INITIAL STUDY

James Ranch Expansion Project

County of Santa Clara

January 22, 2014
The proposed project would involve construction of new facilities at the William F. James Boys Ranch, an existing minimum security juvenile detention facility located 19050 Malaguerra Avenue in Morgan Hill (see Figure 1). The new facilities would include an admissions / treatment / visitors center, a gymnasium building, and a dormitory as well as related infrastructure, such as parking spaces, driveways, covered walkways, and landscaping. The total project footprint would be 380,000 square feet, including about 50,000 square feet of interior space. The proposed project would also include demolition of the existing dormitory following completion and occupancy of the new one. The admissions / treatment / visitors center would be constructed on the southern portion of the area where the dormitory to be demolished is located. Figure 2 shows the locations of the proposed new structures in relation to existing structures and other site features. Access to the facility via Sycamore Avenue would continue to be through the security gate system accessible from Malaguerra Avenue at the west end of the property.

The conceptual drainage plan includes a bioswale adjacent to the new parking lot to capture stormwater runoff from the additional impervious surfaces resulting from the new building as well as paved walkways and fire lane. The proposed landscape plan includes planting about 30 mostly native tree species and as well as a variety of drought-tolerant shrubs.

The current James Ranch facility has a capacity of 84 beds. The expanded facility would accommodate up to 108 beds at full capacity. Currently, the County has no plans to house more than the 84 juveniles that can be accommodated at the existing facility. Operating at full capacity would require four new staff positions in addition to the approximately 80 staff members who operate the facility during a 24-hour day. A portion of the funding for construction would come from the State of California because construction of the facilities is related to SB 81, which shifts key responsibilities for managing juvenile offenders to the counties.

Environmental Setting

On-Site Land Use
James Ranch is located on a narrow plain between Coyote Creek and Pigeon Point Ridge, which is part of the Diablo Range. The current facilities are concentrated in the northwestern portion of the property and include a parking lot, an administration building, office, kitchen, classroom, shop / art buildings, a recreational building, basketball courts, a pool, a warehouse, and various buildings associated with maintenance. The rest of the property is open field with a few scattered trees. Land cover for the non-developed portion of the project site is classified under the Santa Clara County Habitat Conservation Plan as “Grain, Row-crop, Hay and Pasture, Disked / Short-Term Fallowed.” The property is surrounded by a perimeter fence. The City of Morgan Hill’s General Plan designation and zoning for the property is Open Space.

Surrounding Land Uses
The County-owned property is bordered by Anderson Lake County Park on the north and west, the Santa Clara County Justice Training Center to the east, and Coyote Creek to the south. A residential subdivision is located on the south side of Coyote Creek. The nearest residence is approximately 450 feet from the property’s perimeter fence. The project site is located approximately 1 mile southwest of Anderson Lake and 1 mile northeast of Highway 101. No airports or schools are located in the vicinity.
Figure 1 – Project Location
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Agriculture / Forest Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Biological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Geology / Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Hydrology / Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Population / Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Resources / Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Transportation / Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Utilities / Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Printed name: ___________________________ For: ___________________________
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources along a designated scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) If subject to ASA, be generally in non-compliance with the Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) If within a Design Review Zoning District for purposes of viewshed protection (d, -d1, -d2), conflict with applicable General Plan policies or Zoning Ordinance provisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SETTING:

James Ranch is located on a narrow plain between Coyote Creek and foothills of the Diablo Range below Anderson Reservoir. The elevation of the project site is approximately 400 feet above sea level, which is slightly higher than elevation of the valley floor. Along Coyote Creek on the south side of the project site is an approximately 200-foot-wide riparian corridor. No state designated scenic highways are located in the vicinity of the project site, and the nearest County-designated scenic road is Dunne Ave, which is located on the east side of Anderson Reservoir, between 2 and 3 miles to the southeast.

DISCUSSION:

a-d)

Less Than Significant. Because the project site is at the same elevation as the surrounding area and screened by the mature trees of the Coyote Creek riparian corridor, it is not visible and therefore would not be considered a scenic vista. No state designated scenic highways are located in the vicinity of the project site, and the nearest County-designated scenic road is Dunne Ave, which is located on the east side of Anderson Reservoir, between 2 and 3 miles to the southeast. The proposed new buildings would be adjacent to and blend in with the existing campus and would therefore not degrade the visual character of the site. The proposed new buildings would have lighting for nighttime security, but lighting fixtures would be shielded and downward facing to prevent light from spilling onto neighboring properties. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.
No Impact. The project site is not subject to Architecture and Site Approval and is not located in a Design Review District.

MITIGATION:

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert 10 or more acres of farmland classified as prime in the report Soils of Santa Clara County (Class I, II) to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with an existing Williamson Act Contract or the County’s Williamson Act Ordinance (Section C13 of County Ordinance Code)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Conflict with existing zone for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SETTING:

The project site is a mix of built-up land and open field. The field is kept in a grassland / hay mix, which is periodically disked. The property is not used for agricultural production.
DISCUSSION:

a-f)

No Impact. The portion of the project site where construction is proposed is classified by the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as “Other Land.” Therefore, the proposed project would not convert farmland classified as prime to non-agricultural use. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. It is not forest land or zoned for Timberland Production.

MITIGATION:

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. AIR QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? |
| 5,29, 30 |

SETTING:

The proposed project is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), which regulates air pollutants, including those that may be generated by construction and operation of development projects. These so-called criteria pollutants include reactive organic gases, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter (PM). BAAQMD also regulates toxic air contaminants (fine particulate matter), long-term exposure to which is linked with respiratory conditions and increased risk of cancer. Major sources of toxic air contaminants in the Bay Area include major automobile and truck transportation corridors (e.g., freeways and expressways) and stationary sources (e.g., factories, refineries, power plants).
DISCUSSION:

a-d)

**Less Than Significant.** If the expanded juvenile detention center were operated at the ultimate capacity of 108 beds, an additional 4 staff members would commute to the facility at various times during each 24-hour day. These vehicle trips would contribute emissions of criteria pollutants, such as nitrogen dioxide and reactive organic gases. BAAQMD has published screening criteria for operational criteria pollutants for different land use types. The BAAQMD list of land use types does not include correctional facilities. Because James Ranch includes beds for juveniles who do not generally leave during their confinement period as well as staff who operate the facility, the land use type that most closely matches the expanded facility is hospital.

The BAAQMD screening threshold for this land use is 334 beds, which is well above the size of the expansion, which is 24 beds. Construction screening size for criteria pollutants for this land use is 337 beds, which is also well above the size of the expansion. Therefore, construction and operation of the facility would not violate air quality standards, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of any source of toxic air contaminants, such as freeways.

**MITIGATION:**

None required.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. <strong>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</strong></th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOULD THE PROJECT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td>1, 7, 17b, 17o,</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 California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td>3,7, 8a, 17b, 17e, 22d, 22e, 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1Although the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines that contain these screening level sizes have been overturned in court, the County has determined that these thresholds are based on substantial evidence, as identified in Appendix D of the Guidelines, and has therefore incorporated them into this Initial Study.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or tributary to an already impaired water body, as defined by section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ 3, 7, 17n, 33

d) Have a substantial adverse effect on oak woodland habitat as defined by Oak Woodlands Conservation Law (conversion/loss of oak woodlands) – Public Resource Code 21083.4? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 31, 32

e) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ 1, 7, 17b, 17o

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ 3, 4, 17l

g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources:
   i) Tree Preservation Ordinance [Section C16]? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ 1, 3, 31, 32
   ii) Wetland Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 25-30]? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ 3, 8a
   iii) Riparian Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 31-41]? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ 3, 8a,

**SETTING:**

James Ranch is located on a narrow plain between Coyote Creek and foothills of the Diablo Range below Anderson Reservoir. The site is a mix of built-up land and open field. The field is kept in a grassland / hay mix, which is periodically disked.

**DISCUSSION:**

a-b) 

**Less Than Significant.** There are no mapped occurrences of listed candidate, sensitive, or special status species or their habitat on the property, according to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). An area on the northern edge of the property is potential habitat for Opler’s longhorn moth (Adela opleralla), which is not listed. Habitat for Bay Checkerspot butterfly (Euphydryas editha bayensis) is mapped in an area between 400 and 700 feet north of the property line. The area adjacent to the northern property line has been designated as the Kirby Unit of Bay Checkerspot butterfly, which is listed as Threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act. However, the proposed expansion site is located more than 300 feet south of the north property line, on the south side of the already developed campus. A strip of riparian woodland is located in an approximately 50-foot wide by 500-foot long area on the south property line, adjacent to the Coyote Creek riparian corridor. However, the proposed construction site is located a minimum of 100 feet north of this area. Construction of the proposed expansion would not affect these habitats.
No Impact. The project site contains no wetlands or designated oak woodland habitat. Two small non-native trees would be removed from the construction area. These trees are not protected by the County’s tree preservation ordinance due to their small size. Because the expansion would avoid the Coyote Creek riparian corridor, the proposed project 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. The project site is within the Santa Clara County Habitat Permit Area and is designated “Private Development Covered.” The proposed expansion is therefore a covered project, and habitat conservation plan fees would be paid based on the size of the final developed area of the proposed expansion.

MITIGATION:

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, or the County's Historic Preservation Ordinance (Section 17 of County Ordinance Code) – i.e. relocation, alterations or demolition of historic resources?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SETTING:

James Ranch is located on a narrow plain between Coyote Creek and foothills of the Diablo Range below Anderson Reservoir. The location of the dormitory proposed to be demolished is shown on Figure 2. See further discussion below for further Historical and Archaeological environmental setting.
DISCUSSION:

a)

**Less Than Significant.** The proposed project would include demolition of the existing dormitory following completion and occupancy of the new one. The admissions / treatment / visitors center would be constructed on the southern portion of the area where the dormitory to be demolished is located. Archaeological Resource Management of San Jose conducted a historical resources evaluation of the existing James Ranch Dormitory, which included a State Historic Resources Evaluation form (DPR 523) for the structure and an evaluation of the structures based on the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historic Resources. The evaluation is contained in Appendix A of the Initial Study. Based upon the results of this investigation, it was determined that the James Ranch Dormitory, which was constructed in 1952, does not appear to be historically significant. The structure has no known associations with persons, events, or patterns of importance. The structure was not found eligible for inclusion in either the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). This impact is less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

b-d)

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.** Due to the possibility that significant buried cultural resources might be found during construction for an earlier project at James Ranch, a records search and archaeological field reconnaissance was conducted by Archaeological Consulting in November 2002 for the *William F. James Boys Ranch and Harold Holden Ranch Lighting Upgrade and Building Improvements Project Mitigated Negative Declaration* (EMC Planning Group Inc. 2002) to determine if any archaeological resources would be encountered at the project site. Due to the nature of cultural resources, this investigation is applicable to the proposed project. The following discussion includes the results of the records search and field reconnaissance performed for the project proposed in 2002 and subsequently implemented.

**Records Search.** Archaeological Consulting conducted a background search for the proposed project to determine if there are any previously recorded archaeological resources within the project area or in the immediate vicinity and whether the area has been included within any previous archaeological research or reconnaissance projects. The background records search included an examination of the archaeological records, maps, and project files of the Northwest Regional Information Center of the California Archaeological Inventory located at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California. Four prehistoric and three historic archaeological sites were uncovered during the records search within a kilometer of the project site. Three of the prehistoric sites were located along the south bank of Coyote Creek, immediately across from the project site.

The project site is located within the currently recognized ethnographic territory of the Costanoan (Ohlone) linguistic group. The Ohlone group followed a general hunting and gathering subsistence pattern with partial dependence on the natural acorn crop. Habitation was considered semi-sedentary and occupation sites are expected most often at the confluence of streams, other areas of similar topography along streams, or in the vicinity of streams. Also, resource gathering and processing areas, and associated temporary campsites, are frequently
found on the coast and in other locations containing resources utilized by the group. Factors which influence the location of these sites include the presence of suitable exposures of rock or bedrock for mortars or other milling activities, ecotones, the presence of specific resources (oak groves, marshes, quarries, game trails, trade routes, etc.), proximity to water, and the availability of shelter. Temporary camps or other activity areas can also be found along ridges or other travel corridors.

**Field Reconnaissance.** Archaeological Consulting conducted a field reconnaissance on November 20 and 26, 2002 for the *William F. James Boys Ranch and Harold Holden Ranch Lighting Upgrade and Building Improvements Project Mitigated Negative Declaration* (EMC Planning Group Inc. 2002). The survey consisted of a “general surface reconnaissance”, which could be expected to contain visible cultural resources and could be viewed without major vegetation removal. This report can be viewed at the Santa Clara County Facility and Fleet offices. The results are summarized below.

None of the materials frequently associated with prehistoric cultural resources in this area (shell fragments, dark midden soil, fire-altered rock, bones or bone fragments, flaked of ground stone, etc.) were noted during the focused field survey at the lighting upgrade and building improvements project sites. The surface soil ranged from brownish to reddish-brown silty clay at project areas on the James Ranch. The surface soils contained native pebbles and soil in the area of the James Ranch north of the buildings containing copious angled fragments. Hand augering in the James Ranch site produced no evidence of prehistoric cultural resources. The soil became a dense clay with larger rocks with increased depth in the profile. Two of the auger holes were obstructed by very dense clay while the other three encountered impassible rock.

The proposed project is anticipated to involve grading for foundations of the proposed buildings. The proposed project is located in the vicinity of the areas surveyed for the lighting upgrade and building improvements project and no surface evidence of potentially sensitive cultural resources was discovered during surveys for that project. However, if significant buried cultural resources are discovered during construction activities, this would be considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**MITIGATION:**

- Due to the possibility that significant buried cultural resources may be found during construction, the County will ensure that this language is included in all construction contracts in compliance with Section B6-16 of the Santa Clara County Ordinance:

  "If historical or unique archaeological resources are accidentally discovered during construction, work shall be halted at a minimum of 200 feet from the find and the area shall be staked off. The County shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission to arrange for an immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist shall determine whether or not the site is a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(a). If it is determined that the site is a historical resource, the County shall refer to the provisions of CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5 and the provisions of section 15126.4 of the Public Resources Code to determine the significant environmental effects of the project on this historical resource. If the archaeological site does not meet the criteria defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(a), but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource in Public Resources Code section 21083.2, the preferred project site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of this section. If it is
found that the project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the County shall require that reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. Some of the measures to be taken in the event of a discovery include: planning future construction to avoid the archaeological site; deeding archaeological sites into permanent conservation easements; capping or covering archaeological site with a layer of soil before building on the sites; and/or planning parks, greenspace or other open space to incorporate the archaeological sites in the site plan.”

- In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains during earth moving activities, the following language shall be included in all construction contracts in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e):

  “If human remains are found during construction there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the coroner of the County is contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may then make recommendations to the County for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance if: a) the Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission; b) the descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or c) the County rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the County.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
<td>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</td>
<td>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td>6, 17c, 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td>6, 17c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td>6, 17c, 17n, 18b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td>6, 17L, 118b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td>6, 14, 23, 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3, 17c, 23, 24, 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the report, *Soils of Santa Clara County*, creating substantial risks to life or property?  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>14, 23, 24,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3, 6, 23, 24,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Cause substantial compaction or over-covering of soil either on-site or off-site?  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) Cause substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2, 3, 6, 17j, 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SETTING:**

James Ranch is located on a narrow plain between Coyote Creek and Pigeon Point Ridge, which is part of the Diablo Range. Anderson Reservoir is located to the northeast, behind the ridge. The current facilities are concentrated in the northeastern portion of the property and include a parking lot, an administration building, office, kitchen, classroom, shop / art buildings, a recreational building, basketball courts, a pool, a warehouse, and various buildings associated with maintenance. The rest of the property is open field with a few scattered trees.

Jensen-Van Lienden Associates, Inc. conducted geotechnical and geologic investigations of the project site in 2010 that included soil borings and excavation and logging of exploratory trenches across the property. The investigation found that, consistent with geologic mapping, the site is underlain by alluvial soils. The soils mostly consist of silty sand and clayey sand containing numerous rounded cobbles (up to approximately 18 inches in diameter). These soils varied from medium dense to very dense and contained varying amounts of silt and minor amounts of clay. A layer of loose brown sandy silt approximately 5 feet deep is located on the western side of the project site, where construction would occur. No groundwater was encountered even at the deepest borings (32 feet below ground surface).

**DISCUSSION:**

a-c)  

Less Than Significant. The site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Portions of the site are within a County fault rupture zone and State and County liquefaction and landslide hazard zones. However, the geotechnical investigation found no evidence of active faults across the area of proposed construction. Intense ground shaking would be expected at the site during the life of the project. Because the upper layer of loose brown sandy silt located in the area of construction would be vulnerable to consolidation under the loads of the buildings during a ground shaking event, the consultant has recommended over excavation and compaction of this layer beneath the proposed new dormitory building. This recommendation would be incorporated into the construction plan for the project. Erosion control measures would also be part of the construction plan in order to minimize soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Landslides have been mapped on the hillside (Pigeon Point Ridge) above the property, but they are not considered
active. Jensen-Van Lienden Associates concluded that even if landsliding were to occur, the proposed construction site is too far away to be affected.

d-g)

**No Impact.** The project site contains no expansive soils. James Ranch is access to a sanitary sewer system; therefore, no septic system would be required to support the proposed expansion. Grading would be conditioned to prevent compaction or over-covering of soil. The project site is generally flat, and construction would not involve a significant change in the site topography.

**MITIGATION:**

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SETTING:**

Given the overwhelming scope of global climate change, it is not anticipated that a single development project would have an individually discernible effect on global climate change. It is more appropriate to conclude that the greenhouse gas emissions generated by the proposed project would combine with emissions across the state, nation, and globe to cumulatively contribute to global climate change. The primary GHG associated with development projects is carbon dioxide, which is directly generated by fuel combustion (vehicle trips, use of natural gas for buildings) and indirectly generated by use of electricity.

**DISCUSSION:**

a-b)

**Less Than Significant.** Operation of the proposed James Ranch expansion would involve a small number of additional vehicle trips as well as consumption of gas and electricity for operation of the building, which would contribute GHG emissions. BAAQMD has published
screening criteria for operational criteria pollutants for different land use types. The BAAQMD list of land use types does not include correctional facilities. Because James Ranch includes beds for juveniles who do not generally leave during their confinement period as well as staff who operate the facility, the land use type that most closely matches the expanded facility is hospital. The BAAQMD GHG screening threshold for this land use is 84,000 square feet, which is well above the size of the expansion, which is approximately 50,000 square feet. It should be noted that this addition of square footage overstates the actual expansion because the new dormitory building would replace the existing dormitory, which would be demolished. Construction emissions are also considered to be less than significant when the development is below the operational screening level size. Therefore, construction and operation of the facility would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in GHG emissions.

MITIGATION:

None required.

---

2Although the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines that contain these screening level sizes have been overturned in court, the County has determined that these thresholds are based on substantial evidence, as identified in Appendix D of the Guidelines, and has therefore incorporated them into this Initial Study.
with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4, 17g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Provide breeding grounds for vectors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Proposed site plan result in a safety hazard (i.e., parking layout, access, closed community, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SETTING:**

James Ranch is located on a narrow plain between Coyote Creek and foothills of the Diablo Range below Anderson Reservoir. The current facilities are concentrated in the northwestern portion of the property and include a parking lot, an administration building, office, kitchen, classroom, shop/art buildings, a recreational building, basketball courts, a pool, a warehouse, and various buildings associated with maintenance. The rest of the property is open field with a few scattered trees.

**DISCUSSION:**

a-i)

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not involve transport of hazardous materials or emit hazardous emissions. The project site is not within ¼ mile of a school or within 2 miles of a public use airport or private airstrip, and it is not located on a hazardous materials site or within a wildland fire urban interface. The project would not include standing water or other conditions that could provide a breeding ground for vectors. The project involves expansion of an existing facility in an isolated area and would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

**MITIGATION:**

None required.

**H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Note policy regarding flood retention in watercourse and restoration of riparian vegetation for West Branch of the Llagas.)

e) Create or contribute increased impervious surfaces and associated runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

j) Be located in an area of special water quality concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)?

k) Be located in an area known to have high levels of nitrates in well water?

l) Result in a septic field being constructed on soil where a high water table extends close to the natural land surface?

m) Result in a septic field being located within 50 feet of a drainage swale; 100 feet of any well, water course or water body or 200 feet of a reservoir at capacity?

n) Conflict with Water Collaborative Guidelines and Standards for Land Uses Near Streams?

**SETTING:**

James Ranch is located on a narrow plain between Coyote Creek and Pigeon Point Ridge, which is part of the Diablo Range. The Flood Insurance Rate Map shows an area along Coyote Creek as Zone AE, which is subject to inundation by the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event determined by detailed methods. The project site is located approximately 1 mile southwest of Anderson Lake, a man-made lake along Coyote Creek owned and operated by the Santa Clara Valley Water District. Most of the site is located in dam failure inundation area of this reservoir. The
The project site is located within District 2 of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, which develops and enforces water quality objectives and implementation plans for areas under its jurisdiction.

**DISCUSSION:**

a,c-f) **Less Than Significant.** The proposed project would add more than 1 acre of impervious surface over pre-project conditions. In addition, the project site is located in a hydromodification management (HM) area of Santa Clara County. Therefore, HM controls to minimize discharge of stormwater and comply with the current regional stormwater NPDES permit. The conceptual drainage plan includes a bioswale adjacent to the new parking lot to capture stormwater runoff from the additional impervious surfaces resulting from the new building as well as paved walkways and fire lane. The design/build contractor would be responsible for implementing bioswales or other low-impact development methods to ensure compliance with the current Santa Clara County stormwater regulations and the current regional stormwater NPDES permit. Drainage patterns would not be substantially altered, and as noted above, stormwater would be retained on site. Construction BMPs, such as use of straw wattles and grass seeding, would be employed to prevent erosion during construction.

b,g-n) **No Impact.** Water and sanitary sewer service is provided to the project site by the City of Morgan Hill. The proposed project would not require on-site wells or require development of a septic system. The project site does not provide significant groundwater recharge. It does not contain areas of high groundwater, areas known to have high levels of nitrates, or areas of flood risk. A portion of the project site along Coyote Creek contains an area mapped Zone AE, which is subject to inundation by the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event determined by detailed methods. The proposed project would be constructed outside of this mapped area, and therefore would not place structures place within a 100-year flood hazard area. The proposed construction footprint is a minimum of 150 feet from the top of bank of Coyote Creek; therefore the project would not conflict with the County’s Riparian Setback policies (R-RC 37 and 38), which are consistent with the Water Collaborative Guidelines.

**MITIGATION:**

None required.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

c) Conflict with special policies:

i) San Martin &/or South County?  
   | | | | ❌ 1, 3, 8a, 20

ii) Los Gatos Specific Plan or Lexington Watershed?  
    | | | | ❌ 1, 3, 8a, 22b, 22c

iii) Guadalupe Watershed?  
     | | | ❌ 1, 8a

iv) Stanford?  
    | | | ❌ 8a, 21

v) City of Morgan Hill Urban Growth Boundary Area?  
   | | | ❌ 8a, 17a

vi) West Valley Hillsides Preservation Area?  
    | | | ❌ 1, 8a

vii) Water Collaborative (Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams)  
     | | | ❌ 22d, 22e

SETTING:

The project site is owned by the County of Santa Clara and operated as a juvenile detention facility. The City of Morgan Hill’s General Plan designation and zoning for the property is Open Space.

DISCUSSION:

a-c)

No Impact. Construction would occur within the confines of the existing juvenile facility site. The proposed project would not divide an established community. Morgan Hill’s Open Space zoning district allows public structures and uses with a conditional use permit. However, as a public agency, the County is not subject to these regulations. Special policies c), i-vi) are not applicable to the location of the proposed project. Construction would occur outside of the stream protection zone of the Water Collaborative Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams, and therefore would not conflict with this policy.

MITIGATION:

None required.

J. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACTS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other  
   | | | | ❌ 8a, 13, 22a, 45
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ 13, 45

c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ 1, 2, 5, 45

d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ 1, 2, 5, 45

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ 1, 5, 22a

SETTING:

The County-owned property is bordered by Anderson Lake County Park on the north and west, the Santa Clara County Justice Training Center to the east, and Coyote Creek to the south. A residential subdivision is located on the south side of Coyote Creek. The nearest residence is approximately 450 feet from the property’s perimeter fence. The project site is located approximately 1 mile southwest of Anderson Lake and 1 mile northeast of Highway 101. No airports or schools are located in the vicinity.

DISCUSSION:

a)

Potentially Significant. Construction of the James Ranch expansion project would generate noise and would temporarily increase noise levels in adjacent areas. Noise impacts resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise sensitive receptors. Construction noise impacts primarily occur when construction activities take place during noise-sensitive times of the day (early morning, evening, or nighttime hours), the construction occurs in areas immediately adjoining noise sensitive land uses, or when construction durations last over extended periods of time.

The County noise ordinance restricts construction-related noise near single-family residential areas to 60 dBA for mobile equipment operated Monday through Saturday from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM. The City of Morgan Hill noise ordinance is less restrictive, prohibiting construction activities except between the hours of 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Friday and between the hours of 9:00 AM and 6 PM on Saturday.

Anticipated noise emissions associated with equipment used for construction of the roadway, utility, private recreation, and drainage improvements are identified in Table 1. The table also provides a typical usage factor for each equipment type and the estimated number of hours that each piece of equipment would be used for project construction. The acoustical usage factor is an estimate of the fraction of time each piece of equipment operates at full power.
Construction-related noise levels are normally highest during grading phases and during the construction of project foundations and framing. These phases of construction require heavy equipment that normally generates the highest noise levels over extended periods of time. Additional construction activities, such as interior finishing work, would continue after this period, but would generate much lower noise levels.

The nearest sensitive noise receptors to both construction sites are the existing residences in the south of Coyote Creek, most of which are more than 800 ft. from the construction area with the nearest residents as close as 600 feet. Typical hourly average construction generated noise levels are about 80 dBA to 85 dBA measured at a distance of 50 feet from the center of the site during busy construction periods (e.g., earth moving equipment, impact tools, etc.). Construction generated noise levels drop off at a rate of about six dBA per doubling of distance between the source and receptor; therefore, at 800 feet from the noise source, exterior hourly average noise levels would be approximately to 56 to 61 dBA Leq during busy construction periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Construction Equipment and Typical Noise Emission Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Grader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-end Loader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Truck*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nearest residences would be exposed to noise levels slightly above the standard of 60 dBA for mobile equipment. In addition, they would experience an increase of ambient noise levels of more than five dBA Leq. There would be variations in construction noise levels on a day-to-day basis depending on the actual activities occurring at the site. Mitigation would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.

**b-d)**

**Less Than Significant.** Construction of the proposed project would not involve use of pile-drivers or other equipment that would generate groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan referral area or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or private airstrip.
MITIGATION:

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce temporary construction impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- **Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7 AM to 8 PM Monday through Friday and 9 AM to 6 PM on Saturdays. This includes all construction activities associated with the project, including grading, excavation, stripping, pavement, foundation, and installing new structures and improvements etc., on-site.**

- **Contractors shall use "new technology" power equipment with state of the art noise shielding and muffling devices. All internal combustion engine driven equipment shall be equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers which are in good working condition and appropriate for the equipment.**

- **Stationary noise generating equipment shall be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors south of Coyote Creek. Staging areas shall be located a minimum of 200 feet from the perimeter of the facility.**

- **Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be prohibited.**

---

### K. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>1, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SETTING:**

The proposed project is located at the existing James Ranch juvenile detention facility, which is at the eastern edge of the City of Morgan Hill.

**DISCUSSION:**

a-b)

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not involve development or displacement of housing. Construction of the proposed structures would not induce growth in the area as no new infrastructure is required to serve the facilities.
MITIGATION:

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L. PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
   i) Fire Protection?  
   ii) Police Protection?  
   iii) School facilities?  
   iv) Parks?  
   v) Other public facilities?


c, i-v)

**Less Than Significant.** Law enforcement and fire services are already being provided to the project site the Santa Clara County Sheriff and Santa Clara County Fire Department. The proposed project would not require expansion of facilities that support these services. The proposed project would not require other public services, such as schools or parks.

MITIGATION:

None required.
M. RESOURCES AND RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state?</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 as delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Be on, within or near a public or private park, wildlife reserve, or trail or affect existing or future recreational opportunities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in loss of open space rated as high priority for acquisition in the “Preservation 20/20” report?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SETTING:

The project site is adjacent to a portion of the Anderson Lake County Park to the northeast. Coyote Creek is located on the south side of the project site.

DISCUSSION:

a-b)

No Impact. Construction would occur either on areas developed as part of the existing facility or on a disked field (previously disturbed ground). No known mineral resources would be affected.

c-f)

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is expansion of an existing juvenile detention center; therefore, it would not increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks or require the expansion of existing recreational facilities. The proposed project would not affect existing or future recreational opportunities in the surrounding area. Because construction would occur on already developed sites, it would not result in the loss of open space that could be acquired in the future.

MITIGATION:

None required.
### N. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPACT</strong></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Not provide safe access, obstruct access to nearby uses or fail to provide for future street right of way?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SETTING:

The project site is located at located 19050 Malaguerra Avenue in Morgan Hill. Access to the facility via Sycamore Avenue would continue to be through the security gate system accessible from Malaguerra Avenue at the west end of the property.

### DISCUSSION:

a-b,d-e)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The current James Ranch facility has a capacity of 84 beds. The expanded facility would accommodate up to 108 beds at full capacity. Currently, the County has no plans to house more than the 84 juveniles that can be accommodated at the existing facility. Operation of the expanded facility at full capacity would require 4 new staff positions. Vehicle trips from this additional staffing would be too small to have an effect on roadway operations
even in the worst-case scenario of these four additional employees all commuting during a.m. / p.m. peak hours. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not conflict with a circulation plan or other transportation-related plan. The expansion would be constructed at the existing juvenile detention facility off of Malaguerra Avenue and would not include design features that would create traffic-related hazards. Primary emergency access to the project site would continue to be provided by Malaguerra Avenue, and the project site already meets all requirements for access by emergency vehicles.

c,f,g)

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not involve or otherwise affect air traffic. The expansion would be constructed at the existing detention center and would not affect plans or policies related to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or affect the performance or safety of such facilities. The project site has existing access via Malaguerra Avenue, and no changes to this access route are proposed.

**MITIGATION:**

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>0. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</strong></th>
<th><strong>IMPACT</strong></th>
<th><strong>NO</strong></th>
<th><strong>SOURCE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOULD THE PROJECT:</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SETTING:

The proposed project is located at the existing James Ranch juvenile detention facility, which is at the eastern edge of the City of Morgan Hill and within the City’s Urban Service Area.

DISCUSSION:

a-g)

**Less Than Significant.** The existing juvenile detention center is already served by municipal water and sanitary sewer systems. The expansion, with an increase in total capacity from 84 to 108 beds, would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. As a condition of project approval, all stormwater run-off that would result from additional impermeable surfaces (e.g., structure, paving) would be retained on site through bioswales or other low-impact development methods (see Hydrology/Water Quality). The existing dormitory is proposed to be demolished. However, it is anticipated that either the Kirby Canyon Landfill or San Martin Transfer Station would have adequate capacity to access any debris that would be removed from the project site.

MITIGATION:

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE**

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? □ □ ✗ □ 1 to 52

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? □ ✗ □ □ 1 to 52

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? □ □ ✗ □ 1 to 52
DISCUSSION:

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed in the Biological Resources section, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of any fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** All impacts evaluated in this Initial Study were found to be less than significant, or could be reduced to less than significant with incorporation of mitigation (Cultural Resources, Noise). When added to past, current, or probable future projects identified in the project vicinity that, the incremental effects of these project-related impacts would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** As described in the environmental topic sections of this Initial Study where impacts were found to be less than significant, the proposed project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
**Initial Study Source List***

1. Environmental Information Form
2. Field Inspection
3. Project Plans
4. Working knowledge of site and conditions
5. Experience With Other Projects of This Size and Nature
6. County Expert Sources: Geologist, Fire Marshal, Roads & Airports, Environmental Health, Land Development Engineering, Parks & Recreation, Zoning Administration, Comprehensive Planning, Architectural & Site Approval Committee Secretary
7. Agency Sources: Santa Clara Valley Water District, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Midpeninsula OpenSpace Regional District, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, CA Dept. of Fish & Game, Caltrans, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Public Works Deps. of individual cities, Planning Deps. of individual cities,
8a. Santa Clara County (SCC) General Plan
8b. The South County Joint Area Plan
9. SCC Zoning Regulations (Ordinance)
10. County Grading Ordinance
11. SCC Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval
12. SCC Development Guidelines for Design Review
14. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (expansive soil regulations) [1994 version]
15. Land Use Database
16. Santa Clara County Heritage Resource (including Trees) Inventory [computer database]
17. GIS Database
   a. SCC General Plan Land Use, and Zoning
   b. USFWS Critical Habitat & Riparian Habitat
   c. Geologic Hazards
   d. Archaeological Resources
   e. Water Resources
   f. Viewshed and Scenic Roads
   g. Fire Hazard
   h. Parks, Public Open Space, and Trails
      i. Heritage Resources - Trees
      j. Topography, Contours, Average Slope
      k. Soils
      l. HCP Data (habitat models, land use coverage etc)
   m. Air photos
   n. USGS Topographic
   o. Dept. of Fish & Game, Natural Diversity Data
   p. FEMA Flood Zones
   q. Williamson Act
   r. Farmland monitoring program
   s. Traffic Analysis Zones
   Base Map Overlays & Textual Reports (GIS)
18. Paper Maps
   a. SCC Zoning
   b. Barclay’s Santa Clara County Locaide Street Atlas
   c. Color Air Photos (MPSI)
   d. Santa Clara Valley Water District - Maps of Flood Control Facilities & Limits of 1% Flooding
   e. Soils Overlay Air Photos
   f. “Future Width Line” map set
19. CEQA Guidelines [Current Edition]
   Area Specific: San Martin, Stanford, and Other Areas
   San Martin
   20a. San Martin Integrated Design Guidelines
   20b. San Martin Water Quality Study
   20c. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Santa Clara County & Santa Clara Valley Water District
   Stanford
   21a. Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP), Community Plan (CP), Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
   21b. Stanford Protocol and Land Use Policy Agreement
   Other Areas
   22a. South County Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Palo Alto Airport comprehensive Land Use Plan [November 19, 2008]
   22b. Los Gatos Hillsides Specific Area Plan
   22c. County Lexington Basin Ordinance Relating to Sewage Disposal
   22f. Monterey Highway Use Permit Area
   Soils
   23. USDA, SCS, “Soils of Santa Clara County”
   24. USDA, SCS, “Soil Survey of Eastern Santa Clara County”
   Agricultural Resources/Open Space
   25. Right to Farm Ordinance
   26. State Dept. of Conservation, "CA Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model"
   28. Williamson Act Ordinance and Guidelines (current version)
   Air Quality
   29. BAAQMD Clean Air Plan, and BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (2011)
   Biological Resources/
   Water Quality & Hydrological Resources/
   Utilities & Service Systems*
   31. Site-Specific Biological Report
Initial Study Source List*

32. Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance
   Section C16, Santa Clara County Guide to
   Evaluating Oak Woodlands Impacts, Santa Clara
   County Guidelines for Tree Protection and
   Preservation for Land Use Applications
33. Clean Water Act, Section 404
34. Riparian Inventory of Santa Clara County, Greenbelt
   Coalition, November 1988
35. CA Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water
   Quality Control Plan, San Francisco Bay Region
   [1995]
36. Santa Clara Valley Water District, Private Well Water
   Testing Program [12-98]
37. SCC Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program,
   Urban Runoff Management Plan [1997]
38. County Environmental Health / Septic Tank Sewage
   Disposal System - Bulletin "A"
39. County Environmental Health Department Tests and
   Reports
40. Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State
   University
41. Site Specific Archaeological Reconnaissance
    Report
42. Site Specific Geologic Report
43. State Department of Mines and Geology, Special
    Report #42
44. State Department of Mines and Geology, Special
    Report #146
45. County Noise Ordinance
46. Section 21151.4 of California Public Resources Code
47. State Department of Toxic Substances, Hazardous
   Waste and Substances Sites List
48. County Office of Emergency Services Emergency
   Response Plan [1994 version]
49. Transportation Research Board, "Highway
50. SCC Congestion Management Agency, "Monitoring
    and Conformance report" (Current Edition)
51. Official County Road Book
52. Site-specific Traffic Impact Analysis Report

*Items listed in bold are the most important sources
and should be referred to during the first review of the
project, when they are available. The planner should
refer to the other sources for a particular
environmental factor if the former indicate a potential
environmental impact.
Appendix A

Archaeological Resource Management

Historical Evaluation of James Ranch Dormitory
Mr. Stephen White
IBI Group
160 West Santa Clara Street
San Jose, CA 95113

Dear Mr. White,

As per your request our firm is submitting the enclosed historical evaluation of the James Ranch Dormitory in the County of Santa Clara. Based upon the requirements of the County of Santa Clara, a methodology was designed which included the following services:

- a State Historic Resources Evaluation form (DPR 523) for the structures
- evaluation of the structures based on the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historic Resources

Based upon the results of this investigation, it was determined that the James Ranch Dormitory does not appear to be historically significant. The structure has no known associations with persons, events, or patterns of importance. The structure was not found eligible for inclusion in either the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). Therefore, no further recommendations are being made.

Sincerely,

Robert Cartier, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

RC/dj
Resource Name or #: James Ranch Dormitory

P1. Other Identifier: ____________________________________________

P2. Location: Not for Publication  X Unrestricted  *a. County  Santa Clara
          and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
          *b. USGS 7.5' Quad:
          Morgan Hill, CA  Date: 1978  T  ;  R  ;  1/4 of  1/4 of Sec  ;  BM
          c. Address:  19050 Malaguerra Avenue  City: Morgan Hill  Zip: 95037
          d. UTM:  10S 6 20 081mE/41 14 348mN
          e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
          The Assessor’s Parcel Number of the subject property is: APN 728-35-001.

*P3a. Description:  (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries.)
The dormitory building is a single story modernist structure. The roof is in extremely shallow pitched shed formation,
and surfaced with roll out gravel sheeting. Numerous exposed vents and associated piping are present on the roof.
The eaves are broadly cantilevered, with boxed and enclosed rafters. The exterior walls are of cinderblock
construction, painted off-white with dark brown trim. Fenestration consists primarily of high clerestory ribbon windows
which run along the top portion of the majority of the exterior walls. The interior is open, also featuring exposed vents,
and separated into small multi-bed “pods” by moveable divider walls.

*P3b. Resource Attributes:  (List attributes and codes.)
HP03 (Dormitory)

*P4. Resources Present:  X Building  __Structure  __Object  __District  __Element of District  __Site  __Other

P5a. Photo or drawing (Photo required for buildings, structures, objects.)

P5b. Description of Photo:  (View, date, accession #)
View of the William F. James Ranch Dormitory

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources
Historic  X  Prehistoric  Both
Constructed 1952

*P7. Owner and Address:
County of Santa Clara

*P8. Recorded by:
Robert Cartier
Archaeological Resource Management
496 North 5th Street
San Jose, CA  95112

*P9. Date Recorded: 11/12/13

*P10. Survey Type: Intensive

*P11. Report Citation:  (Cite Survey Report and other sources, or enter "none.")
None

* Attachments:  _X_None  _X_Location Map  _X_Sketch Map  _X_Continuation Sheet  _X_Building, Structure, and Object Record
             _X_Archaeological Record  _X_District Record  _X_Linear Feature Record  _X_Milling Station Record  _X_Rock Art Record  _X_Artifact
             Record  _X_Photographic Record  _X_Other (List):
**NRHP Status Code _________________________**

**Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) __________ James Ranch Dormitory________

**B1. Historic Name:** James Ranch Dormitory

**B2. Common Name:** James Ranch Dormitory

**B3. Original Use:** Dormitory

**B4. Present Use:** Dormitory

**B5. Architectural Style:** Modernist

**B6. Construction History:** (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
Based upon the original plans and elevations for the structure provided by the Santa Clara County Facilities and Fleet Department, the James Ranch dormitory was designed in 1952. The only significant modification to the building consisted of the addition of the current bathroom/shower facilities wing in 1968.

**B7. Moved?**  
- X No  
- Yes  
- Unknown

**B8. Related Features:**
The larger property includes several other structures which make up the William F. James Ranch, a juvenile correctional facility administered by the County of Santa Clara. These structures include an administration building, a kitchen, office, recreation room, shops, mental health facilities, classrooms, and modular buildings.

**B9a. Architect:** Logue & Walter

**B9b. Builder:**

**B10. Significance:** Theme Gov't and Public Services Area Santa Clara County

**Period of Significance:** Post WWII

**Property Type:** County Facility

**Applicable Criteria:** N/A

The William F. James Ranch is located within the Rancho La Laguna Seca, approximately four square leagues originally granted to Juan Alvirez on July 22, 1834 by Governor Jose Figueroa. According to the Thompson & West 1876 Historical Atlas of Santa Clara County, by that time the land on which the William F. James Ranch now stands made up a portion of the 244 acre property of a J. Phlegley. In 1895 the property was among those lands which made up the J. M. McElhany’s of Sam McPherson’s Ranch, a property of 142.83 acres, Book H of Maps, Page 129. The subject property is made up of all of Lots 6, 7, and 8 and a portion of Lots 4, 5, 9, 13, and 14 of the J. M. McElhany Subdivision.

See Continuation Sheet, Page 4

**B11. Additional Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)  
N/A

**B12. References:**
See Continuation Sheet, Page 6

**B13. Remarks:**

**B14. Evaluator:** Robert R. Cartier

**Date of Evaluation:** 11/12/13

(This space reserved for official comments.)
Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder)  James Ranch Dormitory

*Map Name: Morgan Hill, CA  *Scale: 7.5 Minute  *Date of Map: 1978
Continued from B10:

The property was purchased by Santa Clara County in 1951 from multiple owners, as shown in Book 2299 of Official Records, Page 80. Since the early 1950’s, the property has operated as a juvenile correctional facility, originally for boys, but now serving both males and females.

California Register of Historic Resources Criteria

A cultural resource is considered “significant” if it qualifies as eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). Properties that are eligible for listing in the CRHR must meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States;
2. Association with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history;
3. Embodying the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or representing the work of a master, or possessing high artistic values; or
4. Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

A property may be automatically listed in the CRHR if it is formally determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Properties that are formally determined eligible for the NRHP are those that are designated as such through one of the federal preservation programs administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation (i.e., the National Register, Tax Certification, and Section 106 review of federal undertakings).

The CRHR interprets the integrity of a cultural resource based upon its physical authenticity. An historic cultural resource must retain its historic character or appearance and thus be recognizable as an historic resource. Integrity is evaluated by examining the subject's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. If the subject has retained these qualities, it may be said to have integrity. It is possible that a cultural resource may not retain sufficient integrity to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places yet still be eligible for listing in the CRHR. If a cultural resource retains the potential to convey significant historical/scientific data, it may be said to retain sufficient integrity for potential listing in the CRHR.

The James Ranch Dormitory is not currently listed on the CRHR. In addition, the structure does not appear to be eligible for inclusion in this register. The structure is not associated with events or persons significant to the history of the nation, California, or the local area. Thus the dormitory does not appear eligible for listing under criteria 1 or 2. The structure does not appear to be a significant example of the modernist architectural style, and thus does not appear to qualify as potentially eligible for listing under criterion 3. In addition, the structure does not appear to have the potential to yield information important to history, and does not appear to be potentially eligible for listing under criterion 4.
The National Register of Historic Places was first established in 1966, with major revisions in 1976. The register is set forth in 36 CFR 60 which establishes the responsibilities of the State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO), standards for their staffs and review boards, and describes the statewide survey and planning process for historic preservation. Within this regulation guidelines are set forth concerning the National Register of Historic Places (36 CFR 60.6). In addition, further regulations are found in 36 CFR 63-66, 800, and Bulletin 15 which define procedures for determination of eligibility, identification of historic properties, recovery, reporting, and protection procedures. The National Register of Historic Places was established to recognize resources associated with the accomplishments of all peoples who have contributed to the country's history and heritage. Guidelines were designed for Federal and State agencies in nominating cultural resources to the National Register. These guidelines are based upon integrity and significance of the resource. Integrity applies to specific items such as location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture is present in resources that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and meet at least one of the following criteria:

a. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of our history;

b. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

c. that embody distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;

d. that have yielded, or are likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Integrity is defined in Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service 1982) as:

the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's historic or prehistoric period. If a property retains the physical characteristics it possessed in the past then it has the capacity to convey association with historical patterns or persons, architectural or engineering design and technology, or information about a culture or peoples.

There are also seven aspects of integrity which are used. These aspects are:

1. location
2. design
3. setting
4. materials
5. workmanship
6. feeling
7. association

The James Ranch Dormitory is not currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, the structure does not appear to be potentially eligible for listing in this register. The structure is not associated with significant historic events or persons, thus it does not appear to be potentially eligible for listing under criteria a or b. The structure is not a significant example of the modernist architectural style, thus it does not appear to qualify as potentially eligible under criterion c. The dormitory building does not appear to be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history, thus it does not appear to qualify as potentially eligible under criterion d.
Continued from B12:

Assessor's Office, County of Santa Clara
2013 Record search of assessed value and associated taxes for the William F. James Ranch property.

Calloway, S. and E. Cromley

Douglas, J.
1993 *Historical Footnotes of Santa Clara Valley.* San Jose: San Jose Historical Museum Association.

Payne, S.

Recorder's Office, County of Santa Clara
2013 Record search of recorded information for the William F. James Ranch property.

Thompson & West
1876 *Historical Atlas of Santa-Clara County, California.* San Francisco: Thompson & West.

US Department of the Interior
1990 *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*

US Department of the Interior
1982 Bulletin 15 - "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation."

Whiffen, Marcus
Photo #1: View of the James Ranch Dorm from the north.

Photo #2: View of the covered walkway and entry to the dorm.
Photo #3: View of the northwest wing, showing clerestory windows.

Photo #4: View of the central portion of the western façade.
Photo #5: Oblique view of the southern portion of the western façade.

Photo #6: View of the southern portion of the western façade.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 10 of 16</th>
<th>Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder)</th>
<th>James Ranch Dorm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recorded by</td>
<td>Archaeological Resource Management</td>
<td>Date 11/12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resource Name or #**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinomial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Ranch Dorm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary #**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRI #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Photo #7: Oblique view of the southern façade.**

![Oblique View of the Southern Façade](image1)

**Photo #8: Direct view of the southern façade.**

![Direct View of the Southern Façade](image2)
Photo #9: Detail of brickwork and clerestory windows.

Photo #10: Detail of wide cantilevered eaves.
Photo #11: Oblique view of the southern façade from the east.

Photo #12: View of the eastern façade.
Photo #13: View of the dorm entry sign.

Photo #14: Interior view of the entry area.
Photo #15: View of the observation room in the dorm.

Photo #16: View of one of the “pods” within the dorm.
Photo #17: View of built-in lockers adjacent to the entry.

Photo #18: Detail of the ceiling showing exposed vents.
Photo #19: View of the dorm bathroom showing tilework.

Photo #20: View of the dorm kitchen.