INITIAL STUDY
Environmental Checklist and Evaluation for Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number:</th>
<th>1201-65-27-10GP-10EA</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>May 15, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
<td>APN(s):</td>
<td>776-11-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location / Address</td>
<td>12970 Uvas Rd., Morgan Hill</td>
<td>GP Designation Existing:</td>
<td>Hillside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Name</td>
<td>Jeff Pickett</td>
<td>Zoning Existing:</td>
<td>HS-sr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s Name</td>
<td>Jeff Pickett</td>
<td>Zoning Proposed:</td>
<td>RR-sr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description:

The proposed project is an application for a General Plan Amendment (GPA) for an undeveloped, triangular-shaped 60-acre lot located at the junction of Uvas Road and Watsonville Road in the western foothills at the entrance to the Uvas Valley in southern Santa Clara County, west of San Martin and south of Morgan Hill. The GPA is to change the Land Use Plan designation for the subject property from “Hillside” to “Rural Residential.” The minimum lot size for purposes of subdivision would change from 20 acres to 5 acres under the new designation thus changing the maximum allowed number of lots from three lots to 12 lots on the site.

If the GPA request is approved, the owners intend to apply to rezone and subdivide the property. Because these applications are reasonably foreseeable, the analysis in this Initial Study includes consideration of future conceptual subdivisions, as a means to illustrate potential environmental impacts of future development. The following describes the property and how it could conceptually develop today under the existing General Plan designation in comparison with the proposed General Plan designation.

1) **3 Lot Hillside Cluster Subdivision**. One cluster of three lots of two acres each, as an example of a cluster subdivision if the property remains zoned Hillsides (HS). The three residential lots would be located in the center of the site, between the two riparian corridors.

2) **12 Lot Rural Residential Subdivision**. Twelve lots of five acres each, if the site is re-designated and rezoned to Rural Residential (RR). This alternative depicts the maximum density and number of lots that may be created under the Rural Residential GP and zoning designations, with each meeting the 5 acre minimum lot size requirement. Of the 12 possible lots, five lots would be adjacent to Watsonville road, another five would be in the middle of the lot between the two riparian corridors, and the remaining two would be at the foot of the hill at the west side of the property.

These examples are provided within the context of the Initial Study for informational purposes, consistent with the explanation of alternatives developed as part of the policy analysis for the project. A brief description is below.
3 Lot Hillside Cluster Subdivision

Under the current General Plan designation of Hillsides and HS zoning, the development area must be no more than 10% of the lot (6 acres). This illustrative example above indicates how three residential development sites could be accommodated centrally on the property without being located within the 150 feet stream setbacks stipulated in the General Plan, or within 100 feet of scenic roads, and without utilizing or impacting the steeper, more wooded portions of the lot. This illustrative example also shows that the lots could be designed so that there would be enough room for wells and leach fields, and could accommodate the Santa Clara Valley Water District easement. It conserves 90% or more of the site in open space, per the requirements of the General Plan.
Twelve Lot Rural Residential Subdivision.

This example illustrates how the site might accommodate up to 12 separate lots for residential development, with a simplified road and driveway access scheme.

The 12 lots proposed under this configuration would meet the 5 acre minimum lot size, and utilize the entire 60 acre property, with portions of the steeper hillside and stream areas included in a number of lots. It represents a configuration of five acre lots, not a cluster configuration, because clustering is optional, not mandatory, in Rural Residential areas.

Each lot would be served by its own driveway, shared driveway, or a private road. One of the driveways, to lot 1 in the southwest, would have to cross a riparian corridor. The building envelopes would need to be carefully placed so as not to encroach on the Santa Clara Valley Water District easement.
Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The site is an undeveloped, triangular 60-acre lot. The site is located at the junction of Uvas Road and Watsonville Road. Watsonville road runs the entire length of the eastern boundary of the site. Uvas Road borders the southwest boundary of the site. The site’s regional setting is the western foothills at the entrance to the Uvas Valley in southern Santa Clara County, west of San Martin and south of Morgan Hill.

The majority of the site is flat, with a hilly area of over 30% slope at the west side of the lot. There is a small swale at the base of the hill, and a creek running north to south through the center of the flat part of the lot. There are oak woodlands present on the hill and willow and mixed riparian forest and scrub woodlands along the swale and creek. The flat portion of the site is occasionally disked, but there are no agricultural uses on the site, and the site is not under a Williamson Act contract.

The site is not connected to a sewer or water system. Future lots would need to be served by individual on-site wastewater systems. To the north and northeast of the site are a number of small lots (less than 5 acres in size) with single family residences. On its southern corner the site is immediately adjacent to and bounded by large lots (10 acres and more) with agricultural uses and single family residences. There are three recreational vehicle parks within a half mile of the southern corner of the site. To the northwest of the site is a mix of small and large lots with single family residences.

Other agencies sent a copy of this document:
California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture / Forest Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology / Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Population / Housing
- Public Services
- Resources / Recreation
- Transportation / Traffic
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- None
DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

___________________________  ________________________
Signature                          Date

___________________________  ________________________
Printed name                      For
### ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

#### A. AESTHETICS

<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 Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 6, 17f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources along a designated scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3, 6, 7 17f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3</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>
<td></td>
<td>3, 4</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>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) If within a Design Review Zoning District for purposes of viewed protection (d, -d1, -d2), conflict with applicable General Plan policies or Zoning Ordinance provisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 8a, 9, 12, 17f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SETTING:
The site is located south of Morgan Hill and west of Gilroy at the junction of Uvas Rd. and Watsonville Rd., both of which are scenic roads. The site is relatively flat, stretching from the crest of a hill to the west of Sycamore creek, across the flat areas around Sycamore creek, to the base of hills to the east of Sycamore creek. The project proposal is a General Plan Amendment. The site carries a scenic road (-sr) designation, which would not change as a result of the Zoning Change.

The General Plan Amendment would not itself entail any physical changes to the site. However, approval of the project would enable a subsequent application to rezone, subdivide and develop the property with a greater number of residences than currently allowed. The discussion below provides information on site aesthetics in the context of the General Plan Amendment, along with a reasonably foreseeable future rezoning and subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.

### DISCUSSION:

a) The site is only visible to homes and passing cars on roads immediately adjacent to the site. Views from the site are primarily of the hills that line Watsonville Rd. and Uvas Rd. A few neighboring homes are visible looking north or south from the site, while east-west views are mostly blocked by trees that line Sycamore creek.

b) The site is located at the junction of Uvas Rd. and Watsonville Rd., both of which are designated Scenic Roads in the County Zoning Ordinance. The property’s current zoning designation of HS –sr reflects this designation. The “-sr” designation requires that structures
built within 100 feet of a scenic road right-of-way are subject to the requirements of the County’s Design Review regulations.

c) A subsequent subdivision could result in the development of as many as 12 new homes on the site, on lots as small as 5 acres each, or smaller if part of a cluster subdivision. That density of development would be similar to that of an area of lots zoned Rural Residential to the north of the site, and to several other lots on the east and southwest borders of the site.

Any proposed future subdivision application would be accompanied by a tentative map. However, using the two conceptual subdivision alternatives outlined in the Project Description as a guide, some potential visual and aesthetic impacts can be analyzed at a conceptual level as part of this Initial Study.

Generally, development of up to 12 residential sites (nine additional units in comparison with the existing General Plan) would result in a change in the character of the lot from open space to rural residential, similar to parcels and areas adjacent to the subject property. Existing trees along Sycamore creek might screen some of the new development west of the creek from viewers traveling on Watsonville Road, but any lots east of Sycamore creek would be clearly visible from Watsonville Rd. unless screened by new trees. One neighbor to the north has commented that their view looking south to the open space currently on the site would be affected by new development.

Potential visual and aesthetic impacts of the conceptual subdivision possibilities, comparing the existing and proposed General Plan designations, are as follows:

- **3 Lot Hillside Cluster Subdivision (Existing General Plan Designation):** Under this example, there is adequate room to locate the residential lots far away from neighboring properties, away from sensitive natural features, roads, and streams. With landscaping, visual/aesthetic impacts would be minimized.

- **12 Lot Rural Residential Subdivision:** As exemplified in the conceptual site plan shown in the project description, five building sites could be immediately visible from Watsonville Road, affecting the visual character of the corridor more than other configurations. Another three building sites would be located in the middle segment of the site, visible from Uvas Road to the south, and visible from the homes of neighbors to the north. The last four building sites located on the hill or base of that hill to the northwest, would have varying visibility, depending on exact location, from adjoining properties. They would have minimal visibility from nearby streets.

In summary, the foreseeable visual and aesthetic changes resulting from the development of up to nine additional residences onsite would still be consistent with the character of the surrounding area, and therefore would not have a significant visual or aesthetic impact.

d) Any proposed future subdivision and associated improvements would be evaluated under CEQA for light and glare.

e), f) The project is not subject to Architecture and Site Approval, nor is it within a Design Review Combining District. The rezoning of the property to RR-sr would not change the property’s status as being within a scenic road combining district, though some lots created
through a subsequent subdivision might not be within 100 ft of the scenic Uvas and/or Watsonville roads, and would therefore not carry the –sr designation.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** The proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would not result in any significant Aesthetic impacts.

**MITIGATION:** None Required.

### B. AGRICULTURE / FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPACT</strong></td>
<td>Potential Significance of Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a)</strong> Convert 10 or more acres of farmland classified as prime (by the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program) to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b)</strong> Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c)</strong> 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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d)</strong> 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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e)</strong> Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f)</strong> 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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SETTING:**

The project is a General Plan Amendment, and does not entail any physical changes to the site. However, a future subdivision application for development at a higher density is reasonably foreseeable, should the project be approved. Any proposed future subdivision application would include a subsequent evaluation of environmental impacts on agricultural and forest resources on the site.

The following discussion provides information regarding onsite agricultural and forest resources, in the context of the General Plan Amendment and a reasonably foreseeable future subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.
BACKGROUND: The California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) 2010 data indicates that the site does not contain any Prime Farmland. The soil types present on the site are Gilroy Clay Loam 5%-30% slopes (GoD, Class IVe5), Gilroy Clay Loam 50%-75% slopes (GoG, Class VIIe5), Keefers Clay Loam 0%-2% slopes (KeA, Class IIIs3), Keefers Clay Loam 2%-9% slopes (KeC2, Class IIIe3), and Terrace Escarpments (TeF, Class VIIe1). The Keefers Clay Loam soil type is a candidate soil for being considered Prime Farmland, and would be considered Prime Farmland if it has been also been irrigated in the four years previous to the latest mapping effort (in this case, 2010). However, there is no indication (neither from the applicant, through a site visit, nor the FMMP data) that the site has been irrigated for agricultural purposes in recent years.

Consistent with the data from the FMMP, the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service classifies a majority of the land on the site as Prime Farmland if Irrigated, and the rest is classified as Not Prime Farmland. The area designated Prime Farmland if Irrigated is in areas likely to be converted to residential use if the applicant’s request for a General Plan Amendment is accepted and their plans for a subsequent subdivision and residential development are carried out. However, as mentioned above, there is no indication (not from the applicant, through a site visit, or the FMMP data) that the site has been irrigated for agricultural purposes in recent years. Thus, according to Department of Conservation criteria, the property does not contain prime farmland.

DISCUSSION:

a) As there is no Prime Farmland on the site, a subsequent subdivision would not convert 10 or more acres of Prime Farmland unless the site were to have been irrigated for agricultural use within the four years previous to the subdivision application.

b) Approval of the General Plan Designation would allow for a future zone change from HS (Hillsides) to RR (Rural Residential). The allowable agricultural uses under both zoning designations are almost the same, so the proposed project would have little conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. However, once the site is zoned Rural Residential, if there ever were a conflict between uses, residential uses would have primacy over agricultural uses, so such conflicts would be resolved in favor of residential uses.

c) The parcel is not under a Williamson Act contract. Only one adjacent parcel is under Williamson Act contract, and a second nearby parcel is under a non-renewed contract that will expire in 2017. There are no agricultural ties between any of these three parcels. Therefore neither the project nor any subsequent subdivision proposal would conflict with any Williamson Act requirements.

d) Approval of the General Plan Designation would allow for a future rezoning of the property, which contains portions of the property that would be considered forest land per the Public Resources Code. According to the information regarding onsite habitat types from the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) created by ICF in November 2006, the site contains an area of Coast Live Oak Forest and Woodland in the hills at the northwest of the site and two areas containing Riparian Forest and Woodland along the small watercourse and creek on the site. Any future development of the site would need to comply with County General Plan, which includes policies that specifically protect riparian resources (R-RC 31 through R-RC 40) such as the onsite Riparian Forest and Woodland. The onsite coast live oak forest and woodland only constitutes 8.5 acres, or just over 14% of the site, and is located on the steeply sloped area at...
the northwest of the site that is neither attractive nor suitable for development. Rezoning of the property would not result in a significant impact to this small area of forest land. The site does not contain any timberland or timberland zoned as Timberland Production. Therefore, neither the project nor any subsequent subdivision would have an impact on forest land.

e), f) Any subsequent subdivision and residential development would need a separate environmental review that would consider the areas with trees in the context of the proposed lot and improvement locations. As shown in the conceptual development plan, the available areas for lot development would primarily be the flat areas designated Prime Farmland if Irrigated (not considered Prime Farmland by the FMMP) and thus would be less likely to impact onsite trees.

In summary, because there are no physical changes associated with the General Plan Amendment, and no prime agricultural land or timberland could be affected by a subsequent subdivision proposal, the project has no significant impact on agricultural and forest resources.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** None.

**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>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,29, 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT BACKGROUND:**
The project is a General Plan Amendment application. The General Plan Amendment would allow for a subsequent rezoning and subdivision to create a greater maximum number of residences, 12, nine greater than the maximum of three possible under current zoning.

**AIR QUALITY BACKGROUND:**
In June 2010, BAAQMD adopted updated draft California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Guidelines and finalized them in May 2011 (BAAQMD, 2011). These guidelines
superseded previously adopted agency air quality guidelines and were intended to advise lead agencies on how to evaluate potential air quality impacts.

In late 2010, the Building Industry Association filed a lawsuit in Alameda Superior Court, challenging BAAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines on the grounds that the agency did not comply with CEQA. In March of 2012, the Court ruled that the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines constitute a project under CEQA and that the District must “set aside all approvals in [the resolution approving the Guidelines] and … not disseminate these or any new approvals of officially sanctioned air quality thresholds of significance until the District fully complies with CEQA.” The claims made in the case concerned the CEQA impacts of adopting the thresholds. Those issues are not relevant to the scientific soundness of the BAAQMD’s analysis of what level of air quality analysis should be deemed significant. 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.

DISCUSSION:
a), b) The creation of nine additional residences is below the significance threshold of 56 new residences established by BAAQMD to determine what size of project would likely result in significant new criteria pollutants (generated by associated vehicle trips). For this reason, the project will not have any significant air quality impacts.

c), d) According to the U.S. EPA Criteria Pollutant Area Summary Report of April 21, 2011, the San Francisco Bay Area is in Nonattainment for the criteria pollutant PM$_{2.5}$, but the proposed project by itself would not entail any industrial or construction activity that would increase release of PM$_{2.5}$, and would not expose any sensitive receptors to pollutants (there are no schools or hospitals within 1,000 feet of the site).

Fugitive dust would be created during grading for any subdivision that might be proposed. However, standard dust control measures as stipulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District would be employed to mitigate any air quality impacts from construction including fugitive dust from NOx (oxides of nitrogen) and PM10 (respirable particulate matter with aerodynamic resistance diameter of 10 micrometers) emissions.

Activities in the area are primarily single family residential, agricultural, and recreational. The site itself is not in an area where there are substantial pollutant concentrations. The site is not in an area designated as being exposed to significant existing health hazards as determined by the BAAQMD Air Hazard maps for surface streets and freeways.

Overall, the proposed General Plan Amendment would not result in any significant Air Quality impacts, nor would a subsequent rezoning and subdivision.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS: None

MITIGATION: None Required
## D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<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 Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</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>☒</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>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Tree Preservation Ordinance [Section C16]?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Wetland Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 25-30]?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Riparian Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 31-41]?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BACKGROUND:
The project is a General Plan Amendment application, and does not entail any physical changes to the site. However, approval of the project would allow a subsequent subdivision application and possible residential development. Subsequent subdivision and residential development would be subject to subsequent environmental review and would need to take into consideration location of the species and riparian habitat with respect to the location of the proposed residences.
The following discussion provides information regarding on site biological resources, in the context of the General Plan Amendment and a reasonably foreseeable future rezoning and subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.

SETTING:
The site is mostly flat and covered with dry grass where not recently disked. The site has two creeks (one of which, Sycamore creek, is included in the USGS “U.S. Rivers and Streams” data collection) and a hill that host a mix of tree types (primarily oaks, but also some pines and eucalyptus), along with shrubs and blackberry vines.

Using the two conceptual subdivision alternatives (development under existing and proposed General Plan designations) outlined in the Project Description as a guide, the potential biological impacts that could result from the General Plan Amendment are evaluated using the following assumptions:

• **3 Lot Hillside Cluster Subdivision**: Under this example, there is adequate room in the center of the property to locate the residential lots, and arrange structures, wells, and leach fields, without encroaching on sensitive natural features.

• **12 Lot Rural Residential Subdivision**: Under this example, lots would need to be carefully located and arranged to avoid encroaching on natural features and biological resources. Lot #1, in the southwest of the site, would be accessed with a driveway crossing a riparian corridor.

DISCUSSION:
a) The US Fish and Wildlife Service Critical Habitat data on the County’s GIS does not designate the property as critical habitat for the Bay Checkerspot Butterfly, California Tiger Salamander (CTS), or California Red Legged Frog (CRLF) on or within a mile of the site. The California Natural Diversity Database shows an occurrence of Bay Checkerspot Butterfly within 300 ft of the northeast corner of the site, and area demoting a past sighting of California Tiger Salamander straddling the southwest boundary of the site.

Biological Resources surveys were conducted in March 2007 and again in July 2012 by Olberding Environmental, Inc. for the property. The survey reports and analyses concluded with the following observations regarding special-status species:

• **Monarch butterfly:**
  a. 2007: One monarch butterfly was observed on site, but monarchs are unlikely to use the Property as a winter roosting site.
  b. 2012: No monarch butterflies were observed on the site; however, the larval host plant was present on the property.

• **CTS and CRLF:**
  a. 2007: Neither CTS nor CRLF were seen on site, and the species are not expected to occur on the Property due to lack of aestivation sites, but a directed survey is necessary to determine their presence or absence on the Property.
  b. 2012: CTS could potentially occur on the property while it is assumed that CRLF is absent due to lack of recent sittings.

• The site contains habitat suitable for the Cooper’s hawk (2012 report only), sharp-shinned hawk (2012 report only), tricolored blackbird, red-tailed hawk, red-shouldered hawk, American kestrel, and white-tailed kite to nest and forage. Directed surveys are necessary
to determine their presence or absence on the site. Two red-tailed hawks and one red shouldered hawk were observed (2007 report only) foraging on the site.

- The site provides suitable habitat for several species that were not observed on the site but for which a directed survey is necessary to determine the species’ presence or absence on the site. Those species mentioned were the western pond turtle, least Bell’s vireo, the great egret, great blue heron, and snowy egret, and the loggerhead shrike.

Neither the 2007 nor the 2012 Biological Resources analyses included an analysis of how the General Plan Amendment or a subsequent subdivision might affect special-status species or their potential habitats found on the site, or could be designed to mitigate potential impacts.

b) A 1990 map created for the Santa Clara County Water District shows, and a viewing of aerial maps for the site confirms, that there is a riparian woodland habitat running north to south across the center of the site. A site visit in July 2011 found a small amount (1 inch) of running water in the southern end of the creek bed. A second riparian corridor runs north to south along the foot of the hill at the west end of the property. Any future subdivision proposal would have to comply with General Plan policies for stream setbacks, in particular Policy R-RC 37 establishing a 150 foot setback from top of bank of streams that are predominantly in their natural state.

c) The Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) data in the County’s GIS system does not show any vernal pools, ponds, or reservoirs on the site. The data does show a pond adjacent to the southwest boundary of the site. The 2007 Biological Resources analysis notes that there is a pool formed by Sycamore Creek along Uvas Road that provides excellent breeding habitat for amphibians, and the 2012 Biological Resources analysis makes a similar observation, but the General Plan Amendment would not directly affect this portion of the site. If the General Plan Amendment request is approved and a subsequent Subdivision application is filed for, it may be necessary to request a biological study of the site that includes an analysis of this portion of the site and also of whether there are other wetlands on the site.

d) The HCP data indicates and a site visit confirmed that there is an area of Oak Woodland on the hill at the northwest corner of the site, and that there is an area of Mixed Woodlands along the riparian area in the center of the site that contains oaks.

e) The HCP data shows an aquatic/riparian linkage corridor running along Uvas creek to the south of the project site, but there is no such corridor on the site itself.

f) The project site is located within the Study area of the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (“Habitat Plan”) that was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in October 2012. The Habitat Plan, which acts as a regional endangered species habitat mitigation plan in compliance with State and Federal Endangered Species Act requirements, is anticipated to become operative in the Fall of 2013.

The Habitat Plan provides programmatic endangered species permitting for projects that are consistent with the existing General Plans that are in effect prior to Habitat Plan adoption. The project consists of a proposed amendment to the General Plan and thus is likely not a covered project as defined in the Habitat Plan. In order to obtain endangered species permits for future development, the applicant would need to pursue one of the following options:
(a) Apply to amend the Habitat Plan to allow additional development as allowed under the General Plan Amendment.
(b) Obtain endangered species permits separately from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
(c) Demonstrate, at the time of future subdivision application, that the amount of land impacted will be consistent with the amount of land modeled to be developed under the existing General Plan. This would likely require that future residential development be configured to minimize impacts, using smaller building footprints.

The project by itself does not conflict with the conservation strategy of the Habitat Plan. The majority of the site is in Fee Zone B (mostly agricultural lands), and is in a Low Priority Conservation Analysis Zone of the Habitat Plan.

g i) Tree removal permits are not required for trees on this site (the site is over the 3 acre size under which properties in Hillside zones would be subject to tree removal permits), and there are no Heritage trees on the site. Removal of any trees associated with grading for a future subdivision and residential constriction impacts would be subject to additional environmental review at the time of subdivision application. A summary of trees present may be required to be submitted as part of any subdivision application process.


g ii), g iii) The General Plan Amendment does not entail any physical changes to the site, but if the applicant’s request is approved, it would allow subsequent subdivision and development of the site. The project itself would not directly affect either the candidate/sensitive/special species habitat, Oak Woodlands or woodlands including oaks, or the riparian area. Any future subdivision proposal would have to comply with California Public Resources Code requirements for Oak Woodlands, but using the conceptual subdivision alternatives as a guide, development on the site at maximum densities is possible without decreasing native oak canopy by ½ acre or more. Any future subdivision proposal would also have to comply with General Plan policies for stream setbacks, in particular Policy R-RC 37 establishing a 150 foot setback from top of bank of streams that are predominantly in their natural state.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** The proposed project would not have any significant impacts on Biological Resources on the site, nor would, in general, the subsequent subdivision of the lot into 12 separately developable lots. Detailed environmental assessment of design-specific aspects of a subdivision on Biological Resources would be assessed at the time a subdivision is proposed and tentative map submitted for review.

**MITIGATION:** None Required.
### E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<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>3, 16, 19, 40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO IMPACT</td>
<td></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>3, 19, 40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>2, 40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) If within New Almaden Historic area, conflict with General Plan policies of this designated special policy area?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>8a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT BACKGROUND:

The project is a General Plan Amendment application, and would not result in any direct physical changes to the site. There are no known historic resources on the site.

The following discussion provides information related to cultural resources, researched and presented in the context of the General Plan Amendment and a reasonably foreseeable future subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.

### DISCUSSION:

a) There are only two structures on the portion of the site most likely to be developed in the event of a subdivision proposal. One is a carport large enough to shelter a recreational vehicle, and the other is a shack that shelters well equipment. Neither of these buildings have been identified as historic resources. Review of air photos indicate that the large carport has been on the site not more than 20 years. Depending on the type of improvements proposed with the subdivision application, further historical review of the existing well equipment shack could be required.

Across Uvas Road to the south of the site is the historic Marchetti Winery (now Sycamore Winery), in operation since 1935. There are no commercial, agricultural, or infrastructural relationships between the two sites, so the General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would not have an impact on historic resources on the Marchetti Winery site.

b), c) There are no known archaeological, unique paleontological or geologic features on the site.
The Northwest Information Center has no record of any previous cultural resource studies for the project area, but also states that the project area has the possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological sites, and recommends in their letter of August 2, 2011 that a study be conducted prior to commencement of project activities.

An archaeology report prepared in October 2012 for the site found no local, state, or federal historically or architecturally significant structures, landmarks, or points of interest within or adjacent to the project site. A field survey conducted for the report noted the presence of the remains of several old structures including a steel windmill tower (on the top of the hill in the northwest corner of the property, a location not likely to be affected by any subsequent development), and a debris pile containing historic era artifacts. A metate (grinding slab) fragment was found in the northern part of the project property near the west bank of Sycamore Creek.

Given that neither the NIC nor the October 2012 archaeological assessment identified any archaeological, unique paleontological, or geologic features, the project will not have any impact on archaeological, unique paleontological, or geologic features on the site.

d) There are no known human remains on the site. Adoption of the General Plan Amendment and Rezoning will not disturb soil on the site. Any subsequent project such as a subdivision or building permit application that could result in soil disturbance would be subject to standard requirements such that in the event that human skeletal remains are encountered, the applicant is required by County Ordinance No. B6-18 to immediately notify the County Coroner. Upon determination by the County Coroner that the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission, pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and the County Coordinator of Indian affairs. No further disturbance of the site may be made except as authorized by the County Coordinator Of Indian Affairs in accordance with the provisions of state law and this chapter. If artifacts are found on the site a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted along with the County Planning Office. No further disturbance of the artifacts may be made except as authorized by the County Planning Office.

e) The site is not within the New Almaden Historic Area.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** The proposed project would not have any significant impacts on Historic Resources. There are no known historic structures on site, although one building on site that has not been evaluated for historical eligibility will require further evaluation, should the proposed improvements associated with a future subdivision potentially impact this buildings.

**MITIGATION:** None Required
## F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<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>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the report, Soils of Santa Clara County, creating substantial risks to life or property?</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 waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Cause substantial compaction or over-covering of soil either on-site or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Cause substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT BACKGROUND:

The project is a General Plan Amendment application, and does not entail any direct physical changes to the site. However, approval of the project would enable a subsequent subdivision application requesting creation of up to 12 lots. A subsequent proposal for subdivision and residential development would be subject to its own environmental assessment and would need to take into consideration geology and soils with respect to the location of the proposed residences.

The following discussion provides information on site geology and soils resources, in the context of the General Plan Amendment and a reasonably foreseeable future subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.
DISCUSSION:

a), c) The Santa Clara County Seismic Hazards map 60 shows that the site is over two miles from the nearest Fault Rupture Hazard zone. Other Geologic Hazard Zone data in the County’s GIS shows that the site is not in a State Fault Zone or Seismic Hazard Zone, and is not in a County Liquefaction, Dike Failure Flooding, Compressible Soils, or Landslide Hazard Zone.

The project does not include development of any new structures, so no people or structures would be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects. However, development associated with any subsequent subdivision application will be subject to Santa Clara County's Policies and Standards Pertaining to Grading and Erosion Control.

The site is not located in a State or County Fault zone, so is not in an area subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Because the project does not include the development of any new structures, the project would not expose additional people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects.

b), f), g) The project will not lead to any compaction or over-covering of soil on or off-site, or erosion or loss of topsoil. It will not cause any change in topography or soil conditions due to excavation, grading, or fill. It is not in a Landslide Hazard or Liquefaction Hazard zone, and is relatively flat except for a hill in the northwest corner of the property, so the site is not unstable nor would it become unstable as a result of the project. If the project is approved, the applicant might apply to subdivide the site into as many as 12 lots. Any such subdivision application would be subject to its own environmental assessment and geologic review.

d) Using soil runoff and erosion hazard qualities to determine the expansiveness of the soils, the Gilroy Clay Loams (GoD and GoG) forming the hill on the site have Medium and Above runoff characteristics and Moderate and Above erosion hazard characteristics, so could be considered expansive soils. The Keefers Clay Loams (KeA and KeC2) on the flat parts of the site have Slight to Moderate or Below runoff and erosion hazard characteristics, and are not considered expansive. The Terrace Escarpment soils in the main riparian area of the site have Rapid and High runoff and erosion hazard characteristics so are considered expansive. However, the General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would not entail any development that would create substantial risk to life or property as a result of the presence of expansive soils, and any future subdivision would likely lead to development on the flat parts of the site that are not considered expansive soils, and therefore would not create substantial risk to life or property.

e) Records from the County Department of Environmental Health indicate that sites in the area around the project site are generally adequate for septic systems.

Overall, there is no evidence that the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would not result in any significant Geology and Soils impacts, nor would a subsequent subdivision proposal.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS: None

MITIGATION: None Required.
## G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact 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>
<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>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BACKGROUND

In 2006, California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill No. 32; California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, Sections 38500, et seq.), which limits statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) to 1990 levels and establishes a goal of achieving these emissions reductions by 2020 (representing a 25 percent reduction in emissions). AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt a comprehensive blueprint for limiting greenhouse gas emissions by the end of 2008 and complete the necessary rulemaking to implement that plan by the end of 2011. That rulemaking and its implementation measures, the AB 32 Climate Change Scoping Plan, were approved in August, 2011.

In addition, the adoption of SB 97 in 2007 mandates that the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) prepare CEQA Guidelines which establish standards for evaluating greenhouse gas emissions including the creation feasible mitigation measures. The California Resource Agencies adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions on December 30, 2009, which became effective on March 18, 2010. The modified CEQA Guidelines require that public agencies in California evaluate greenhouse gas emissions within their CEQA documents, using either qualitative or quantitative methods. Although the modified CEQA guidelines prescribe that CEQA documents must evaluate Greenhouse Gas emissions and determine if emissions will be significant, they do not establish a clear methodology or quantitative thresholds for making this determination.

In November 2009, The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) published proposed revisions to its CEQA Guidelines for addressing Air Quality impacts. These updated Guidelines included proposed quantitative thresholds for Greenhouse Gas Emissions, establishing both a “bright line” threshold of significance for GHG emissions and also an efficiency threshold. Using a methodology that models how new land use development in the San Francisco Bay area can meet AB 32 GHG reduction goals, the BAAQMD Guidelines establish a significance threshold of 1,100 metric tons of CO₂ per year. In addition to this bright line threshold, the Guidelines include an “efficiency” threshold to be used for urban high density, transit oriented development projects that are intended to reduce vehicle trips but may still result in overall emissions greater than 1,100 metric tons per year. These proposed GHG thresholds were adopted by the BAAQMD Board of Directors on June 2, 2010.
In late 2010, the Building Industry Association filed a lawsuit in Alameda Superior Court, challenging BAAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines on the grounds that the agency did not comply with CEQA. In March of 2012, the Court ruled that the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines constitute a project under CEQA and that the District must “set aside all approvals in [the resolution approving the Guidelines] and … not disseminate these or any new approvals of officially sanctioned air quality thresholds of significance until the District fully complies with CEQA.” The claims made in the case concerned the CEQA impacts of adopting the thresholds. Those issues are not relevant to the scientific soundness of the BAAQMD’s analysis of what level of GHG emissions should be deemed significant. 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.

DISCUSSION

a), b) According to the screening threshold prepared by BAAQMD to determine what size of projects would likely result in significant greenhouse gas emissions (1,100 metric tons), a single family residential project would need to encompass 56 houses. While the project being assessed in this study would not directly result in the creation of a housing development, its approval will likely lead to a subsequent subdivision application that could result in the creation of as many as 12 new residential building sites. The construction of 12 single family residences would create greenhouse gas emissions that are below the BAAQMD screening thresholds.

Because neither the General Plan Amendment nor any potential subsequent subdivision application would create greenhouse gas emission above the BAAQMD screening thresholds, it is anticipated that the proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable greenhouse gas impact.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS: The proposed project would not have any significant impacts on greenhouse gas emissions.

MITIGATION: None Required.
# G. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<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) 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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</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>
</tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Provide breeding grounds for vectors?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Involve construction of a building, road or septic system on a slope of 30% or greater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Involve construction of a roadway greater than 20% slope for a distance of 300’ or more?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT BACKGROUND:**
The project is a General Plan Amendment application, and does not entail any activity on the site or physical changes to the site. However, approval of the project would enable a subsequent application to subdivide the lot into as many as 12 new lots. Subsequent subdivision and residential development would be subject to further environmental review and would need to
take into consideration hazards and hazardous materials with respect to the location of the proposed residences and with respect to construction activity on the site.

The following discussion provides information on hazards and hazardous materials, in the context of the General Plan Amendment project and a reasonably foreseeable future subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.

**DISCUSSION:**

a), b), c), d), e) The project would not incorporate the routine transport, use, storage, emission, release, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project would not require hazardous materials to be present on site, so will not create any hazard to the public or the environment through upset or accident involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. There is no school within ¼ mile of the site, and there is no airport within two miles of a public or public use airport. The site is not on the State Department of Toxic Substances, Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites, nor is it on the County’s list of sites with hazardous materials.


g) The property is located in a Very High Fire Risk area of the County’s Wildland/Urban Interface area, in the South Santa Clara County Fire Protection District, and in the State Responsibility Area. The General Plan Amendment and Zone Change itself would not expose people or structures to fire-related loss.

Any subsequent proposal to subdivide the site would be subject to further fire-related environmental review, and development would have to comply with County Fire Marshal Office requirements for defensible space around structures in Very High Fire Risk zones of the Wildland/Urban Interface area.

At the time of site development the applicant shall meet all requirements of the County Fire Marshal's Office for fire protection and fire prevention which may include, but not be limited to, providing on-site fire flow, a fire hydrant, an automatic fire sprinkler system, and appropriate driveway turnouts and turnarounds for firefighting equipment.

A subsequent subdivision application would also need to comply with Government Code 66474.02 (a portion of the Subdivision Map Act) as amended by SB 1241, referencing findings required for projects located in a state responsibility area or a very high fire hazard severity zone:

(a) Before approving a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, for an area located in a state responsibility area or a very high fire hazard severity zone, as both are defined in Section 51177, a legislative body of a county shall make the following three findings:

1. A finding supported by substantial evidence in the record that the design and location of each lot in the subdivision, and the subdivision as a whole, are consistent with any applicable regulations adopted by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection pursuant to Sections 4290 and 4291 of the Public Resources Code.
2. A finding supported by substantial evidence in the record that structural fire protection and suppression services will be available for the subdivision through any of the following entities:
A. A county, city, special district, political subdivision of the state, or another entity organized solely to provide fire protection services that is monitored and funded by a county or other public entity.
B. The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection by contract entered into pursuant to Section 4133, 4142, or 4144 of the Public Resources Code.
3. A finding that to the extent practicable, ingress and egress for the subdivision meets the regulations regarding road standards for fire equipment access adopted pursuant to Section 4290 of the Public Resources Code and any applicable local ordinance.
(b) This section shall not supersede regulations established by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection or local ordinances that provide equivalent or more stringent minimum requirements than those contained within this section.

Given the above evaluation required at the time of future development, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

h) The General Plan Amendment has no physical component, so would not create breeding grounds for vectors. Such breeding grounds may be already present on the site. A biologist’s or other similar report would be required to make any further determination regarding current or potential vector breeding grounds on the site, and could be required at the time in which a subsequent rezoning and subdivision be proposed. In particular, changes in drainage and water retention patterns caused by subsequent development could cause changes in the site’s susceptibility to being a host for vector breeding grounds.

i) The General Plan Amendment has no physical components (of the type that would require a site plan), so there would be no safety hazard created by the project. A subsequent proposal to rezone and subdivide the site might create safety hazards related to parking, access, and other aspects of site design, and the site plan associated with this future proposal would be reviewed upon submission for the evaluation of such safety hazards.

j), k) The project does not require or involve construction of any building, road, or septic system on a slope of 30% or greater. Similarly, the project does not involve construction of a roadway with over 20% slope for over 300 feet. The site is mostly flat, but there is a hill at the northwest corner of the site with slopes over 30%. If a subsequent subdivision proposal includes the creation of a lot or lots on that hill, the environmental review for the proposal would have to include analysis of the impacts of residential infrastructure being constructed on that hill.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** The proposed General Plan Amendment would not create nor be impacted by any significant hazards or hazardous materials. Any subsequent rezoning and subdivision proposal would require subsequent environmental review of features that can only be evaluated once a tentative map is submitted.

**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><img src="No" alt="Yes" /></td>
<td><img src="No" alt="Less Than Significant Impact" /></td>
<td><img src="No" alt="Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \square \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( \times \) No
- \( 34, 36 \)

#### b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?)
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 3, 4 \)

#### c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 3, 17n, \)

#### d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Note policy regarding flood retention in watercourse and restoration of riparian vegetation for West Branch of the Llagas.)
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 3, 17p \)

#### 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?
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 1, 3, 5, 36, 21a \)

#### f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 1, 3, 5 \)

#### g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 3, 17p, 18b, 18d \)

#### h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 3, 18b, 18d \)

#### i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 2, 3, 4, 17p \)

#### j) Be located in an area of special water quality concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)?
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 4, 6a, \)

#### k) Be located in an area known to have high levels of nitrates in well water?
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 4, 20b, 20c \)

#### l) Result in a septic field being constructed on soil where a high water table extends close to the natural land surface?
- \( \square \) Yes
- \( \square \) No
- \( \times \) Mitigation Incorporated
- \( 3 \)
m) Result in a septic field being located within 50

feet of a drainage swale; 100 feet of any well,
water course or water body or 200 feet of a
reservoir at capacity?  

☐  ☐  ☐  ☒  1, 3, 17e

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

☐  ☐  ☐  ☒  22d, 22e

PROJECT BACKGROUND:
The project is a General Plan Amendment application, does not entail any physical changes to
the site, and does not entail the construction of any residences. However, approval of the project
would allow a subsequent rezoning of the parcel and subdivision for as many as 12 lots. Such a
rezoning and subdivision for residential development proposal would be subject to subsequent
environmental review and would need to take into consideration hydrology and water quality
with respect to the number and location of the proposed residences.

The following discussion provides information on site hydrology and water quality, in the
context of the General Plan Amendment and a reasonably foreseeable future rezoning and
subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.

SETTING:
The site is mostly flat, with one riparian area around Sycamore creek running north to south
across the middle of the site, a swale running north to south across the west of the site, and a hill
at the northwest corner of the site.

DISCUSSION:
a) The project itself will not impose any demands on water quality or waste discharge. The lots
that would result from a subsequent subdivision will require well water and septic systems with
leach fields. The impact of those demands on water quality and waste discharge will need to be
analyzed at the time a future subdivision application is filed. Per discussion with Environmental
Health staff, this area does not contain high groundwater or other physical characteristics that
would prevent the use of an onsite septic system.

b) Although the General Plan Amendment by itself will not place any demand on water supply,
the impact of future wells associated with a subsequent subdivision application and residential
development could result in lowering of the local water table, if the demand for water exceeds
existing groundwater resources. Informal discussions with staff at the County’s Department of
Environmental Health did not reveal any concerns about groundwater supply within the area in
which the General Plan Amendment is proposed.

c), d) The riparian area in the center of the site is in FEMA flood area A, which has a 1% annual
chance of flooding. The project will not alter the courses of creeks on the site, nor alter the
existing drainage pattern of the site; however, a subsequent subdivision and residential
development could impact these resources, based on the design. Any subsequent subdivision of
the site would need its own analysis of the proposal’s impact on drainage patterns on the site,
particularly with respect to the potential for flooding onsite, and for floodwater flow and
retention on site. A subdivision proposal will require review under National Point source
Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for stormwater management compliance.
A subdivision proposal may require hydromodification such that there is no increase in erosion
potential compared to pre-subdivision conditions. Special runoff and siltation prevention
measures may need to be implemented to protect the creek from runoff and silt during residential construction activities.

e), f) Some of the hardscape features of future residential development could interfere with water table recharge or the levels of polluted runoff. The creek on the site, Sycamore Creek, is not on the State 303(d) list of Water Quality Limited Segments Requiring Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) to be established.

g), h), i) The General Plan Amendment does not place structures within 100-year flood hazard areas. The only flood hazard area on the site is along the channel of Sycamore Creek. The development pattern of any subsequent subdivision application would have to show consideration of the flood hazard area along Sycamore Creek. The site is just to the north of a Dam Failure Inundation Zone associated with Uvas Dam.

j), k) The site is outside of the portion of Llagas Basin known to have high levels of nitrates in well water. The site is not located in an area of special water quality concern (Los Gatos or Guadalupe watersheds).

l), m) The site is in an area where the depth to the water table is 71 inches or more, so a septic system is not at risk of interfering with the water table. Proposed locations of septic systems and their distance from drainage swales, watercourses, water bodies, and reservoirs will only become an issue to review upon submission of a subdivision application.

n) The General Plan Amendment would not entail any activity that would conflict with the county’s Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams. A subsequent subdivision application would be reviewed for distance of structures and leach fields from creeks, and could be referred to the State Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and/or the Santa Clara Valley Water District as appropriate for further review.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** The proposed General Plan Amendment would not have any significant impacts on hydrology and water quality. Any subsequent subdivision would require subsequent environmental review to determine if the specific design of the subdivision would have impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.

**MITIGATION:** None Required
### PROJECT BACKGROUND:
The project is a General Plan Amendment application. Should the project be approved, it is reasonably foreseeable that a rezoning and subdivision application will follow.

### DISCUSSION:

a) The project would not physically divide an established community, as there is no infrastructure such as roads that are part of the project. A subsequent subdivision would also not physically divide an established community, as the lots would be developed at a density and for a use that is consistent with nearby areas.

b) Staff evaluation of the project has determined that the project conflicts with General Plan policy R-LU 61 which states that the outward expansion of existing Rural Residential areas shall not be allowed. The project also conflicts with policy R-LU 62, which states that re-designation to Rural Residential may be considered only for the purposes of “infilling” existing Rural Residential areas. These policy conflicts, however, do not create a significant environmental impact per CEQA guidelines and practice. Policies R-LU 61 and R-LU 62 were adopted primarily not for purposes of avoiding or mitigating direct environmental impacts of land use and development, but to govern the application of the Rural Residential land use designation, particularly, to provide clarity regarding proposals for infill and expansion thereof.

Staff has determined that the project also conflicts with aspects of several other General Plan policies as follows:
- **Policy R-LU 3 on Resource Conservation Areas**: The current zoning, Hillsides, designates a type of Resource Conservation Area (RCA). The proposed zoning, Rural Residential, is not

---

**TABLE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a, 9, 18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3, 8a, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3, 8a, 22b, 22c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a, 17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22d, 22e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a)** Physically divide an established community?

**b)** Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

**c)** Conflict with special policies:

i) San Martin &/or South County?

ii) Los Gatos Specific Plan or Lexington Watershed?

iii) Guadalupe Watershed?

iv) Stanford?

v) City of Morgan Hill Urban Growth Boundary Area?

vi) West Valley Hillsides Preservation Area?

vii) Water Collaborative (Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams)
an RCA designation. Per Policy R-LU 3, RCAs are intended, among other things, to preserve rural character, preserve agriculture and prime agricultural soils, and minimize the demand for and cost of public services and facilities. Changing the general plan and zoning to a non-RCA designation would reduce the likelihood that the characteristics protected by RCA designations would still be as fully protected for this site.

- **Policies R-LU 16 through R-LU 18 on intent of Hillside designation:** The intent of the Hillside designation, among other things, is to support and enhance rural character, and development is to be limited to avoid increased demand for public services and facilities. Allowable uses consistent with this intent include leaving land in its natural state, agriculture and grazing, and very low density residential development. Changing the zoning to Rural Residential would reduce the likelihood that the environmental assets protected by a Hillsides designation would continue to be as fully protected.

- **Policy R-LU 62 on infilling of existing Rural Residential areas:** An environmental consideration related to R-LU 62 is that proposed infill sites have minimal long term viability for agricultural uses. The subject site, while not used currently or historically for agriculture, has agricultural soil considered prime if irrigated, and therefore has long term agricultural potential similar to sites across the street to south in active use as vineyards. Changing the zoning to Rural Residential would jeopardize that long term agricultural viability.

c) The site is not affected by special policies for San Martin and/or South County, Los Gatos Specific Plan or Lexington Watershed, Guadalupe Watershed, Stanford, the City of Morgan Hill Urban Growth Boundary Area, or the West Valley Hillsides Preservation Area. Special policies of the Water Collaborative (Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams) would be analyzed for applicability upon submission of a Subdivision Application.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** None. Although staff evaluation has determined that the proposed General Plan Amendment conflicts with existing county General Plan policies, these policies were not adopted specifically to protect an environmental resource (such as a riparian setback) and this conflict is not considered to be significant environmental impacts under CEQA review guidelines. A future subdivision application, based on its specific design, would be evaluated for consistency with General Plan policies such as the Riparian Setbacks (R-RC 37 & R-RC 38).

**MITIGATION:** None Required
### J. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACTS</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT BACKGROUND:

The project is a General Plan Amendment application, does not entail any physical changes to the site, and does not entail the construction of any residences. However, approval of the project would enable a subsequent application to rezone and subdivide the property into as many as 12 lots. A subsequent rezoning and subdivision application for residential development would be subject to subsequent environmental review, based on the specific design of the subdivision, and would need to take noise impacts into consideration.

The following discussion provides information on noise impacts, in the context of the General Plan Amendment and a reasonably foreseeable future rezoning and subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.

### DISCUSSION:

a), b), d) The General Plan Amendment will not create any noise impacts. If and when a subsequent subdivision proposal and improvement plans are submitted and approved, grading and construction of single family homes and associated improvements could create a temporary disturbance to neighboring properties. However, when the construction is completed, noise levels will return to levels similar to those emitted by the surrounding residential uses. Land uses on the site, including residential ones, must conform to the County Noise Ordinance, which sets maximum exterior noise levels for land use categories, and compliance with these specifications will ensure that there is no significant noise impact on the neighboring properties.
Neither the project nor any subsequent subdivision would expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibrations or noise.

c) The site is bordered on one side by Watsonville Road, which carries a steady flow of traffic traveling at high speeds. Any residential development resulting from a subdivision application and located near Watsonville Road could be impacted by noise from that traffic. Analysis of the impact of noise from Watsonville Road would be carried out if and when a subdivision application and site plan are submitted.

e) The site is not within two miles of an airport.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** The proposed General Plan Amendment would not cause or be affected by any significant noise impacts. Any subsequent rezoning and subdivision proposal would require subsequent environmental review of noise impacts of traffic on Watsonville Road.

**MITIGATION:** None Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K. POPULATION AND HOUSING</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</td>
<td>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT BACKGROUND:**
The project is a General Plan Amendment application, and does not entail the construction of any residences. However, approval of the project would enable a subsequent application to subdivide the property into as many as 12 lots, an increase in residential density of 9 residences in comparison with the existing General Plan designation of Hillsides.

The following discussion provides information on site population and housing impacts, in the context of the General Plan Amendment and a reasonably foreseeable future rezoning and subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.

**DISCUSSION:**

a) The project would not by itself create substantial growth. Should the proposal be approved, the applicant intends to apply to subdivide the property. A subdivision under the proposed General Plan designation (Rural Residential) could create up to 12 lots, and in this manner would be growth inducing in comparison with the existing General Plan designation (Hillsides), that
only allows 3 lots. However, using an estimated 3.24 people per household in the unincorporated county, the project would increase the population in the area by less than 40 people, which is not a significant increase or impact.

Approval of the General Plan Amendment and Rezoning could set a growth inducing precedent to re-designate, rezone, then subdivide similarly situated lots that are surrounded by non-conforming rural residential uses in zones that are not Rural Residential. There are 40 lots currently zoned HS or A that are or would be similarly situated to the current parcel, if the precedent set by approval of this rezoning were to be continued. Each of those 40 lots would need to go through its own planning process and environmental assessment, were the respective owners interested in taking advantage of the new precedent.

Foreseeable improvements required to establish residences on the lots could include driveways with right-of-way improvements on Watsonville Road and/or Uvas Road, septic systems with leach fields, and wells.

b) There is no housing and no population on the site that would be displaced either by the project or by a subsequent subdivision, so there is no need for construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** None. The proposed project would not have any significant impacts on population or housing.

**MITIGATION:** None Required
### PUBLIC SERVICES

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

---

**PROJECT BACKGROUND:**

The project is a General Plan Amendment application, does not by itself entail any physical changes to the site, and does not entail the construction of any residences. The General Plan Amendment would increase the allowed density on the site from approximately 1 residence per 20 acres to 1 residence per 5 acres, and if approved and followed by a subdivision application and subsequent residential development could possibly result in up to nine more residences located on the site than if the project were not approved. A future rezoning and subdivision application would be subject to subsequent environmental review and would need to take into consideration impacts on public services.

The following discussion provides information on the project’s impact on public services, in the context of the General Plan Amendment and a reasonably foreseeable future rezoning and subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.

**DISCUSSION:**

a) Fire protection is already provided for the site through the South Santa Clara Valley Fire Protection District. One fire-related issue that might require a specific future study or review by the Fire Marshal’s Office at the time of subdivision proposal is whether there is enough well water available to supply both residential and fire protection needs.

a ii), a iii), a iv) The nine additional residences (in addition to the three residences already allowed under current zoning) that could be allowed if the General Plan Amendment is approved would modestly increase demand for Police Protection and School Facilities commensurate with the increase in population. There may be an even smaller increase in demand for Parks.
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS: None. The proposed project would not have any significant impacts on public services.

MITIGATION: None Required

### M. RESOURCES AND RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in loss of open space rated as high priority for acquisition in the &quot;Preservation 2020&quot; report?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT BACKGROUND:
The project is a General Plan Amendment application. It would not itself entail any physical changes to the site or construction on the site. However, approval of the project would enable a subsequent application to rezone and subdivide for development of the property. Impacts of a subdivision proposal on resources and recreation would have to be analyzed further in an environmental study specifically addressing any subdivision proposal.

The discussion below provides information on site resources and recreation in the context of the General Plan Amendment, along with a reasonably foreseeable future subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.

DISCUSSION:
a), b) Special Report 146 from the California Department of Conservation does not identify the site as hosting mineral resources with high economic value. USGS Miscellaneous Field Studies #2373 of 2002 shows greenstone which could contain limestone in the hill at the northwest corner of the lot. A subsequent subdivision and residential development would not significantly decrease the already low potential future value of mineral resources on the site, so the change of
General Plan designation would not result in loss of availability of mineral resources of state, regional, or local importance.

c), d) By itself, the General Plan Amendment would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. A subsequent subdivision could increase use of regional recreational facilities slightly, although this would not result in a significant impact.

e) The Countywide Trails Master Plan Update, an element of the Parks and Recreation element of the County General Plan that the Board of Supervisors adopted on November 14, 1995, shows proposed trail routes along both roads that border the property, Watsonville Road and Uvas Road. There are no existing trails on or near the site, and the nearest park is Uvas Reservoir County Park, over a mile away. The project would not necessarily prevent the proposed trails from being created, but it could result in greater challenges to implementing the trails master plan in this area. The environmental review of any subsequent subdivision proposal would have to consider possible interaction, whether negative or positive, with nearby existing or proposed trails.

f) The project site is not a part of any open space rated as high priority for acquisition in the “Preservation 2020” report.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** The proposed General Plan Amendment would not have any significant impacts on mineral resources or recreation facilities. Any subsequent subdivision proposal would require subsequent environmental review of impacts on the trails master plan for the area. Aside from that, any subsequent subdivision is not likely to have any significant impacts on Resources and Recreation.

**MITIGATION:** None
## N. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC

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

### PROJECT BACKGROUND:
The project is a General Plan Amendment application. It would not entail any physical changes to the site or construction on the site, nor would it establish any new use on the site. However, approval of the General Plan Amendment would enable a subsequent application to rezone, subdivide and develop the property at a higher intensity than currently allowed.

The site is currently vacant and unused, and therefore generates no traffic. The General Plan Amendment would not immediately change uses on the site, though a subsequent rezoning and subdivision would result in an increased number of residential units to be built onsite. The following describes subdivision alternatives that could occur under the existing and proposed General Plan designation, with a description of access and road patterns on the site:
• **3 Lot Hillside Cluster Subdivision**: The lots could be accessed through a shared road in the center section of the site. This configuration would minimize road improvements and demonstrate economy pursuant to cluster provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

• **12 Lot Rural Residential Subdivision**: Lots would have separate driveways, shared driveways and private road access.

The discussion below provides information on transportation in the context of the General Plan Amendment, along with evaluation of a reasonably foreseeable future subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.

**DISCUSSION:**

a) The project would allow consideration of a future subdivision proposal that could create up to possibly 12 residential lots. Under the current General Plan designation, up to 3 residential lots could be created onsite. Thus approval of the General Plan Amendment would result in the allowance of up to 9 additional residences. According to standard trip generation methodologies, a residence is estimated to generate nine trips per day, so a subsequent subdivision could increase the number of trips to and from the site by 81 a day. However, this number of trips would be below the 100 peak period trips threshold used by County Roads to determine if a traffic study is necessary. There are no known Level Of Service problems on the adjacent roads, which are rural roads. Traffic impacts are not likely to be significant.

b) The roads adjacent to the project site, Watsonville Road and Uvas Road, are not Rural Highways and are not listed in the VTA’s 2009 Congestion Management Program.

c) The project site is not in an airport referral area, and would not change air traffic patterns nor create new safety risks.

d) The project does not entail any design features or incompatible uses that would increase site hazards.

e), g) The General Plan Amendment would not change anything related to emergency access or parking capacity. Such impacts would need to be examined if and when a subdivision is proposed, as would potential conflicts with alternative transportation policies, access to nearby uses, and provisions for future street right of way. However, using the conceptual subdivision alternatives as a guide, it can be determined that the site has sufficient access to roads to facilitate subdivision designs that would have sufficient emergency access, safe and easy access to nearby uses, and sufficient space for future street right of way.

f) The Countywide Trails Masterplan shows proposed trails along both roads that border the property, Watsonville Road and Uvas Road. Environmental review of any subsequent subdivision proposal would have to consider possible interaction, whether negative or positive, with nearby existing or proposed trails.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:** None. The proposed project would not have any significant transportation or traffic impacts, nor would creation of nine additional residences on the site as result of a subdivision. If a subsequent subdivision proposal is submitted, site-specific design impacts on traffic would be evaluated as part of subsequent environmental review.

**MITIGATION:** None Required
O. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1, 3, 5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 21a, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Require new or expanded entitlements in order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 21,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Not be able to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Be in non-compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT BACKGROUND:

The project is a General Plan Amendment application. It would not entail any physical changes to the site or construction on the site, nor would it establish any new use on the site. However, approval of the project would enable a subsequent application to rezone and subdivide the property into as many as 12 lots.

The site is not connected to water, stormwater, or sewer systems, nor would a subsequent subdivision require that the site be connected to such services. Impacts of a subdivision proposal on other utilities and service systems would have to be analyzed further in an environmental study specifically addressing any subdivision proposal.

The discussion below provides information on site resources and recreation in the context of the General Plan Amendment, along with a reasonably foreseeable future rezoning and subdivision application should the General Plan Amendment be approved.
DISCUSSION:
a), e) The General Plan Amendment would not entail an increase in wastewater treatment requirements. Any development of the property would require an on-site wastewater system. The specific impact of the additional lots and subsequent residential development on wastewater treatment capacity would need to be examined at the time such a subdivision is proposed.

b), c), d) The General Plan Amendment itself would not generate any solid waste nor require any water supply from offsite, though the needs of any proposed subdivision would need to be analyzed as part of subsequent environmental review to see if there would be sufficient landfill capacity and sufficient well water capacity on the site to serve the additional lots and residences that would be allowed under the new zoning.

f), g) Garbage service is mandatory in the unincorporated areas of Santa Clara County. A condition of any subdivision approval would be that the applicant provides proof of garbage service at the time of final occupancy signoff.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS: None. The General Plan Amendment would not have any impact on utilities or service systems. A subsequent subdivision proposal would be subject to subsequent environmental review that would evaluate impacts on utilities and service systems.

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>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Potential Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | SOURCE | 1 to 52 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|
| 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 |

The project will not trigger any Mandatory Findings of Significance.
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 Depts. of individual cities, Planning Depts. of individual cities,
8a. Santa Clara County (SCC) General Plan
8b. The South County Joint Area Plan
9. SCC Zoning Regulations (Ordinance)
10. County Grading Ordinance
11. SCC Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval
12. SCC Development Guidelines for Design Review
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
19. CEQA Guidelines [Current Edition]
   e. Soils Overlay Air Photos
   f. “Future Width Line” map set
   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 (2010)
   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

Archaeological Resources
40. Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University
41. Site Specific Archaeological Reconnaissance Report

Geological Resources
42. Site Specific Geologic Report

43. State Department of Mines and Geology, Special Report #42
44. State Department of Mines and Geology, Special Report #146

Noise
45. County Noise Ordinance

Hazards & Hazardous Materials
46. Section 21151.4 of California Public Resources Code
47. State Department of Toxic Substances, Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List

Transportation/Traffic
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.