fields, softball fields, swimming pools, and tennis courts. In addition to parks, recreational facilities include community centers, trails, and open space preserves.120

The City’s General Plan has established level of service benchmarks for parks and community centers. The City has a service level objective of 3.5 acres of neighborhood and community serving recreational lands per 1,000 residents, of which a minimum is 1.5 acres of City-owned neighborhood, community, or locally serving regional/city-wide park lands and up to 2 acres of school playgrounds, and all of which are located within a reasonable walking distance from the surrounding residences; 7.5 acres of regional/city-wide parkland per 1,000 population; and 500 square feet of community center floor area per 1,000 population.121

As of the General Plan Environmental Impact Report conducted in 2011, the City has sufficient neighborhood/community and combined City and other City/wide regional parkland. The City is deficient

117 City of San José, 2011. *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*, Chapter 4 (Quality of Life), page 48.
119 City of San José, 2011. *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*, Chapter 4 (Quality of Life), page 50.
120 City of San José Greenprint, 2009 Strategic Plan Update, Chapter 4 (Facilities and Programs), pages 47-48.
121 City of San José, 2011. *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*, Chapter 4 (Quality of Life), page 49.
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

in school recreation and City-owned Citywide/regional parkland. The nearest City parks to the project site include Butcher Dog Park 0.5 miles to the southeast, Doerr Park 0.75 miles to the northeast, and Houge Park 0.85 miles to the southwest. Butcher Dog Park includes a dog play area as well as barbecue amenities, playground, softball field, water play feature, volleyball courts, and basketball courts, and Doerr Park and Houge Park include barbecue amenities, playgrounds, and various sport and exercise courts. In addition, Camden Community Center is located less than 0.25 mile from the project site to the west, and includes a gymnasium, fitness rooms, programs for youth, adults, and seniors, computer lab and classrooms, leisure classes, and aquatic facilities.

DISCUSSION

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?

The proposed General Plan Amendment does not include a specific development proposal. However, as described in Section 3.3.2, Potential Future Development, potential future development could result in development of approximately 20 single-family homes supporting approximately 64 residents. To ensure that there are adequate parks for the residents of San José, the future development would be required to comply with the PDO, which could result in approximately 0.19 acres of parkland dedication or payment of the equivalent parkland in-lieu fee per SJMC Chapter 19.38. Required compliance with these regulations would result in impacts to park facilities in San José being less than significant.

b) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The proposed project would not result in specific development and therefore does not include recreational facilities. However potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would include future residents that would be reasonably expected to use the City’s parks and recreational facilities. Given the City’s amount of parkland which encompasses 3,520 acres and over 200 facilities, compared to the potential new residents on the project site, implementation of the proposed project would not result in their substantial deterioration. The increase in usage that could potentially result from the potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would not result in the construction of new recreational facilities over and above established goals for maintaining existing recreation facilities in the General Plan. Therefore, impacts to recreational facilities would be less than significant.

c) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public parks facilities, or the need for new or physically altered public parks

---

122 City of San José, 2011. Envision San José 2040 General Plan Draft Program EIR, Section 3 (Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation), Table 3.9-3, page 599, June.
124 Section 19.38.310 of the SJMC uses the following formula for minimum acreage dedication: (0.003 acres) x (number of dwelling units) x (average number of persons per dwelling unit, based on most recent available federal census data). For the project site, this may result in (0.003) x (20) x (3.19) = 0.19 acres.
As described above, the General Plan Environmental Impact Report found in 2011 that, relative to the City’s goals regarding amount of park space per resident, the City has sufficient neighborhood/community and combined City and other City/wide regional parkland and is deficient in school recreation and City-owned Citywide/regional parkland. As discussed under criterion (b) above, the potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with park and recreational facilities, due to the size of the project site relative to the amount of park space available. Furthermore, as described under criterion (a) above, the potential future development would be required to comply with SJMC Chapter 19.38 to ensure adequate parks facilities for the residents of San José. Finally, the proposed project is a policy level change with no specific development proposed. Potential future development would be subject to further review to assess environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts would be \textit{less than significant}.

\textbf{XVII. TRANSPORTATION}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subdivision (b)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING}

\textbf{Regulatory Framework}

The following is a summary of the relevant local regulations pertaining to transportation. There are no federal regulations governing this topic relevant to the project.

\textit{State}

\textbf{Senate Bill 743}

Senate Bill 743 (SB 743), which became effective September 2013, initiated reforms to the CEQA Guidelines to establish new criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts that “promote the reduction of GHG emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and
a diversity of land uses.” Specifically, SB 743 directs the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to update the CEQA Guidelines to replace automobile delay—as described solely by level of service (LOS) or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion—with vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the recommended metric for determining the significance of transportation impacts. OPR has approved the CEQA Guidelines implementing SB 743.

SB 743 did not authorize OPR to set specific VMT impact thresholds, but it did direct OPR to develop guidelines for jurisdictions to use. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(1) describes factors that might indicate whether a development project’s VMT may be significant or not. Notably, projects that are located within one half mile of transit should be considered to have a less than significant transportation impact based on OPR guidance.

Regional

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the transportation planning, coordinating, and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, including Santa Clara County. MTC is charged with regularly updating the Regional Transportation Plan, a comprehensive blueprint for the development of mass transit, highway, airport, seaport, railroad, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities in the region. MTC and the ABAG adopted the final Plan Bay Area 2040 in July 2017, which includes the region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy and the most recently adopted Regional Transportation Plan (2040).

Congestion Management Program

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) oversees the Congestion Management Program (CMP), which is aimed at reducing regional traffic congestion. The relevant State legislation requires that all urbanized counties in California prepare a CMP to obtain each county’s share of gas tax revenues. State legislation requires that each CMP define traffic LOS standards, transit service standards, a trip reduction and transportation demand management plan, a land use impact analysis program, and a capital investment element. VTA has review responsibility for proposed development projects that are expected to affect CMP designated intersections.

City of San José

Transportation Analysis Policy (City Council Policy 5-1)

As established in City Council Policy 5-1 “Transportation Analysis Policy” (2018), the City of San José uses VMT as the metric to assess transportation impacts from new development. According to the policy, an employment (e.g., office or research and development) or residential project’s transportation impact would be less than significant if the project VMT is 15 percent or more below the existing average regional per capita VMT. For industrial projects (e.g., warehouse, manufacturing, distribution), the impact would be less than significant if the project VMT is equal to, or less than, existing average regional per capita VMT. The threshold for a retail project is whether it generates net new regional VMT, as new retail typically redistributes existing trips and miles traveled as opposed to inducing new travel. If a project’s VMT does not meet the established thresholds, mitigation measures would be required, where feasible.
The policy also requires preparation of a Local Transportation Analysis to analyze non-CEQA transportation issues, including local transportation operations, intersection level of service, site access and circulation, and neighborhood transportation issues such as pedestrian and bicycle access, and recommend needed transportation improvements.

Screening criteria have been established to determine which projects require a detailed VMT analysis. If a project meets the relevant screening criteria, it is considered to have a less than significant VMT impact.

The VMT policy does not negate Area Development policies and Transportation Development policies approved prior to adoption of Policy 5-1. Policy 5-1 does, however, negate the City’s Protected Intersection policy as defined in Policy 5-3.

**Envision San José 2040 General Plan**

Various policies in the City’s 2040 General Plan have been adopted for reducing or avoiding impacts related to transportation, as listed in Table 4-3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR-1.1</td>
<td>Accommodate and encourage use of non-automobile transportation modes to achieve San José’s mobility goals and reduce vehicle trip generation and vehicle miles traveled (VMT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-1.2</td>
<td>Consider impacts on overall mobility and all travel modes when evaluating transportation impacts of new developments or infrastructure projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-1.4</td>
<td>Through the entitlement process for new development, fund needed transportation improvements for all transportation modes, giving first consideration to improvement of bicycling, walking and transit facilities. Encourage investments that reduce vehicle travel demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-2.8</td>
<td>Require new development where feasible to provide on-site facilities such as bicycle storage and showers, provide connections to existing and planned facilities, dedicate land to expand existing facilities or provide new facilities such as sidewalks and/or bicycle lanes/paths, or share in the cost of improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-3.3</td>
<td>As part of the development review process, require that new development along existing and planned transit facilities consist of land use and development types and intensities that contribute towards transit ridership. In addition, require that new development is designed to accommodate and to provide direct access to transit facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TR-5.3        | Development projects’ effects on the transportation network will be evaluated during the entitlement process and will be required to fund or construct improvements in proportion to their impacts on the transportation system. Improvements will prioritize multimodal improvements that reduce VMT over automobile network improvements.  
  - Downtown: Downtown San José exemplifies low-VMT with integrated land use and transportation development. In recognition of the unique position of the Downtown as the transit hub of Santa Clara County, and as the center for financial, business, institutional and cultural activities, Downtown projects shall support the long-term development of a world class urban transportation network. |
| TR-8.4        | Discourage, as part of the entitlement process, the provision of parking spaces significantly above the number of spaces required by code for a given use. |
| TR-9.1        | Enhance, expand and maintain facilities for walking and bicycling, particularly to connect with and ensure access to transit and to provide a safe and complete alternative transportation network that facilitates non-automobile trips. |

*Source: City of San José. Envision San José 2040 General Plan. 2020.*
Existing Conditions

There are no existing structures on the 2.5-acre portion of the project site for which the proposed project would change the General Plan land use designation. Traffic to the project site is associated with the private sports center and two private daycare facilities that are located on the remaining 7.5 acres of the project site, for which there is a parking lot accessible from Cambrianna Drive, which is a residential street. Vehicular and pedestrian access to the project site is currently provided via Cambrianna Drive on the south side of the project site. The nearest public transit services include bus service along Union Avenue, which borders the project site to the west.

Analysis Methodology

General Plan Amendments in the City of San José require a long-range transportation analysis of potential impacts on the citywide transportation system in the horizon year of the General Plan. The General Plan horizon year is when the development anticipated in the General Plan is built out. There are two types of General Plan Amendment transportation analysis: 1) a site-specific long-range transportation analysis for individual General Plan Amendments that exceed 250 peak-hour trips; and 2) a cumulative long-range transportation analysis of the combined effect of all General Plan Amendments proposed with each annual General Plan Amendment cycle.

In 2011, the City certified the Envision San José 2040 General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (General Plan FEIR) and adopted the Envision San José 2040 General Plan (General Plan). The General Plan FEIR and supporting Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) identified programmatic long-range transportation impacts based on planned land uses and the planned transportation system within the City projected to the horizon of the General Plan in year 2035.

In 2016, a subsequent TIA was prepared for the General Plan Four-Year Review that evaluated minor adjustments to planned job growth in the adopted General Plan and updated the projection of regional growth to the year 2040. The existing conditions for transportation were updated to reflect the actual development that occurred since the adoption of the General Plan and its base year of 2008 to the year 2015. The General Plan Four-Year Review TIA evaluated the effects of the updated existing conditions in 2015 plus future planned growth, and future conditions projected to the Year 2040, that established the baseline for the evaluation of transportation impacts of General Plan Amendments considered for approval during and after the Four-Year Review.

In 2017, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) published the BART Phase II EIR that included updated regional transportation projects based on 2015 existing roadway conditions. The City acquired this new model to use as the basis for the transportation analysis in the Downtown Strategy 2040 EIR, which evaluated an increase of 4,000 households and 10,000 jobs in Downtown San Jose by transferring General Plan growth capacity from other areas within the City. Once again, the model was validated with current traffic data to update the existing transportation conditions.

The cumulative long-range transportation impacts of the proposed 2020 General Plan Amendments were evaluated in the Long Range Transportation Analysis prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. located in the Appendix of this Initial Study. This analysis evaluated both the site-specific long-range...
transportation impacts for General Plan Amendments that exceeded 250 peak-hour trips per day and the cumulative impacts of the seven privately-initiated General Plan Amendments in the 2020 General Plan Amendment cycle.

Each of the proposed General Plan Amendments would result in changes to the assumed number of households and/or jobs on each site when compared to the current General Plan land use and intensity assumptions for each site in the TIA for the General Plan FEIR and the General Plan Four-Year Review TIA. Like the analysis in the General Plan FEIR and subsequent Four-Year Review, the 2020 General Plan Amendment TIA assumed development in either the middle range of the density allowed under each proposed General Plan land use designation or assumed a density consistent with the density of surrounding development with a similar land use designation. The City uses the middle range or typical range based on surrounding development densities, as opposed to the maximum intensities potentially allowed under each proposed General Plan land use designation, because build out under the maximum density allowed for all General Plan land designations would exceed the total citywide planned growth capacity allocated in the General Plan. Furthermore, maximum build-out at the highest end of the density range does not represent typical development patterns or the average amount of development built on each site. General Plan land use designations allow a wide range of development intensities and types of land uses to accommodate growth; however, development projects are not typically proposed at the maximum densities due to existing development patterns, site and parking constraints, Federal Aviation Administration regulations, maximum allowable height provisions and other development regulations in the San José Municipal Code Title 20 (Zoning), market conditions, and other factors.

The results of the analysis for the proposed General Plan Amendments are then compared to the results of the 2017 updated General Plan Four-Year Review TIA evaluation of the General Plan through 2040 to determine if the proposed 2020 General Plan Amendments would result in any new, or substantially more severe transportation impacts than those impacts that were already analyzed for the General Plan, as amended by the City Council in December 2017. None of the proposed General Plan Amendments would change the total number of jobs and households citywide that were assumed with buildout of the Envision San José 2040 General Plan.

The analysis consists of land use changes to the current adopted General Plan land uses. The analysis does not propose any changes to the citywide transportation system. The General Plan Amendment long-range analysis focuses on the potential changes on the citywide transportation system in the horizon year of the Envision San José 2040 General Plan when the capacities for housing and jobs are fully developed. The analysis includes evaluation of increased vehicle miles traveled, increased traffic volume on specified roadway segments, impacts to travel speeds on transit priority corridors, and impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. Impacts are evaluated based on the same Measures of Effectiveness (MOE) and significance criteria utilized in the Envision San José 2040 General Plan TIA. Traffic conditions were evaluated for the following traffic scenarios using the City’s Travel Demand Forecasting (TDF) model:

- **Projected Year 2015 Conditions**: The Projected Year 2015 Conditions represent a projection of transportation conditions in 2015 using the City’s General Plan TDF model. The roadway network also reflects the Year 2015 roadway network and transportation system.
Current 2040 General Plan Conditions: Future traffic due to the current General Plan land uses (i.e., including the adopted General Plan Four-Year Review Land Use adjustments and adopted 2019 General Plan Amendments) is added to regional growth that can be reasonably expected to occur by 2040. Current 2040 General Plan conditions include the current roadway network as well as all transportation system improvements as identified in the current General Plan.

Cumulative 2040 General Plan Amendment Conditions: Current 2040 General Plan conditions with the proposed land use amendments at all seven proposed General Plan Amendment sites. Transportation conditions for the Cumulative 2040 General Plan Amendment conditions were evaluated relative to the currently adopted 2040 General Plan Conditions to determine any long-range traffic impacts.

Proposed 2040 General Plan Amendment Conditions: Current 2040 General Plan conditions with the proposed land use amendments at each of the proposed General Plan Amendment sites for which a site-specific analysis is required. Transportation conditions for the Proposed 2040 General Plan Amendment conditions were evaluated relative to the currently adopted 2040 General Plan Conditions to determine any long-range traffic impacts.

Based on the results of the TDF model, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would result in an additional 12 AM (morning) and 13 PM (evening) peak-hour trips. Therefore, a site-specific General Plan Amendment traffic analysis is not required for the proposed project.

Significance Impact Criteria

The City of San José adopted policies and goals in General Plan to reduce the drive alone mode share to no more than 40 percent of all daily commute trips, and to reduce the VMT per service population by 40 percent from existing (year 2015) conditions. To meet these goals by the General Plan horizon year and to satisfy CEQA requirements, the City developed a set of MOEs and associated significance thresholds to evaluate long-range transportation impacts resulting from land use adjustments. Table 4-4 summarizes the significance thresholds associated with vehicular modes of transportation as defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11) for the evaluation of long-range traffic impacts resulting from proposed land use adjustments and used in this analysis.

In addition to the MOEs described above, the effects of the proposed land use adjustments on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities were evaluated. A significant long-range transportation impact would occur if the adjustments would:

- Disrupt existing, or interfere with, planned transit services or facilities;
- Disrupt existing, or interfere with, planned bicycle facilities;
- Conflict or create inconsistencies with adopted bicycle plans, guidelines, policies, or standards;
- Not provide secure and safe bicycle parking in adequate proportion to anticipated demand;
- Disrupt existing, or interfere with, planned pedestrian facilities;
- Not provide accessible pedestrian facilities that meet current ADA best practices; or
- Create inconsistencies with adopted pedestrian plans, guidelines, policies, or standards.
**TABLE 4-4 MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Citywide Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT/Service Population</td>
<td>Any increase over current 2040 General Plan conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Share (Drive Alone %)</td>
<td>Any increase in journey-to-work drive alone mode share over current 2040 General Plan conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Corridor Travel Speeds</td>
<td>Decrease in average travel speed on a transit corridor below current 2040 General Plan conditions in the AM peak one-hour period when: 1. The average speed drops below 15 mph or decreases by 25% or more, or 2. The average speed drops by 1 mph or more for the transit corridor with average speed below 15 mph under current 2040 General Plan conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: MOE = Measures of Effectiveness  
Source: City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook, April 2018.

**DISCUSSION**

*a) Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?*

Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in the generation of 12 AM (morning) and 13 PM (evening) peak-hour trips. As this is below the City’s screening criteria to conduct a site-specific long-range transportation analysis, it would be unlikely to result in significant changes to the circulation system and to affect associated programs, plans, ordinances, or policies. Potential future development would be required to comply with all applicable regulations pertaining to transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. In addition, potential future development would be limited to the 2.5-acre area of the project site, and unlikely to significantly alter the surrounding circulation system to the extent that it would conflict with existing related programs, plans, ordinances, or policies. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

*b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subdivision (b)??*

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subdivision (b) lists that, for land use projects, “vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less-than-significant transportation impact.”

The proposed project is not within a major transit top or corridor. As previously discussed, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in 12 AM (morning) and 13 PM (evening) peak-hour trips, which could represent a small increase in daily VMT. However, this is below the City’s threshold for a site-specific long-range transportation analysis, and the increase is too small to have a measurable effect on the citywide VMT per service population. Based on the TDF modeling results, the proposed amendment would not result in a substantial net increase of peak-hour trips generated by GP20-003 and a site-specific GPA traffic analysis is not required. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.
c) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The proposed project would only change the Land Use/Transportation Diagram from PQP to RN on 2.5 acres. The project would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment but could result in future development that would result in physical changes to the environment. The City would review future plans for redevelopment of the project site for consistency with General Plan policies and applicable design guidelines at the planning permit phase to ensure that hazards due to a design feature would not occur. Potential future development of the project site, in accordance with City design standards, would ensure that hazards due to a design feature would be avoided and would be \textit{less than significant}.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

The proposed project would only result in a land use change from PQP to RN. As the project would generate less than 250 peak-hour trips per day, no project specific long range analysis is needed. Future redevelopment plans for the project site would be reviewed and approved by the San José Fire Department and Department of Public Works to ensure adequate emergency access. The City would review future designs for vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian access and access to public transportation for consistency with General Plan policies and Residential Design Guidelines at the Planning permit phase. The proposed General Plan Amendment would not conflict with existing or planned multimodal transportation facilities. Therefore, the impact would be \textit{less than significant}.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would implementation of the proposed project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5024.1. In applying these criteria, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the relevant State, and local regulations pertaining to tribal cultural resources. There are no federal regulations that are applicable to the project site.

Regulatory Framework

State

Assembly Bill 52

Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), the Native American Historic Resource Protection Act, sets forth a proactive approach intended to reduce the potential for delay and conflicts between Native American and development interests. Projects subject to AB 52 are those that file a notice of preparation for an EIR or notice of intent to adopt a negative or mitigated negative declaration on or after July 1, 2016. AB 52 adds “tribal cultural resources” (TCR) to the specific cultural resources protected under CEQA. Under AB 52, a TCR is defined as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape (must be geographically defined in terms of size and scope), sacred place, and object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that is either included or eligible for inclusion in the California Register, or included in a local register of historical resources. A Native American Tribe or the lead agency, supported by substantial evidence, may choose at its discretion to treat a resource as a TCR. AB 52 also mandates lead agencies to consult with tribes, if requested by the tribe, and sets the principles for conducting and concluding consultation. In June 2020, notification letters were sent to a list of Native American contacts provided by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). At the time of preparation of this Initial Study, the City of San José had yet to receive any requests for notification from tribes.

At the time of preparation of this Initial Study, the City of San José had yet to receive any requests for notification from tribes.

Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5

California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods regardless of their antiquity and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered has determined whether or not the remains are subject to the coroner’s authority. If the human remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the county coroner must contact the California NAHC within 24 hours of this identification. An NAHC representative will then identify a Native American Most Likely Descendant to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. In
addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 specifies the procedures to be followed in case of the discovery of human remains on non-federal land. The disposition of Native American burials falls within the jurisdiction of the NAHC.

Local

General Plan

The Environmental Resources (ER) section of the General Plan includes the following environmental goals and policies relevant to the tribal cultural resources and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project:

- **Goal ER-10 Archaeology and Paleontology** – Preserve and conserve archaeologically significant structures, sites, districts and artifacts in order to promote a greater sense of historic awareness and community identity.

- **Policy ER-10.2:** Recognizing that Native American human remains may be encountered at unexpected locations, impose a requirement on all development permits and tentative subdivision maps that upon their discovery during construction, development activity will cease until professional archaeological examination confirms whether the burial is human. If the remains are determined to be Native American, applicable state laws shall be enforced.

Existing Conditions

As described in Section V, Cultural Resources, currently there are no Traditional Cultural Properties or Cultural Landscapes identified within the city.125

DISCUSSION

e) Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources as defined in PRC Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: (1) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or (2) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying these criteria, the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe shall be considered.

As discussed under Criteria (b) and (d) above, no known archeological resources, ethnographic sites, or Native American remains are known to be located on the project site. While implementation of the proposed project would not directly result in development that could adversely affect any potentially identified TCRs, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in

125 Envision San José 2040 General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse Number 2009072096), page 703.
construction activities such as site preparation, grading, and excavation that could potentially unearth previously unknown and potentially identified TCRs. Future development on the project site would be required to adhere to General Plan Policies ER-10.1, ER-10.2, and ER-10.3 (listed above) and State laws regulating the discovery of human remains of Native American ancestry discussed under Criterion (d) for the discovery of unknown prehistoric or historic resources or human remains of Native American ancestry that could be determined to be a TCR. In addition, as described under Criterion (b), the City could require additional measures to further reduce potential impacts to unknown prehistoric or historic resources that could be determined to be a TCR. At the time that the Initial Study was prepared and Negative Declaration determination, no Native American tribes that are or have been traditionally culturally affiliated with the project vicinity have requested notification from the City of San José under AB 52 regarding projects in the area and their effects on a tribal cultural resource. In addition, the City has sent out referral and consultation requests to all applicable tribal representatives within the City of San José for all General Plan Amendments in June 2020 and has not received as further consultation request.

Mandatory Compliance with General Plan Policies ER-10.1, ER-10.2, and ER-10.3, and State laws regulating the discovery of human remains of Native American ancestry listed above, would ensure that implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on TCRs.

### XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the relevant State and local regulations pertaining to utilities and service systems. There are no federal regulations governing this topic relevant to the project relevant to the project.

Regulatory Framework

State

California Urban Water Management Planning Act

Through the Urban Water Management Planning Act of 1983, the California Water Code requires all urban water suppliers within California to prepare and adopt a Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) and update it every 5 years. This requirement applies to all suppliers providing water to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually. The Act is intended to support conservation and efficient use of urban water supplies. The Act requires that total project water use be compared to water supply sources over the next 20 years in 5-year increments, that planning occur for single and multiple dry water years, and that plans include a water recycling analysis that incorporates a description of the wastewater collection and treatment system within the agency’s service area along with current and potential recycled water uses. In September 2014, SB 1420 amended the Act to require urban water suppliers to provide descriptions of water demand management measures and similar information.

State Updated Model Landscape Ordinance

The updated Model Landscape Ordinance requires cities and counties to adopt landscape water conservation ordinances by February 1, 2016 or to adopt a different ordinance that is at least as effective in conserving water as the updated Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO). The City adopted SJMC Chapter 15.11, Water Efficient Landscaping Standards for new and Rehabilitated Landscaping in 2013 and revised according to the State Updated MWELO.

Assembly Bill 939

AB 939 established the California Integrated Waste Management Board and required all California counties to prepare integrated waste management plans. AB 939 also required all municipalities to divert 25 percent of their solid waste from landfill disposal by January 1, 1995. Fifty percent of the waste stream was to be diverted by the year 2000. The City currently generates approximately 1.7 million tons of solid waste annually and diverts approximately 60 percent of its waste streams through a variety of waste diversion programs, including curbside recycling and yard waste collection and composting.

California Building Code: Building Energy Efficiency Standards

The State provides a minimum standard for energy conservation through Part 6 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, commonly referred to as the “California Energy Code”. The California Energy Code was originally adopted in June 1977 and is updated on a three-year cycle. Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The 2019 California Energy
Code is the most recent version and improves upon the previous 2016 standards for new construction of, and additions and alterations to, residential and nonresidential buildings. The 2019 standards move toward cutting energy use in new homes by more than 50 percent and will require installation of solar photovoltaic systems for single-family homes and multifamily buildings of three stories and less. Under the 2019 standards, single-family homes will be 7 percent more energy efficient. When accounting for the electricity generated by the solar photovoltaic system, single-family homes would use 53 percent less energy compared to homes built to the 2016 standards. The City regularly adopts updates under the SJMC Chapter 17.04, Building Code.

California Building Code: CALGreen

The California Building Standards Commission adopted the California Green Building Standards Code, also known as CALGreen, in Part 11 of Title 24. CALGreen establishes standards that apply to the planning, design, operation, construction, use, and occupancy of every newly constructed building or structure throughout the State, unless otherwise indicated in the California Building Standards Code. The purpose of CALGreen is to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings. CALGreen encourages sustainable construction practices in energy efficiency. Compliance with the CALGreen Code is not a substitution for meeting the certification requirements of any green building program.

Senate Bill (SB) X7-7

SB X7-7 was enacted in November 2009, requiring all water suppliers to increase water use efficiency. The legislation sets an overall goal of reducing per capita urban water use by 20 percent by December 31, 2020. The State was to make incremental progress towards this goal by reducing per capita water use by at least 10 percent by December 31, 2015.

Local

2015 Urban Water Management Plan

Water is provided to the project site by the San José Water Company (SJWC). The SJWC adopted the 2015 UWMP in May 2016, which was submitted to the SWRCB in accordance with the SB X7-7 and the Urban Water Management Planning Act, outlined in Section 10610 of Division 6 of the California Water Code. One of the purposes of UWMPs is to identify measures to meet SB X7-7 requirements that mandate a 20-percent reduction of per capita water use and agricultural water use throughout the State by 2020. The UWMP evaluates the water supply capacity and the projected water demands of the service area over a 20- or 25-year planning horizon. A range of water supply scenarios were modeled, including 1) normal, 2)
single-dry, and 3) multiple-dry water year conditions. The UWMP also provides action plans in the event of a catastrophic interruption in water supplies.128

**Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan**

The Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan, adopted in September 2019, provides strategies for the City of San José to transition from a traditional “gray” infrastructure to a greener stormwater infrastructure system. The Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (MRP) Provision C.3 requires Permittees to develop and implement long term green stormwater infrastructure plans, and therefore this plan includes low impact development design for storm drain infrastructure on public and private lands, including streets, roads, storm drains, parking lots, building roofs, and other development elements. The goals of this plan are to protect beneficial uses of waterways within San José, including the Bay, and provide environmental and community benefits; capture, infiltrate, treat, and/or “repurpose” stormwater with multi-benefit projects that can enhance public spaces, water supply, flood control, habitat, and green spaces; retrofit public rights-of-ways to exhibit complete streets with green stormwater infrastructure, reduce pollutants discharging to creeks from the MS4; and demonstrate quantitatively the pollutant load reductions that can be achieved through implementation of green stormwater infrastructure.

**Zero Waste Resolution**

In October 2007, the City Council adopted a Zero Waste Resolution (No. 74077), which set a goal of 75 percent waste diversion by 2013 and a goal of zero waste by 2022 for the City. “Zero Waste” requires rethinking what is traditionally regarded as garbage and treating all materials as valued resources instead of items to discard. Zero waste accounts for the whole materials management system, from product design and the extraction of natural resources, to manufacturing and distribution, to product use and reuse, to recycling or disposal. The Zero Waste Resolution identifies the City’s zero waste principles as the following:

- Improving “downstream” reuse and recycling of end-of-life products and materials to ensure their highest and best use.
- Pursuing “upstream” redesign strategies to reduce the volume and toxicity of discarded products and materials while promoting less wasteful lifestyles.
- Supporting the reuse of discarded products and materials to stimulate and drive local economic workforce development.
- Preserving land for sustainable development and green industry infrastructure.

**Zero Waste Strategic Plan**

The Integrated Waste Management Zero Waste Strategic Plan developed in November 2008, supports several Green Vision Goals, and is primarily focused on the path to achieve zero waste. The Zero Waste

---

Strategic Plan identifies policies, programs, and facilities to help the City reach its zero waste goals. To achieve zero waste, the City has adopted the following phased approach:

- Phase 1 – voluntary actions, education, and creation of incentives;
- Phase 2 – new programs and advocacy; and
- Phase 3 – bans, mandates, and legislation.

San José has been active over the years in phase one and two activities, but to meet zero waste goals, the City may need to focus on bans, mandates, advocacy, and legislation. To achieve the City’s short-term goal of diverting 75 percent of waste from landfills by 2013, the City completed the following measures:

- Enhancing residential recycling;
- Redesigning the commercial waste system to provide recycling and composting services;
- Enhancing the construction and demolition debris recycling;
- Evaluating anaerobic digestion of food scraps at the RWF; and
- Pursuing opportunities to support Extended Producer Responsibility initiatives and target reduction of single-use carryout bags as well as non-recyclable/non-compostable take-out food packaging.

To achieve the long-term goal of zero waste by 2022, the Zero Waste Strategic Plan identifies that the City needs to:

- Modify existing revenue streams to mitigate funding lost from zero waste efforts;
- Support implementing zero waste policies locally, regionally, and statewide;
- Continue implementing mixed waste recycling of single-family residential garbage and recycling processing residue;
- Develop and strengthen markets for recoverable and reusable materials, and lead by example;
- Promote the future development of energy conversion technologies for converting residual wastes into energy; and
- Educate the public about the benefits of reducing wasteful consumption.

**General Plan**

The Infrastructure (IN) and the Measurable Environmental Sustainability (MS) sections of the General Plan includes the following goals and policies relevant to utilities and public services and are applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project:

**Goal IN-3 Water Supply, Sanitary Sewer, and Storm Drainage** – Provide water supply, sanitary sewer, and storm drainage infrastructure facilities to meet future growth planned within the City, to assure high-quality service to existing and future residents, and to fulfill all applicable local, State and Federal regulatory requirements.

- **Policy IN-3.1:** Achieve minimum level of services:
  - For sanitary sewers, achieve a minimum level of service “D” or better as described in the Sanitary Sewer Level of Service Policy and determined based on the guidelines provided in the Sewer Capacity Impact Analysis (SCIA) Guidelines.
  - For storm drainage, to minimize flooding on public streets and to minimize the potential for property damage from stormwater, implement a 10-year return storm design standard
throughout the City, and in compliance with all local, State and Federal regulatory requirements.

- **Policy IN-3.3:** Meet the water supply, sanitary sewer and storm drainage level of service objectives through an orderly process of ensuring that, before development occurs, there is adequate capacity. Coordinate with water and sewer providers to prioritize service needs for approved affordable housing projects.

- **Policy IN-3.5:** Require development which will have the potential to reduce downstream LOS to lower than “D”, or development which would be served by downstream lines already operating at a LOS lower than “D”, to provide mitigation measures to improve the LOS to “D” or better, either acting independently or jointly with other developments in the same area or in coordination with the City’s Sanitary Sewer Capital Improvement Program.

- **Policy IN-3.7:** Design new projects to minimize potential damage due to stormwaters and flooding to the site and other properties.

- **Policy IN-3.9:** Require developers to prepare drainage plans that define needed drainage improvements for proposed developments per City standards.

- **Policy IN-3.10:** Incorporate appropriate stormwater treatment measures in development projects to achieve stormwater quality and quantity standards and objectives in compliance with the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

- **Goal IN-5 Solid Waste-Materials Recovery/Landfill** — Develop and maintain materials recovery and landfill facilities to meet community needs, advance the City’s Zero Waste goals and to comply with applicable regulatory requirements.

- **Policy IN-5.3:** Use solid waste reduction techniques, including source reduction, reuse, recycling, source separation, composting, energy recovery and transformation of solid wastes to extend the life span of existing landfills and to reduce the need for future landfill facilities and to achieve the City’s Zero Waste goals.

- **Goal MS-3 Water Conservation and Quality** — Maximize the use of green building practices in new and existing development to minimize use of potable water and to reduce water pollution.

- **Policy MS-3.1:** Require water-efficient landscaping, which conforms to the State’s Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, for all new commercial, institutional, industrial, and developer-installed residential development unless for recreation needs or other area functions.

- **Policy MS-3.2:** Promote use of green building technology or techniques that can help to reduce the depletion of the City’s potable water supply as building codes permit.

- **Policy MS-3.3:** Promote the use of drought-tolerant plants and landscaping materials for nonresidential and residential uses.

- **Goal MS-6 Waste Reduction** — Reduce generation of solid and hazardous waste.

- **Policy MS-6.3:** Encourage the use of locally extracted, manufactured or recycled and reused materials, including construction materials and compost.
Policy MS-6.5: Reduce the amount of waste disposed in landfills through waste prevention, reuse, and recycling of materials at venues, facilities, and special events.

Policy MS-6.6: Promote the development of energy conversion technologies for converting residual wastes into energy.

Policy MS-6.8: Maximize reuse, recycling, and composting citywide.

Policy MS-6.12: Promote use of recycled materials, including reuse of existing building shells/elements, as part of new construction or renovations.

Policy MS-14.4: Implement the City’s Green Building Policies (see Green Building Section) so that new construction and rehabilitation of existing buildings fully implements industry best practices, including the use of optimized energy systems, selection of materials and resources, water efficiency, sustainable site selection, passive solar building design, and planting of trees and other landscape materials to reduce energy consumption.

Goal MS-19 Water Recycling – Recycle or beneficially reuse 100% of the City’s wastewater supply, including the indirect use of recycled water as part of the potable water supply.

Policy MS-19.4: Require the use of recycled water wherever feasible and cost-effective to serve existing and new development.

Existing Conditions

The project site is located within the City of San José Urban Service Area.¹²⁹

Wastewater

Wastewater is water containing wastes from residential, commercial, and industrial processes. Municipal wastewater contains sewage, gray water (e.g., water from sinks and showers), and sometimes industrial wastewater.

Wastewater Treatment

The City of San José provides wastewater treatment service within the city limits. The San José-Santa Clara Regional Wastewater Facility (RWF) provides primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment of wastewater, which is located approximately 15 miles north of the project site. The existing capacity of the RWF is 167 million gallons per day (mgd). The RWF currently treats an average of approximately 110 mgd (dry weather flow), or about 65 percent of its 167 mgd capacity.¹³⁰ Treated effluent is discharged to the San


Francisco Bay. As discussed below, the RWQCB also has established an effluent flow trigger of 120 mgd, to minimize the amount of freshwater effluent discharged to the Bay.\textsuperscript{131} In 2019, the actual Average Dry Weather Influent flow (ADWIF), defined as the highest 5-weekday period from June through October, was 109.6 mgd. For 2019, actual Average Dry Weather Effluent flow was 79.3 mgd and occurred during the months of July to September.\textsuperscript{132} Based on the average daily dry weather influent flow from sources in San José of approximately 109.6 mgd, or 66 percent of the City’s total allocated 167 mgd of wastewater flow to the RWF, the City currently has approximately 57.4 mgd of excess treatment capacity.\textsuperscript{133} The City’s level-of-service goal for sewage treatment is to remain within the capacity of the RWF.

The RWF is currently operating under a 120 mgd (dry weather) effluent flow trigger. This requirement is based upon the San Francisco Bay RWQCB concerns over the effects of additional freshwater discharges from the RWF on saltwater marsh habitat, and pollutant loading to the Bay from the RWF. In response to these issues, the City has prepared a Clean Bay Strategy and the South Bay Action Plan. The Clean Bay Strategy details the City’s control strategy to reduce effluent discharges to the South San Francisco Bay as required by the NPDES permit. The Clean Bay Strategy promotes an integrated watershed protection approach and considers all factors influencing water quality in the South Bay, including point and non-point sources of pollution, water supply issues and improving plant performance. The South Bay Action Plan describes in some detail the conservation, reuse, and diversion activities designed to reduce effluent flow from the RWF to ensure that it remains below 120 mgd. A contingency plan, which includes additional measures, will be implemented if Average Dry Weather Effluent flow reaches a trigger of 115 mgd.

**Sanitary Sewer System**

The City maintains the wastewater collection system within the project site. Wastewater is conveyed to the RWF through the City’s sewer collection system, which consists of lateral lines and main lines in the public right-of-way. The City has developed a sewer capacity improvement program to prioritize and construct capital projects that address the needs identified in the Sewer Master Plan that will be based on a hydraulic model of the trunk sewer system (10-inch and larger pipes), using land use and flow information.

The City’s sanitary sewer system serves a population of approximately 1 million people in a 178-square-mile service area. The City owns and operates approximately 2,294 miles of wastewater collection system pipeline that ranges from 6 to 90 inches in diameter, approximately 45,000 manholes and 16 sewage lift stations.

Sewer laterals, ranging in size from 6 to 8 inches in diameter, originate at individual sites and convey flows by gravity to sewer mains. Sewer lift stations and force mains are used at several locations to transport

sewer flows that cannot be conveyed by gravity. The sanitary sewer system lines nearest the project site are located along Union Avenue and Cambrianna Drive.\textsuperscript{134}

The SWRCB issued statewide waste discharge requirements for sanitary sewer systems, which include requirements for development of a Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP). The City prepared a SSMP in October 2014.\textsuperscript{135} The purpose of the SSMP is to provide guidance to the City in the operation, maintenance and rehabilitation of the sewer assets of the City.

The Department of Public Works (DPW) designs and builds sanitary sewer infrastructure funded through the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Public Works also reviews and inspects sanitary sewer improvements performed by private developers and other public agencies.

The Sanitary Sewer Condition Assessment (SSCA Program) was initiated in 2010 by DPW. The original pilot project utilized closed circuit television (CCTV) to video and collect data on a 46-mile, representative sample, of the City’s approximately 2,290-mile sanitary sewer system. The raw data established the foundation to begin analysis on the overall condition of the City’s sanitary sewer network. The long-term goal of the program is to utilize larger data sets to perform analysis and ultimately develop various risk assessments to develop and prioritize the rehabilitation portion of the Sanitary Capital Improvement Program. The current program schedule involves condition assessment on one-tenth of the City every year with an anticipated completion of the full assessment of the City by 2021.

The majority of funds in the Sanitary Sewer System CIP are used to construct sewer improvement projects. Construction projects in the Proposed CIP meet one of two goals: (a) enhance sewer capacity to meet economic development; or (b) rehabilitate existing sewers, with higher priority given to those with extensive, severe deterioration. A project that will enhance capacity and rehabilitate existing sewers is considered a rehabilitation project for the purpose of the City’s budget process. Priority is given to larger lines within each category. The Sanitary Sewer Master Plan Capacity Assessment was completed on April 2013 and is used to help identify high priority capacity in the proposed CIP.

Capacity improvement projects are selected by utilizing a computerized sewer flow model (which utilizes the General Plan to project sewage flows in the system), City maintenance records, and flow monitoring. These allow sewer capacity constraints to be identified. The Sewer System Master Plan identified a total of 93 new capacity projects that will upsize for existing deficiencies and will accommodate near-term and long-term flows. Rehabilitation projects are selected based on hydrogen sulfide studies that analyze pipe corrosion, condition assessment studies, maintenance records and reports, and actual pipe failures due to pipe corrosion or other physical deficiencies. The actual condition of candidate projects is verified by internal video inspections, which are then evaluated to establish project priorities.

The General Plan calls for a level of service (LOS) D for sanitary sewer lines. At LOS D, the sewer main is occasionally running full. New development is required by existing policies to avoid or minimize impacts upon any existing or anticipated LOS E sewer lines by constructing or contributing to the construction of new lines or by waiting for completion of planned sewer line improvements. The City’s existing sanitary sewer system operates with approximately 95 percent of the trunk sewer pipelines at LOS D or better, under dry weather conditions.

**Water Service and Supply**

Potable water is provided to the project site by SJWC. SJWC’s service area encompasses 139 square miles, including most of San José, most of Cupertino, the entire cities of Campbell, Monte Sereno, Saratoga, the Town of Los Gatos, and parts of unincorporated Santa Clara County.

SJWC obtains its water from three sources of potable supply: groundwater, imported treated surface water, and local surface water. A fourth and growing source of supply is non-potable recycled water, which is discussed in Chapter 6 System Supplies, of the 2015 UWMP.

**Groundwater**

Groundwater comprises just over one third of SJWC’s supply total. SJWC has over 100 wells that pump groundwater from the aquifers of the Santa Clara Subbasin of the Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin. These aquifers recharge naturally by rainfall and artificially by a series of local reservoirs, percolation ponds, and an injection well.

The SCVWD manages groundwater in Santa Clara County. SJWC has the right to withdraw groundwater from aquifers below properties within its service area boundary when in compliance with the SCVWD’s permitting requirements. In Santa Clara County, this right is subject to a groundwater extraction fee levied by SCVWD based on the amount of groundwater pumped into SJWC’s distribution system. SJWC draws water from the Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin in the north part of Santa Clara County. The basin extends from Coyote Narrows at Metcalf Road to the County’s northern boundary. It is bounded on the west by the Santa Cruz Mountains and on the east by the Diablo Range; these two ranges converge at the Coyote Narrows to form the southern limit of the Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin. The Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin is 22 miles long and 15 miles wide, with a surface area of 225 square miles. The SJWC 2015 UWMP indicates the groundwater level has been steadily on the rise for the past 40 years in the Santa Clara Subbasin.

SJWC generally uses the most economical source of water, which is largely determined by SCVWD groundwater extraction fee rates and contracted water rates.

**Purchased Imported Surface Water**

In 1981, SJWC entered into a 70-year master contract with SCVWD for the purchase of treated water. About 50 percent of needed water supply is purchased by SJWC under contract from the SCVWD. This water originates from several sources including local reservoirs, the State Water Project (SWP), and the federally funded San Felipe Division of the Central Valley Project (CVP). Imported surface water provided
by SCVWD primarily comes from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the majority of which originates as snowmelt in the Sierras.

**Local Surface Water**

SJWC’s remaining source of potable water is surface water runoff from the watersheds of the Santa Cruz Mountains. This amounts to about 10 percent of SJWC’s potable water supply, depending on rainfall.

SJWC has pre-1914 surface water rights to raw water in Los Gatos Creek and local watersheds in the Santa Cruz Mountains. Prior to 1872, appropriative water rights could be acquired by taking and beneficially using water. In 1914, the California Water Code was adopted, and it grandfathered in all existing water entitlements to license holders. SJWC filed for a license in 1947 and was granted license number 10933 in 1976 by the SWRCB to draw 6,240 acre-feet per year (afy) from Los Gatos Creek. SJWC has upgraded the collection and treatment system that draws water from this watershed, which has increased the capacity of this entitlement to approximately 11,200 afy for an average rain year. A series of dams and automated intakes collect the water released from SJWC’s lakes. The water is pumped into the SJWC’s Montevina water treatment plant for treatment prior to entering the distribution system. SJWC’s Saratoga water treatment plant draws water from a local stream that collects water from the nearby Santa Cruz Mountains.

SJWC owns and operates its water distribution system, which lies beneath roadways in the public street rights-of-way.

**Per Capita Water Use – San José Water Company**

The Water Conservation Act of 2009 (SB X7-7) requires water purveyors to demonstrate appropriate reductions in water use. This demonstration requires the water suppliers do the following: determine a base daily per capita water use; determine urban water use targets; compare water use targets to five-year baseline; and determine interim water use targets.

Per capita usage in 2010 was slightly above 126 gallons per capita per day (gpcd), which is much lower than the 10-year SB X7-7 baseline gpcd from 1995-2004 of 154 gpcd. It is not anticipated that the per capita usage can or will continue to decrease at such a rapid rate. However, due to ongoing conservation efforts such as the installation of low-flow showerheads, faucet aerators, high efficiency toilets, and clothes washers, as well as changes in landscape plant choice and continual efforts to reduce leakage and runoff, it is expected that the per capita usage for the existing population will experience a steady decline of 0.2 percent per year until 2040.

Coupling projected demand increases due to population growth with anticipated demand decreases due to conservation efforts, it is estimated that in 2040 SJWC’s demand will be approximately 114 gpcd, with a system-wide potable and raw water demand of approximately 144 MGD. SJWC’s actual water use during 2015 was 96 gpcd as shown in Table 5-2 of the 2015 UWMP.\(^{136}\)

---

Water Demand and Supply Projections – San José Water Company

Most of SJWC’s customers within its 139-square-mile service territory are residential or commercial. SJWC also provides water to industrial, municipal, and private fire services and public fire protection services. SJWC’s total demand is the sum of projected metered demand plus 7 percent of that amount for non-revenue water, which includes authorized unmetered uses for firefighting, main flushing and public use, and unauthorized use due to meter reading discrepancies, reservoir cleaning, malfunctioning valves, leakage, and theft.

The 2015 UWMP projects adequate supply in normal and single dry years through 2035. However, the 2015 UWMP projects a supply-demand deficiency in 2040 for a single dry year, and in the second and third years of multi-year droughts. The 2015 UWMP indicates SJWC and SCVWD have adequate regional water supply to meet the demand forecasts. Additionally, the SJWC has an updated Water Shortage Contingency Plan (WSCP). SJWC’s 2015 WSCP, filed with the CPUC, consists of two documents called Schedule 14.1 Water Shortage Contingency Plan with Staged Mandatory Reductions and Drought Surcharges and Rule 14.1 Water Shortage Contingency Plan. The revised WSCP was modified to include only four stages and many of the actions were modified. SJWC worked with SCVWD and other retail agencies in Santa Clara County to develop common actions that would be implemented at each stage of supply reduction from 10 percent to 50 percent.

SJWC also has a well replacement program. The program identifies and replaces two wells per year based on numerous criteria, including well production and observed water quality problems. The replacement of older wells and optimization of existing wells allows SJWC to maintain its groundwater supply reliability. SCVWD’s policy is to achieve 95 percent reliability of supply during significant water shortages that occur during multi-year droughts. To accomplish this, SJWC can use less groundwater in certain areas to achieve the overall balance, which meets both SCVWD’s and SJWC’s operational goals.

The 2015 UWMP also has a complete water conservation and public outreach program (Chapter 9, Demand Management Measures). During a drought, SJWC works with its wholesale water supplier and other retail agencies in the County to collaborate on additional public outreach strategies. For example, in 2015 SJWC and the other retailers in Santa Clara County worked with SCVWD on a two-day per week outdoor irrigation limitation program.

The SCVWD continues to work with SJWC and other local water retailers to refine future projections of both treated water and groundwater to ensure planning efforts are consistent.

Stormwater

The City storm drainage system consists of a network of storm drain inlets, manholes, pipes, outfalls, channels, and pump stations designed to protect infrastructure and the traveling public from flood waters during storm events. The various components function collectively to collect, convey, and discharge stormwater runoff to receiving water bodies. The underground collection system consists of approximately 1,250 miles of reinforced concrete pipes varying in size from 12 to 144 inches in diameter that function by gravity to carry untreated stormwater to local creeks and rivers. Collected stormwater runoff is discharged to the creeks and rivers via storm outfall structures. The creeks and rivers, flow to the
San Francisco Bay. In low lying areas of the city stormwater pump stations are employed to facilitate drainage when gravity drainage is not possible or feasible.\(^{137}\)

The nearest mapped stormwater infrastructure to the project site includes manholes and a 12 inch storm drain pipe along Cambrianna Drive to the south and manholes and a 10 inch storm drain pipe along Browning Avenue to the north.\(^{138}\)

**Solid Waste**

In 2018, the City generated approximately 728,000 tons of solid waste, including 4,662 tons of green materials.\(^{139}\) The City is primarily served by five landfills, nine recycling and transfer stations, five composting facilities, and eight processing facilities for construction and demolition debris.\(^{140}\) The landfills include Guadalupe Mines, Kirby Canyon, Newby Island, Zanker Road Materials Processing Facility, and Zanker Road. The five landfills have a total permitted capacity of 5.3 million tons per year.\(^{141}\) Based on available capacity of the landfills, the projected closure dates are 2021 for Guadalupe Mines and 2025 for Kirby Canyon and Newby Island.\(^{142}\) The Zanker Road facilities have no closure date due to the minimal amount of material landfilled each year. Considering these projected closure dates and current generation rates, there will be adequate landfill capacity to accommodate waste generated in Santa Clara County for at least 15 years.\(^{143}\) After this time, regional landfills could reach capacity in the absence of additional waste reduction efforts. According to the Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP), the County has adequate disposal capacity beyond 2022.

In October 2007, the San José City Council adopted a Zero Waste Resolution which set a goal of 75 percent waste diversion by 2013 and zero waste by 2022. In 2014, City diverted approximately 73 percent of the waste generated through a variety of programs, including residential curbside recycling and yard trimmings collection programs, civic recycling, and the Construction & Demolition Diversion Deposit (CDDD) program.\(^{144}\)

---

\(^{137}\) Envision San José 2040 Draft Environmental Impact Report, June 2011.


\(^{140}\) This does not include the numerous facilities that primarily handle a single type of material such as scrap metal. Source: City of San José, Assessment of Infrastructure for the Integrated Waste Management Zero Waste Strategic Plan Development, 2008.


\(^{142}\) Envision San José 2040 General Plan EIR. In August 2012, the City approved the expansion of the Newby Island landfill to allow operation through 2025.


\(^{144}\) The CDDD is an incentive program to encourage the recovery of debris from construction and demolition projects. The City collects a deposit that is fully refundable with proper documentation that the debris was diverted from burial in a landfill. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/waste-management/zero-waste/case-studies/cs_sanjose.pdf, accessed on April 21, 2020.
Republic Services is the commercial waste hauler serving the project site.145

*Electricity and Natural Gas*

SJCE provides electricity to the city. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) provides electricity infrastructure and natural gas services to the city. PG&E owns and maintains above- and below-ground networks of electric and gas transmission and distribution facilities throughout the city. Both gas and electrical service is available throughout the San José. Energy infrastructure is described in more detail in Section VI, Energy, of this Initial Study.

**DISCUSSION**

a) *Would the project required or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

**Wastewater Treatment Facilities**

As described above, the RWF provides wastewater treatment services to the City of San José and other cities and tributary agencies in the South Bay Area. While the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, it does not include a specific development proposal. Potential future development could include approximately 20 single-family homes would generate up to 64 new residents. Wastewater produced on-site would be directed to the RWF facilities for treatment.

The RWF has the capacity to process an average of 167 mgd of dry weather influent flow and is permitted to discharge 120 mgd dry weather effluent flow. If the average dry weather effluent flow equals or exceeds 120 mgd, the RWF is required to immediately implement measures to reduce discharge flows as identified in the *South Bay Action Plan and* submit annual self-monitoring reports describing the year’s accomplishments and actions planned for the upcoming year to the RWQCB. As described above, the RWF currently treats an average of approximately 109.6 mgd and discharges an average of approximately 79.3 mgd of effluent to the San Francisco Bay. Based on the average daily dry weather flows from sources in San José (approximately 109.6 mgd), the City currently has approximately 57.4 mgd of excess treatment capacity. Potential future development associated with implementation of the proposed project could generate an average of about 7,296 gallons per day (gpd)—or 0.007 mgd.146 As described above, the City has approximately 57.4 mgd of excess treatment capacity at the RWF; therefore, the RWF has adequate capacity to accept wastewater produced by potential future development under the proposed project. In addition, future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with existing wastewater treatment regulations of the San Francisco Bay RWQCB, and water conservation policies adopted by the City, such as those included in the General Plan and the San José Green Vision, and the SJMC Chapter 15.10, Water Waste Prevention and Water Shortage Measures, which would serve to minimize the amount of wastewater generated. Mandatory compliance with these regulations would ensure that potential future development under the proposed project would not exceed the RWF’s
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146 Assuming the estimated 7,296 gpd water demand for the proposed project all becomes wastewater.
wastewater treatment requirements. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

**Stormwater Drainage**

As discussed under Criterion (c) in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, above, potential future development under the proposed project would add impervious surfaces. However, implementation of stormwater treatment control measures in accordance with the MRP and SCVURPPP guidelines could reduce the total percentage of impervious surface.

Operational best management practices would be required to meet the C.3 provisions of the MRP, and potential future development under the proposed project would be required to implement site design, source control, and stormwater treatment measures that would minimize any increase in stormwater runoff. The proposed project would result in changes at the policy level and does not include a specific development proposal. Therefore, low impact development features and stormwater treatment measures that would be implemented as part of a potential future development on the project site have yet to be determined. Once detailed engineering drawings are drafted and submitted along with the Stormwater Control Plan (SCP), the City would review the potential future development project’s planned connection to the City’s storm drain system and would determine whether the storm drain can accept the stormwater runoff from the site without exceeding the capacity of the storm drain system.

As under Criterion (a) in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, above, best management practices and low impact development features would be implemented during future construction and project operation that would control and reduce the potential for sediment, debris, and other pollutants to be discharged into the storm drain system. With implementation of these measures, implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, any impact on the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems would not be substantial.

Additionally, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with existing stormwater management policies adopted by the City such as General Plan Policy 6-29, the SJMC Chapter 15.10, Water Waste Prevention and Water Shortage Measures, and General Plan Policy IN-3.10, which requires compliance with the City’s NPDES permit. Mandatory compliance with these regulations would ensure that future development facilitated by the proposed project would not require the expansion of existing stormwater facilities or the construction of new facilities, the construction of which could otherwise have significant impacts. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

**Other Utility Facilities**

Potential future development facilitated by proposed project would involve developing the project site with a new infill residential development that would be served by existing PG&E distribution systems that would provide natural gas. SJCE would provide electricity. Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would require electrical services that would represent modest increases in energy use,
especially compared to the total for the PG&E service territory. Potential future development would include new residential development that is already located in an urbanize area. Future development facilitated by the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in natural gas and electricity use requiring new energy supply facilities for SJCE or PG&E. Additionally, future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with energy efficiency standards set forth by the California Energy Code and CALGreen, which requires reduced energy use through construction techniques and design, and City Council Policy 8-13, which made green building the standard practice in San José. Furthermore, as discussed in Section VI, Energy, of this Initial Study, impacts due to the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, as well as conflict with state or local plans for renewable energy would be less than significant. Accordingly, impacts to other utility facilities would be less than significant.

b) Would there be sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

Potential future development could facilitate future construction of approximately 20 single-family homes generating up to 64 residents. The SJWC 2015 UWMP identified 114 gpcd as the projected per capita water demand rate in the SJWC service territory in 2040. SJWC’s actual water use during 2015 was 96 gpcd as shown in Table 5-2 of the 2015 UWMP. For purposes of this water supply analysis, a water demand rate of 114 gpcd is applied.

Potential future development under the proposed project would require approximately 7,296 gpd (64 residents and employees x 114 gpcd = 7,296 gpd), or approximately 2.7 million gallons per year (mgd). This is a very small fraction of the water demand of the approximately 1 million population served by SJWC in its 139-square-mile service territory.

The 2015 UWMP projects adequate supply in normal and single dry years through 2035. While in 2040 for a single dry year, and in the second and third years of multi-year droughts, a supply-demand deficiency is projected. However, the 2015 UWMP indicate SJWC and SCVWD have adequate regional water supply to meet the referenced demand forecasts. Additionally, the SJWC has an updated WSCP. SJWC works with SCVWD and other retail agencies in Santa Clara County to develop common actions that would be implemented at each stage of supply reduction from 10 percent to 50 percent.

SJWC also has an established well replacement program. The replacement of older wells and optimization of existing wells will allow SJWC to maintain its groundwater supply reliability. SCVWD’s policy is to achieve 95 percent reliability of supply during significant water shortages that occur during multi-year droughts. To accomplish this, SJWC can use less groundwater in certain areas or zones to achieve the overall balance, which best meets SCVWD’s and SJWC’s operational goals. Additionally, SJWC has a complete
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water conservation and public outreach program. During a drought, SJWC works with its wholesale water supplier and other retail agencies in the County to collaborate on additional public outreach strategies.

Furthermore, potential future development under the proposed project would be required to comply with General Plan Policies MS-3.2 to promote use of green building techniques that can help reduce the depletion of the City’s potable water supply, as building codes permit, and MS-19.4 to require the use of recycled water. Potential future development would also include on-site landscaping in accordance with the SJMC Chapter 15.11, Water Efficient Landscape Standards for New and Rehabilitated Landscaping, which regulates water conservation through landscape design, installation, and maintenance consistent with the Water Conservation in Landscaping Act, California Government Code Section 65591 et seq.

Mandatory compliance with these regulations would ensure that water demand from potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would not exceed the available water supply or require new or expanded entitlements. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

c) Would the project 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?

As described under Criterion (a) above, the RWF has the available capacity to treat the 7,296 gpd of influent conservatively estimated to be produced by potential future development facilitated by the proposed project. Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would also be required to comply with existing wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco RWQCB, and water conservation policies adopted by the City, such as those included in the General Plan, the San José Green Vision, and SJMC Chapter 15.10, Water Waste Prevention and Water Shortage Measures, which would serve to minimize the amount of wastewater generated. Mandatory compliance with these regulations would ensure that the proposed project would not exceed the design or permitted capacity of the RWF and would not require new or expanded water treatment facilities. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

As described above, the City currently generates 728,000 tons of solid waste per year. All solid waste produced in the city is processed by five landfills, nine recycling and transfer stations, five composting facilities, and eight processing facilities for construction and demolition debris. The five landfills have a total permitted capacity of 5.3 million tons per year. Potential future development facilitated under the proposed project could generate approximately 16 tons of waste per year.\textsuperscript{149,150} Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with the City’s Zero Waste

\textsuperscript{149} City of San José, 2011. Envision San José 2040 General Plan EIR, Section 3.10.3.4, Solid Waste, page 663.

\textsuperscript{150} 31.1 pounds of solid waste per week for residential x 20 units = 622 pounds of solid waste per week or 32,344 pounds per year.

32,344/2000 (the number of pounds in 1 ton) = 16 tons of solid waste per year.
Resolution and Strategic Plan and the SJMC Chapter 9.10, Solid Waste Management, which sets forth requirements for solid waste management. Additionally, potential future development facilitated by proposed project would be required to comply with General Plan Policies IN-5.3 related to integrating solid waste technology into new development, Policy MS-6.3 to reduce construction waste, and Policies MS-6.5, MS-6.8, and MS-6.12, which encourages and promotes recycling, composting and reusing in the city. Mandatory compliance with these regulations would ensure that implementation of the proposed project would not cause landfills or transfer stations to exceed permitted capacity. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not exceed State or local standards, generate solid waste beyond the current capacity of landfills, or impair solid waste goals. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Comply with federal, State, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?

As discussed above under Criteria (d), potential future development facilitated by the proposed project could generate 16 tons of solid waste per year. The San José City Council adopted a Zero Waste Resolution which set a goal of 75 percent waste diversion by 2013 and zero waste by 2022. In 2014, City diverted approximately 73 percent of the waste generated through a variety of programs, including residential curbside recycling and yard trimmings collection programs, civic recycling, and the CDDD program.\(^{151}\) Additionally, the City’s Environmental Services Department prepared an Integrated Waste Management Zero Waste Strategic Plan in November 2008. The Zero Waste Strategic Plan supports several Green Vision Goals, but its primary focus is to identify the path to achieve zero waste. These programs would ensure that potential future development facilitated by proposed project would not compromise the ability to achieve or exceed the State-mandated waste target. Furthermore, the project would be subject to the SJMC Chapter 9.10, Solid Waste Management, which sets forth requirements for solid waste management. Mandatory compliance with applicable statutes and regulations would ensure that the impact would be less than significant.

### XX. WILDFIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If located in or near a State Responsibility Area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would implementation of the proposed project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{151}\) The CDDD is an incentive program to encourage the recovery of debris from construction and demolition projects. The City collects a deposit that is fully refundable with proper documentation that the debris was diverted from burial in a landfill, [https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/waste-management/zero-waste/case-studies/cs_sanjose.pdf](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/waste-management/zero-waste/case-studies/cs_sanjose.pdf), accessed on April 21, 2020.
If located in or near a State Responsibility Area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would implementation of the proposed project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landsides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following is a summary of the relevant regional and local regulations pertaining to wildfire. There are no federal regulations governing this topic relevant to the project.

Regulatory Framework

State

Fire Hazard Severity Zones and Responsibility Areas

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) publishes maps recommending fire hazard severity zones for every California county. The maps identify lands in California as falling within one of the following management areas: Local Responsibility Area (LRA), State Responsibility Area (SRA), and Federal Responsibility Area (FRA). Within each of these areas, a single agency has direct responsibility: in LRAs, local fire departments or fire protection districts are responsible; in SRAs, CAL FIRE is responsible; in FRAs, federal agencies such as the United States Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of Defense, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and Department of the Interior are responsible.152 Within the LRA, CAL FIRE designates lands as being within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) or non-VHFHSZ.

California Building Code

The California Building Code, contained in Part 2 of Title 24, California Code of Regulations, identifies building design standards, including those for fire safety. The California Building Code is updated on a three-year cycle. It is effective Statewide, but a local jurisdiction may adopt more restrictive standards based on local conditions under specific amendment rules prescribed by the State Building Standards Commission. Commercial and residential buildings are plan-checked by local city and county building...

---

officials for compliance with the California Building Code and any applicable local edits. Typical fire safety requirements of the California Building Code include the installation of fire sprinklers in all new residential, high rise, and hazardous materials buildings; the establishment of fire resistance standards for fire doors, building materials, and particular types of construction; and clearance of debris and vegetation within a prescribed distance from occupied structures in wildfire hazard areas.

**California Fire Code**

The California Fire Code incorporates, by adoption, the International Fire Code of the International Code Council, with California amendments. This is the official Fire Code for the State and all political subdivisions. It is found in California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 9 and, like the California Building Code California Building Code, it is revised and published every three years by the California Building Standards Commission. Also like the California Building Code, the California Fire Code is effective Statewide, but a local jurisdiction may adopt more restrictive standards based on local conditions. The City of San José regularly adopts each new Fire Code update under the SJMC Chapter 17.12, City of San José Fire Code. The California Fire Code includes provisions and standards for emergency planning and preparedness, fire service features, fire protection systems, hazardous materials, fire flow requirements, and fire hydrant locations and distribution. Typical fire safety requirements include installation of sprinklers in all high-rise buildings; the establishment of fire resistance standards for fire doors, building materials, and particular types of construction; and the clearance of debris and vegetation within a prescribed distance from occupied structures in wildfire hazard areas.

**2018 Strategic Fire Plan for California**

CAL FIRE produced the 2018 *Strategic Fire Plan for California*, which contains goals, objectives, and policies to prepare for and mitigate for the effects of fire on California’s natural and built environments. The 2018 *Strategic Fire Plan for California*, focuses on fire prevention and suppression activities to protect lives, property, and ecosystems; in addition to providing natural resource management to maintain State forests as a resilient carbon sink to meet California’s climate change goals. This plan provides State Responsibility Fire Safe Regulations, which requires that all parcels 1 acre or larger provide a minimum 30-foot setback for buildings from all property lines and/or the center of the road. A key component of the 2018 *Strategic Fire Plan for California* is the collaboration between communities to ensure fire suppression and natural resource management is successful.

**California Public Utilities Commission**

In 2007, wildfires in southern California were ignited by overhead utility power lines and aerial communication facilities near power lines. In response, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) began considering and adopting regulations to protect the public from fire hazards due to overhead power lines and nearby aerial communication facilities. The CPUC published a Fire-Threat Map under
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Rulemaking 15-05-006, following procedures in Decision 17-01-009, revised by Decision 17-06-024, which adopted a work plan for the development of a utility High Fire-Threat District where enhanced fire safety regulations in Decision 17-12-024 apply.155

Regional

Santa Clara County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan

The San Local Santa Clara Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), adopted in October 2017, is a guide to hazard mitigation within the within Santa Clara County, including the City of San José, and serves as a tool to help decision makers direct hazard mitigation activities and resources. In the context of an LHMP, mitigation is an action that reduces or eliminates long-term risk to people and property from hazards, including wildfire.

Santa Clara County Community Wildfire Protection Plan

The Santa Clara County Community Wildfire Protection Plan156 (CWPP), adopted in August 2016, is intended to provide a foundation for and facilitate continued collaboration between the multiple agencies providing fire protection within Santa Clara County. The CWPP aims to foster collaboration between local and state government representatives, prioritize fuel reduction, and provides measures to treat structural ignitability through the area. The CWPP contains a separate annex for the City of San José, with fuel reduction projects, public education projects, structural ignitability projects, and general planning projects to reduce fire hazards within the city.

Local

City of San José Emergency Operations Plan

The City of San José Emergency Operations Plan (EOP), adopted in November 2018, establishes emergency management policies and procedures, in addition to assigning responsibilities to ensure the effective management of emergency operations within the city. Emergency operations are split in to five phases: 1) Prevention, 2) Preparedness, 3) Response, 4) Recovery, and 5) Mitigation. The City of San José coordinates with Santa Clara County Office of Emergency Services to ensure emergency management functions meet the expectation of the City.

General Plan

The Environmental Considerations / Hazards (EC) section of the General Plan includes the following goals and policies specific to wildfire factors and applicable to future development facilitated by the proposed project.

Goal EC-8 Wildland and Urban Fire Hazards – Protect lives and property from risks associated with fire-related emergencies at the urban/wildland interface.

Policy EC-8.1: Minimize development in very high fire hazard zone areas. Plan and construct permitted development so as to reduce exposure to fire hazards and to facilitate fire suppression efforts in the event of a wildfire.

Municipal Code

Chapter 17.12, City of San José Fire Code

The City of San José Fire Code integrates the 2019 California Fire Code as published by the California Building Standards Commission. This code created the Bureau of Fire Prevention in June 1945 and requires the Bureau of Fire Prevention of review all building plans for compliance with State and local regulations for residential units. Residential units are reviewed for fire access, fire flow, fire hydrants, and all fire protection systems.

Chapter 17.82, Fire Safety During Construction

The purpose of this chapter is to minimize the potential for the occurrence and spread of fires during construction, as well as facilitate firefighting efforts. This chapter applies to construction of certain wood framed buildings and requires applicants of building permits to submit a construction fire protection plan and received approval from the fire safety officer prior to issuance of building permits.

Existing Conditions

The project site is located in an urbanized area within a CAL FIRE designated Local Responsibility Area. The project site is not located within a VHFHSZ.157 The nearest VHFHSZ within the LRA is approximately 2 miles to the south, near the Santa Rosa Open Space.158 Land between the edge of the VHFHZS and the project site is dense urban development, and therefore the project site is not located within the wildland-urban interface. Additionally, the project site is not located in an area designated as a CPUC fire threat.159

DISCUSSION

The project site is not located in or near SRAs or lands classified as high fire hazard severity zones, therefore, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would have no impact in regard to wildfire.

See Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for a discussion of the potential future development facilitated by proposed project’s potential to conflict with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and expose people and structures to a significant loss, injury, or death involving wildfires.

See Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, for additional discussion on the potential future development facilitated by the proposed project’s potential to alter the existing drainage pattern.

## XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DISCUSSION

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

As discussed throughout this Initial Study, the project site is in a highly urbanized, extensively developed area of San José. It is an underdeveloped portion of a larger former school site with maintained lawn (vegetated) and paved areas. As discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources, of this Initial Study, the site is in an area classified as “developed habitat”, and special-status species are generally not believed to
occur on the project site nor is the site suitable for such species. Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with General Plan Policies ER-4.4, ER-5.1 and ER-5.2, which call for surveys and implementation of protection measures for special-status species (particularly migratory birds). In addition, as a matter of standard practice for sites with existing trees, the City could require additional measures that call for seasonal avoidance measures and preconstruction bird surveys in order to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds and raptors. Mandatory compliance with General Plan policies as well as SJMC Chapters 13.32, Tree Removal Controls, and federal laws, including the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, (listed in Section IV, Biological Resources) would ensure approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment would result in a less-than-significant impact to the environment and wildlife.

As discussed in Section V, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, of this Initial Study, the project site is not included as a designated historic resource in the City’s Historic Resource Inventory database, and there are currently no Traditional Cultural Properties or Cultural Landscapes identified within the city. In addition, future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to adhere to General Plan Policies ER-10.1, ER-10.2, and ER-10.3 that require adequate protection of archaeological resources, paleontological resources, human remains, and Tribal Cultural Resources, as well as California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA), which mandate procedures of conduct following the discovery of human remains. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to major periods of California history or prehistory.

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)?

Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines defines cumulative impacts as two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. Cumulative impacts may result from individually minor, but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b) advises that a discussion of cumulative impacts should reflect both the severity of the impacts and the likelihood of their occurrence. To accomplish these two objectives, CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 permits two different methodologies for completion of a cumulative impact analysis:

- The ‘list’ approach permits the use of a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including projects both within and outside the city; and
- The ‘projections’ approach allows the use of a summary of projections contained in an adopted plan or related planning document, such as a regional transportation plan, or in an EIR prepared for such a plan. The projections may be supplemented with additional information such as regional modeling.
This Initial Study uses the projections approach and takes into account growth from the proposed project together with the existing General Plan projections together combined with the proposed General Plan Amendments projections applied in the 2020 General Plan Amendment TIA.

The cumulative setting considered for each cumulative impact depends upon the impact that is being analyzed. For example, in assessing aesthetic impacts, the pertinent geographic study area is the vicinity of the areas of potential future development facilitated by the proposed project from which the new development can be publicly viewed and may contribute to a significant cumulative visual effect. In assessing macro-scale air quality impacts, on the other hand, all development within the air basin contributes to regional emissions of criteria pollutants, and basin-wide projections of emissions is the best tool for determining the cumulative effect.

The discussion below addresses two aspects of cumulative impacts: (1) would the effects of the cumulative development result in a cumulatively significant impact on the resources in question and, if that cumulative impact is likely to be significant, (2) would the contributions to that impact from the project, which is the subject of this Initial Study, be cumulatively considerable. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(1), “cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. The CEQA Guidelines state that a lead agency has discretion to determine if a project’s contribution to a significant cumulative impact is cumulatively considerable.

As discussed in the sections below, the implementation of the proposed project would not be expected to contribute to or result in significant cumulative impacts. The following provides cumulative impact analysis for each impact area discussed in this Initial Study:

- **Aesthetics:** The cumulative impact for aesthetics includes potential future development under the proposed project combined with effects of development on lands in close proximity to the project site that together would result in a substantial adverse effect on a designated scenic vista or if it would result in a substantial degradation of the visual quality or character in the vicinity of the project site. As described in Section I, Aesthetics, of this Initial Study, all new development is subject to the City’s design review process to ensure that project features such as building design, landscaping, site planning, and signage, are consistent with the City’s adopted plans, regulations, and design aesthetics. Moreover, similar to the proposed project, other projects would be required to be in conformance with General Plan goals and policies that seek to preserve and enhance the character of existing neighborhoods in San José. The uniform application of these regulations, goals, and policies would ensure that all development in San José is compatible with its surroundings upon approval. Additionally, the design review requirement as well as subsequent CEQA review, if necessary, would give the City the opportunity to evaluate projects’ potential impacts on scenic resources prior to approval. Finally, the proposed project would add to the existing RN land use designations surrounding the project site, and therefore would not introduce land uses that are drastically different from the surrounding area to an extent as to impact aesthetics in that way. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially contribute to or result in a significant cumulative impact. Cumulative impacts would be **less than significant**.

- **Agriculture and Forestry Resources:** As described in Section II, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, of this Initial Study, the project site is currently in an urbanized area and part of a larger existing parcel
that is developed with uses including the sports center and two preschools. It is not considered Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance within the city. Due to the urban uses on-site and surrounding the project site, it is not a part of woodland or forest land cover. Accordingly, the project would not contribute to or result in a cumulative impact on farmland of forest land. In addition, potential future development within San José would be subject to SJMC Chapter 20.20 and General Plan goals and policies which seek to preserve agricultural lands. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to agriculture and forestry resources.

- **Air Quality:** Emissions affecting air quality are by their nature regionally and globally cumulative impacts; therefore, the discussion in Section III, Air Quality of this Initial Study, evaluates cumulative conditions. As discussed in Section III, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is currently designated as a nonattainment area for California and National AAQS for ozone (O₃) and PM₂.₅, and under the California AAQS for PM₁₀. Any project that does not exceed or can be mitigated to less than the BAAQMD levels will not result in a significant or cumulatively considerable impact. Potential future development on the project site would be subject to CEQA review and would determine whether emissions would be in excess of State or federal AAQS. Additionally, any new development would be required to comply with BAAQMD regulations to mitigate or prevent the generation of criteria pollutant emissions. The proposed project would result in changes at the policy level and does not include a specific development proposal. Thus, the proposed project would not directly result in any criteria air pollutant emissions. In addition, potential future construction on the site would be required to implement BAAQMD’s best management practices for dust control in accordance with the City’s General Plan Policies MS-13.1 and MS-13.3. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to or result in a cumulative impact with respect to air quality. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

- **Biological Resources:** The potential impacts of a proposed project on biological resources tend to be site-specific, and the overall cumulative effect is dependent on the degree to which significant vegetation and wildlife resources are protected on a particular site. This includes preservation of well-developed native vegetation (e.g., marshlands, native grasslands, oak woodlands, riparian scrub and woodland, etc.), populations of special-status plant or animal species, and wetland features (including seasonal wetlands and drainages). Environmental review of specific development proposals in the vicinity of a development site should serve to ensure that important biological resources are identified, protected, and properly managed, and to prevent any significant adverse development-related impacts, including development for the remaining undeveloped lands in the surrounding area.

As discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources, of this Initial Study, the footprint of the project site lacks any sensitive biological resources. In addition, required compliance with General Plan ER-4.4, ER-5.1 and ER-5.2 would ensure potential impacts to special-status species (particularly migratory birds) would be less than significant. Accordingly, the project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts on special-status species, sensitive natural communities, or regulated wetlands. And the impacts associated with future development facilitated by the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative reduction of important wildlife habitat. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to biological resources.
- **Cultural Resources**: The cumulative impact for cultural resources includes potential future development under the proposed project combined with effects of development on lands within the San José and region. Future development facilitated by the proposed project, in conjunction with development on lands within the SOI, has the potential to cumulatively impact cultural resources including archaeological and paleontological deposits, human remains, and Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs). As discussed in Section V, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, of this Initial Study, the project site is not included as an historic resource in the City’s Historic Resource Inventory database. Future development facilitated by the proposed project would result in no impact to historic architectural resources. Compliance with General Plan Policies ER-10.1, ER-10.2, and ER-10.3, and with State regulations for managing human remains, listed in Section V, would ensure that implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact to potentially unknown archaeological resources, paleontological resources, human remains, or TCRs on the project site. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not create or contribute to a cumulative impact on cultural resources. Additionally, the existing federal, State, and General Plan policies serve to protect cultural resources in San José. Other projects in San José would be required to comply with these regulations to avoid impacts to historical, archaeological, paleontological resources, human remains, and TCRs to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, the project would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to cultural resources.

- **Energy**: Impacts to cumulative energy would be in the context of the City of San José, which falls under the local GHG Reduction Strategy and Climate Smart San José plans relating to renewable energy and energy efficiency. As described in Section VI, Energy, of this Initial Study, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to energy. Potential future projects within the City would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local energy and energy efficiency regulations, including the Building Energy Efficiency Standards and the California Green Building Standards Code as well as the SJMC and goals within the City’s GHG Reduction Strategy and Climate Smart San José plans. Adherence to the regulations and strategies put in place to increase the City’s energy efficiency would serve to minimize cumulative energy impacts. Therefore, cumulative energy impacts contributed to by the proposed project would be less than significant.

- **Geology and Soils**: Any potential future development facilitated by the proposed project or in the surrounding vicinity would be required to meet the latest standards set forth in the California Building Code. The California Building Code requirements, along with requirements in the SJMC, ensure that any development on unstable soil or expansive soil is regulated to minimize potential hazards. The SJMC includes requirements for the performance and review of geological investigations prior to the issuance of building permits in a State-designated Alquist-Priolo fault zone. Moreover, in combination with foreseeable development in the surrounding area, implementation of the proposed project would not change the geology or soil characteristics of the project area as a whole. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant impact with respect to geology, and soils, and would not significantly contribute to cumulative impacts in this regard. Therefore, the cumulative impacts associated with potential future development facilitated by the proposed project, together with anticipated cumulative growth, would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to geology and soils.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Emissions contributing to the accumulation of GHG emissions are by nature regionally and globally cumulative impacts; therefore, the discussion in Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Initial Study, evaluates cumulative impacts. The proposed project as well as cumulative projects would also be subject to measures in the City’s GHG Reduction Strategy in addition to statewide measures to reduce GHG emissions. The amount of GHG emissions caused by potential future development would be dependent on specific development projects proposed. Compliance with regulatory measures to evaluate and reduce GHG emissions would evaluate GHG emissions quantitatively at the time specific projects are proposed, based on project characteristics. Therefore, as a policy-level land use change, the proposed project would not substantially contribute to long-term cumulative GHG emissions and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: As discussed in Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this Initial Study, the project site does not include recorded hazardous materials on-site, and the proposed project would not include the regular use of hazardous materials beyond those typical to construction during potential future development facilitated by the proposed project. Due to the history of the general area, there could be unrecorded levels of contaminants on the project site from previous potential agricultural uses which could be disturbed during ground disturbance activities from potential future development. Standard precautions and best management practices to minimize exposure of potential hazardous materials to people and the environment would be carried out in accordance with applicable local, State, and federal laws described in Section IX. In addition, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would support land uses under the RN land use designation, which would not involve the use of hazardous materials large enough in quantity (cleansers, degreasers, pesticides, and fertilizers) to create a hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a significant cumulative hazardous materials impact. In addition, the project site is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip or airport, located in a wildfire hazard area, and would not obstruct any routes identified in the City of San José Emergency Operations Plan. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact related to airports, wildfires, or interference with an emergency response plan. Potential future development on the project site and other future development in San José, would be required to comply with the existing General Plan policies, such as Policy EC-6.2, which requires proper storage and use of hazardous materials and Policy EC-7.11, which requires sampling for residual agricultural chemicals for sites to be used for new development to account for worker and community safety during construction, in addition to other local, State and federal regulations discussed in Section IX aimed at protecting public safety. As such, the cumulative impacts from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality: The geographic context used for the cumulative assessment of water quality and hydrology impacts is the Guadalupe River Watershed, which encompasses a large portion of south and western San José. As discussed in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, potential future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with State and local policies that would reduce hydrology and water quality impacts to less-than-significant levels. Any new development in San José and the Guadalupe River Watershed would be subject, on a project-by-project basis, to independent CEQA review, if necessary, as well as policies in the General Plan, design guidelines, zoning codes, adherence to SJMC Chapter 20.95, Storm Water Management, and other applicable City requirements that protect water quality. More specifically, potential changes
from cumulative development related to stormwater quality, stormwater flows, drainage, impervious surfaces, and flooding would be minimized via the implementation of stormwater control measures, retention, and low impact development measures, and review by City personnel that could require additional measures to reduce potential flooding impacts.

Compliance with the City’s Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy 6-20, Santa Clara County’s low impact development regulations, and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board’s (San Francisco Bay RWQCB’s) Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) would require best management practices and low impact development features to be included in any proposed project. These best management practices include site design, source control, and treatment control measures that provide both flow control and treatment to runoff before it enters the storm drain system or receiving water bodies. In addition, all projects that disturb over 1 acre or more would be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with erosion and sediment controls that address construction impacts.

All cumulative projects would be subject to similar permit requirements. The water quality regulations implemented by the San Francisco Bay RWQCB take a basin-wide approach and consider water quality impairment in a regional context. For example, the NPDES Construction Permit ties receiving water limitations and basin plan objectives to terms and conditions of the permit, and the MRP works with all municipalities to manage stormwater systems to be collectively protective of water quality. For these reasons, impacts to water quality for the proposed project are not cumulatively considerable and the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

- **Land Use:** As discussed in Section XI, Land Use, of this Initial Study, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations. In addition, the proposed project would not physically divide an existing community, nor would the proposed project conflict with an adopted conservation plan. If this General Plan Amendment is approved, potential future developments on the project site would be reviewed for future conformance with applicable municipal codes and general plan policies. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to or result in a significant cumulative impact land use and planning impact. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

- **Mineral Resources:** As described in Section XII, Mineral Resources, of this Initial Study, the project site is not identified as containing any mineral deposits and is located approximately 4 miles northeast of the Communications Hill Area, which is identified as containing mineral deposits of regional significance per the San José General Plan. Accordingly, the project would not contribute to or result in a cumulative impact on mineral resources. In addition, potential future development in San José would be subject to General Plan Policy ER-11.2, which encourages the conservation of Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA)-designated mineral deposits. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to mineral resources.

- **Noise:** Noise impacts discussed in Section XIII, Noise, of this Initial Study are evaluated in their cumulative context. Potential future development at the project site could increase the community noise environment around the area due to stationary sources from construction equipment and building operation and from vehicles trips traveling to and from the project site. Cumulative projects
in the area of the proposed project that could increase the community noise level would be subject to the same applicable standards aimed at controlling stationary noise sources (primarily through the SJMC) and at managing traffic-related noise emissions to would ensure that impacts would be less than significant. As discussed in Section XIII, the proposed project would not contribute to or result in a significant cumulative impact. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant*.

### Population and Housing:
Impacts of cumulative growth are considered in the context of their consistency with regional planning efforts. As described in Section XIV, Population and Housing, the proposed project would not induce a substantial amount of growth or require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Although the proposed project could generate up to 64 new residents, future development under the proposed project would not induce substantial growth through the extension of roads or other new infrastructure that would lead to additional growth outside the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with regional growth projections and would not induce substantial regional population growth. As future projects are proposed, they would be required to demonstrate consistency with regional growth projections the same as the proposed project. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be *less than significant*.

### Public Services:
The primary purpose of a public services impact analysis is to examine the impacts associated with physical improvements to public service facilities required to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. Public service facilities need improvements (i.e., construction, renovation or expansion) as demand for services increase. Increased demand is typically driven by increases in population. A significant environmental impact would occur if a proposed project would exceed the ability of public service providers to adequately serve residents, thereby requiring construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities resulting in a physical impact to the environment. Future development in San José would be required to undergo project review and comply with the most recent California Building Code as California Fire Code as incorporated into the SJMC and General Plan policies required to reduce impacts to public services. In addition, future projects would be required to pay all developer impact fees to the school districts that serve their sites per Section 65996 of the California Government Code, which is deemed to fully mitigate the impacts of new development on school services. As discussed in section XIV, Public Services, of this Initial Study, the proposed project would not cause any of the public service providers that serve the project site to construct a new facility or modify an existing facility in order to meet their performance objectives. Accordingly, the proposed project would not result in or contribute to a significant cumulative impact, and impacts would be *less than significant*.

### Parks and Recreation:
Cumulative projects in San José that introduce new residents to the City would be required to comply with the Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PDO), which requires new housing projects to provide 0.003 acres per new resident (based on the average number of persons per dwelling unit per most recent available federal census data) or pay the equivalent Parkland In-Lieu Fee, per SJMC Chapter 19.38.\(^{160}\) Per SJMC Section 19.38.345, Use of Parkland Fees, the Parkland In-Lieu Fees supports the development, acquisition, and renovation of park facilities and recreational facilities. Potential future development facilitated by the proposed project and future projects would

---

\(^{160}\) City of San José Municipal Code, Title 19 (Subdivisions), Chapter 19.38 (Parkland Dedication).
be required to comply with the PDO requirements. Therefore, cumulative impacts to park facilities in San José would be less than significant.

- **Transportation and Circulation:** The long-range cumulative traffic impacts resulting from the proposed 2020 General Plan Amendments were determined based on the MOEs significance thresholds for vehicle modes of travel and the impact criteria for transit, bicycle and pedestrian described in Chapter 3 of the *Long Range Transportation Analysis* prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. located in the Appendix of this Initial Study. The results of the General Plan Amendment long-range analysis are summarized below.

**Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population**

The San José General Plan TDF model was used to project daily VMT per service population, where service population is defined as the number of residents plus the number of employees citywide. This approach focuses on the VMT generated by new population and employment growth. VMT is calculated as the number of vehicle trips multiplied by the length of the trips in miles.

As shown in Table 4-5, below, the citywide daily VMT and the VMT per service population would decrease due to the proposed land use amendments when compared to the current General Plan. This is because (1) the total number of jobs and households would not change citywide as a result of the General Plan Amendments (only shifting of households and jobs would occur) and (2) the addition of households to areas with more jobs and transit options. Vehicle trips citywide would be reduced due to the reallocation of jobs and housing within and surrounding the downtown area which provides for greater opportunities for multi-modal travel. The availability of current and planned transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities in the area of the General Plan Amendment sites will result in an increase in trips made by transit and other non-vehicular modes.

### Table 4-5  Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus General Plan Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citywide Daily VMT</strong></td>
<td>17,505,088</td>
<td>28,035,508</td>
<td>27,995,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citywide Service Population</strong></td>
<td>1,392,946</td>
<td>2,054,758</td>
<td>2,054,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td>319,870</td>
<td>429,350</td>
<td>429,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residents</strong></td>
<td>1,016,043</td>
<td>1,303,108</td>
<td>1,303,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Jobs</strong></td>
<td>376,903</td>
<td>751,650</td>
<td>751,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily VMT Per Service Population</strong></td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in VMT/Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Over General Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant Impact?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, City of San José 2020 General Plan Amendments, August 11, 2020.

**Findings:** Compared to the current General Plan, the proposed land use adjustments would not result in an increase in citywide VMT per service population. Therefore, cumulatively, the proposed 2020 General Plan Amendments would result in a less than significant impact on citywide daily VMT per service population. It is important to note that the VMT per service population is based on raw model
output and does not reflect the implementation of adopted General Plan policies and goals that would further reduce VMT by increased use of non-auto modes of travel.

**Journey-to-Work Mode Share**

The San José General Plan TDF model was used to calculate citywide journey-to-work mode share percentages. Journey-to-work mode share is the distribution of all daily work trips by travel mode, including drive alone, carpool with two persons, carpool with three persons or more, transit (rail and bus), bike, and walk trips. Although work trips may occur at any time of the day, most of the work trips occur during typical peak commute periods (6:00 to 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 7:00 p.m.). As defined in the *City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook*, any increase in the journey-to-work drive alone mode share percentage over the current General Plan conditions due to the proposed land use amendments is considered a significant impact. Table 4-6, below, summarizes the citywide journey-to-work mode share analysis results. When compared to the current Envision San José 2040 General Plan, the percentage of journey-to-work drive alone trips would decrease slightly and the percentage of transit and bike trips would increase slightly as a result of the proposed General Plan Amendments.

**Table 4-6 Journey-to-Work Mode Share**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus General Plan Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>753,264</td>
<td>76.69</td>
<td>1,092,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,090,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool 2</td>
<td>85,496</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>137,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>137,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool 3+</td>
<td>28,526</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>54,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>48,181</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>182,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>14,120</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>26,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>15,666</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>29,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Drive Alone Percentage Over General Plan Conditions</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, City of San José 2020 General Plan Amendments, August 11, 2020.

Findings: The proposed land use adjustments will not result in an increase of drive alone trips when compared to the current General Plan conditions. Therefore, cumulatively, the proposed 2020 General Plan Amendments would result in a less than significant impact on citywide journey-to-work mode share.

**Average Vehicle Speeds in Transit Priority Corridors**

The San José General Plan TDF model was used to calculate the average vehicle travel speeds during the AM peak hour for the City’s 14 transit corridors that were evaluated in the Envision San José 2040 General Plan TIA. A transit corridor is a segment of roadway identified as a Grand Boulevard in the Envision San José 2040 General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram. Grand Boulevards serve as major transportation corridors and, in most cases, are primary routes for VTA’s LRT, BRT, local buses, and other public transit vehicles. The travel speeds are calculated by dividing the segment distance by the vehicle travel time. As defined in the *City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook* (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), land use amendments that result
in a decrease in average travel speed on a transit corridor in the AM peak one-hour period when the average speed drops below 15 miles per hour (mph) or decreases by 25 percent or more, or the average speed drops by one mph or more for a transit corridor with average speed below 15 mph when compared to the current GP conditions is considered a significant impact.

Table 4-7 presents the average vehicle speeds on the City’s 14 transit priority corridors (i.e., Grand Boulevard segments) during the AM peak-hour of traffic. When compared to travel speeds under current General Plan conditions, the change in traffic resulting from the proposed land use amendments would have minimal effect on the travel speeds in the transit corridors. The TDF model estimates a decrease in travel speeds of 0.1 mph or less (or a change of 0.4% or less) on one corridor due to the proposed General Plan Amendments. Travel speeds on the remaining corridors would improve slightly or remain unchanged when compared to the current General Plan. Therefore, cumulatively, the proposed 2020 General Plan Amendments would result in a less than significant impact on the AM peak-hour average vehicle speeds on the transit priority corridors.

**TABLE 4-7 AM PEAK-HOUR VEHICLE SPEEDS (MPH) FOR SAN JOSÉ TRANSIT PRIORITY CORRIDORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Priority Corridor</th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td>Percent Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Street from San Carlos Street to St. James Street</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock Avenue from Capital Avenue to US 101</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Avenue from SR17 to Meridian Avenue</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Avenue from South Milpitas Boulevard to Capitol Expressway</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expressway from Capital Avenue to Meridian Avenue</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Santa Clara Street from US 101 to Delmas Avenue</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Avenue from Park Avenue to Blossom Hill Road</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Road from Keyes Street to Metcalf Road</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North 1st Street from SR 237 to Keyes Street</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Street from Bascom Avenue to SR 87</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Creek Boulevard from Bascom Avenue to Tantau Avenue</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasman Drive from Lick Mill Boulevard to McCarthy Boulevard</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alameda from Alameda Way to Delmas Avenue</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West San Carlos Street from SR 87 to 2nd Street</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, City of San José 2020 General Plan Amendments, August 11, 2020.
Findings: The proposed land use adjustments would not result in a decrease in travel speeds greater than 1 mph or 25 percent on any of the 14 transit priority corridors when compared to current General Plan conditions. Therefore, cumulatively, the proposed 2020 General Plan Amendments would result in a less than significant impact on the AM peak-hour average vehicle speeds on the transit priority corridors.

Impacts on Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Circulation

Transit Services or Facilities

Planned transit services and facilities include additional rail service via the future Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) extension, light rail transit (LRT) extensions, new bus rapid transit (BRT) services, and the proposed California High Speed Rail (HSR) project. The proposed General Plan Amendment land use adjustments would not result in a change to the existing and planned roadway network that would result in an adverse effect on existing or planned transit facilities. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Amendment land use adjustments would not substantially disrupt existing or interfere with planned transit services or facilities.

Bicycle Facilities

The adopted Envision San José 2040 GP supports the goals outlined in the City’s Better Bike Plan 2025 and contains policies to encourage bicycle trips (Policies TR-1.1, TR-1.2, TR-1.4 through TR-1.9, TR 2.1 through TR 2.11, TR-7.1, TN-1.1 through TN-1.5, TN-2.1 through TN-2.7, and TN-3.1 through 3.6; Implementing Actions TR-1.12 thorough TR-1.15, TR-2.12 through TR-2.21, TR-7.2, TR-7.3, TN-1.6, TN-2.8 through 2.10, and TN-3.7; Performance Measures TN-2.11, TN-2.12). The proposed General Plan Amendment land use adjustments would not result in a change to the existing and planned roadway network that would affect existing or planned bicycle facilities. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Amendment land use adjustments would not substantially disrupt existing or interfere with planned bicycle facilities; conflict or create inconsistencies with adopted bicycle plans, guidelines, policies, or standards; and provide insecure and unsafe bicycle parking in adequate proportion to anticipated demand.

Pedestrian Facilities

The adopted Envision San José 2040 GP contains goals and policies (Policies TR-1.1, TR-1.2, TR-1.4 through TR-1.9, TR-2.11 through TR-2.11, TR-7.1, TN-1.1 through TN-1.5, TN-2.1 through TN-2.7, and TN-3.1 through 3.6; Implementing Actions TR-1.12 thorough TR-1.15, TR-2.12 through TR-2.21, TR-7.2, TR-7.3, TN-1.6, TN-2.8 through 2.10, and TN-3.7; Performance Measures TN-2.11, TN-2.12) to improve pedestrian walking environment, increase pedestrian safety, and create a land use context to support non-motorized travel. The proposed General Plan Amendment land use adjustments would not result in a change to the existing and planned roadway network that would affect existing or planned pedestrian facilities. Therefore, the proposed 2020 General Plan Amendment land use adjustments would not substantially disrupt existing or interfere with planned pedestrian facilities; create inconsistencies with adopted pedestrian plans, guidelines, policies, or standards; and provide accessible pedestrian facilities that would not meet current ADA best practice.
Utilities and Service Systems: Impacts evaluated under Section XIX, Utilities and Service Systems, are assessed in their cumulative context. As discussed in Section XIX, the utility service providers that serve the project site (San José-Santa Clara Regional Wastewater Facility, San José Water Company, the City’s storm drainage system, and the Guadalupe Mines, Kirby Canyon, Newby Island, Zanker Road Materials Processing Facility, and Zanker Road landfills) and residents of San José in their service area have adequate supply and capacity to serve a future development on the project site facilitated by the proposed project in addition to their other customers/users. Future projects developed in San José would be required to demonstrate there are adequate supplies and capacity to serve their projects in addition to the other users in the service provider’s area. Future development would also be required to comply with regulations that reduce water use, solid waste disposal, and conserve energy as described in Section XVII. As shown in Section XVII, the proposed project would not result in or contribute to a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Wildfire: As discussed in Section XX, Wildfire, of this Initial Study, the proposed project is not located in or near SRAs or lands classified as high fire hazard severity zones and would therefore have no impact regarding wildfire. The proposed project is also located within an urbanized area surrounded by existing development and is part of a larger parcel that is currently developed. Due to the project’s location and the resulting fact that there would be no wildfire impacts from the proposed project, the proposed project would also not contribute to cumulative impacts regarding wildfire. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact regarding wildfire when considered in a cumulative context with the surrounding area and other proposed projects.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The proposed project, a General Plan Amendment, would not directly result in physical changes on the project site causing an adverse environmental impact to human beings. However, potential future development of the project site could result in construction-related air and noise emissions that have potential to adversely impact residents in the vicinity of the project site. Compliance with local, State and federal regulations, described in detail in each environmental topic area of this Initial Study, aimed at protecting human beings from adverse environmental effects would reduce these impacts. Potential future development projects would be required to adhere to relevant building codes and follow recommendations of a site-specific geotechnical report in order to avoid and mitigate potential seismic hazards. In addition, future development on the project site may require additional potential measures through future environmental clearance or standard conditions of approval to ensure impacts would be less than significant. Potential impacts from the proposed project on the environment and to human health would be less than significant.
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1. Introduction

This report presents the results of the long-range traffic impact analysis completed for the proposed City of San José 2020 General Plan Amendments (project). The project consists of amending the current adopted land use designations of the Envision San José 2040 General Plan (GP) for seven sites within the City of San José. The purpose of the General Plan Amendments (GPAs) traffic analysis is to assess the long-range impacts of the amendments on the citywide transportation system. The potential traffic impacts of the project were evaluated in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the City of San José for GPA traffic analysis.

The GPA analysis provides an evaluation of the changed circumstances of future conditions in the currently adopted Envision San José 2040 General Plan due to the proposed 2020 General Plan amendments. The adopted GP identifies long-range planned land uses and transportation system within the City projected to the Year 2040, which is the baseline for the evaluation of transportation impacts of the GPAs. The results of the analysis for the proposed land use adjustments are compared to the results of the adopted GP to determine if the proposed 2020 General Plan amendments would result in any new, or substantially more severe transportation impacts than those impacts that were already analyzed for the adopted GP.

After General Plan amendments to the Land Use/Transportation Diagram become effective, which is generally 30 days after Council approval, these General Plan amendments are incorporated into the updated General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram. This process may occur up to four times a year under State law. Therefore, the current General Plan includes all amendments that are currently effective.

The Envision San José 2040 General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram designates the type, intensity, and general distribution of planned land uses within San José. Because the 2020 General Plan amendments propose changes to sites’ land use designations, this transportation analysis (TA) evaluates the incremental changes from uses and intensities allowed under the sites’ current land use designations to the uses and intensities proposed under the proposed General Plan land use designations for each site. The baseline of the current land use designation is used (as opposed to the existing physical condition) because the General Plan EIR and subsequent reviews have already evaluated the potential transportation CEQA impacts of building out the adopted General Plan using an existing condition baseline in 2015. The existing condition baseline was reviewed, analyzed, and updated again as part of this study, and it was determined based on substantial evidence that the proposed 2020 General Plan amendments would not result in any new, or substantially more severe transportation impacts than those impacts that were already analyzed for the General Plan.

Further, the Build-out of the General Plan and related environmental analysis under CEQA assumes development overall in the City will occur at the middle range of the General Plan land use designations or consistent with surrounding development intensities. The reason why the middle or typical range is
used as opposed to the maximum intensities potentially allowed under various General Plan land use designations is because building out under the maximum intensities for all General Plan land designation would exceed the total planned growth capacity allocated in the General Plan, and this maximum amount of build-out does not represent typical development patterns or the average amount of development built on each site. General Plan land use designations allow a wide range of development intensities and types of land uses to accommodate growth; however, development projects are not typically proposed at the maximum densities due to existing development patterns, site and parking constraints, Federal Aviation Administration regulations, maximum allowable height provisions and other development regulations in the San José Municipal Code in Title 20 (Zoning), market conditions, and other factors.

For example, several General Plan land use designations include a maximum intensity for each use allowed under a land use designation, and also allow a mix of land uses. On a site where development is mixed-use, or there is a height limit, or there is a minimum required setback, achieving the maximum allowable intensities for each land use in the development is often physically infeasible. To evaluate the incremental changes of the proposed General Plan land use amendments, average residential and commercial densities for development under these land use designations and in the planning areas of the proposed General Plan amendments for San José are assumed for the current and proposed land use designations on each site. Individual development projects would be required to complete a near term traffic analysis in conjunction with any future development permit applications.

Proposed 2020 GPA Site Descriptions

The project consists of amending the current adopted land use designations of the Envision San José 2040 General Plan (GP) for seven sites within the City of San José (see Figure 1). The GPA sites, described in detailed in the following chapter, include the following:

Site 1 – GPT18-009/PDC17-022 (1ST/Virginia Mixed-Use; "Wheelworks")
Site 2 – GP19-012/C19-042 (329 Gifford Avenue)
Site 3 – GP20-001/C20-007 (790 Portswood Drive)
Site 4 – GP19-008/H20-004 (276 Woz Way)
Site 5 – GP20-002 (1906 Via Reggio Court)
Site 6 – GP20-003 (1975 Cambrianna Avenue)
Site 7 – GP18-012 (Airport/Guadalupe Gardens)

Each of the proposed land use amendments and resulting changes in households, employment for each of the proposed GPA sites are described in detail within the following chapters.

GPA Analysis Exemption

The City of San José Travel Demand Forecasting (TDF) model, which is described in detail in Chapter 3, was developed to help the City project peak-hour traffic impacts attributable to proposed amendments to the City’s General Plan. The model is used to estimate the net change in peak-hour trips that are attributable to a proposed amendment. The City has established peak-hour trip thresholds for GP land use amendments that require a site-specific GPA analysis. It is presumed that amendments that result in trips less than the trip thresholds would not create significant long-term impacts by themselves. The City’s trip thresholds for requiring a site-specific GPA traffic analysis are presented in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook, April 2018 and are shown in Table 1 below. With the exception of GPA sites located within the identified North San José, Evergreen, and South San José special subareas, a proposed land use amendment that would result in an increase of more than 250 PM peak-hour trips to be generated by the subject site would be required to prepare a site-specific GPA traffic analysis.
Figure 1
Proposed GPA Site Locations
Table 1
Site-Specific Long-Range Transportation Analysis Screening Criteria for Land Use Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Amendment</th>
<th>Expansion of Residential Use $^1$</th>
<th>Conversion from Residential to Non-Residential Use $^2$</th>
<th>Conversion from Non-Residential to Residential Use $^2$</th>
<th>Expansion of Non-Residential Use $^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North San Jose</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Jose</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of City</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
$^1$ The screening criteria for a proposed expansion of the same land use are measured in net new PM peak hour vehicle trips.
$^2$ The screening criteria for a proposed land use conversion are measured in total PM peak hour vehicle-trips generated by the proposed use.
Source: City of San Jose Transportation Analysis Handbook, April 2018.

All of the seven subject GPA sites are located outside the special subareas, and therefore are subject to the 250 PM peak-hour trip threshold. The proposed land use amendments on three of the seven amendment sites would result in a net increase of more than 250 PM peak-hour trips (See Table 3 in the next chapter) and require a site-specific GPA traffic analysis.

The following GPA site requires a site-specific GPA traffic analysis:
- GP19-012/C19-042 (329 Gifford Avenue)
- P19-008/H20-004 (276 Woz Way)
- GP18-012 (Airport/Guadalupe Gardens)

Scope of Study

The purpose of the GPAs transportation analysis is to assess the long-range impacts of the proposed amendments on the citywide transportation system. This study includes an evaluation of the cumulative impacts of all seven GPA sites with the proposed land use amendments. The study also provides the required site-specific GPA traffic analysis for the above identified GPA sites. Individual development projects also will be required to complete a near-term traffic analysis in conjunction with any future development permit applications consistent with the Envision San José 2040 GP. The potential traffic impacts of the project were evaluated in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the City of San José for GPA transportation analysis.

The project consists of land use changes to the current adopted GP land uses. The project does not propose any changes to the citywide transportation system. The GPA long-range analysis focuses on the potential changes on the citywide transportation system in the horizon year of the GP (2040) when the GP capacities for housing and jobs are fully developed. The analysis includes evaluation of increased vehicle miles traveled, increased traffic volume on specified roadway segments, impacts to...
travel speeds on transit priority corridors, and impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. Impacts are evaluated based on the same Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) and significance criteria utilized in the Envision San José 2040 GP TIA. Traffic conditions were evaluated for the following traffic scenarios using the City’s TDF model:

- **Projected Year 2015 Conditions**: The Projected Year 2015 Conditions represent a projection of transportation conditions in 2015 using the City’s GP TDF model. The roadway network also reflects the Year 2015 roadway network and transportation system.

- **Current 2040 General Plan Conditions**: Future traffic due to the current GP land uses (i.e., including the adopted GP Four-Year Review Land Use adjustments and adopted 2019 GP Amendments) is added to regional growth that can be reasonably expected to occur by 2040. Current 2040 GP conditions include the current roadway network as well as all transportation system improvements as identified in the current GP.

- **Cumulative 2040 General Plan Amendment Conditions**: Current 2040 GP conditions with the proposed land use amendments at all seven proposed GPA sites. Transportation conditions for the Cumulative 2040 GPA conditions were evaluated relative to the currently adopted 2040 GP Conditions to determine any long-range traffic impacts.

- **Proposed 2040 General Plan Amendment Conditions**: Current 2040 GP conditions with the proposed land use amendments at each of the proposed GPA sites for which a site-specific analysis is required. Transportation conditions for the Proposed 2040 GPA conditions were evaluated relative to the currently adopted 2040 GP Conditions to determine any long-range traffic impacts.

**Report Organization**

The remainder of this report is divided into the following chapters; Chapter 2 presents a detailed description of each of the proposed GPA sites included in the analysis. Chapter 3 describes analysis methodology, including the City’s TDF model, and the MOEs and significance thresholds used in the analysis. Chapter 4 presents the results of the cumulative analysis based on the TDF modeling and citywide MOEs for the proposed GPAs. Chapters 5, 6, and 7 present the site-specific analyses for the 329 Gifford Avenue, 276 Woz Way, Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GPA sites, respectively. Chapter 8 presents the conclusions of the long-range cumulative and site-specific GPA analyses.
2. General Plan Amendment Site Descriptions

The proposed project consists of amending land uses currently adopted in the Envision San José 2040 General Plan on seven sites. The amendment sites are described in more detail below along with peak-hour trip generation estimates for each of the proposed GPA sites.

ENVISION SAN JOSÉ 2040 GENERAL PLAN

The City of San José Envision San José 2040 General Plan was adopted in 2011 and was based on planned land uses within the City projected to the Year 2035. Subsequent reviews in 2010, 2011, and 2016 resulted in the currently adopted General Plan, which includes a base year of 2015 and horizon year of the planned land uses to the Year 2040. Thus, the adopted General Plan traffic analysis provides a comprehensive evaluation of the effects of planned land use as identified in the current GP on the citywide transportation system and is used as the baseline from which impacts due to land use amendments such as the proposed project are evaluated.

Land use data consisting of households and employment growth for each of the proposed GPA sites as reflected in the adopted GP and the proposed land use amendments was prepared by the Department of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement and provided to Hexagon for use in this analysis.

AMENDMENT SITES

The project includes seven proposed GPA sites: GPT18-009/PDC17-022, GP19-012/C19-042, GP20-001/C20-007, GP19-008/H20-004, GP20-002, GP20-003, GP18-012. Each of the proposed GPAs would result in changes to the number of households and jobs on each site when compared to those adopted per the Envision San José 2040 GP for each site. However, the proposed GPAs will not change the total number of jobs and households citywide. The TDF model is used to rebalance the number of jobs and households citywide to maintain the General Plan Goal of 751,650 jobs and 429,350 households.

Table 2 summarizes the land uses and density for each proposed site under the current 2040 GP and the proposed GPAs. Table 3 summarizes the changes in households and jobs for each site and the resulting increases in peak-hour trips. The peak-hour trips for each site were estimated using the City of San José’s TDF model. The TDF modeling is described in Chapter 3.
## Table 2
### Existing General Plan and Proposed GPA Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Existing General Plan</th>
<th>Proposed General Plan Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GPT18-009/PDC17-022; 1ST/Virginia Mixed-Use; &quot;Wheelworks&quot;</td>
<td>838, 831, 833, 802 S 1st Street</td>
<td>472-17-005, -006, -034, -095</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Commercial (MCU); Mixed-Use Neighborhood (MUN)</td>
<td>Transit Residential 50-250 DU/AC; FAR 2.0 to 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GP19-012/C19-042 (329 Gifford Avenue)</td>
<td>321, 323, 327, 329 Gifford Avenue; 462, 466, 470 W. San Carlos Street</td>
<td>264-20-082, -083, -084, -085, -086, -087, -088</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>Residential Neighborhood 8 DU/AC (match existing neighborhood character); FAR up to 0.7</td>
<td>Downtown 50-800 DU/AC; typical FAR 2.0 to 12.0, max FAR 30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GP20-001/C20-007 (790 Portswood Drive)</td>
<td>790 Portswood Drive; 0 Bret Hartle Drive</td>
<td>701-48-057, 701-58-048</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>Transportation and Utilities N/A</td>
<td>Residential Neighborhood 8 DU/AC; FAR up to 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GP19-008/H20-004 (276 Woz Way)</td>
<td>Generally bounded by Woz Way, Almaden Boulevard, Reed Street, and Guadalupe River</td>
<td>264-31-037, -038, -039, -040, -041, -042, -043, -044, -092, -061, -062, -063, -064, -065, -066, -067, -107, -108</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Public Quasi Public 100 DU/AC</td>
<td>Downtown 50-800 DU/AC; typical FAR 2.0 to 12.0, max FAR 30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GP20-002 (1906 Via Reggio Court)</td>
<td>1906 Via Reggio Court</td>
<td>092-01-018</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Commercial up to 50 DU/AC; FAR 0.5 to 4.5</td>
<td>Urban Residential 30-95 DU/AC; FAR 1.0 to 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GP20-003 (1975 Cambrianna Avenue)</td>
<td>1975 Cambrianna Avenue</td>
<td>414-21-062</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Public Quasi Public N/A</td>
<td>Residential Neighborhood 8 DU/AC; FAR up to 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GP18-012 (Airport/Guadalupe Gardens)</td>
<td>Generally bounded by I-880, SR 87, Taylor Street, and Coleman Avenue</td>
<td>230-38-104; 230-38-076; 259-02-131; 259-08-102; 259-08-072; 259-08-101</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>Open Space Parkland and Habitat N/A</td>
<td>Neighborhood Community/Commercial (NCC); Combined Industrial/Commercial (CIC) NCC: 10 acres CIC: 1.6 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: FAR = floor-to-area ratio; DU = dwelling units; AC = acre; APN = assessor's parcel number; N/A = not applicable
Source: City of San Jose Planning Department (June 2020).
Table 3
Changes in Households, Jobs, and Peak-Hour Trips Due to Proposed GPAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>TOTHH Baseline</th>
<th>TEMP Baseline</th>
<th>TOTHH Amendment</th>
<th>TEMP Amendment</th>
<th>Net Land Use Change</th>
<th>Net Peak-Hour Trip Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GPT18-009/PDC17-022; 1ST/Virginia Mixed-Use; &quot;Wheelworks&quot;</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GP19-012/C19-042 (329 Gifford Avenue)</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GP20-001/C20-007 (790 Portswood Drive)</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GP19-008/H20-004 (276 Woz Way)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,760</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>6411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GP20-002 (1906 Via Reggio Court)</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GP20-003 (1975 Cambrianna Avenue)</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GP18-012 (Airport/Guadalupe Gardens)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: TOTHH = total number of households; TEMP = total number of jobs.
1 Total number of households and jobs under the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
The buildout of the 2040 GP represents baseline conditions.
2 Total number of households and jobs as proposed by the GP Amendments.
**Outlined** indicates GPA that results in an increase in peak hour trips greater than 250 PM trips and requires site-specific GPA traffic analysis.
Source: City of San Jose Planning Department, June 2020.
City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
Proposed land use changes for each of the GPA sites are described below.

- **Site 1 - GPT18-009/PDC17-022 (1ST/Virginia Mixed-Use/Wheelworks):** The 1.19-acre site is located between First Street and Second Street, just south of Virginia Street. Figure 2 shows the location of the site. The adopted GP land use designation for the site is *Mixed-Use Commercial/Mixed-Use Neighborhood* and the proposed amendment involves changing the adopted land use to *Transit Residential*. The proposed amendment would result in 178 additional households and 12 additional jobs on the site. Based on the TDF modeling results, the proposed amendment would not result in a substantial net increase of peak-hour trips generated by GPT18-009/PDC17-022 and a site-specific GPA traffic analysis is not required.

- **Site 2 - GP19-012/C19-042 (329 Gifford Avenue):** The 0.44-acre site, located at 462-470 W. San Carlos Street and 321-329 Gifford Avenue, is bounded by San Carlos Street to the north, Gifford Avenue to the east, and commercial uses to the west and south. Figure 3 shows the location of the site. The adopted GP land use designation for the site is *Residential Neighborhood*, and the proposed amendment involves changing the adopted land use to *Downtown*. The proposed amendment would result in 183 additional households and 537 additional jobs on the site. Based on the TDF modeling results, the increase in households and jobs would result in a net increase of greater than 250 PM peak-hour trips to the GP19-012/C19-042 site. Therefore, the preparation of a site-specific GPA traffic analysis for the proposed land use amendment on the GP19-012/C19-042 site is required.

- **Site 3 - GP20-001/C20-007 (790 Portswood Drive):** The 8.60-acre site is generally located on the vacant parcels north and south of Almaden Expressway at Hampswood Way and Portswood Drive. Figure 4 shows the location of the site. The adopted GP land use designation for the site is *Transportation and Utilities* and the proposed amendment involves changing the adopted land use to *Residential Neighborhood*. The proposed amendment would result in 69 additional households on the site. Based on the TDF modeling results, the proposed amendment would not result in a substantial net increase of peak-hour trips generated by GP20-001/C20-007 and a site-specific GPA traffic analysis is not required.

- **Site 4 - GP19-008/H20-004 (276 Woz Way):** The 3.08-acre site is generally bounded by Woz Way to the north, Almaden Boulevard to the east, Reed Street to the south, and Guadalupe River to the west. Figure 5 shows the location of the site. The adopted GP land use designation for the site is *Public Quasi Public* and the proposed amendment involves changing the adopted land use to *Downtown*. The proposed amendment would result in 29 fewer households and 6,411 additional jobs on the site. Based on the TDF modeling results, the increase in jobs would result in a net increase of greater than 250 PM peak-hour trips to the GP19-008/H20-004 site. Therefore, the preparation of a site-specific GPA traffic analysis for the proposed land use amendment on the GP19-008/H20-004 site is required.

- **Site 5 - GP20-002 (1906 Via Reggio Court):** The 1.64-acre site is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Lakewood Drive and Cropley Avenue. Figure 6 shows the location of the site. The adopted GP land use designation for the site is *Mixed-Use Commercial* and the proposed amendment involves changing the adopted land use to *Urban Residential*. The proposed amendment would result in 64 additional households on the site. Based on the TDF modeling results, the proposed amendment would not result in a substantial net increase of peak-hour trips generated by GP20-002 and a site-specific GPA traffic analysis is not required.

- **Site 6 - GP20-003 (1975 Cambrianna Avenue):** The 2.50-acre site is located on the north side of Cambrianna Avenue and east of Union Avenue. Figure 7 shows the location of the site. The adopted GP land use designation for the site is *Public Quasi Public* and the proposed amendment involves changing the adopted land use to *Residential Neighborhood*. The
proposed amendment would result in 20 additional households on the site. Based on the TDF modeling results, the proposed amendment would not result in a substantial net increase of peak-hour trips generated by GP20-003 and a site-specific GPA traffic analysis is not required.

- **Site 7 - GP18-012 (Airport/Guadalupe Gardens):** The 11.60-acre site is generally bounded by I-880 to the north, SR 87 to the east, Taylor Street to the south, and Coleman Avenue to the west. Figure 8 shows the location of the site. The adopted GP land use designations for the site include Open Space Parkland and Habitat and the proposed amendment involves changing the adopted land uses to Neighborhood Community or Commercial. The proposed amendment would result in 603 additional jobs on the site. Based on the TDF modeling results, the increase in households would result in a net increase of greater than 250 PM peak-hour trips to the GP18-012 site. *Therefore, the preparation of a site-specific GPA traffic analysis for the proposed land use amendment on the GP18-012 site is required.*
Figure 2
Location of GPA Site 1: GPT18-009/PDC17-022 (1st/Virginia Mixed-Use and Wheelworks)
Figure 3
Location of GPA Site 2: GP19-012/C19-042 (329 Gifford Avenue)
Figure 4
Location of GPA Site 3: GP20-001/C20-007 (790 Portswood Drive)
Figure 5
Location of GPA Site 4: GP19-008/H20-004 (276 Woz Way)
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Figure 6
Location of GPA Site 5: GP20-002 (1906 Via Reggio Court)
Figure 7
Location of GPA Site 6: GP20-003 (1975 Cambrianna Avenue)
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Figure 8
Location of GPA Site 7: GP18-012 (Airport/Guadalupe Gardens)
3. Analysis Methodology and Impact Criteria

This chapter describes the travel demand forecasting modeling methodology used for the analysis and the methods used to determine the traffic conditions for the study scenarios described in the previous chapter. It includes descriptions of the measures of effectiveness (MOE) and the applicable impact criteria for GP traffic analysis.

Travel Demand Forecasting Model

The citywide travel demand forecasting (TDF) model was prepared as part of the Envision San José 2040 GP. The TDF model was developed to provide improved citywide travel demand forecasting as part of continued planning efforts to address transportation infrastructure needs and to assist in the update of the City’s GP. The model was developed from the VTA’s countywide travel demand model, based on Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC’s) BAYCAST trip-based regional model. The VTA model contains all cities and counties within the model’s extents roughly bounded by southern Monterey County, eastern San Joaquin County, northern Sonoma County, and the Pacific Ocean. The San José model is a sub-area model of the VTA model – it maintains the general inputs (roadway network, land use, trip generation rates, etc.), structure, and process as the VTA model, but with refinement within the City of San José. This allows regional travel patterns and behavior to be accounted for in the focused area of San José, which will become more important with the recent legislative requirements associated with greenhouse gas quantification and impacts.

The VTA and San José models both include four elements traditionally associated with models of this kind. These elements include trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice, and traffic assignment.

- **Trip Generation.** Trip generation involves estimating the number of trips that would occur with the proposed GP land uses. The City’s TDF model includes trip generation formulas based on the MTC regional travel demand model. Trip generation is estimated based on the type and amount of specific land uses within each travel analysis zone (TAZ). The TDF model produces trip estimates in person trips (as opposed to vehicle trips, which are typically used in near-term traffic analyses).

- **Trip Distribution.** Trip distribution involves distributing the trips to various internal destinations and external gateways. The model pairs trip origins and trip destinations (starting and ending points) for each person trip based on the type of trip (e.g., home-to-work, home-to-school, etc.) and the distance a person is willing to travel for that purpose. The distance a person is willing to travel is determined by a gravity model, which is analogous to Newton’s law of gravity. In a gravity model, estimates are made about how many trips occur between two locations where
the interaction between those two locations diminishes with increasing distance, time, and cost between them.

- **Mode Choice.** Mode choice, as assigned by the model, determines which mode of transport a person will choose for each trip, based on the availability of a vehicle, the trip distance, and the trip purpose.

- **Traffic Assignment.** Traffic assignment involves determining which route to take to travel between the trip origin and destination. The model assigns the trips to the roadway network to minimize travel time between the start and end points.

Subsequent trip distribution, assignment, and mode choice iterations are completed by the model to account for roadway congestion. These iterations continue under equilibrium traffic conditions until the optimal trip assignment is reached.

**Transportation Network and Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs)**

The fundamental structure of the model includes a computer readable representation of the roadway system (highway network) that defines roadway segments (links) identified by end points (nodes). Each roadway link is further represented by key characteristics (link attributes) that describe the length, travel speeds, and vehicular capacity of the roadway segment. Small geographic areas (TAZs) are used to quantify the planned land use activity throughout the City’s planning area. The boundaries of these small geographic areas are typically defined by the modeled roadway system, as well as natural and man-made barriers that have an effect on traffic access to the modeled network. Transit systems are represented in the model by transit networks that are also identifiable by links and nodes. Unlike the roadway network, the key link attributes of a transit link are operating speed and headways – elapsed time between successive transit services. Transit stops and “dwelling times” (the time allowed for passengers embarking and disembarking transit vehicles) are described as transit node attributes. Transit networks are further grouped by type of transit (rail versus bus) and operator (VTA bus versus AC Transit bus). Transit accessibility for each TAZ is evaluated by proximity to transit stops or stations, and the connectivity of transit lines to destinations.

The socioeconomic data for each TAZ in the model includes information about the number of households (stratified by household income and structure type), population, average income, population age distribution, and employment (stratified by groupings of Standard Industrial Codes). The worker per household ratios and auto ownership within a TAZ are calculated based on these factors and the types and densities of residences. The model projects trip generation rates and the traffic attributable to residents and resident workers, categorized by trip purposes, using set trip generation formulas that are based on the MTC regional travel demand model. The land use data and roadway network used for the GP base year reflect land use development and roadway projects completed as of approximately mid-2015.

**Traffic Assignment**

Travel times within and between TAZs (intra-zonal, inter-zonal and terminal times) are developed from the network being modeled. Travel times within zones (intra-zonal travel times) are derived for each zone based on half its average travel time to the nearest three adjacent zones. Time to walk to and from the trip maker’s car (terminal times) are also added. The projected daily trips are distributed using a standard gravity model and friction factors calibrated for the modeling region, which presently consists of 13 counties.

The City of San José TDF model can estimate up to 7 modes of transportation:
- auto drive alone
- auto carpool with two persons
- auto carpool with three+ persons
- rail transit
- bus transit
- bicycle
- walk

Before the traffic is assigned to the roadway networks, time-of-day factors and directionality factors are applied to automobile trips occurring during:

- AM peak hour
- AM 4-hour peak
- PM peak hour
- PM 4-hour peak
- mid-day 6-hour
- mid-night 10-hour periods

The assignment of the trip tables to the roadway network uses a route selection procedure based on minimum travel time paths (as opposed to minimum travel distance paths) between TAZs and is done using a capacity-constrained user equilibrium-seeking process. This capacity constrained traffic assignment process enables the model to reflect diversion of traffic around congested areas of the overall street system. High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on freeways, expressways, and on-ramps are specifically dealt with in the model network, with access restricted to auto-shared-ride mode trips only, similar to real world operations of roadway facilities with HOV lanes.

**Transit Mode Share**

Transit use is modeled for peak and non-peak periods based on computed transit levels of services (speeds and wait times). Based on the conditions that influence transit speeds and wait times (such as traffic congestion), transit use numbers are modified to reflect the likelihood of transit use, based on the constraints to the system. This feedback loop is a modern enhancement in the model to address the dynamics of transit ridership related to the expansion or contraction of roadway capacities.

In addition to providing projected peak hour and peak period volumes and ratios comparing projected traffic volume to available roadway capacity (V/C ratios) on each roadway segment, the model provides information on vehicle-miles and vehicle-hours of travel by facility type (freeway, expressways, arterial streets, etc.). These informational reports can be used to compare projected conditions under the adopted GP with the impacts of proposed land use amendments. The City’s TDF model is intended for use as a "macro analysis tool" to project probable future conditions. Therefore, the TDF model is best used when comparing alternative future scenarios and is not designed to answer "micro analysis level" operational questions typically address in detailed project-specific transportation analyses (TAs).

**General Plan Transportation Network**

The GP TDF model includes all major transportation infrastructure identified in the Envision San José 2040 Land Use/Transportation Diagram, including planned infrastructure that is not yet built and/or funded.
Measures of Effectiveness

This analysis addresses the long-range impacts of the proposed GP land use adjustments on the citywide transportation system by applying measures of effectiveness (MOEs) developed for the Envision San José 2040 GP. The results of the analysis for the proposed land use adjustments are compared to the current GP to determine if the proposed adjustments would result in any new or substantially more severe transportation impacts. The long-range analysis includes analysis of the following MOEs:

- **Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per Service Population.** VMT per service population is a measure of the daily vehicle miles traveled divided by the number of residents and employees within the City of San José. VMT per service population (residents + employees) is used for the analysis as opposed to VMT per capita (residents only), since per service population more accurately captures the effects of land use on VMT. The City not only has residents that travel to and from jobs, but also attracts regional employees. VMT is calculated based on the number of vehicles multiplied by the distance traveled by each vehicle in miles.

- **Journey-to-Work Mode Share (Drive Alone %).** Mode share is the distribution of all daily work trips by travel mode, including the following categories: drive alone, carpool with two persons, carpool with three persons or more, transit (rail and bus), bike, and walk trips.

- **Average Travel Speeds within the City's Transit Priority Corridors.** Average travel speed for all vehicles (transit and non-transit vehicles) in the City’s 14 transit corridors is calculated for the AM peak hour based on the segment distance dividing the vehicle travel time. A transit corridor is a segment of roadway identified as a Grand Boulevard in the Envision San José 2040 GP Land Use/Transportation Diagram. Grand Boulevards serve as major transportation corridors and, in most cases, are primary routes for Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) light-rail transit (LRT), bus rapid transit (BRT), local buses, and other public transit vehicles. Although transit services are found on other street types throughout the City, transit has the utmost priority on Grand Boulevards.

Significance Impact Criteria

The City of San José adopted policies and goals in Envision San José 2040 to reduce the drive alone mode share to no more than 40 percent of all daily commute trips, and to reduce the VMT per service population by 40 percent from existing (year 2015) conditions. To meet these goals by the GP horizon year and to satisfy CEQA requirements, the City developed a set of MOEs and associated significance thresholds to evaluate long-range transportation impacts resulting from land use adjustments. Table 4 summarizes the significance thresholds associated with vehicular modes of transportation as defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11) for the evaluation of long-range traffic impacts resulting from proposed land use adjustments and used in this analysis.

In addition to the MOEs described above, the effects of the proposed land use adjustments on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities were evaluated. A significant long-range transportation impact would occur if the adjustments would:

- Disrupt existing, or interfere with, planned transit services or facilities;
- Disrupt existing, or interfere with, planned bicycle facilities;
- Conflict or create inconsistencies with adopted bicycle plans, guidelines, policies, or standards;
- Not provide secure and safe bicycle parking in adequate proportion to anticipated demand;
### Table 4
**MOE Significance Thresholds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Citywide Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT/Service Population</td>
<td>Any increase over current 2040 General Plan conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Share (Drive Alone %)</td>
<td>Any increase in journey-to-work drive alone mode share over current 2040 General Plan conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transit Corridor Travel Speeds | Decrease in average travel speed on a transit corridor below current 2040 General Plan conditions in the AM peak one-hour period when:  
1. The average speed drops below 15 mph or decreases by 25% or more, or  
2. The average speed drops by one mph or more for a transit corridor with average speed below 15 mph under current 2040 General Plan conditions. |

Source: City of San Jose Transportation Analysis Handbook, April 2018.

- Disrupt existing, or interfere with, planned pedestrian facilities;
- Not provide accessible pedestrian facilities that meet current ADA best practices; or
- Create inconsistencies with adopted pedestrian plans, guidelines, policies, or standards.
4. Cumulative General Plan Long Range Analysis

The long-range cumulative traffic impacts resulting from the proposed 2020 GPAs were determined based on the MOEs significance thresholds for vehicle modes of travel and the impact criteria for transit, bicycle and pedestrian described in Chapter 3. The results of the GPA long-range analysis are described below.

Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population

The San José GP TDF model was used to project daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per service population, where service population is defined as the number of residents plus the number of employees citywide. This approach focuses on the VMT generated by new population and employment growth. VMT is calculated as the number of vehicle trips multiplied by the length of the trips in miles.

Since the City of San José not only has residents that travel to and from jobs within the City, but also attracts regional employees, the daily VMT includes some trips traveling outside of the City limits but with origins or destinations within San José. For this reason, the following trip types were included in the VMT calculation:

- Internal-Internal – All daily trips are made entirely within the San José City limits.
- One-half of Internal-External – One-half of the daily trips with an origin located within the San José City limits and a destination located outside of San José.
- One-half of External-Internal – One-half of the daily trips with an origin located outside the San José City limits and a destination located within San José.

Trips that travel through San José to and from other locations (External-External) are not included in the calculation of VMT. As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), any increase in VMT per service population over the current GP conditions due to the proposed land use amendments is considered a significant impact.

As shown in Table 5, the citywide daily VMT and the VMT per service population would decrease due to the proposed land use amendments when compared to the current GP. This is because (1) the total number of jobs and households would not change citywide as a result of the GPAs (only shifting of households and jobs would occur) and (2) the addition of households to areas with more jobs and transit options. Vehicle trips citywide would be reduced due to the reallocation of jobs and housing within and surrounding the downtown area which provides for greater opportunities for multi-modal travel. The availability of current and planned transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities in the area of the
Table 5
Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Daily VMT</td>
<td>17,505,088</td>
<td>28,035,508</td>
<td>27,995,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Service Population</td>
<td>1,392,946</td>
<td>2,054,758</td>
<td>2,054,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Households</td>
<td>319,870</td>
<td>429,350</td>
<td>429,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Residents</td>
<td>1,016,043</td>
<td>1,303,108</td>
<td>1,303,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Jobs</td>
<td>376,903</td>
<td>751,650</td>
<td>751,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily VMT Per Service Population</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in VMT/Service Population over General Plan Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-0.02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant Impact?**  No

Notes:
- 2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
- GPA = General Plan Amendment
- Service Population = Residents + Jobs
- Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

GPA sites will result in an increase in trips made by transit and other non-vehicular modes. Therefore, cumulatively, the proposed 2020 GPAs would result in a less than significant impact on citywide daily VMT per service population.

**Findings:** Compared to the current GP, the proposed land use adjustments would not result in an increase in citywide VMT per service population. Therefore, cumulatively, the proposed 2020 GPAs would result in a less than significant impact on citywide daily VMT per service population. It is important to note that the VMT per service population is based on raw model output and does not reflect the implementation of adopted GP policies and goals that would further reduce VMT by increased use of non-auto modes of travel.

**Journey-to-Work Mode Share**

The San José GP TDF model was used to calculate citywide journey-to-work mode share percentages. Journey-to-work mode share is the distribution of all daily work trips by travel mode, including drive alone, carpool with two persons, carpool with three persons or more, transit (rail and bus), bike, and walk trips. Although work trips may occur at any time of the day, most of the work trips occur during typical peak commute periods (6:00 – 10:00 AM and 3:00 – 7:00 PM). As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), any increase in the journey-to-work drive alone mode share percentage over the current GP conditions due to the proposed land use amendments is considered a significant impact.

Table 6 summarizes the citywide journey-to-work mode share analysis results. When compared to the current Envision San José 2040 GP, the percentage of journey-to-work drive alone trips would decrease slightly and the percentage of transit and bike trips would increase slightly as a result of the proposed GPAs. Therefore, cumulatively, the proposed 2020 GPAs would result in a less than significant impact on citywide journey-to-work drive alone mode share.
### Table 6
**Journey-to-Work Mode Share**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>753,264</td>
<td>79.69%</td>
<td>1,092,462</td>
<td>71.70%</td>
<td>1,090,766</td>
<td>71.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool 2</td>
<td>85,496</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
<td>137,781</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
<td>137,904</td>
<td>9.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool 3+</td>
<td>28,526</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>54,781</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>54,696</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>48,181</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>182,827</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>183,931</td>
<td>12.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>14,120</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>26,337</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>26,412</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>15,666</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>29,451</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>29,514</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase in Drive Alone Percentage over General Plan Conditions**

-0.09%

| Significant Impact? | No |

**Notes:**
- 2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
- GPA = General Plan Amendment
- Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

**Findings:** The proposed land use adjustments will not result in an increase of drive alone trips when compared to the current GP conditions. Therefore, cumulatively, the proposed 2020 GPAs would result in a less than significant impact on citywide journey-to-work mode share.

### Average Vehicle Speeds in Transit Priority Corridors

The San José GP TDF model was used to calculate the average vehicle travel speeds during the AM peak hour for the City’s 14 transit corridors that were evaluated in the Envision San José 2040 GP TIA. A transit corridor is a segment of roadway identified as a Grand Boulevard in the Envision San José 2040 GP Land Use/Transportation Diagram. Grand Boulevards serve as major transportation corridors and, in most cases, are primary routes for VTA’s LRT, BRT, local buses, and other public transit vehicles. The travel speeds are calculated by dividing the segment distance by the vehicle travel time. As defined in the City of San José *Transportation Analysis Handbook* (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), land use amendments that result in a decrease in average travel speed on a transit corridor in the AM peak one-hour period when the average speed drops below 15 miles per hour (mph) or decreases by 25 percent (%) or more, or the average speed drops by one mph or more for a transit corridor with average speed below 15 mph when compared to the current GP conditions is considered a significant impact.

Table 7 presents the average vehicle speeds on the City’s 14 transit priority corridors (i.e., Grand Boulevard segments) during the AM peak-hour of traffic. When compared to travel speeds under current GP conditions, the change in traffic resulting from the proposed land use amendments would have minimal effect on the travel speeds in the transit corridors. The TDF model estimates a decrease in travel speeds of 0.1 mph or less (or a change of 0.4% or less) on one corridor due to the proposed GPAs. Travel speeds on the remaining corridors would improve slightly or remain unchanged when compared to the current GP. Therefore, cumulatively, the proposed 2020 GPAs would result in a less than significant impact on the AM peak-hour average vehicle speeds on the transit priority corridors.
Table 7
AM Peak-Hour Vehicle Speeds (mph) for San José Transit Priority Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Priority Corridor</th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPAs</th>
<th>% Change (GPplusGPAs - GP)</th>
<th>Absolute Change (GPplusGPAs - GP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Street from San Carlos Street to St. James Street</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock Avenue from Capitol Avenue to US 101</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Avenue from SR 17 to Meridian Avenue</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Avenue from South Milpitas Boulevard to Capitol Expressway</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Expressway from Capitol Avenue to Meridian Avenue</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Santa Clara Street from US 101 to Deltmas Avenue</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Avenue from Park Avenue to Blossom Hill Road</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Road from Keyes Street to Metcalf Road</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North 1st Street from SR 237 to Keyes Street</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Street from Bascom Avenue to SR 87</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Creek Boulevard from Bascom Avenue to Tantau Avenue</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasman Drive from Lick Mill Boulevard to McCarthy Boulevard</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alameda from Alameda Way to Delmas Avenue</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West San Carlos Street from SR 87 to 2nd Street</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
GPA = General Plan Amendment
Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

Findings: The proposed land use adjustments would not result in a decrease in travel speeds greater than one mph or 25 percent on any of the 14 transit priority corridors when compared to current GP conditions. Therefore, cumulatively, the proposed 2020 GPAs would result in a less than significant impact on the AM peak-hour average vehicle speeds on the transit priority corridors.

Impacts on Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Circulation

Transit Services or Facilities

Planned transit services and facilities include additional rail service via the future Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) extension, light rail transit (LRT) extensions, new bus rapid transit (BRT) services, and the proposed California High Speed Rail (HSR) project. The proposed GPAs land use adjustments would not result in a change to the existing and planned roadway network that would result in an adverse effect on existing or planned transit facilities. Therefore, the proposed 2020 GPA’s land use
Bicycle Facilities

The adopted Envision San José 2040 GP supports the goals outlined in the City’s Better Bike Plan 2025 and contains policies to encourage bicycle trips (Policies TR-1.1, TR-1.2, TR-1.4 through TR-1.9, TR 2.1 through TR 2.11, TR-7.1, TN-1.1 through TN-1.5, TN-2.1 through TN-2.7, and TN-3.1 through 3.6; Implementing Actions TR-1.12 thoroughTR-1.15, TR-2.12 through TR-2.21, TR-7.2, TR-7.3, TN-1.6, TN-2.8 through 2.10, and TN-3.7; Performance Measures TN-2.11, TN-2.12). The proposed GPA land use adjustments would not result in a change to the existing and planned roadway network that would affect existing or planned bicycle facilities. Therefore, the proposed 2020 GPA land use adjustments would not substantially disrupt existing or interfere with planned bicycle facilities; conflict or create inconsistencies with adopted bicycle plans, guidelines, policies, or standards; and provide insecure and unsafe bicycle parking in adequate proportion to anticipated demand.

Pedestrian Facilities

The adopted Envision San José 2040 GP contains goals and policies (Policies TR-1.1, TR-1.2, TR-1.4 through TR-1.9, TR-2.1 through TR-2.11, TR-7.1, TN-1.1 through TN-1.5, TN-2.1 through TN-2.7, and TN-3.1 through 3.6; Implementing Actions TR-1.12 through TR-1.15, TR-2.12 through TR-2.21, TR-7.2, TR-7.3, TN-1.6, TN-2.8 through 2.10, and TN-3.7; Performance Measures TN-2.11, TN-2.12) to improve pedestrian walking environment, increase pedestrian safety, and create a land use context to support non-motorized travel. The proposed GPAs land use adjustments would not result in a change to the existing and planned roadway network that would affect existing or planned pedestrian facilities. Therefore, the proposed 2020 GPAs land use adjustments would not substantially disrupt existing or interfere with planned pedestrian facilities; create inconsistencies with adopted pedestrian plans, guidelines, policies, or standards; and provide accessible pedestrian facilities that would not meet current ADA best practice.
5. 329 Gifford Avenue (Site-Specific GPA Traffic Analysis)

This report presents the results of the long-range site-specific transportation analysis for the proposed 329 Gifford Avenue General Plan Amendment (GP19-012/C19-042). The purpose of the General Plan Amendment (GPA) transportation analysis is to assess the long-range impacts of the proposed land use amendment to the 329 Gifford Avenue General Plan site on the citywide transportation system. The potential transportation impacts of the project were evaluated in accordance with the guidelines and thresholds set forth by the Envision San José 2040 General Plan (GP). In addition, a near term transportation analysis in conjunction with any future development permit applications consistent with the Envision San José 2040 GP will be required once a development application is submitted to the City.

General Plan Amendment Site Description

The project consists of amending the adopted land use designation of the Envision San José 2040 GP for the 0.44-acre site, located at 462-470 W. San Carlos Street and 321-329 Gifford Avenue, is bounded by San Carlos Street to the north, Gifford Avenue to the east, and commercial uses to the west and south. The site is located within the Downtown Growth Area Boundary per the Envision San José 2040 GP. The GPA site location is presented on Figure 9. The adopted GP land use designation for the site is Residential Neighborhood, which provides for a density of 8 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC) and a floor area ratio (FAR) of up to 0.7. The proposed amendment involves changing the adopted land use to Downtown, which includes a density of 50-800 DU/AC and a max FAR of 30.0. The site is currently occupied by three single-family homes and a used car dealership. The proposed land use change for development of the site would be consistent with the immediate and surrounding land uses.

The GPA traffic analysis guidelines, described in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook, Volume II (dated April 2018), under the Methodology for Transportation Network Modeling & Analysis section, provide a trip threshold for GP land use amendments that require a site-specific GPA analysis. With the exception of GPA sites located within the identified North San José, Evergreen, and South San José subareas, a proposed land use amendment that would result in an increase of more than 250 PM peak-hour trips to be generated by the subject site due to proposed increases in households or employment would be required to prepare a site-specific GPA traffic analysis. The 329 Gifford Avenue GPA site is not located within the special subareas. According to the TDF modeling results, the proposed amendment at the 329 Gifford Avenue site would result in 183 additional households and 573 additional jobs on the site. The increase in households and jobs would result in an
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additional 273 AM and 352 PM peak-hour trips at the 329 Gifford Avenue GPA site when compared to the current GP land use designation (see Table 8). Therefore, a site-specific GPA traffic analysis is required for the proposed land use amendment. The GPA does not propose any changes to the city’s major transportation system and the transportation policies that were adopted in the Envision San José 2040 GP.

Table 8
329 Gifford Avenue GPA – Changes in Households, Jobs, and Peak-Hour Trips Due to Proposed GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>General Plan Amendment</th>
<th>Net Land Use Change</th>
<th>Net Peak-Hour Trip Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GP19-012/C19-042 (329 Gifford Avenue)</td>
<td>TOTHH</td>
<td>TEMP</td>
<td>TOTHH</td>
<td>TEMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GP19-012/C19-042 (329 Gifford Avenue)</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: TOTHH = total number of households; TEMP = total number of jobs.
1Total number of households and jobs under the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
2Total number of households and jobs as proposed by the GP Amendments.
Outlined indicates GPA that results in an increase in peak hour trips greater than 250 PM trips and requires site-specific GPA traffic analysis.
Source: City of San Jose Planning Department, June 2020.
City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

Scope of the Study

The GPA analysis includes the evaluation of the potential for the proposed land use amendment to result in increased vehicle miles traveled, increased traffic volume on specified roadway segments, impacts to travel speeds on transit priority corridors, and impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. Impacts are evaluated based on the same measures of effectiveness (MOEs) and significance criteria utilized in the Envision San José 2040 GP TIA and described in Chapter 3 of this report. Traffic conditions were evaluated for the following traffic scenarios using the City of San José’s Traffic Demand Forecasting (TDF) model:

- **Projected Year 2015 Conditions:** The Projected Year 2015 Conditions represent a projection of transportation conditions in 2015 using the City’s GP TDF model. The roadway network also reflects the Year 2015 roadway network and transportation system.

- **Current 2040 General Plan Conditions:** Future traffic due to the current GP land uses is added to regional growth that can be reasonably expected to occur by 2040. Current 2040 GP conditions include the current roadway network as well as all transportation system improvements as identified in the current GP.

- **Proposed 2040 General Plan Amendment Conditions:** Current 2040 GP conditions with the proposed land use amendment for the 329 Gifford Avenue GP site. Transportation conditions for the Proposed 2040 GP Amendment Conditions were evaluated relative to the currently adopted 2040 GP Conditions to determine any long-range traffic impacts.

Existing Conditions

This section describes the existing conditions for all of the major transportation facilities in the vicinity of the site, including the roadway network, transit service, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
Existing Roadway Network

Regional access to the project site is provided by State Route 87 and the Interstate 280/680 freeway. Local site access is provided by Bird Avenue, Montgomery Street, San Carlos Street, Auzerais Avenue, and Gifford Avenue. The freeways and local roadways are described below.

**State Route 87** is primarily a six-lane freeway (four mixed-flow lanes and two HOV lanes) that is aligned in a north-south orientation within the project vicinity. SR 87 begins at its interchange with SR 85 and extends northward, terminating at its junction with US 101. Connections from SR-87 to the project site are provided via partial interchanges at Park Avenue (ramps to and from north), Auzerais Avenue (ramps to south only), and Woz Way (ramp from south only). SR 87 provides access to I-280/I-680 and US-101.

**Interstate 280** connects from US-101 in San Jose to I-80 in San Francisco. It is generally an eight-lane freeway in the vicinity of downtown San Jose. It also has auxiliary lanes between some interchanges. The section of I-280 just north of the Bascom Avenue overcrossing has six mixed-flow lanes and two high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes. Connections from I-280 to the project site are provided via its full interchange at Bird Avenue.

**Bird Avenue** is a four-lane north-south roadway, designated as a City Connector Street in the General Plan, that provides access to I-280 via a full interchange. Bird Avenue runs from the Willow Glen Area of San Jose to San Carlos Street, where it transitions into Montgomery Street. Land uses located along Bird Avenue are generally commercial north of the I-280 interchange and residential south of the interchange, with parking provided on both sides of the street in most areas. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of Bird Avenue, south of Virginia Street, while the segment between Virginia Street and San Carlos Street is a designated bike route.

**Montgomery Street** is a north-south roadway that extends between San Carlos Street and Santa Clara Street. Between Santa Clara Street and Park Avenue, Montgomery Street is a two-lane, one-way (southbound), General Plan-designated Grand Boulevard that works as a couplet with Autumn Street. Between Park Avenue and San Carlos Street, it is a two-way Connector Street with three southbound travel lanes, two northbound travel lanes, and bike lanes along both sides of the street. Montgomery Street is lined with commercial and industrial land uses, it includes parking along both sides of the street in most areas, and has a posted speed limit of 35 mph. Access to the project site from Montgomery Street would be provided via its intersection with San Carlos Street.

**San Carlos Street** is a four-lane east-west roadway, designated as a Grand Boulevard in the General Plan, that runs from 4th Street westward to Bascom Avenue, just east of I-880, at which point it transitions into Stevens Creek Boulevard. Land uses located along San Carlos Street are generally commercial and industrial, although some high-density residential developments are planned or under construction. Parking is provided on both sides of the street in most areas. Within the study area, San Carlos Street has a posted speed limit of 35 mph, includes sidewalks along both sides of the street, and has a median island with left-turn pockets. San Carlos Street runs along the southern project site frontage.

**Auzerais Avenue** is an east-west roadway, designated as a Local Connector Street in the General Plan, that extends from Woz Way in Downtown San Jose to Race Street. consists of four lanes between east of Delmas Avenue and two lanes west of Delmas Avenue. The posted speed limit is 25 mph. In the vicinity of the project site, Auzerais Avenue is a designated bike route only with “sharrow” marking and signage; however, there are bike lanes along portions of Auzerais Avenue between Bird Avenue and Sunol Street. Land uses along Auzerais Avenue include both residential and commercial, with parking along both sides of the street in most areas.
**Gifford Avenue** is a north-south roadway that extends from San Fernando Street south to Auzerais Avenue. It consists of one lane in each direction with a posted speed limit of 25 mph in the vicinity of the project. Land uses along Gifford Avenue include both residential and commercial, with parking along both sides of the street in most areas and without on-street bicycle facilities.

**Existing Bicycle Facilities**

Class II bicycle facilities (striped bike lanes) are provided along the following roadways within the project area:

- Park Avenue, along the entire length of the street
- Auzerais Avenue, between Sunol Street and the Los Gatos Creek Trail; between the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and Bird Avenue
- Autumn Street, between Santa Clara Street and Park Avenue
- Montgomery Street, between Park Avenue and San Carlos Street
- Bird Avenue, between San Carlos Street and Coe Avenue
- Lincoln Avenue, south of San Carlos Street
- Woz Way, between San Carlos Street and Almaden Avenue
- The Alameda/Santa Clara Street, between Stockton Avenue and Almaden Boulevard

Designated Class III bike routes with “sharrow” or shared-lane pavement markings and signage are provided along the following roadways:

- Auzerais Avenue, all segments east of Race Street without striped bike lanes
- Dupont Street, north of San Carlos Street
- Sunol Street, between San Fernando Street and Auzerais Avenue
- Laurel Grove Lane, between Park Avenue and Cahill Park
- Lincoln Avenue, between San Carlos Street and Park Avenue
- San Carlos Street, east of Woz Way
- Virginia Street, between Drake Street and 3rd Street

Class IV bicycle facilities (protected bike lanes) are currently being installed throughout the Downtown Area as part of the Better Bikeways project. Protected bike lanes have been implemented along the following roadways:

- San Fernando Street, between Cahill Street and Tenth Street
- Cahill Street, between San Fernando Street and Santa Clara Street

The existing bicycle facilities are shown on Figure 10.

**Guadalupe River Park Trail**

The Guadalupe River multi-use trail system runs through the City of San Jose along the Guadalupe River and is shared between pedestrians and bicyclists and separated from motor vehicle traffic. The Guadalupe River trail is an 11-mile continuous Class I bikeway from Curtner Avenue in the south to Alviso in the north. This trail system can be accessed via a trailhead along San Carlos Street, located approximately 1,500 feet east of the project site.

**Los Gatos Creek Trail**

The Los Gatos Creek Trail begins at Vasona Lake County Park in the south and continues to West San Carlos Street in the north, all alongside Los Gatos Creek. The nearest access point to the Los Gatos Creek Trail is provided via a trailhead at the south end of Dupont Street, south of San Carlos Street, approximately 0.65-mile west of the project site.
Figure 10
329 Gifford Avenue GPA – Existing Bicycle Facilities
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**Bike and Scooter Share Services**

The Bay Wheels (formerly Ford Go Bike) bike share program allows users to rent and return bicycles at various locations. Bike share bikes can be rented and returned at designated docking stations throughout the Downtown area. The nearest bike share stations are located less than 1/3-mile from the project site at the intersection of Bird Avenue/Columbia Avenue and Delmas Avenue/San Fernando Street. In addition, dock-less bike and scooter rentals managed by other micro-mobility services are available throughout the Downtown area. These services provide electric bicycles and scooters with GPS self-locking systems that allow for rental and drop-off anywhere.

**Existing Pedestrian Facilities**

Pedestrian facilities in the study area (shown in Figure 11) consist of sidewalks along all the surrounding streets, including all project frontages. Crosswalks and pedestrian signal heads are located at all signalized intersections within the project area. The majority of the crosswalks at signalized intersections in the vicinity of the project site consist of high visibility crosswalks and countdown signal heads that enhance pedestrian visibility and safety while crossing the intersections. There are also high visibility crosswalks located at some unsignalized intersections, such as the intersection of Josefa Street with San Carlos Street. Sidewalks in the project area are wide and provide an attractive and continuous pedestrian network between the site and local destinations, such as bus stops along San Carlos Street, the Diridon Transit Center, SAP Center, and the Downtown area east of SR-87.

It should be noted, however, that there are no crosswalks across San Carlos Street at its stop-controlled intersection with Gifford Avenue. The nearest crosswalks across San Carlos Street are located at the Josefa Street and Delmas Avenue intersections.

ADA compliant ramps are located at most crosswalks in the vicinity of the project site. However, ADA compliant ramps are missing at the following locations in the project vicinity:

- Delmas Avenue and San Carlos Street – southeast corner
- Gifford Avenue and Auzerais Avenue – northeast corner
- Delmas Avenue and Auzerais Avenue – all corners

Overall, the existing sidewalks and pedestrian facilities provide good pedestrian connectivity and safe routes to the surrounding pedestrian destinations.

**Existing Transit Services**

Existing transit services in the study area are provided by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority VTA, Caltrain, Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), and Amtrak. The project site is located approximately ½-mile from the Diridon Transit Center located on Cahill Street. Connections between local and regional bus routes, light rail lines, and commuter rail lines are provided within the Diridon Transit Center. Figure 12 shows the existing transit facilities.

**Bus Service**

The downtown area is served by many VTA bus routes with high-frequency service. Rapid Bus services provide limited-stop service at frequent intervals (approximately 15 minutes) during daytime. Within the Downtown area, Rapid Routes 522 and 523 run along Santa Clara Street and San Carlos Street, respectively. Additionally, Frequent Bus services provide local service with average headways of 15 minutes during peak commute hours. Express Bus services provide direct service to and from major employment center during peak commute hours only.
Figure 11
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Figure 12
329 Gifford Avenue GPA – Existing Transit Services
The bus lines that operate within walking distance of the project site are listed in Table 9, including their route descriptions and commute hour headways. The nearest bus stops are located along San Carlos Street at the intersections of Josefa Street (eastbound), Gifford Avenue (westbound), and Delmas Avenue (westbound), and are served by Frequent Bus Route 23. Although the Gifford Avenue bus stop is located directly across from the north project frontage (along the north side of San Carlos Street), the walking distance is 600 feet due to a lack of a crosswalk across San Carlos Street at Gifford Avenue. Based on walking distance, the Delmas Avenue bus stop would provide closer access to westbound bus service from the project site. Access to the Rapid Route 523 service is provided at bus stops located at the Bird Avenue/San Carlos Street intersection, less than 1,000 feet walking distance from the project site.

**VTA Light Rail Transit (LRT) Service**

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) currently operates the 42.2-mile VTA light rail line system extending from south San Jose through downtown to the northern areas of San Jose, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Mountain View and Sunnyvale. The service operates nearly from 5:00 AM to 9:00 PM with 30-minute headways.

The San Jose Diridon station is located along the Green LRT line (Winchester-Old Ironsides) and serves as a transfer point to Caltrain, ACE, and Amtrak services.

**Caltrain Service**

Commuter rail service between San Francisco and Gilroy is provided by Caltrain, which currently operates 92 weekday trains that carry approximately 47,000 riders on an average weekday. The project site is located about ¾-mile from the San Jose Diridon station. The Diridon station provides 581 parking spaces, as well as 16 bike racks, 48 bike lockers, and 27 Bay Wheels bike share docks. Trains stop frequently at the Diridon station between 4:28 AM and 10:30 PM in the northbound direction, and between 6:27 AM and 1:41 AM in the southbound direction. Caltrain provides passenger train service seven days a week and provides extended service to Morgan Hill and Gilroy during commute hours.

**Altamont Commuter Express Service (ACE)**

ACE provides commuter rail service between Stockton, Tracy, Pleasanton, and San Jose during commute hours, Monday through Friday. Service is limited to two westbound trips in the morning and two eastbound trips with headways from 120 minutes to 140 minutes. ACE trains stop at the Diridon Station at 6:32 AM and 8:52 AM in the westbound direction, and at 3:35 PM and 5:35 PM in the eastbound direction.

**Amtrak Service**

Amtrak provides daily commuter passenger train service along the 170-mile Capitol Corridor between the Sacramento region and the Bay Area, with stops in San Jose, Santa Clara, Fremont, Hayward, Oakland, Emeryville, Berkeley, Richmond, Martinez, Suisun City, Davis, Sacramento, Roseville, Rocklin, and Auburn. The Capitol Corridor trains stop at the San Jose Diridon Station five times during the weekdays between approximately 6:55 AM and 5:59 PM in the westbound direction. In the eastbound direction, Amtrak stops at the Diridon Station five times during the weekdays between 7:37 AM and 9:05 PM.
Table 9
329 Gifford Avenue GPA – Existing Bus Stops and Headways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Route</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Nearest Stop</th>
<th>Headway ¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Route 22</td>
<td>Palo Alto Transit Center to Eastridge Transit Center</td>
<td>Santa Clara/Cahill</td>
<td>15-20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Route 23</td>
<td>DeAnza College to Alum Rock Transit Center via Stevens Creek</td>
<td>San Carlos/Gifford</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Route 64A</td>
<td>McKee &amp; White to Ohlone-Chynoweth Station</td>
<td>Bird/San Carlos</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Route 64B</td>
<td>McKee &amp; White to Almaden Expressway &amp; Camden</td>
<td>Diridon Transit Center</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Route 68</td>
<td>San Jose Diridon Station to Gilroy Transit Center</td>
<td>Diridon Transit Center</td>
<td>20-30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Route 500</td>
<td>San Jose Diridon Station to Downtown San Jose</td>
<td>Diridon Transit Center</td>
<td>10-20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Route 522</td>
<td>Palo Alto Transit Center to Eastridge Transit Center</td>
<td>Santa Clara/Cahill</td>
<td>15-20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Route 523</td>
<td>Berryessa BART to Lockheed Martin via De Anza College</td>
<td>San Carlos/Bird</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 17 Express (Route 970)</td>
<td>Downtown Santa Cruz / Scotts Valley to Downtown San Jose</td>
<td>Bird/San Carlos</td>
<td>55 - 90 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
¹ Approximate headways during peak commute periods.

General Plan Amendment Site-Specific Long-Range Analysis

The site-specific long-range traffic impacts resulting from the proposed 329 Gifford Avenue site GPA were determined based on the MOEs and associated significance thresholds described in Chapter 3. The results of the site-specific GPA long-range analysis are described below.

Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population

The San José GP TDF model was used to project daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per service population, where service population is defined as the number of residents plus the number of employees citywide. This approach focuses on the VMT generated by new population and employment growth. VMT is calculated as the number of vehicle trips multiplied by the length of the trips in miles. As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 10), any increase in VMT per service population over the current GP conditions due to the proposed land use amendment is considered a significant impact.

As shown in Table 10, the citywide daily VMT would decrease slightly and the VMT per service population would remain unchanged with the proposed land use amendment when compared to the current GP. Therefore, the proposed 329 Gifford Avenue GPA would result in a less than significant impact on the citywide daily VMT per service population.

Journey-to-Work Mode Share

The San José GP TDF model was used to calculate journey-to-work citywide mode share percentages. Journey-to-work mode share is the distribution of all daily work trips by travel mode. The modes of travel included in the TDF model are drive alone, carpool with two persons, carpool with three persons or more, transit (rail and bus), bike, and walk trips. Although work trips may occur at any time of the day, most of the work trips occur during typical peak commute periods (6:00 – 10:00 AM and 3:00 – 7:00 PM). As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), any increase in the journey-to-work drive alone mode share percentage over the current GP conditions due to the proposed land use amendment is considered a significant impact.
Table 10
329 Gifford Avenue GPA – Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Daily VMT</td>
<td>17,505,088</td>
<td>28,035,508</td>
<td>28,004,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Service Population</td>
<td>1,392,946</td>
<td>2,054,758</td>
<td>2,054,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Households</td>
<td>319,870</td>
<td>429,350</td>
<td>429,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Residents</td>
<td>1,016,043</td>
<td>1,303,108</td>
<td>1,303,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Jobs</td>
<td>376,903</td>
<td>751,650</td>
<td>751,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily VMT Per Service Population</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>13.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Increase in VMT/Service Population over General Plan Conditions | -0.02 |

| Significant Impact? | No |

Notes:
- 2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
- GPA = General Plan Amendment
- Service Population = Residents + Jobs
- Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2019 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

Table 11 summarizes the citywide journey-to-work mode share analysis results. Compared to the current Envision San José 2040 GP, the percentage of journey-to-work drive alone trips would decrease slightly as a result of the proposed GPA. Therefore, the proposed 329 Gifford Avenue GPA would result in a less than significant impact on citywide journey-to-work drive alone mode share.

Average Vehicle Speeds in Transit Priority Corridors

The San José GP TDF model was used to calculate the average vehicle travel speeds during the AM peak hour for the City’s 14 transit corridors that were evaluated in the Envision San José 2040 GP TIA. The analysis of transit priority corridor speeds was completed to assist with the assessment of whether the proposed land use amendment would cause a significant change in travel speeds on the transit priority corridors compared to the current GP. A transit corridor is a roadway segment identified as a Grand Boulevard in the Envision San José 2040 GP Land Use/Transportation Diagram. Grand Boulevards serve as major transportation corridors and, in most cases, are primary routes for VTA’s LRT, BRT, local buses, and other public transit vehicles. The travel speeds are calculated by dividing the segment distance by the vehicle travel time. As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), land use amendments that result in a decrease in average travel speed on a transit corridor in the AM peak one-hour period when the average speed drops below 15 miles per hour (mph) or decreases by 25 percent (%) or more, or the average speed drops by one mph or more for a transit corridor with average speed below 15 mph when compared to the current GP conditions is considered a significant impact.
Table 11
329 Gifford Avenue GPA – Journey-to-Work Mode Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>753,264</td>
<td>79.69%</td>
<td>1,092,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool 2</td>
<td>85,496</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
<td>137,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool 3+</td>
<td>28,526</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>54,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>48,181</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>182,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>14,120</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>26,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>15,666</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>29,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase in Drive Alone Percentage over General Plan Conditions

Table 12 presents the average vehicle speeds on the City’s 14 transit priority corridors (i.e., Grand Boulevard segments) during the AM peak-hour of traffic. When compared to the travel speeds under current GP conditions, the change in traffic resulting from the proposed land use amendment would have a minimal effect on the travel speeds in the transit corridors. The TDF model estimates decrease in travel speeds of 0.2 mph or less (or a change of 1.1 % or less) on two corridors due to the proposed 329 Gifford Avenue GPA. Travel speeds on the remaining corridors would improve slightly or remain unchanged when compared to the current GP. Therefore, the proposed 329 Gifford Avenue GPA would result in a less than significant impact on the AM peak-hour average vehicle speeds on the transit priority corridors.

Impacts on Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Circulation

The Circulation Element of the Envision San José 2040 GP includes a set of balanced, long-range, multimodal transportation goals and policies that provide for a transportation network that is safe, efficient, and sustainable (minimizes environmental, financial, and neighborhood impacts). In combination with land use goals and policies that focus growth into areas served by transit, these transportation goals and policies are intended to improve multi-model accessibility to employment, housing, shopping, entertainment, schools, and parks and create a city where people are less reliant on driving to meet their daily needs. San José’s Transportation Goals, Policies, and Actions aim to:

- Establish circulation policies that increase bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel, while reducing motor vehicle trips, to increase the City’s share of travel by alternative transportation modes.
- Promote San José as a walking- and bicycling-first city by providing and prioritizing funding for projects that enhance and improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Notes:
2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
GPA = General Plan Amendment
Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
Table 12
329 Gifford Avenue GPA – AM Peak-Hour Vehicle Speeds (mph) for San José Transit Priority Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Priority Corridor</th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Street from San Carlos Street to St. James Street</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock Avenue from Capitol Avenue to US 101</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Avenue from SR 17 to Meridian Avenue</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Avenue from South Milpitas Boulevard to Capitol Expressway</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Expressway from Capitol Avenue to Meridian Avenue</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Santa Clara Street from US 101 to Delmas Avenue</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Avenue from Park Avenue to Blossom Hill Road</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Road from Keyes Street to Metcalf Road</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North 1st Street from SR 237 to Keyes Street</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Street from Bascom Avenue to SR 87</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Creek Boulevard from Bascom Avenue to Tantau Avenue</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasman Drive from Lick Mill Boulevard to McCarthy Boulevard</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alameda from Alameda Way to Delmas Avenue</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West San Carlos Street from SR 87 to 2nd Street</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
GPA = General Plan Amendment
Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

Included within the GP are a set of Goals and Policies to support a multimodal transportation system that gives priority to the mobility needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and public transit users while also providing for the safe and efficient movement of automobiles, buses, and trucks. Policies TR-2.1 through TR-2.11 provide specific policies to guide improvement to walking and bicycling. Such policies include the provision of continuous bicycle system, constructing sidewalks and crosswalks. Similarly, the Envision San José 2040 GP includes specific policies to maximize use of public transit (TR-3.1 through 3.4). As the 329 Gifford Avenue GP site develops, the project should ensure that it is consistent with the Envision San José 2040 GP to provide safe, accessible and inter-connected pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and accommodate transit services (i.e., bus dugout) as new roadways are constructed. The impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities are less-than-significant.
6. 276 Woz Way (Site-Specific GPA Traffic Analysis)

This report presents the results of the long-range site-specific transportation analysis for the proposed 276 Woz Way General Plan Amendment (GP19-008/H20-004). The purpose of the General Plan Amendment (GPA) transportation analysis is to assess the long-range impacts of the proposed land use amendment to the 276 Woz Way General Plan site on the citywide transportation system. The potential transportation impacts of the project were evaluated in accordance with the guidelines and thresholds set forth by the Envision San José 2040 General Plan (GP). In addition, a near term transportation analysis in conjunction with any future development permit applications consistent with the Envision San José 2040 GP will be required once a development application is submitted to the City.

General Plan Amendment Site Description

The project consists of amending the adopted land use designation of the Envision San José 2040 GP for the approximately 3.08-acre site is generally bounded by Woz Way to the north, Almaden Boulevard to the east, Reed Street to the south, and Guadalupe River to the west. The site is located within the Downtown Growth Area Boundary per the Envision San José 2040 GP. The GPA site location is presented on Figure 13. The adopted GP land use designation for the site is Public Quasi Public, which includes a density of 100 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC). The proposed amendment involves changing the adopted land use to Downtown, which provides for a density of 50-800 DU/AC and a max FAR of 30.0. The site is currently occupied by single family homes. The proposed land use change for development of the site would be consistent with the immediate and surrounding land uses.

The GPA traffic analysis guidelines, described in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook, Volume II (dated April 2018), under the Methodology for Transportation Network Modeling & Analysis section, provide a trip threshold for GP land use amendments that require a site-specific GPA analysis. With the exception of GPA sites located within the identified North San José, Evergreen, and South San José subareas, a proposed land use amendment that would result in an increase of more than 250 PM peak-hour trips to be generated by the subject site due to proposed increase in employment would be required to prepare a site-specific GPA traffic analysis. The 276 Woz Way GPA site is not located within the special subareas. According to the TDF modeling results, the proposed amendment at the 276 Woz Way site would result in 29 fewer households and 6,411 additional jobs on the site. The change in households and jobs would result in an additional 1,161 AM and 1,932 PM peak-hour trips at the 276 Woz Way GPA site when compared to the current GP land use designation (see Table 13). Therefore, a site-specific GPA traffic analysis is required for the
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Table 13
276 Woz Way GPA – Changes in Households, Jobs, and Peak-Hour Trips Due to Proposed GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>General Plan Amendment</th>
<th>Net Land Use Change</th>
<th>Net Peak-Hour Trip Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTHH TEMP</td>
<td>TOTHH TEMP</td>
<td>TOTHH TEMP</td>
<td>AM PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GP19-008/H20-004(276 Woz Way)</td>
<td>29 2,349</td>
<td>0 8,760</td>
<td>-29 6411</td>
<td>1,161 1,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: TOTHH = total number of households; TEMP = total number of jobs.
1Total number of households and jobs under the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
   The buildout of the 2040 GP represents baseline conditions.
2Total number of households and jobs as proposed by the GP Amendments.
Outlined indicates GPA that results in an increase in peak hour trips greater than 250 PM trips and requires site-specific GPA traffic analysis.
Source: City of San Jose Planning Department, June 2020.
City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

The GPA analysis includes the evaluation of the potential for the proposed land use amendment to result in increased vehicle miles traveled, impacts to travel speeds on transit priority corridors, and impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. Impacts are evaluated based on the same measures of effectiveness (MOEs) and significance criteria utilized in the Envision San José 2040 GP TIA and described in Chapter 3 of this report. Traffic conditions were evaluated for the following traffic scenarios using the City of San José’s Traffic Demand Forecasting (TDF) model:

- **Projected Year 2015 Conditions:** The Projected Year 2015 Conditions represent a projection of transportation conditions in 2015 using the City’s GP TDF model. The roadway network also reflects the Year 2015 roadway network and transportation system.

- **Current 2040 General Plan Conditions:** Future traffic due to the current GP land uses is added to regional growth that can be reasonably expected to occur by 2040. Current 2040 GP conditions include the current roadway network as well as all transportation system improvements as identified in the current GP.

- **Proposed 2040 General Plan Amendment Conditions:** Current 2040 GP conditions with the proposed land use amendment for the 276 Woz Way GP site. Transportation conditions for the Proposed 2040 GP Amendment Conditions were evaluated relative to the currently adopted 2040 GP Conditions to determine any long-range traffic impacts.

Existing Conditions

This section describes the existing conditions for all of the major transportation facilities in the vicinity of the site, including the roadway network, transit service, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Existing Roadway Network

Regional access to the project site is provided by the Interstate 280/680 freeway and State Route 87. Local site access is provided by Almaden Boulevard, San Carlos Street, Woz Way/Balbach Street, and Locust Street. The freeways and local roadways are described below.
**Interstate 280** connects from US-101 in San Jose to I-80 in San Francisco. It is generally an eight-lane freeway in the vicinity of downtown San Jose. It also has auxiliary lanes between some interchanges. The section of I-280 just north of the Bascom Avenue overcrossing has six mixed-flow lanes and two high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes. Connections from I-280 to the project site are provided via partial interchanges at First Street (ramps to east only), Fourth Street (ramps to west only), Sixth Street (ramps from west), Seventh Street (ramps from east), Almaden Boulevard (ramps to west), and Vine Street (ramps from west).

**State Route 87** is primarily a six-lane freeway (four mixed-flow lanes and two HOV lanes) that is aligned in a north-south orientation within the project vicinity. SR 87 begins at its interchange with SR 85 and extends northward, terminating at its junction with US 101. Connections from SR-87 to the project site are provided via partial interchanges at Park Avenue (ramps to and from north), Auzerais Avenue (ramps to south only), and Woz Way (ramp from south only).

**Almaden Boulevard** is a north-south arterial with two lanes in each direction between Santa Clara Street and Grant Street and includes bike lanes on both sides of the roadway. North of Santa Clara Street, Almaden Boulevard is a one-lane, southbound-only street providing access from Julian Street. South of Grant Street, Almaden Boulevard transitions to Vine Street. Almaden Boulevard runs along the project’s eastern frontage.

**San Carlos Street** is an east-west four-lane street located north of the project site. It extends as West San Carlos Street from 1st Street westward to Bascom Avenue where it transitions into Stevens Creek Boulevard. East of 1st Street, it extends eastward as East San Carlos Street with a break between 4th and 10th Streets (at San Jose State University) and terminating at 17th Street. In the vicinity of the project site, the VTA light rail tracks run along the middle of the street, separating the eastbound and westbound travel lanes. Access to the project site is provided via Woz Way and Almaden Boulevard.

**Woz Way/Balbach Street** is a two-lane roadway that runs between the SR-87 northbound on-ramps at Park Avenue and Almaden Boulevard. Bike lanes are present on both sides of the street between San Carlos Street and Almaden Boulevard. East of Almaden Boulevard, Woz Way continues as Balbach Street east to Market Street. Woz Way runs along the project’s northern frontage.

**Locust Street** is a two-lane roadway that extends southerly from Woz Way and ends at the cul-de-sac, just north of the I-280 westbound on-ramp. Locust Street bisects and provides direct access to the project site.

**Existing Bicycle Facilities**

Class II bicycle facilities (striped buffered bike lanes) are provided along Almaden Boulevard (along the east project site frontage) and Woz Way (along the north project frontage). Additional Class II bicycle facilities are provided along the following roadways within the project area:

- Almaden Boulevard, between Woz Way and Carlyle Street (including along the east project frontage)
- Almaden Avenue, between Alma Avenue and Grant Street
- Vine Street, between Alma Avenue and Grant Street
- Woz Way, between San Carlos Street and Almaden Avenue (including along the north project frontage)
- Park Avenue, west of Market Street
- Santa Clara Street, between Almaden Boulevard and Stockton Avenue
- San Salvador Street, between Market Street and Fourth Street
- Second Street, south of San Carlos Street
- Third Street, south of Reed Street
- Autumn Street, between Santa Clara Street and San Carlos Street
- Bird Avenue, south of San Carlos Street
- Auzerais Avenue, west of Bird Avenue
- Fourth Street, between Jackson Street and Santa Clara Street; between San Salvador Street and Reed Street

Designated Class III bike routes with “sharrow” or shared-lane pavement markings and signage are provided along the following roadways:

- San Carlos Street, between Woz Way and Fourth Street
- Second Street, between San Carlos Street and Julian Street
- First Street, between San Salvador Street and St. John Street
- Virginia Street, west of Third Street
- Balbach Street, between Almaden Avenue and Market Street
- Auzerais Avenue, between Delmas Avenue and Bird Avenue
- Viola Avenue, between Market Street and Balbach Street
- William Street, between First Street and McLaughlin Avenue

Class IV bicycle facilities (protected bike lanes) are currently being installed throughout the Downtown Area as part of the Better Bikeways project. Protected bike lanes have been implemented along the following roadways:

- San Fernando Street, between Cahill Street and Tenth Street
- Third Street, between St. James Street and Reed Street
- Fourth Street, between Santa Clara Street and San Salvador Street
- San Salvador Street, between Fourth Street and Tenth Street (westbound)
- Cahill Street, between San Fernando Street and Santa Clara Street

The existing bicycle facilities are shown on Figure 14.

Guadalupe River Park Trail

The Guadalupe River multi-use trail system runs through the City of San Jose along the Guadalupe River and is shared between pedestrians and bicyclists and separated from motor vehicle traffic. The Guadalupe River trail is an 11-mile Class I bikeway from Curtner Avenue in the south to Alviso in the north. In the vicinity of the project site, the Guadalupe River Trail consists of trails along the west and east banks of the Guadalupe River. The east trail runs along the proposed project’s entire west frontage and would be directly accessible from the project site. Additionally, a paseo along the north project frontage connects Almaden Boulevard with the east and west sides of the Guadalupe River Trail via a bridge.

Bike and Scooter Share Services

The Bay Wheels (formerly Ford Go Bike) bike share program allows users to rent and return bicycles at various locations. Bike share bikes can be rented and returned at designated docking stations throughout the Downtown area. In addition, dockless bike and scooter rentals are available throughout the Downtown area. These services provide electric bicycles and scooters with GPS self-locking systems that allow for rental and drop-off anywhere. A bike share station is located at the northeast corner of the Almaden Boulevard/Woz Way intersection.
Figure 14
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Existing Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian facilities in the study area (shown in Figure 15) consist of sidewalks along all the surrounding streets, including the project site frontages along Almaden Boulevard and Woz Way. Crosswalks and pedestrian signal heads are located at all signalized intersections within the project area, including the intersections of Almaden Boulevard/Woz Way, Almaden Boulevard/Reed Street, SR 87 off-ramp/Woz Way, and Woz Way/Auzerais Avenue.

ADA compliant ramps are located at all crosswalks at the intersection of Locust Street and Woz Way. However, ADA compliant ramps are missing at the following locations in the project vicinity:

- Almaden Boulevard and Woz Way/Balbach Street – northwest, northeast, and southwest corners
- Almaden Boulevard and Reed Street – all corners
- Woz Way and Auzerais Avenue – all corners
- Woz Way and SR-87 Off-Ramp – all corners

As mentioned previously, the east portion of the Guadalupe River Trail is located along the site’s west frontage. From the project site, pedestrians may use the Guadalupe River Trail as a cut-through route to San Carlos Street, Park Avenue, San Fernando Street, and Santa Clara Street to the north. A high-visibility crosswalk located along the west leg of the Locust Street/Woz Way intersection provides access to the Guadalupe River Trail south across Woz Way. The Children’s Bridge, located north and west of the project site, connects the east and west sides of the Guadalupe River Trail.

Overall, the existing sidewalks and paseos provide good pedestrian connectivity and safe routes to the surrounding pedestrian destinations.

Existing Transit Services

Existing transit services in the study area are provided by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority VTA, Caltrain, Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), and Amtrak. The project site is located approximately 1,500 feet south and west of the Convention Center Light Rail Transit (LRT) Station, 1,300 feet east of the Children’s Discovery Museum LRT Station, and approximately 0.8-mile from the Diridon Transit Center located on Cahill Street. Connections between local and regional bus routes, light rail lines, and commuter rail lines are provided within the Diridon Transit Center. Figure 16 shows the existing transit facilities.

Bus Service

The downtown area is served by many VTA bus routes with high-frequency service. Rapid Bus services provide limited-stop service at frequent intervals (less than 15 minutes) during daytime. Within the Downtown area, Rapid Routes 522 and 523 run along Santa Clara Street and San Carlos Street, respectively. Additionally, Frequent Bus services provide local service with average headways of approximately 15 minutes during peak commute hours. Express Bus services provide direct service to and from major employment centers during peak commute hours only.

The bus lines that operate within walking distance of the project site are listed in Table 14, including their route descriptions and commute hour headways. The nearest bus stops to the project site are located at the San Carlos Street/Woz Way intersection (Route 23) and San Carlos Street/Convention Center intersection (Routes 23 and 523).

Regional bus services operated by other transit agencies are accessible from bus stops within Downtown San Jose. The Highway 17 Express, a weekday commuter service that runs between San Jose and Santa Cruz via SR-17, runs along Santa Clara Street.
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Figure 16
276 Woz Way GPA – Existing Transit Facilities
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Table 14
276 Woz Way GPA – Existing Bus Stops and Headways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Route</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Nearest Stop</th>
<th>Headway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Route 22</td>
<td>Palo Alto Transit Center to Eastridge Transit Center</td>
<td>Santa Clara/Almaden</td>
<td>15-20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Route 23</td>
<td>DeAnza College to Alum Rock Transit Center via Stevens Creek</td>
<td>San Carlos/Woz</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Route 64A</td>
<td>McKee &amp; White to Ohlone-Chynoweth Station</td>
<td>Santa Clara/Almaden</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Route 64B</td>
<td>McKee &amp; White to Almaden Expressway &amp; Camden</td>
<td>Santa Clara/Almaden</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Route 66</td>
<td>North Milpitas to Kaiser San Jose</td>
<td>First/Paseo de San Antonio</td>
<td>20-30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Route 68</td>
<td>San Jose Diridon Station to Gilroy Transit Center</td>
<td>First/Paseo de San Antonio</td>
<td>20-30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Route 72</td>
<td>Downtown San Jose to Senter &amp; Monterey via McLaughlin</td>
<td>First/Santa Clara</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Route 73</td>
<td>Downtown San Jose to Senter &amp; Monterey via Senter</td>
<td>First/Santa Clara</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Route 500</td>
<td>San Jose Diridon Station to Downtown San Jose</td>
<td>Santa Clara/Almaden</td>
<td>10-20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Route 522</td>
<td>Palo Alto Transit Center to Eastridge Transit Center</td>
<td>Santa Clara/First</td>
<td>15-20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Route 523</td>
<td>Berryessa BART to Lockheed Martin via De Anza College</td>
<td>San Carlos/Convention Center</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 17 Express (Route 970)</td>
<td>Downtown Santa Cruz / Scotts Valley to Downtown San Jose</td>
<td>Santa Clara/Almaden</td>
<td>55 - 90 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Approximate headways during peak commute periods.

VTA Light Rail Transit (LRT) Service
The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) currently operates the 42.2-mile VTA light rail line system extending from south San Jose through downtown to the northern areas of San Jose, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Mountain View and Sunnyvale. The service operates nearly from 5:00 AM to 9:00 PM with 30-minute headways.

The Green (Old Ironsides – Winchester) and Blue (Baypointe – Santa Teresa) LRT lines operate along San Carlos Street. The Convention Center LRT station platforms on San Carlos Street are located within walking distance, approximately 1,500 feet, of the project site. The Children’s Discovery Museum LRT station located south of the Woz Way/San Carlos Street intersection is served by the Blue LRT line and is located approximately 1,200 feet northwest of the project site. The San Jose Diridon station is located along the Green LRT line and serves as a transfer point to Caltrain, ACE, and Amtrak services.

Caltrain Service
Commuter rail service between San Francisco and Gilroy is provided by Caltrain, which currently operates 92 weekday trains that carry approximately 47,000 riders on an average weekday. The project site is located about ¾-mile from the San Jose Diridon station. The Diridon station provides 581 parking spaces, as well as 16 bike racks, 48 bike lockers, and 27 Bay Wheels bike share docks. Trains stop frequently at the Diridon station between 4:28 AM and 10:30 PM in the northbound direction, and between 6:27 AM and 1:41 AM in the southbound direction. Caltrain provides passenger train service seven days a week and provides extended service to Morgan Hill and Gilroy during commute hours.

Altamont Commuter Express Service (ACE)
ACE provides commuter rail service between Stockton, Tracy, Pleasanton, and San Jose during commute hours, Monday through Friday. Service is limited to two westbound trips in the morning and two eastbound trips with headways from 120 minutes to 140 minutes. ACE trains stop at the Diridon Station at 6:32 AM and 8:52 AM in the westbound direction, and at 3:35 PM and 5:35 PM in the eastbound direction.
Amtrak Service

Amtrak provides daily commuter passenger train service along the 170-mile Capitol Corridor between the Sacramento region and the Bay Area, with stops in San Jose, Santa Clara, Fremont, Hayward, Oakland, Emeryville, Berkeley, Richmond, Martinez, Suisun City, Davis, Sacramento, Roseville, Rocklin, and Auburn. The Capitol Corridor trains stop at the San Jose Diridon Station five times during the weekdays between approximately 6:55 AM and 5:59 PM in the westbound direction. In the eastbound direction, Amtrak stops at the Diridon Station five times during the weekdays between 7:37 AM and 9:05 PM.

General Plan Amendment Site-Specific Long-Range Analysis

The site-specific long-range traffic impacts resulting from the proposed 276 Woz Way site GPA were determined based on the MOEs and associated significance thresholds described in Chapter 3. The results of the site-specific GPA long-range analysis are described below.

Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population

The San José GP TDF model was used to project daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per service population, where service population is defined as the number of residents plus the number of employees citywide. This approach focuses on the VMT generated by new population and employment growth. VMT is calculated as the number of vehicle trips multiplied by the length of the trips in miles. As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), any increase in VMT per service population over the current GP conditions due to the proposed land use amendment is considered a significant impact.

As shown in Table 15, the citywide daily VMT would decrease slightly and the VMT per service population would remain unchanged with the proposed land use amendment when compared to the current GP. Therefore, the proposed 276 Woz Way GPA would result in a less than significant impact on the citywide daily VMT per service population.

Table 15
276 Woz Way GPA – Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Daily VMT</td>
<td>17,505,088</td>
<td>28,035,508</td>
<td>27,983,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Service Population</td>
<td>1,392,946</td>
<td>2,054,758</td>
<td>2,054,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Households</td>
<td>319,870</td>
<td>429,350</td>
<td>429,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Residents</td>
<td>1,016,043</td>
<td>1,303,108</td>
<td>1,303,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Jobs</td>
<td>376,903</td>
<td>751,650</td>
<td>751,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily VMT Per Service Population</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in VMT/Service Population over General Plan Conditions</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
GPA = General Plan Amendment
Service Population = Residents + Jobs
Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2019 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
Journey-to-Work Mode Share

The San José GP TDF model was used to calculate journey-to-work citywide mode share percentages. Journey-to-work mode share is the distribution of all daily work trips by travel mode. The modes of travel included in the TDF model are drive alone, carpool with two persons, carpool with three persons or more, transit (rail and bus), bike, and walk trips. Although work trips may occur at any time of the day, most of the work trips occur during typical peak commute periods (6:00 – 10:00 AM and 3:00 – 7:00 PM). As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), any increase in the journey-to-work drive alone mode share percentage over the current GP conditions due to the proposed land use amendment is considered a significant impact.

Table 16 summarizes the citywide journey-to-work mode share analysis results. Compared to the current Envision San José 2040 GP, the percentage of journey-to-work drive alone trips would decrease slightly as a result of the proposed GPA. Therefore, the proposed 276 Woz Way GPA would result in a less than significant impact on citywide journey-to-work drive alone mode share.

### Table 16
276 Woz Way GPA – Journey-to-Work Mode Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>753,264</td>
<td>79.69%</td>
<td>1,092,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool 2</td>
<td>85,496</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
<td>137,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool 3+</td>
<td>28,526</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>54,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>48,181</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>182,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>14,120</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>26,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>15,666</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>29,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase in Drive Alone Percentage over General Plan Conditions -0.12%

**Significant Impact?** No

**Notes:**
- 2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
- GPA = General Plan Amendment
- Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

Average Vehicle Speeds in Transit Priority Corridors

The San José GP TDF model was used to calculate the average vehicle travel speeds during the AM peak hour for the City’s 14 transit corridors that were evaluated in the Envision San José 2040 GP TIA. The analysis of transit priority corridor speeds was completed to assist with the assessment of whether the proposed land use amendment would cause a significant change in travel speeds on the transit priority corridors compared to the current GP. A transit corridor is a roadway segment identified as a Grand Boulevard in the Envision San José 2040 GP Land Use/Transportation Diagram. Grand Boulevards serve as major transportation corridors and, in most cases, are primary routes for VTA’s LRT, BRT, local buses, and other public transit vehicles. The travel speeds are calculated by dividing the segment distance by the vehicle travel time. As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), land use
amendments that result in a decrease in average travel speed on a transit corridor in the AM peak one-hour period when the average speed drops below 15 miles per hour (mph) or decreases by 25 percent (%) or more, or the average speed drops by one mph or more for a transit corridor with average speed below 15 mph when compared to the current GP conditions is considered a significant impact.

Table 17 presents the average vehicle speeds on the City’s 14 transit priority corridors (i.e., Grand Boulevard segments) during the AM peak-hour of traffic. When compared to the travel speeds under current GP conditions, the change in traffic resulting from the proposed land use amendment would have a minimal effect on the travel speeds in the transit corridors. The TDF model estimates decrease in travel speeds of 0.1 mph or less (or a change of 0.5% or less) on two corridors due to the proposed 276 Woz Way GPA. Travel speeds on the remaining corridors would improve slightly or remain unchanged when compared to the current GP. Therefore, the proposed 276 Woz Way GPA would result in a less than significant impact on the AM peak-hour average vehicle speeds on the transit priority corridors.

**Table 17**  
276 Woz Way GPA – AM Peak-Hour Vehicle Speeds (mph) for San José Transit Priority Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Priority Corridor</th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPA</th>
<th>% Change (GPplusGPA - GP)</th>
<th>Absolute Change (GPplusGPA - GP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Street from San Carlos Street to St. James Street</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock Avenue from Capitol Avenue to US 101</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Avenue from SR 17 to Meridian Avenue</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Avenue from South Milpitas Boulevard to Capitol Expressway</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Expressway from Capitol Avenue to Meridian Avenue</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Santa Clara Street from US 101 to Delmas Avenue</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Avenue from Park Avenue to Blossom Hill Road</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Road from Keyes Street to Metcalf Road</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North 1st Street from SR 237 to Keyes Street</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Street from Bascom Avenue to SR 87</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Creek Boulevard from Bascom Avenue to Tantau Avenue</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasman Drive from Lick Mill Boulevard to McCarthy Boulevard</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alameda from Alameda Way to Delmas Avenue</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West San Carlos Street from SR 87 to 2nd Street</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).  
GPA = General Plan Amendment  
Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
Impacts on Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Circulation

The Circulation Element of the Envision San José 2040 GP includes a set of balanced, long-range, multimodal transportation goals and policies that provide for a transportation network that is safe, efficient, and sustainable (minimizes environmental, financial, and neighborhood impacts). In combination with land use goals and policies that focus growth into areas served by transit, these transportation goals and policies are intended to improve multi-model accessibility to employment, housing, shopping, entertainment, schools, and parks and create a city where people are less reliant on driving to meet their daily needs. San José’s Transportation Goals, Policies, and Actions aim to:

- Establish circulation policies that increase bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel, while reducing motor vehicle trips, to increase the City’s share of travel by alternative transportation modes.
- Promote San José as a walking- and bicycling-first city by providing and prioritizing funding for projects that enhance and improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Included within the GP are a set of Goals and Policies to support a multimodal transportation system that gives priority to the mobility needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and public transit users while also providing for the safe and efficient movement of automobiles, buses, and trucks. Policies TR-2.1 through TR-2.11 provide specific policies to guide improvement to walking and bicycling. Such policies include the provision of continuous bicycle system, constructing sidewalks and crosswalks. Similarly, the Envision San José 2040 GP includes specific policies to maximize use of public transit (TR-3.1 through 3.4). As the 276 Woz Way GP site develops, the project should ensure that it is consistent with the Envision San José 2040 GP to provide safe, accessible and inter-connected pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and accommodate transit services (i.e., bus dugout) as new roadways are constructed. The impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities are less-than-significant.
7. Airport/Guadalupe Gardens (Site-Specific GPA Traffic Analysis)

This report presents the results of the long-range site-specific transportation analysis for the proposed Airport/Guadalupe Gardens General Plan Amendment (GP18-012). The purpose of the General Plan Amendment (GPA) transportation analysis is to assess the long-range impacts of the proposed land use amendment to the Airport/Guadalupe Gardens General Plan site on the citywide transportation system. The potential transportation impacts of the project were evaluated in accordance with the guidelines and thresholds set forth by the Envision San José 2040 General Plan (GP). In addition, a near term transportation analysis in conjunction with any future development permit applications consistent with the Envision San José 2040 GP will be required once a development application is submitted to the City.

General Plan Amendment Site Description

The project consists of amending the adopted land use designation of the Envision San José 2040 GP for the approximately 11.60-acre site is generally bounded by I-880 to the north, SR 87 to the east, Taylor Street to the south, and Coleman Avenue to the west. The GPA site location is presented on Figure 17. The adopted GP land use designation for the site is Open Space Parkland and Habitat. The proposed amendment involves changing the adopted land use to include 10 acres of Neighborhood Community/Commercial and 1.6 acres of combined Industrial/Commercial. A portion of the site is currently occupied by the Guadalupe Community Garden, and the remaining is vacant. The proposed land use change for development of the site would be consistent with the immediate and surrounding land uses.

The GPA traffic analysis guidelines, described in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook, Volume II (dated April 2018), under the Methodology for Transportation Network Modeling & Analysis section, provide a trip threshold for GP land use amendments that require a site-specific GPA analysis. With the exception of GPA sites located within the identified North San José, Evergreen, and South San José subareas, a proposed land use amendment that would result in an increase of more than 250 PM peak-hour trips to be generated by the subject site due to the proposed land use amendment would be required to prepare a site-specific GPA traffic analysis. The Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GPA site is not located within the special subareas. According to the TDF modeling results, the proposed amendment at the Airport/Guadalupe Gardens site would result 603 additional jobs on the site. The increase in jobs would result in an additional 365 AM and 576 PM peak-hour trips at the
Figure 17
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Airport/Guadalupe Gardens site when compared to the current GP land use designation (see Table 18). Therefore, a site-specific GPA traffic analysis is required for the proposed land use amendment. The GPA does not propose any changes to the city’s major transportation system and the transportation policies that were adopted in the Envision San José 2040 GP.

Table 18
Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GPA – Changes in Households, Jobs, and Peak-Hour Trips Due to Proposed GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>General Plan (Baseline)¹</th>
<th>General Plan Amendment²</th>
<th>Net Land Use Change</th>
<th>Net Peak-Hour Trip Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GP18-012 (Airport/Guadalupe Gardens)</td>
<td>18 138</td>
<td>18 741</td>
<td>0 603</td>
<td>365 576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: TOTHH = total number of households; TEMP = total number of jobs.
¹Total number of households and jobs under the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
²The buildout of the 2040 GP represents baseline conditions.
Outlined indicates GPA that results in an increase in peak hour trips greater than 250 PM trips and requires site-specific GPA traffic analysis.
Source: City of San Jose Planning Department, June 2020.
City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

Scope of the Study

The GPA analysis includes the evaluation of the potential for the proposed land use amendment to result in increased vehicle miles traveled, impacts to travel speeds on transit priority corridors, and impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. Impacts are evaluated based on the same measures of effectiveness (MOEs) and significance criteria utilized in the Envision San José 2040 GP TIA and described in Chapter 3 of this report. Traffic conditions were evaluated for the following traffic scenarios using the City of San José’s Traffic Demand Forecasting (TDF) model:

- **Projected Year 2015 Conditions**: The Projected Year 2015 Conditions represent a projection of transportation conditions in 2015 using the City’s GP TDF model. The roadway network also reflects the Year 2015 roadway network and transportation system.

- **Current 2040 General Plan Conditions**: Future traffic due to the current GP land uses is added to regional growth that can be reasonably expected to occur by 2040. Current 2040 GP conditions include the current roadway network as well as all transportation system improvements as identified in the current GP.

- **Proposed 2040 General Plan Amendment Conditions**: Current 2040 GP conditions with the proposed land use amendment for the Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GP site. Transportation conditions for the Proposed 2040 GP Amendment Conditions were evaluated relative to the currently adopted 2040 GP Conditions to determine any long-range traffic impacts.

Existing Conditions

This section describes the existing conditions for all of the major transportation facilities in the vicinity of the site, including the roadway network, transit service, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
**Existing Roadway Network**

Regional access to the project site is provided by the I-880 freeway and SR 87. Local site access is provided by Hedding Street, Taylor Street, Coleman Avenue, First Street, Spring Street, and Ruff Drive. The freeways and local roadways are described below.

**I-880** is a north/south freeway providing regional access from East Bay cities to San Jose, where it ultimately becomes SR 17 and extends into Santa Cruz. Within the vicinity of the project site, I-880 primarily is a six-lane freeway. Connection from I-880 to the project site is provided via a full interchange at Coleman Avenue.

**SR 87** is primarily a six-lane freeway (four mixed-flow lanes and two HOV lanes) that is aligned in a north-south orientation within the project vicinity. SR 87 begins at its interchange with SR 85 and extends northward, terminating at its junction with US 101. Connection from SR-87 to the project site is provided via a full interchange at Taylor Street.

**Hedding Street** is generally an east-west roadway that extends from I-880 to US 101. Hedding Street generally provides one lane in each direction with buffered bike lanes. Access to the project site from Hedding Street is provided via Ruff Drive and Coleman Avenue.

**Taylor Street** is generally an east-west roadway that extends from The Alameda to US 101. Taylor Street has two lanes in each direction west of First Street and one lane in each direction east of First Street. Taylor Street has striped bike lanes between Walnut Street and First Street. Access to the project site from Taylor Street is provided via Coleman Avenue and Hedding Street.

**Coleman Avenue** is a four- to six-lane arterial that begins at its intersection with De La Cruz Boulevard in Santa Clara and terminates where it becomes North Market Street in San Jose. Coleman Avenue has bicycle lanes on both sides of the street in the project vicinity with the exception of the segment between Taylor Street and Hedding Street. Access to the project site from Coleman Avenue is provided via Hedding Street and Taylor Street.

**First Street** is generally a two- to four-lane north-south roadway in the vicinity of the project site that extends from the north San Jose area through downtown San Jose. The Green and Blue LRT lines run along the middle of First Street from downtown San Jose to Tasman Drive in north San Jose. Access to the project site from First Street is provided via Hedding Street and Taylor Street.

**Spring Street** is a two-lane north-south roadway that bisects the project site and extends northward from Taylor Street and terminates just before I-880. Access to the project site from Spring Street is provided via Taylor Street and Hedding Street.

**Ruff Drive** is a two-lane north-south roadway that begins at Hedding Street and provides direct access to a portion of the project site.

**Existing Bicycle Facilities**

Class II bicycle facilities are provided along Hedding Street and Taylor Street (along the north project frontage). Additional Class II bicycle facilities are provided along the following roadways within the project area:

- Coleman Avenue, between SR 87 and Taylor Street; north of Hedding Street
- Taylor Street, between Walnut Street and First Street
- Stockton Avenue, between railroad track and The Alameda
- Hedding Street, along the entire length of the street
Designated Class III bike routes with “sharrow” or shared-lane pavement markings and signage are provided along the following roadways:

- San Pedro Street, between Hedding Street and Coleman Avenue
- Mission Street, between Guadalupe Parkway and Seventh Street

The existing bicycle facilities are shown on Figure 18.

**Guadalupe River Park Trail**

The Guadalupe River multi-use trail system runs through the City of San Jose along the Guadalupe River and is shared between pedestrians and bicyclists and separated from motor vehicle traffic. The Guadalupe River trail is an 11-mile Class I bikeway from Curtner Avenue in the south to Alviso in the north. This trail system can be accessed via Hedding Street, west of SR 87.

**Bike Share Services**

The Bay Wheels bike share program allows users to rent and return bicycles at various locations. Bike share bikes can be rented and returned at designated docking stations throughout the Downtown area. These services provide electric bicycles with GPS self-locking systems that allow for rental and drop-off anywhere. A bike share station is located approximately ½ of a mile from the project near the Autumn Street/Coleman Avenue intersection.

**Existing Pedestrian Facilities**

Pedestrian facilities in the study area (shown in Figure 19) consist of sidewalks along all the surrounding streets. Crosswalks and pedestrian signal heads are located at all signalized intersections within the project area, including the intersections of Coleman Avenue/Hedding Street, Coleman Avenue/Taylor Street, and Ruff Drive/Hedding Street.

ADA compliant ramps are located at all crosswalks at the Coleman Avenue/Hedding Street, Spring Street/Hedding Street, Spring Street/Taylor Street, and Walnut Street/Taylor Street. However, ADA compliant ramps are missing at the following locations in the project vicinity:

- Ruff Drive and Hedding Street – southwest corner
- Coleman Avenue and Asbury Street – southwest corner
- Coleman Avenue and Taylor Street – northwest corner

As mentioned previously, pedestrians from the project site may use the Guadalupe River Trail located just west of SR 87 to access destinations between Downtown San Jose and North San Jose.

Sidewalks are missing on the east side of Coleman Avenue north of Hedding Street and on the north side of Hedding Street west of Coleman Avenue.

Overall, the existing sidewalks provide good pedestrian connectivity and safe routes to the surrounding pedestrian destinations.

**Existing Transit Services**

Existing transit services in the study area are provided by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority VTA. The VTA transit services are described below and shown on Figure 20.

**Bus Service**

The project area is served by only one Frequent Route 61, which runs from the Sierra Road/Piedmont Road intersection to the Good Samaritan Hospital and operates from 7:15 AM to 9:00 PM on weekdays.
Figure 18
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Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GPA – Existing Pedestrian Facilities
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with 20- to 40-minute headways during the commute period. Frequent Route 61 has bus stops near the project site along Hedding Street and Coleman Avenue.

**VTA Light Rail Transit (LRT) Service**

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) currently operates the 42.2-mile VTA light rail line system extending from south San Jose through downtown to the northern areas of San Jose, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Mountain View and Sunnyvale. The service operates nearly from 5:00 AM to 9:00 PM with 30-minute headways.

The Green (Old Ironsides to Winchester) and Blue (Baypointe to Santa Teresa) LRT lines operate along First Street in the project vicinity. The project site is located approximately ¾ of a mile west of the Civic Center Light Rail Transit (LRT) Station located along First Street, between Taylor Street and Hedding Street.

**General Plan Amendment Site-Specific Long-Range Analysis**

The site-specific long-range traffic impacts resulting from the proposed Airport/Guadalupe Gardens site GPA were determined based on the MOEs and associated significance thresholds described in Chapter 3. The results of the site-specific GPA long-range analysis are described below.

**Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population**

The San José GP TDF model was used to project daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per service population, where service population is defined as the number of residents plus the number of employees citywide. This approach focuses on the VMT generated by new population and employment growth. VMT is calculated as the number of vehicle trips multiplied by the length of the trips in miles. As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), any increase in VMT per service population over the current GP conditions due to the proposed land use amendment is considered a significant impact.

As shown in Table 19, the citywide daily VMT would decrease slightly and the VMT per service population would remain unchanged with the proposed land use amendment when compared to the current GP. Therefore, the proposed Airport/Guadalupe Gardens would result in a less than significant impact on the citywide daily VMT per service population.

**Journey-to-Work Mode Share**

The San José GP TDF model was used to calculate journey-to-work citywide mode share percentages. Journey-to-work mode share is the distribution of all daily work trips by travel mode. The modes of travel included in the TDF model are drive alone, carpool with two persons, carpool with three persons or more, transit (rail and bus), bike, and walk trips. Although work trips may occur at any time of the day, most of the work trips occur during typical peak commute periods (6:00 – 10:00 AM and 3:00 – 7:00 PM). As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), any increase in the journey-to-work drive alone mode share percentage over the current GP conditions due to the proposed land use amendment is considered a significant impact.

Table 20 summarizes the citywide journey-to-work mode share analysis results. Compared to the current Envision San José 2040 GP, the percentage of journey-to-work drive alone trips would decrease slightly as a result of the proposed GPA. Therefore, the proposed Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GPA would result in a less than significant impact on citywide journey-to-work drive alone mode share.
### Table 19
Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GPA – Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Daily VMT</td>
<td>17,505,088</td>
<td>28,035,508</td>
<td>28,017,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Service Population</td>
<td>1,392,946</td>
<td>2,054,758</td>
<td>2,054,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Households</td>
<td>319,870</td>
<td>429,350</td>
<td>429,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Residents</td>
<td>1,016,043</td>
<td>1,303,108</td>
<td>1,303,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Jobs</td>
<td>376,903</td>
<td>751,650</td>
<td>751,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily VMT Per Service Population</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase in VMT/Service Population over General Plan Conditions**

-0.01

**Significant Impact?**

No

**Notes:**

- 2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
- GPA = General Plan Amendment
- Service Population = Residents + Jobs
- Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

### Table 20
Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GPA – Journey-to-Work Mode Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>753,264</td>
<td>79.69%</td>
<td>1,092,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool 2</td>
<td>85,496</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
<td>137,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool 3+</td>
<td>28,526</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>54,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>48,181</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>182,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>14,120</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>26,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>15,666</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>29,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase in Drive Alone Percentage over General Plan Conditions**

-0.04%

**Significant Impact?**

No

**Notes:**

- 2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
- GPA = General Plan Amendment
- Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
Average Vehicle Speeds in Transit Priority Corridors

The San José GP TDF model was used to calculate the average vehicle travel speeds during the AM peak hour for the City’s 14 transit corridors that were evaluated in the Envision San José 2040 GP TIA. The analysis of transit priority corridor speeds was completed to assist with the assessment of whether the proposed land use amendment would cause a significant change in travel speeds on the transit priority corridors compared to the current GP. A transit corridor is a roadway segment identified as a Grand Boulevard in the Envision San José 2040 GP Land Use/Transportation Diagram. Grand Boulevards serve as major transportation corridors and, in most cases, are primary routes for VTA’s LRT, BRT, local buses, and other public transit vehicles. The travel speeds are calculated by dividing the segment distance by the vehicle travel time. As defined in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook (Thresholds of Significance for General Plan Amendments, Table 11), land use amendments that result in a decrease in average travel speed on a transit corridor in the AM peak one-hour period when the average speed drops below 15 miles per hour (mph) or decreases by 25 percent (%) or more, or the average speed drops by one mph or more for a transit corridor with average speed below 15 mph when compared to the current GP conditions is considered a significant impact.

Table 21 presents the average vehicle speeds on the City’s 14 transit priority corridors (i.e., Grand Boulevard segments) during the AM peak-hour of traffic. When compared to the travel speeds under current GP conditions, the change in traffic resulting from the proposed land use amendment would have a minimal effect on the travel speeds in the transit corridors. The TDF model estimates decrease in travel speeds of 0.2 mph or less (or a change of 0.7% or less) on three corridors due to the proposed Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GPA. Travel speeds on the remaining corridors would improve slightly or remain unchanged when compared to the current GP. Therefore, the proposed Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GPA would result in a less than significant impact on the AM peak-hour average vehicle speeds on the transit priority corridors.

Impacts on Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Circulation

The Circulation Element of the Envision San José 2040 GP includes a set of balanced, long-range, multimodal transportation goals and policies that provide for a transportation network that is safe, efficient, and sustainable (minimizes environmental, financial, and neighborhood impacts). In combination with land use goals and policies that focus growth into areas served by transit, these transportation goals and policies are intended to improve multi-model accessibility to employment, housing, shopping, entertainment, schools, and parks and create a city where people are less reliant on driving to meet their daily needs. San José’s Transportation Goals, Policies, and Actions aim to:

- Establish circulation policies that increase bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel, while reducing motor vehicle trips, to increase the City’s share of travel by alternative transportation modes.
- Promote San José as a walking- and bicycling-first city by providing and prioritizing funding for projects that enhance and improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Included within the GP are a set of Goals and Policies to support a multimodal transportation system that gives priority to the mobility needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and public transit users while also providing for the safe and efficient movement of automobiles, buses, and trucks. Policies TR-2.1 through TR-2.11 provide specific policies to guide improvement to walking and bicycling. Such policies include the provision of continuous bicycle system, constructing sidewalks and crosswalks. Similarly, the Envision San José 2040 GP includes specific policies to maximize use of public transit (TR-3.1 through 3.4). As the Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GP site develops, the project should ensure that it is consistent with the Envision San José 2040 GP to provide safe, accessible and inter-connected pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and accommodate transit services (i.e., bus dugout) as new roadways are constructed. The impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities are less-than-significant.
## Table 21
Airport/Guadalupe Gardens GPA – AM Peak-Hour Vehicle Speeds (mph) for San José Transit Priority Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Priority Corridor</th>
<th>Base Year (2015)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan (Baseline)</th>
<th>2040 General Plan Plus GPA</th>
<th>% Change (GPplusGPA - GP)</th>
<th>Absolute Change (GPplusGPA - GP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from San Carlos Street to St. James Street</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock Avenue</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Capitol Avenue to US 101</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Avenue</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from South Milpitas Boulevard to Capitol Expressway</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Santa Clara Street</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from US 101 to Delmas Avenue</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Road</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Keyes Street to Metcalf Road</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Creek Boulevard</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Bascom Avenue to Tantau Avenue</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasman Drive</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Lick Mill Boulevard to McCarthy Boulevard</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Alameda Way to Delmas Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West San Carlos Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from SR 87 to 2nd Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- 2040 General Plan (Baseline) = Buildout conditions of the adopted Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (GP).
- GPA = General Plan Amendment
- Source: City of San Jose Travel Forecasting Model runs completed July 2020 by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
6. Conclusions

This report presents the results of the long-range traffic impact analysis for the proposed City of San José 2020 General Plan Amendments (project). The project consists of amending the current adopted land use designations of the Envision San José 2040 GP for seven sites within the City of San José. The purpose of the GPAs traffic analysis is to assess the long-range impacts of the amendments on the citywide transportation system. The analysis includes evaluation of increased vehicle miles traveled, impacts to travel speeds on transit priority corridors, and impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. Impacts were evaluated based on the same measures of effectiveness (MOEs) and significance criteria utilized in the Envision San José 2040 GPA TIA.

This study includes an evaluation of the cumulative impacts of all seven GPA sites. The study also includes the required site-specific GPA traffic analysis for three GPA sites. Individual development projects also will be required to complete a near term traffic analysis in conjunction with any future development permit applications consistent with the Envision San José 2040 GP once a development application is submitted to the City.

Cumulative GPA Long-Range Traffic Impacts

Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population

When compared to the current GP, the proposed land use adjustments would not result in an increase in citywide VMT per service population. Therefore, cumulatively, the 2020 GPAs would result in a less than significant impact on citywide daily VMT per service population. It is important to note that the VMT per service population is based on raw model output and does not reflect the implementation of adopted GP policies and goals that would further reduce VMT by increased use of non-auto modes of travel.

Journey-to-Work Mode Share

The proposed land use adjustments will not result in an increase of drive alone trips when compared to the current GP conditions. Therefore, cumulatively, the 2020 GPAs would result in a less than significant impact on citywide journey-to-work mode share.

Average Vehicle Speeds in Transit Priority Corridors

The proposed land use adjustments will not result in a decrease in travel speeds of greater than one mph or 25 percent on any of the 14 transit priority corridors when compared to current GP conditions.
Therefore, cumulatively, the 2020 GPAs would result in a less than significant impact on the AM peak-hour average vehicle speeds on the transit priority corridors.

### Site-Specific GPA Traffic Analysis

Per GPA traffic analysis guidelines, described in the City of San José Transportation Analysis Handbook, Volume II (dated April 2018), under the Methodology for Transportation Network Modeling & Analysis section, a proposed land use amendment that would result in a net increase of more than 250 PM peak-hour trips due to increased households or employment is required to prepare a site-specific GPA traffic analysis, with the exception of GPA sites located within the identified North San José, Evergreen, and South San José subareas. All of the seven GPA sites are located outside of the three special subareas and therefore are subject to the 250 PM peak-hour trip threshold. The proposed land use amendments for the following three amendment sites would result in a net increase of more than 250 PM peak-hour trips and require site-specific analyses:

- GP19-012/C19-042 (329 Gifford Avenue)
- P19-008/H20-004 (276 Woz Way)
- GP18-012 (Airport/Guadalupe Gardens)

The results of the analyses show that the additional traffic generated by each of the three individual GPA sites that required site-specific analysis would not cause any additional transportation impacts beyond those identified for the adopted Envision San José 2040 GP. Therefore, each of the individual GPA sites would result in a less than significant impact on the citywide roadway system.

### Impacts on Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Circulation

#### Transit Services or Facilities

The proposed GPAs land use adjustments would not result in a change to the existing and planned roadway network that would have an adverse effect on existing or planned transit facilities. Therefore, the proposed 2020 GPAs land use adjustments would not substantially disrupt existing or interfere with planned transit services or facilities.

#### Bicycle Facilities

The proposed GPAs land use adjustments would not result in a change to the existing and planned roadway network that would affect existing or planned bicycle facilities. Therefore, the proposed 2020 GPA land use adjustments would not substantially disrupt existing or interfere with planned bicycle facilities; conflict or create inconsistencies with adopted bicycle plans, guidelines, policies, or standards; and provide insecure and unsafe bicycle parking in adequate proportion to anticipated demand.

#### Pedestrian Facilities

The proposed GPAs land use adjustments would not result in a change to the existing and planned roadway network that would affect existing or planned pedestrian facilities. Therefore, the proposed 2020 GPA land use adjustments would not substantially disrupt existing or interfere with planned pedestrian facilities; create inconsistencies with adopted pedestrian plans, guidelines, policies, or standards; and provide accessible pedestrian facilities that would not meet current ADA best practices.
Consistency with General Plan Polices

The City of San José’s Transportation Policies contained in the General Plan are intended to do the following:

1. Establish circulation policies that increase bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel, while reducing motor vehicle trips, to increase the City’s share of travel by alternative transportation modes; and

2. Promote San José as a walking- and bicycling-first city by providing and prioritizing funding for projects that enhance and improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Implementation of the General Plan Transportation Policies can help to promote a multi-modal transportation system and stimulate the use of transit, bicycle, and walk as practical modes of transportation in the City, which ultimately will improve operating speeds in the City’s 14 transit priority corridors. An enhanced multi-modal transportation system can reduce reliance on the automobile and decreasing the amount of vehicle travel, specifically journey-to-work drive alone trips.

Based on the result of the analysis, the 2020 GPAs are consistent with the City of San José GP transportation policies, as they are projected to increase transit travel, while slightly reducing motor vehicle (drive alone) trips and slightly improving operating speeds along some of the City’s 14 transit priority corridors, when compared to the current GP conditions.