

# Initial Study Source List\*

(AMENDED)

## INITIAL STUDY

### Environmental Checklist and Evaluation for Santa Clara County

<b>File Number:</b>	1592 -14A -14G-14EA	<b>Date:</b>	January 27, 2015
<b>Project Type:</b>	Architecture and Site Approval and Grading for the Camp Saratoga Rehabilitation	<b>APN(s):</b>	503-43-001 & 503-35-001
<b>Project Location</b>	24500 Big Basin Way, Saratoga, CA 95070	<b>GP Designation:</b>	Hillsides
<b>Owner</b>	Valley Inception, LLC. / Jack Smith	<b>Zoning:</b>	HS-d1-sr & HS-sr
<b>Applicant</b>	Jack Smith	<b>Urban Service Area:</b>	N/A

#### Project Description

The proposed project is to rehabilitate an existing camp / retreat facility, Camp Saratoga, through obtaining Architecture and Site Approval (ASA) and Grading. Proposed project scope includes demolishing (9) existing cabins, consolidating and building four (4) new camper / staff cabins, one (1) facility storage building, reconstructing the existing Norris House for administration functions and various site improvements such as installing new parking lot, internal access serving the new buildings, ADA and utility upgrades.

The subject site was recognized as a camp since 1965 through the issuance of a use permit allowing "rehabilitation of camp" (4A65.1). The use permit allowed for a capacity of 435 attendees and support/staff. The camp was formerly known as UAHC Swig Camp-Institute. The camp provided overnight religious summer camps until 2005. Since 2005, other types of organized overnight camps and retreat programs were provided onsite and through an administrative hearing decision, the County recognized that the uses conducted onsite have been consistent with the use permit allowing for camp and retreat. The current proposal is to rehabilitate and modernize the existing camp facility. There is no expansion proposed to the existing camp capacity. A similar rehabilitation was proposed by the previous organization, Camp Swig, and approved in 2002. Upon completion of the rehabilitation, subject facility will resume operation hosting a variety of programs in varying durations year-round. Summer programs may be as minimal as days or weeks, while school year programs will be longer.

The proposed cabin buildings are approximately 4,500 s.f. in size, two-story. Each cabin will be able to accommodate 40 campers and one staff member. A total of 164 beds to replace the existing 161 beds will be provided for the camp. The slight increase in accommodation is due to the required compliance stipulated by the California Department of Public Health for organized camps where one staff member is required to be in the same cabin for every 40 campers. The project also includes a new facility storage building of approximately 2,500 s.f. and the reconstruction of Norris House. The storage building is to be located adjacent to the new parking lot close to Redwood Gulch Road. The Norris House has traditionally provided administration functions for the camp and was severely damaged by a fallen tree. Included in the proposed scope is to reconstruct the Norris House at its current location with a minor expansion in the basement to provide additional storage.

## Initial Study Source List\*

Other onsite improvements include installing a new parking lot of 40 spaces closed to Redwood Gulch Road connecting to a new internal 20-foot wide access driveway serving the new cabin buildings. The new parking area is a consolidation of other various spaces available onsite and to provide a central parking area. The existing waste water treatment plan will be repaired per requirements stipulated by State Regional Water Quality Control Board. Various ADA and infrastructure upgrades, such as electric, water lines, and/or communication security lines will be installed onsite.

Estimated grading quantities for the project including improvements associated with the parking area, driveway, ADA upgrade and utility and infrastructure trenching are approximately 4,450 c.y. of cut and 3,590 of fill (860 c.y. to be exported).

### Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The subject property is located outside City of Saratoga's urban service area in an unincorporated portion of the Santa Clara County. The parcel is approximately 2.5 miles west of County Sanborn Park and 3.5 miles east of Hwy 35 / Skyline Blvd, on the north side of Big Basin Way / Hwy 9 / Congress Springs Road. The site is approximately 198 acres in size, comprising of APN 503-35-001 and 503-43-001, while the proposed activity primarily is on a small area in the western portion of APN 503-43-001. The proposed development mostly involves existing buildings and nearby vicinity.

The site is located off Big Basin Way / Hwy 9 / Congress Springs Road, a State Highway and a County scenic road. The general topography slopes down and away from Big Basin Way. There are two creeks, Booker Creek and Saratoga Creek, winding along Hwy 9 on subject property. There are three existing driveways connecting to Hwy 9 and one access on Redwood Gulch Road, a County-maintained road. The area proposed to accommodate the new cabins is generally flat and has been previously disturbed and developed as part of the camp.

There are a number of existing structures that serve the camp facility including cabins, a program building, a dining hall, a swimming pool, sports /play field, an outdoor stage with assembly area, caretaker's unit, an infirmary, a Jewish temple, storage buildings as well as various sports and recreational areas. The subject site is surrounded by open space with a few hillside residential developments along Hwy 9. A proposed wildlife rescue center is to the south of subject property.

### Other agencies sent a copy of this document:

CA Department of Fish & Wildlife, US Fish & Wildlife,  
California Department of Health / Domestic Water Supply, State Regional Water Quality Control Board

## Initial Study Source List\*

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

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics           | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture / Forest Resources                | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emission         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise   | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources / Recreation                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input type="checkbox"/> None                                 |

### II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS WITH NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Some proposed applications that are not exempt from CEQA review may have little or no potential for adverse environmental impact related to most of the topics in the Environmental Checklist; and/or potential impacts may involve only a few limited subject areas. These types of projects are generally minor in scope, located in a non-sensitive environment, and are easily identifiable and without public controversy. For the environmental issue areas where there is no potential for significant environmental impact (and not checked above), the following finding can be made using the project description, environmental setting, or other information as supporting evidence.

Check here if this finding is not applicable

**FINDING:** For the following topics, there is no potential for significant environmental impact to occur either from construction, operation or maintenance of the proposed project and no further discussion in the Environmental Checklist is necessary.

## Initial Study Source List\*

**EVIDENCE:** Agricultural and Forest Resources: The subject parcel is zoned Hillsides and the property is not a designated farmland. The proposed project includes removing existing cabins and administration hall to build new structures at the previously disturbed area. The parcel is not contracted under the Williamson's Act. The proposed project will not result in any further prime agricultural land conversion. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 3, 5, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28)

**EVIDENCE:** Air Quality: The proposed development associated with camp rehabilitation would involve grading and construction activities. Fugitive dust would be created during the construction of the proposed structures and site improvements. However, dust emissions would be controlled through standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) dust control measures that would be a condition of the project. Emissions generated from the proposed development would well below the BAAQMD operational-related emissions thresholds. Construction and grading will not result in long-term air quality pollution sources. Short-term air quality impacts (dust and diesel emissions) may result from construction activities. However, standard dust control measures as stipulated by County Land Development Engineering and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District will be employed as Mitigation Measures as conditions of approval, to ensure that any air quality impacts remain less than significant. Upon completion of the construction of the project, there will be no significant dust or air pollution generated. There will be no increase in traffic trips with the proposed camp rehabilitation. The proposed project is to rehabilitate an existing camp and its operation would not generate a significant increase in daily vehicle trips or involve the emissions of criteria pollutants. (Project Description; Reference # 3, 4, 5, 13, 29, 30)

**EVIDENCE:** Greenhouse Gas: The proposed camp rehabilitation to demolish existing cabins and build new structures would involve the use of construction equipment, but emissions of greenhouse gases would be minimal and temporary. The camp would consume electricity and gas for the general operation. However, the amount would be minimal, and therefore would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the effect of GHG emissions on the environment. The emission generated from the camp would be below the BAAQMD operational-related emissions thresholds stipulated for an elementary school (44,000 s.f.), the most compatible use as described in the BAAQMD adopted guidelines since the proposed use (camp / retreat) is not listed. There will be no increase in traffic trips with the proposed camp rehabilitation. The proposed project to rehabilitate the existing camp would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation for reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. (Project Description; Reference # 3, 4, 5, 29, 30)

**EVIDENCE:** Land Use: The proposed project to rehabilitate the existing camp conforms to both the County General Plan as well as the Zoning Ordinance. The subject site is with the General Plan land use designation, Hillsides. The existing use, camp / retreat, is consistent with allowable uses stipulated in County General Plan policies R-LU 16. In accordance with County Zoning Ordinance, uses such as camp / retreat facilities are allowed in HS zoning districts and the rehabilitation of an existing camp is subject to Architecture and Site Approval. There is no proposed expansion of the existing facility. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)

## Initial Study Source List\*

- EVIDENCE:** Noise. The noise levels generated during the grading and construction of this project would create a temporary disturbance to neighboring properties. The project shall conform to the County Noise Ordinance. The County Noise Ordinance (Section B11-152) sets maximum exterior noise levels for land use categories, and compliance with these specifications will ensure that the neighboring properties are not significantly impacted. . (Project Description; Reference # 1, 5, 45)
- EVIDENCE:** Population and Housing: The existing facility has been utilized as a camp / retreat center since before 1965. Faculty and staff will have temporary and seasonal fluctuation in population, but the proposed project will not displace any existing housing, or to induce population growth. The proposed project will maintain the same amount of overnight accommodation for camp for both campers and staff with a slight increase of staff units, due to compliance with guidelines stipulated for any organized camp. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 3, 4, 5)
- EVIDENCE:** Public Services: The proposed camp rehabilitation involves no further expansion of the existing facility. Therefore, there will be no significant increase in the need for additional fire or police protection to the area. Other public services, such as provided by schools or parks, would not be impacted. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 38, 39)
- EVIDENCE:** Resources/Recreation: The proposed project site is not located in an area where mineral resources of value to the region or state have been identified. The site is also not located on locally important mineral resource recovery sites. The proposed project to rehabilitate Camp Saratoga by demolishing existing cabins and building new ones would not involve either the use or construction of recreational facilities. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 3, 5, 6, 27, 32)
- EVIDENCE:** Transportation/Traffic: The proposed project including the installation of a new parking area and the new internal driveway access to serve the new cabins will not generate any more daily trips. No expansion on the overall camp capacity is proposed. Most campers / students will be bused into the facility on a weekly or longer duration, pending on the length of the program. The project will not generate substantial new traffic, impair existing transportation facilities, or result in inadequate emergency access or parking capacity. Construction activities for the proposed development would involve a temporary increase of vehicle trips related to delivery of material and workers commuting to the site. Because the number of trips would be temporary and small in number, and road use in the vicinity is relatively light, the proposed project would not have impacts on traffic and circulation. In addition, both State Department of Transportation and County Roads and Airports have concurred that no ~~additional traffic impact~~ *increased traffic intensity* might occur on either Hwy 9 (State highway) or Redwood Gulch Roach (County road) *since this project is an ADA upgrade which would not generate additional trips*. New parking area and the internal access have been designed in conformance with requirements listed in Zoning Ordinance Section 4.30.040. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 49, 50, 51, 52)

## Initial Study Source List\*

**EVIDENCE:** Utilities/Service Systems: The proposed project to rehabilitate the existing camp includes repairing the existing wastewater treatment system to accommodate the camp use. The existing system has been permitted by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and repaired under review by State Department of Public Health. The new storm water drainage facility will mitigate any erosion control caused by added impervious area will not cause any significant environmental effects. Water is provided through onsite springs (Booker Creek) to provide both fire protection storage and domestic uses. Construction activities would involve minimal amounts of debris that would need be removed and disposed of, and existing landfill capacity would sufficient to accommodate it. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 3, 5, 6, 24b, 70)

## Initial Study Source List\*

**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**

## Initial Study Source List\*

### ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

A. AESTHETICS					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCES
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	No Impact	
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2,3,4, 6,17f
b) Substantially damage scenic resources along a designated scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 6,7 17f
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2,3
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3,4
e) If subject to ASA, be generally in non-compliance with the Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11
f) If within a Design Review Zoning District for purposes of viewshed protection (d, -d1, -d2), conflict with applicable General Plan policies or Zoning Ordinance provisions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2,3,4,8a, 9,12, 17f

#### DISCUSSION:

(b,c,e,f)

#### **No Impacts.**

The subject property is located on Big Basin Way / Hwy 9 / Congress Springs Road. Congress Springs Road is a County designated Scenic Road per Section 3.30.050 of Zoning Ordinance. The proposed camp rehabilitation to build new cabins and storage buildings will be located greater than 100 feet from the scenic road right-of-way and that all of the improvements will comply with the Architecture and Site Approval Guidelines. The subject facility is comprised of APN 503-43-001 and APN 503-35-001 and APN 503-35-001 is within the -d1 (design review combining district) zoning district. However, there is no proposed development on APN 503-35-001. Therefore, Design Review is not required.

(a,d)

#### **Less Than Significant.**

The proposed project replaces sections of existing chain-link fence with a stretch of 8-ft height decorative walls along the main entrance on Hwy 9. An informational sign, approximately 8-ft wide by 4-ft tall, is proposed to be installed on the western side of the decorative wall. A security gate is also proposed at this entrance. In accordance with Section 5.50.060.D of the County Zoning Ordinance, fences or similar structures conforming to applicable standards can be allowed within the scenic setback of a scenic resource.

## Initial Study Source List\*

In addition, all exterior light fixtures to support the camp use will be required to be downward directed to avoid spillover of any light source. Both the fence and sign along Hwy 9 and the exterior lights will be required to comply with applicable standards resulting less than significant aesthetic impacts.

### MITIGATION:

#### Fence / Retaining wall within scenic setback of Congress Springs Road

1. Fences shall not exceed eight (8) feet in height within 100-feet of Congress Springs Road.

#### Exterior Lighting

1. All on-site lighting fixtures installed within 100 feet of the edge of right-of-way of Congress Springs Road shall be designed, controlled, and maintained so that emitted light source is cast at a downward angle or away from the roadway, and that bare bulbs within these fixtures are not visible from the roadway. Pathway, roadway, and parking lighting to provide safety and security within this setback should be limited to a 4-foot maximum fixture height. In order to ensure that the existing and proposed light fixtures throughout subject property do not create a significant new source of light, light shields will be required to direct the light down and avoid light source to be spillover onto adjacent property. A lighting plan and fixture manufacturer's details must be submitted for review and approval.

<b>B. AGRICULTURE / FOREST RESOURCES</b>					
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.					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Convert 10 or more acres of farmland classified as prime in the report Soils of Santa Clara County (Class I, II) to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,23,24,26
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9,21a
c) Conflict with an existing Williamson Act Contract or the County's Williamson Act Ordinance (Section C13 of County Ordinance Code)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 28
d) Conflict with existing zone for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9,
e) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	32
f) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,4,26

## Initial Study Source List\*

nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**DISCUSSION:** See Section II: Agriculture and Forest Resources

**MITIGATION:** None.

<b>C. AIR QUALITY</b>					
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.					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,29, 30
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,29, 30
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,29, 30
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5,29, 30

**DISCUSSION:** See Section II: Air Quality

**MITIGATION:** None.

## Initial Study Source List\*

<b>D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>					
	<b>IMPACT</b>				<b>SOURCE</b>
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT:</b>	<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 7, 17b, 17o,
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3,7, 8a, 17b, 17e, 22d, 22e, 33
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 7, 17n, 33
d) Have a substantial adverse effect on oak woodland habitat as defined by Oak Woodlands Conservation Law (conversion/loss of oak woodlands) – Public Resource Code 21083.4?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 31, 32
e) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,7, 17b, 17o
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,4, 17l
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources:					
i. Tree Preservation Ordinance [Section C16]?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,31, 32
ii. Wetland Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 25-30]?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 8a
iii. Riparian Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 31-41]?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3, 8a,

## Initial Study Source List\*

### DISCUSSION:

(c through g.ii)

#### **No Impacts.**

The proposed project will not have any impact on any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. In the report prepared by Zanders Associates dated September 22, 2014 and a supplemental memo dated November 17, 2014, it indicates that all proposed structures are to be kept a minimum of 50-feet from the top of bank of Saratoga Creek. All of the proposed improvements will occur within previously disturbed areas and will therefore not result in any further removal of native habitat. The approximately 375 linear feet of the upper reaches of Saratoga Creek that winds through the study area will be unaffected. No direct impacts to the creek are anticipated as there will be no new outfalls or any other encroachment into the channel, bed or bank. No indirect impacts are anticipated as none of the improvements will be closer to the channel than existing structures. Most of the construction activities will occur over 300 feet away from the channel; only a small portion of the relocated basketball court will be within 78 feet, that is on an previously-disturbed area.

No special status plant species were found or are expected to occur in the study area and therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

The proposed project is outside of the permit area for the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan.

(a, b, g.iii)

#### **Less Than Significant.**

A biological report was conducted and prepared by Zander Associates, dated September 22, 2014, addressing concerns specifically regarding western pond turtles, S.F. dusky footed wood rats, special-status bats, nesting raptors and the CA red legged frogs. Based on a query of the California Natural Diversity Database (2014), review of the California Native Plant Society list of rare plants in the Santa Clara County, and review of recent environmental documents prepared for projects in the vicinity of the camp, a list was developed along with findings for each species. Eighteen plants were evaluated for their potential to occur in the study area, although none of these species is expected to be present because the study area either lacks suitable habitat or potential presence based on the results of previous field surveys conducted in 2010 (August 25 and October 14) and a field survey of the study area conducted August 28, 2014. Thirteen animal species were evaluated for their potential to occur in the study area. Most of the species were dismissed due to the lack of suitable habitat. Two of these species warrant further discussion: California red-legged frog and olive-sided flycatcher.

#### California Red-Legged Frogs

The California red-legged frog is a federally-listed threatened species and is designated a Species of Special Concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). There was a recorded sighting in 1997 of a juvenile CA red legged frog next to the Saratoga Creek three miles downstream from the camp and in 2011 another sighting one mile from the camp property. The biological report concluded that the portion of the Saratoga Creek that runs through the property has a relatively narrow, shallow and cobble-lined channel that is dry throughout most of the year, therefore the study area does not provide suitable breeding habitat for CA red-legged frogs. CA red-legged frogs could move through the Saratoga Creek corridor during the winter/spring if water is present but they are unlikely to be present when the creek is dry (summer and fall

## Initial Study Source List\*

months). The frogs are also unlikely to move far away from the corridor because of the lack of suitable aquatic habitats in or nearby the study area. The project will not result in degradation of potential California red-legged frog habitat and it will not interfere substantially with frogs that may move through the creek corridor. Recommended mitigation strategies for CA red-legged frogs are listed in mitigation below.

California red-legged frogs could move through the Saratoga Creek corridor during the winter/spring if water is present but they are unlikely to be present when the creek is dry (summer and fall months). The frogs are also unlikely to move far away from the corridor because of the lack of suitable aquatic habitats in or nearby the study area. The closest construction activities will be more than 75 feet away from the channel and would be unlikely to affect frogs travelling through the corridor during the winter/spring months. Nevertheless, avoidance and minimization measures should be implemented to reduce the potential of encountering red-legged frogs in disturbance areas during construction. The report concluded that the proposed project will not result in the removal or degradation of potential California red-legged frog habitat with the implementation of imposed mitigations and it will not interfere substantially with frogs that may move through the creek corridor.

### Olive-Sided Flycatchers and other Migratory Birds

The olive-sided flycatcher is designated a Species of Special Concern by CDFW with its nesting habitat of primary concern. The biological report found there is a potential for olive-sided flycatchers to breed in the trees of the Santa Clara Mountains, building nests in the mid to upper canopy. Because the surrounding trees in the study area are suitable nesting habitat for a variety of birds, under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (17 USC 703), which prohibits the taking, hunting, killing, selling, purchasing, etc. of migratory birds, and their eggs and nests and Section 3503.5 of the Fish and Game Code which protects the nests and eggs of birds-of-prey, means to avoid removal of trees with active nests until such time as the young have fledged and the nest is abandoned.

The large trees in the study area provide suitable nesting habitat for a variety of birds, including migratory birds such as the red-tailed hawk and red-shouldered hawk. These birds are not considered sensitive but they do receive some protection under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC 703). Some large trees may be removed for construction of the new parking area and smaller trees and shrubs may be cleared where the new building abut patches of woodland but the extent of that tree removal is expected to be less than 0.1 acre. The large trees could provide suitable nesting habit for the olive-sided flycatcher, raptor, or other migratory birds. However, removal of these trees is unlikely to sustainably reduce potential nesting habitat for the olive-sided flycatcher, raptors, or other migratory birds. However, removal of these trees is unlikely to substantially reduce potential nesting habitat for these birds in the vicinity. Any active nests in trees to be removed or nearby construction activities should be protected in compliance with standards until the nest is vacated. The proposed project will cause less than significant impact with proper implementation of the imposed mitigations.

### Bay Checkerspot Butterfly

The proposed facility improvements and new parking areas are likely to result in an increase in traffic and vehicle exhaust resulting in an increase in atmospheric nitrogen deposition within serpentine grassland habitat for the threatened Bay Checkerspot butterfly and listed serpentine plants within the Santa Clara Valley. This nitrogen fertilizing effect will increase the invasion of weeds into suitable serpentine grassland habitat for the

## Initial Study Source List\*

Bay Checkerspot butterfly and listed serpentine plants thereby degrading habitat for these listed species. Thus the proposed project should minimize the effects on the Bay Checkerspot butterfly and listed serpentine plants consistent with the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan such as by funding the preservation of suitable habitat and management of weeds within serpentine grassland habitat for the Bay Checkerspot butterfly and listed serpentine plants in the Santa Clara Valley.

A follow-up memo prepared by the Zanders Association confirmed that the proposed project to rehabilitate the existing camp would not result in an increase in traffic since the proposed scope is to replace buildings at an already-developed area. Since there is no proposed expansion to the existing camp, the level of usage will remain the same. There will not be an increase in atmospheric nitrogen deposition negatively impacting serpentine grassland habitat.

### Riparian Habitat

There are two creeks meandering through the subject property: Saratoga Creek and Booker Creek. Several existing buildings that support the camp are located within 150-feet to the top of bank of creeks. Saratoga Creek enters the proposed scope area through a culvert under Redwood gulch Road and winds its way southeast towards Big Basin Way where it parallels the road through the remainder of the property. The proposed scope to rehabilitate camp including installing a new parking lot, new driveway and other improvement will be located on an existing disturbed area, and within the 150-foot riparian setback per General Plan Policy R-RC 37 & 38. However, there will be no further encroachment of the required 150-foot riparian setback as stipulated in General Plan Policy R-RC 37 and R-RC 38, which would preclude any commercial development within 150-ft. from top of bank of a natural creek. The proposed project would take place on the existing impervious area and would not result in any additional conversion of natural soil. The report prepared by Zander Associates also concluded that there will be no impacts anticipated to the creek as most of the construction activities will occur over 300 feet away with only a small part of the basketball court that is within 78-feet., on an area where it was previously developed.

### MITIGATION:

#### California Red-Legged Frog

1. *Complete work activities that are within 100 feet of Saratoga Creek between April 1 and November 1 or when the creek channel is completely dry and unlikely to carry storm flows. If these activities cannot occur during this timeframe, then the following measures should be implemented:*
  - a. *Erect a silt fence just outside the top of the bank along the reach of Saratoga Creek through the study area. The fencing should be placed along the northern bank and should be continuous (no gaps).*
  - b. *Have a qualified biologist on-call to monitor construction activities. If any red-legged frogs are encountered, the biologist should halt construction activities and notify United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to determine how to proceed. Only USFWS-approved biologists are allowed to handle red-legged frogs.*
  - c. *Designate a member of the construction crew to be responsible for regularly inspecting and maintaining the integrity of the exclusion fencing.*

## Initial Study Source List\*

2. *Prior to initiation of construction, a qualified biologist should conduct a training session for all construction personnel. The training should include a description of the California red-legged frog and his habitat, the importance of the species and its habitat, the general measures that are being implemented to keep red-legged frogs out of harm's way during construction, and the procedures to follow should red-legged frogs be encountered in the work area.*
  
3. *Implement best management practices to control erosion during and after construction and to keep the creek channel free of trash and other pollutants.*
  
4. *If red-legged frogs are encountered at any time during construction in the work area, construction activities should stop and USFWS should be notified. Only USFWS-approved biologists are allowed to handle red-legged frogs.*

### Migratory Birds

1. *If construction activities are initiated after September 1 through January 31 (outside of typical nesting season for the birds-of-prey and migratory birds that may nest in the study area), then pre-construction surveys for active nests should not be necessary. If activities are initiated before August or after January, then pre-construction surveys for active nests within a certain radius of proposed activities are recommended. If active nests are found and the biologist determines that construction activities would remove the nest or have potential cause abandonment, then those activities should be avoided until the young have fledged as determined through monitoring of the nest. Once the young have fledged, construction activities can resume in the vicinity.*

### Riparian Habitat

1. *No new permanent disturbed area should be allowed within 150-feet from top of bank of Saratoga Creek and Booker Creek. The proposed development is to be installed on previously disturbed area.*

### General Habitat Protection

1. *Limit tree removal to smallest area necessary to complete demolition/construction activities.*
  
2. *Keep fueling and vehicle maintenance sites within existing developed/paved areas and face from the creek channel.*
  
3. *Implement best management practices during construction to keep silt, trash and other pollutants out of the creek channel.*

<b>E. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
	<b>IMPACT</b>			<b>SOURCE</b>
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT</b>	<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	

## Initial Study Source List\*

		<u>Mitigation Incorporated</u>			
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3, 16, 19, 40, 41
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3, 19, 40, 41,
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2,3,4,,40,41
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 40,41
e) If within New Almaden Historic area, conflict with General Plan policies of this designated special policy area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a

### DISCUSSION:

(c,e)

#### **No Impact.**

The proposed development to rehabilitate the existing camp will not cause any adverse impact to any historical resource onsite. All proposed grading will occur on a previously disturbed area that has been utilized as a camp. There are no known resources located on subject site that are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources.

(a,b,d)

#### **Less Than Significant.**

The existing cabins and other buildings that are proposed to be demolished may be more than 50 years in age. A Historic Information Questionnaire will be required for review at the time of building permit application. In addition, a historical resources evaluation report was prepared by JRP Historical Consulting Service for Camp Swig on December 11, 2002. In reviewing the report at the time, staff concurred with JRP's analysis that the subject property is not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources.

The report states that "while prominent writers, Kathleen and Charles Norris, owned the resources between 1920 and ca. 1945, La Estancia (Camp Swig / Camp Saratoga site) does not appear to be important for its association with their productive lives as writers." Furthermore, none of these resources appear to meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places because they lack sufficient integrity to convey their significant association with historically important events, individuals or architecture. This lack of integrity applies to the resources as a district and as individual resource, as their ability to contribute to a potential district of similar resources should such a district be identified in the area. None of these historic-era properties appear to be a historic resource under the edibility criteria for the California Register of Historic

## Initial Study Source List\*

Resources and therefore do not appear to be historic resources for the purpose of CEQA. This report is further reinforced by a preliminary report issued on December 9, 2002 indicating that there was a structure fire on site. Upon observation, there were four to six one-story buildings involved with fire (plus two other structures and a van). It is likely that these structures were several of the small cabins constructed in the 1920s by the Norris for Kathleen Norris' siblings and their families. The damaged / destruction of these cabins further diminishes the historic integrity of the property. Therefore, the proposed project will cause less than significant impact to any potential historic resource.

Further, Unknown human remains could be found during excavation or grading for the proposed project. The approval of the project will include the following condition, which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level:

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.

### MITIGATION:

#### *Cultural Resources*

1. *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.*

<b>F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>				
	<b>IMPACT</b>			<b>SOURCE</b>
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT:</b>	<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

## Initial Study Source List\*

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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6, 17c, 43
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6, 17c
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 17c, 17n, 18b
iv)	Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6, 17L, 118b
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 14, 23, 24
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 17c, 23, 24, 42
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the report, Soils of Santa Clara County, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14,23, 24,
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,6, 23,24,
f)	Cause substantial compaction or over-covering of soil either on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 6
g)	Cause substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 6,17j, 42

### DISCUSSION:

**Geographic Setting** - The site is located on the Cupertino 7 ½' USGS topographic quadrangle map. Surface topography is gently to moderately sloped (0-30%), with some areas of greater slope (>30%) in areas of the site that are currently developed and proposed for the project (southwest to southeastern portion of property adjacent to Highway 9). Areas of the site to north of the developed areas have significant slopes greater than 30%. The site elevation ranges from approximately 1350 feet above mean sea level (MSL) in the southeast portion of the property, to as high as 1750 feet above MSL in the eastern central portion of the property and as low as approximately 950 feet above MSL in the northwestern portion of the property. The nearest surface water body, Saratoga Creek, is located on the southern boundary of the site, and intersects with Booker Creek in the southeastern portion of the site.

**Geologic Setting** - The property is located along a mid-slope ridgeline within the San Andreas Rift Zone along Saratoga Creek in the Santa Cruz Mountains. The San Andreas fault zone has experienced repeated faulting over millions of years resulting in fractures and weakened rocks within the fault zone. Erosion of the sheared, weakened rocks has created the linear valley and recurrent faulting has also created complex geologic relationships in and near the fault zone. Geologic mapping and exploratory trenching conducted during

## Initial Study Source List\*

previous consultant investigations (summarized on Plate 4), combined with mapping by Rogers and Armstrong (1973), Woodward- Clyde Consultants (1975) Chin, et al. (1993) and our geologic reconnaissance for this investigation, indicates the bedrock underlying the eastern half of the property consists of Cretaceous age Franciscan sandstone and shale. The Franciscan rocks are in fault contact with a wedge of younger sandstone. The fault contact is approximately located as it is covered by colluvial and/or old landslide deposits. The highly sheared Franciscan rocks appear to be traversed by a zone of surface faulting associated with the April 18, 1906 "San Francisco"(Plate 4).

The Vaqueros sandstone appears to underlie the western part of the former main camp area and was exposed in highway road cuts west of the property, and was reported by Woodward-Clyde (1976) in this area. Franciscan shale and sandstone are in fault contact with the Vaqueros sandstone (Plate 4). Overlying the Vaqueros sandstone in the project area is a sequence of soils and fluvial gravels associated with Saratoga Creek which flows between the site and Highway 9. These gravels and soil sequences were exposed in the exploratory trench and in one of the test pits (e.g. Environmental Geology Services, 1993 and Environmental Geology Services, 2002). Sheared Vaqueros sandstone, seen in the road cut in the southern part of the property, likely underlies fluvial deposits along and adjacent to Saratoga Creek. These deposits are mapped as the area of historic liquefaction occurrence on Plate 5.

Although there are some observed slope failures on site, and there are wide spread landslide deposits, there are no specific landslides mapped on the property. Previous studies of the former Upper Kibbutz area (location of the Chaple on Plate 4) exposed Butano sandstone partially overlain by an old landslide deposit exposed in trenches (Merrill & Seeley, Inc., 1980). The age of the landslide deposits is unknown; but was estimated to be pre-Holocene (i.e. older than 10,000 years). In addition, there appears to be an ancient landslide in the northern part of the property along the east side of the San Andreas fault valley. This area of ancient landslide deposits include the existing waste water disposal area (Plate 3 and 3A) where recent subsidiary failures have occurred. Additional small recent failures were observed by Environmental Geology Services during their February 2011 geologic reconnaissance of the area in conjunction with the geotechnical exploration for the Norris House reconstruction. The approximate location of the recent slope failure is shown on Plate 5. This Plate also delineates areas of the landslide movement that present a potential for renewed movement, including earthquake induced landsliding based on mapping by the California Geological Survey (2002). Plate 5 also shows our interpretation of an expanded area where field observations and topography indicate a potential for landsliding (including earthquake induced landsliding). Regional and local geologic mapping (Brab & Dibblee, 1979) show landsliding along the San Andreas rift zone is common.

The overall "camp Saratoga" property and its various phases of construction have been the subject of a number of geologic fault investigations extending back to 1975. More recent investigations have been conducted by Environmental Geology Services and confirmed that there will be less than significant impact to any regional geologic and seismic setting as well as the site geologic and geotechnical characteristics.

However, the area of the proposed development (new cabins, storage building, parking area, driveway and the reconstruction of Norris House) is not within any fault rupture, unstable slope stability, or the liquefaction areas. Specifically, a supplemental memo dated June 23, 2014, prepared by T. Makdissy, concluded that there is a low potential for primary fault ground rupture occurring at the location of the Norris House. The report includes the results of a supplemental trench intended to "fill the gap" between previous trenches (WCC

## Initial Study Source List\*

and EGS). The new trench revealed deeply weathered Vaqueros Formation with relic bedding throughout and "did not encounter evidence of through-going structures such as shears or truncated bedrock nor fault breccia..." The report concludes that "the current footprint of the Norris House is set back sufficiently from the nearest suspected fault trace such that the potential for fault rupture directly impacting the Norris House is low." Therefore, the report is approved and no further geologic requirements are necessary.

The project will be subject to Santa Clara County's Policies and Standards Pertaining to Grading and Erosion Control. The consulting geologist shall provide verification to the County Geologist that all geologic investigations have been performed prior to approval of final improvement plans and the issuance of building permits and shall also observe construction and provide an "as built" letter to the County Geologist prior to final occupancy signoff.

The required grading will be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set forth by the County Grading Ordinance. At the time of construction, all graded areas shall be reseeded in conformance with the County Grading Ordinance to ensure that the project will minimize the potential for erosion on the site. All other land use and engineering aspects of this project will be conditioned by the recommendations set forth by the County Land Development Engineering Office.

**MITIGATION:** None

G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS					
WOULD THE PROJECT	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,4,6,9
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,6,8,9,10,20

**DISCUSSION:** See Section II: Greenhouse Gas

**MITIGATION:** None.

## Initial Study Source List\*

<b>G. HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>					
WOULD THE PROJECT	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	No Impact	
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 5
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	46
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	47
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 22a
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5, 48
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4, 17g
h) Provide breeding grounds for vectors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 31
i) Proposed site plan result in a safety hazard (i.e., parking layout, access, closed community, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
j) Involve construction of a building, road or septic system on a slope of 30% or greater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 17n
k) Involve construction of a roadway greater than 20% slope for a distance of 300' or more?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 17n

## Initial Study Source List\*

**DISCUSSION:**

(c-g, i-k)

**No Impact.**

The property is located in the Wildland Urban Interface area. Through complying with the stipulated conditions of approval, the applicant shall comply with all requirements stipulated through County Fire Marshal's Office for fire protection and fire prevention water system, and appropriate driveway turnouts and turnarounds for fire-fighting equipment. The proposed access driveways would conform to all requirements of the Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access. . The proposed project would not involve transport of hazardous materials or emit hazardous emissions. The project site is not located on a hazardous materials site and is more than two miles from a public use airport.

(a,b,h)

**Less Than Significant.**

There are minimal amount of hazardous material stored onsite to support the camp use. These hazardous materials include propane tanks and various chemical used for necessary pool cleaning and upkeep. The facility will be required to obtain clearance from HMCD (Hazardous Material Clearance Division) of both Fire Marshal's Office as well as the Department of Environmental Health. A Hazardous Materials Inventory and Hazardous Materials Business Activity Form has been submitted and approved by Department of Environmental Health.

The existing swimming pool that serves the camp has also been regularly inspected by Department of Environmental Health which would have little possibility in providing breeding grounds for vectors.

**MITIGATION:** None

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 17n,

## Initial Study Source List\*

	substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 36, 21a
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 17p, 18b, 18d
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 4, 17p
j)	Be located in an area of special water quality concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4, 6a,
k)	Be located in an area known to have high levels of nitrates in well water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 17e
n)	Conflict with Water Collaborative Guidelines and Standards for Land Uses Near Streams?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22d, 22e

### DISCUSSION:

(a-d, f-n)

#### **No Impact.**

The proposed project is to rehabilitate an existing camp. There are two creeks that meander through subject parcel along Hwy 9. All proposed development area will be at kept a minimum of 50-feet away from the top of bank of these creeks on a previously disturbed area. The subject site is not within any FEMA flood zone.

The existing wastewater system has been repaired per standards stipulated by State Department of Public Health to support the camp use and. No expansion of the existing wastewater treatment system is proposed.

## Initial Study Source List\*

(e)

### Less Than Significant

Other onsite improvements such as installing new parking area and emergency access to Redwood Gulch Road are proposed. This project is located within the San Francisco Bay Watershed and it is a regulated project that is also a Hydromodification Management (HM) project. Pursuant to the 2009 Municipal Regional NPDES Storm Water Permit (MRP), the improvement plans shall include Low Impact Development (LID) treatment measures ((harvesting and re-use, infiltration, evapotranspiration; or bio-treatment may be used if the first three measures mentioned are infeasible), source control (as applicable) and site design measures complying with Provision C3 of the 2009 MRP, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board approved Hydromodification Management Plan per Attachment F of the MRP, in its design. The total new impervious area proposed will exceed 2,000 s.f. so that the project will be required to comply with the County Drainage Manual to minimize erosion during construction. A series of bio-swale/bio-retention areas are proposed as shown on the preliminary grading plans that will eventually flow into Saratoga Creek but the on-site drainage will be controlled in such a manner that no increase generated to the downstream peak flow will cause a hazard or public nuisance. All detention facility shall be designed pursuant to the Design Guidelines in Section 6.3.3 of the 2007 Santa Clara County Drainage Manual. The proposed project would not alter drainage and would be conditioned to ensure that no stormwater would be displaced from the property. BMPs would be required as a condition to minimize erosion during construction.

MITIGATION: None

I. LAND USE		IMPACT				SOURCE
WOULD THE PROJECT:		YES			NO	
		<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
a)	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 4
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 9, 18a
c)	Conflict with special policies:					
i)	San Martin &/or South County?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 8a, 20
ii)	Los Gatos Specific Plan or Lexington Watershed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 8a, 22b, 22c
iii)	Guadalupe Watershed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 8a
iv)	Stanford?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 21
v)	City of Morgan Hill Urban Growth Boundary Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 17a
vi)	West Valley Hillside Preservation Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 8a
vii)	Water Collaborative (Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22d, 22e

## Initial Study Source List\*

**DISCUSSION:** See Section II: Land Use.

**MITIGATION:** None.

<b>J. NOISE</b>					
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT:</b>	<b>IMPACTS</b>				<b>SOURCE</b>
	<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporat ed</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 13, 22a, 45
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13, 45
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 5, 45
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 5, 45
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or private airstrip would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 5, 22a

**DISCUSSION:** See Section II: Noise.

**MITIGATION:** None

## Initial Study Source List\*

K. POPULATION AND HOUSING					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4

**DISCUSSION:** See Section II: Population and Housing.

**MITIGATION:** None.

L. PUBLIC SERVICES					
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE
	YES			NO	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
ii) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
iii) School facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 17h
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5

**DISCUSSION:** See Section II: Public Services.

**MITIGATION:** None

## Initial Study Source List\*

<b>M. RESOURCES AND RECREATION</b>					
	<b>IMPACT</b>				<b>SOURCE</b>
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT:</b>	<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 6, 44
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 6,8a
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 4, 5, 17h
d) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5
e) Be on, within or near a public or private park, wildlife reserve, or trail or affect existing or future recreational opportunities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17h, 21a
f) Result in loss of open space rated as high priority for acquisition in the "Preservation 20/20" report?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	27

**DISCUSSION:** See Section II: Resources / Recreation.

**MITIGATION:** None

<b>N. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC</b>					
	<b>IMPACT</b>				<b>SOURCE</b>
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT:</b>	<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 49, 52
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6, 49, 50, 52

## Initial Study Source List\*

	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?					
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5, 6, 7, 52
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 5, 6,7, 52
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 48, 52
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8a, 21a
g)	Not provide safe access, obstruct access to nearby uses or fail to provide for future street right of way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3, 6, 7, 52

**DISCUSSION:** See Section II: Transportation / Traffic

**MITIGATION:** None

O. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS						
WOULD THE PROJECT:	IMPACT				SOURCE	
	YES			NO		
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5,
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 21a, 38
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
d)	Require new or expanded entitlements in order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 21,
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5

## Initial Study Source List\*

capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
f) Not be able to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5
g) Be in non-compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5, 6

**DISCUSSION:** See Section II: Utilities / Service System.

**MITIGATION:** None.

<b>P. Mandatory Finding of Significance</b>					
	<b>IMPACT</b>				<b>SOURCE</b>
<b>WOULD THE PROJECT:</b>	<b>YES</b>			<b>NO</b>	
	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 to 52
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 to 52

## Initial Study Source List\*

### DISCUSSION:

(a,b,c)

**Less Than Significant.** The measures listed in this environmental document demonstrate that the proposed project for camp rehabilitation to demolish existing cabins, building new building, reconstructing the existing administration Norris House and other various onsite improvements will not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of any special statues plant or animal species. The project does not have the potential to 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.

No past, current, or probable future projects were identified in the project vicinity that, when added to project-related impacts, would result in cumulatively considerable impacts. No cumulatively considerable impacts would occur with development of the proposed project. As discussed in the analyses provided in this Initial Study, project impacts were found to be less than significant or would not occur. The incremental effects of the proposed project are not cumulatively significant when viewed in context of the past, current, and/or probable future projects. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant*.

Overall, as mitigated, the proposed project would not significantly degrade the quality of the environment, have substantial adverse effects on human beings directly or indirectly, or have any cumulatively considerable impacts.

## 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, Mid-peninsula Open space 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
  13. County Standards and Policies Manual (Vol. I - Land Development)
  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 Local Street Atlas
    - c. Color Air Photos (MPSI)
    - d. Santa Clara Valley Water District - Maps of Flood Control Facilities & Limits of 1% Flooding
    - e. Soils Overlay Air Photos
    - f. "Future Width Line" map set
  19. CEQA Guidelines [Current Edition]
- Area Specific:  
San Martin, Stanford, and Other Areas
- San Martin
- 20a. San Martin Integrated Design Guidelines
  - 20b. San Martin Water Quality Study
  - 20c. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Santa Clara County & Santa Clara Valley Water District
- Stanford
- 21a. Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP), Community Plan (CP), Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

## Initial Study Source List\*

21b. Stanford Protocol and Land Use Policy Agreement

Development - Guidelines for Assessing Impacts of Projects & Plans" [current version]

### Other Areas

- 22a. South County Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Palo Alto Airport comprehensive Land Use Plan [November 19, 2008]
- 22b. Los Gatos Hillside Specific Area Plan
- 22c. County Lexington Basin Ordinance Relating to Sewage Disposal
- 22d. User Manual Guidelines & Standards for Land Uses Near Streams: A Manual of Tools, Standards and Procedures to Protect Streams and Streamside Resources in Santa Clara County by the Santa Clara Valley Water Resources Protection Collaborative, August 2005 – Revised July 2006.
- 22e. Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams: Streamside Review Area – Summary prepared by Santa Clara County Planning Office, September 2007.
- 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"
- 27. Open Space Preservation, Report of the Preservation 2020 Task Force, April 1987 [Chapter IV]
- 28. Williamson Act Ordinance and Guidelines (current version)

### Air Quality

- 29. BAAQMD Clean Air Plan, and BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (2010)
- 30. BAAQMD Annual Summary of Contaminant Excesses & BAAQMD, "Air Quality & Urban

### Biological Resources/

### Water Quality & Hydrological Resources/ Utilities & Service Systems"

- 31. Site-Specific Biological Report
- 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

## Initial Study Source List\*

### Hazards & Hazardous Materials

- 46. Section 21151.4 of California Public Resources Code
- 47. State Department of Toxic Substances, Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List
- 48. County Office of Emergency Services Emergency Response Plan [1994 version]

### Transportation/Traffic

- 49. Transportation Research Board, "Highway Capacity Manual", Special Report 209, 1995.

- 50. SCC Congestion Management Agency, "Monitoring and Conformance report" (Current Edition)
- 51. Official County Road Book
- 52. Site-specific Traffic Impact Analysis Report

---

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

---