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INTRODUCTION

The Draft EIR for the proposed Boulder Ridge Fitness and Swim Center project (State Clearinghouse No. 2013052012) was released on December 20, 2013 for a 60-day public review period. The Lead Agency, Santa Clara County, prepared responses to comments on the Draft EIR and published them on March 17, 2014, as part of the Final EIR. The EIR evaluated the potential environmental impacts of a modification of an existing Use Permit to allow construction of approximately 20,000 square-foot fitness and swim center in the northeast corner of the golf club site at 1000 Old Quarry Road in San Jose (see Figure 1 – Site Location). Construction would also include grading to expand the paved maintenance yard to provide additional outdoor storage space. The proposed project also includes a County-initiated Zoning Ordinance Amendment to clarify fitness and swim facilities as uses related to golf clubs.

Since the Final EIR was published, the applicant has revised the design of the fitness and swim center. The revised design consists of a main building of 12,442 square feet and two smaller buildings, a group fitness building of 1,705 square feet and a pool / shower building of 571 square feet. The revised project is described in detail under “Description of Revisions” below. This First Amendment to the Final EIR has been prepared to evaluate whether the changes to the project constitute significant new information requiring recirculation of the EIR for public review and comment. Per CEQA, the
availability of significant new information requires recirculation of the EIR to allow the public a meaningful opportunity to comment.

Significant new information includes the identification of a new significant environmental effect from the project (including new mitigation measures), a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance, or development of a new feasible alternative or mitigation considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts, but the applicant declines to adopt it. Recirculation of an EIR is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.).

The County has determined based on substantial evidence that the changes to the proposed Boulder Ridge fitness and swim center do not constitute significant new information that would require recirculation of the document because no new significant or substantially more severe environmental impacts have been identified. Analysis supporting this conclusion is provided below under “Environmental Analysis of Project Revisions.”
DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT REVISIONS

The Boulder Ridge Fitness and Swim Center, as originally proposed, consisted of a single 3-story building of approximately 20,000 square feet. The revised layout (see Figure 2) shows a reduced size main building (2 stories, 12,442 square feet) in the same approximate location as in the original proposal, a 1,705 square-foot group fitness building to the south of the main fitness building, and a 571-square-foot pool shower building located just west of the main building.

Figure 2: Revised Site Layout for Fitness and Swim Center
The total square footage of the facility would be 14,665 square feet, a reduction of approximately 26%. Figures three (3) and four (4) below show renderings of the revised facility from two different perspectives. A comparison of the changes is summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Original Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Size</td>
<td>14,665 square feet</td>
<td>~20,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Building(s)</td>
<td>3 buildings:</td>
<td>1 building:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-main fitness building (12,442 sf)</td>
<td>-fitness center building (~20,000 sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-group fitness building (1,705 sf)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-pool shower building (571 sf)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>2 stories (main fitness building)</td>
<td>3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional parking</td>
<td>61 spaces</td>
<td>61 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Quantities</td>
<td>7,500 cut / 7,500 fill (includes 400 for</td>
<td>4,300 cut / 4,300 fill (includes 400 for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cubic yards)</td>
<td>maintenance yard expansion)</td>
<td>maintenance yard expansion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revised building pad for the fitness and swim facility would be lowered further into existing onsite topography, thus excavation of the foundation of the revised fitness and swim center would result in 7,100 cubic yards in cut (excluding 400 cubic yards for the maintenance yard expansion), with 6,430 yards of excess fill that would be used to recontour a portion of the driving range downhill of the fitness and swim center site (see Figure 5). As shown on Figure 5, a septic drainfield would be located in the same area of the driving range as originally proposed. Figure 5 also shows a reserve drainfield in the driving range approximately 300 feet west of the primary drainfield. This reserve drainfield is a requirement of all septic systems, but was not shown on the project site map in the Draft EIR. These drainfields would be installed on already developed golf course, and would be subject to review and approval by the Department of Environmental Health to ensure the designs are sized and engineered to provide adequate treatment.

The revised proposal includes no changes to operations, including the hosting of up to six dual youth swim meets on Saturday mornings during the summer. The maintenance yard expansion component of the proposed project has not changed. The proposed County-initiated Zoning Ordinance to clarify that fitness and swim facilities are uses related to golf clubs has not changed.
Figure 3: Revised Fitness and Swim Center – East Side of Main Building

Figure 4: Revised Fitness and Swim Center – West Side of Pool
Figure 5: Project Site Features
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS OF PROJECT REVISIONS

ISSUES PREVIOUSLY ADDRESSED IN THE INITIAL STUDY

The Draft EIR included an Initial Study, which was used to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project using the Appendix G checklist from the CEQA Guidelines. The Initial Study found impacts would be less than significant for the following environmental topics:

- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use
- Public Services
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Agriculture / Forest Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Resources / Recreation
- Air Quality
- Geology / Soils
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Population / Housing

The proposed project modifications would not change these conclusions, as summarized in the following table:

Table 2: Analysis of Issues Addressed in the Initial Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Discussion / Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Consistent with the original project, all construction, including placement of fill to recontour portion of driving range, would occur on already developed areas of the golf club property. No biological resources would be affected, and the Initial Study conclusion that there would be <strong>No Impact</strong> would not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality / Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>The square footage of the proposed fitness and swim center has been reduced by approximately 5,000 square feet, and the project would remain below BAAQMD screening thresholds. Therefore, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions would remain <strong>less than significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use / Population / Housing</td>
<td>Location and land use of the revised project is the same as the original project, and there is no change. The Initial Study conclusion that there would be <strong>No Impact</strong> would not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services / Utilities</td>
<td>Public services and utilities are already provided to the project site. Water demand would be the same as in the original project because although the square footage has been reduced, usage of the facility is not expected to change. San Jose Water Company would continue to be the water supplier; therefore, the project would not require new or expanded entitlements to provide sufficient water supplies. Therefore, Public Services and Utilities impacts would remain <strong>less than significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Area</td>
<td>Discussion / Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture / Forest Resources</td>
<td>As with the original project, all construction, including placement of fill to recontour portion of driving range, would occur on already developed areas of the golf club property and would not impact these resources because no agriculture or forest resources are located on site. The Initial Study conclusion that there would be No Impact would not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Location of the fitness center and associated infrastructure has not changed, and project conditioning to protect undiscovered cultural resources would be maintained. The Initial Study conclusion that there would be No Impact would not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Location of the fitness center and associated infrastructure has not changed. The Initial Study conclusion that there would be No Impact would not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources / Recreation</td>
<td>Location and use of the proposed facilities would not change. The Initial Study conclusion that there would be No Impact would not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology / Soils</td>
<td>The location of the proposed facilities would not change, and the same engineering conditions would be applied to ensure building safety. The excess fill would be spread over an area of the driving range that has been previously graded to ensure slope stability. The Initial Study conclusion that Geology / Soils impacts would be Less Than Significant would not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology / Water Quality</td>
<td>The revised project would include the same standard stormwater conditions applied under NPDES requirements to minimize new stormwater discharge. Placement of excess fill in an area of the driving range would not create any new impervious surfaces and would not change the direction or volume of sheet flows that already occur and which are captured by the existing downstream drainage system (pers. comm. Teresa Price, Land Development Engineering Division, Santa Clara County, Nov. 10, 2014). Wastewater flow and the location of the septic drainfields have not changed. Figure 5 also shows a reserve drainfield in the driving range approximately 300 feet west of the primary drainfield. This reserve drainfield is a requirement of all septic systems, but was not shown on the project site map in the Draft EIR. The Department of Environmental Health (DEH) has determined that the location of the septic drainfields has the conditions necessary to support adequate wastewater treatment, subject to review of engineered plans to ensure that the system conforms to horizontal setbacks set forth in the County’s On-Site Wastewater Treatment Systems Ordinance and is sized and engineered to provide adequate wastewater treatment. The revised project would not require on-site wells, and groundwater levels would not be affected. The Initial Study conclusion that Hydrology / Water Quality impacts would be Less Than Significant would not change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the prior findings of less-than-significant, potential environmental impacts from the revised project are consistent with this previous environmental analysis and conclusions, and thus the revisions do not constitute significant new information that...
would require recirculation of the document because no new significant or substantially more severe environmental impacts has been identified.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES PREVIOUSLY ADDRESSED IN THE FOCUSED EIR

The Initial Study (Appendix B of the Draft EIR) identified potentially significant impacts of the proposed project for Aesthetics, Noise, and Transportation / Traffic, and these impacts were further evaluated in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR also evaluated Cumulative Impacts and Project Alternatives. The following sections provide additional analysis of these topics in light of the revisions to the project. Because the square footage of the project has been reduced and operations would not change, no changes in energy consumption are expected. Therefore this topic, which was discussed in Chapter V., Section E. of the Draft EIR, is not further addressed in this amendment to the Final EIR.

Aesthetics

The Draft EIR evaluated the proposed project for impacts in terms of scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, light and glare, and ASA and Design Review, concluding that all aesthetic impacts would be less than significant. Using photosimulations, the visibility of the original fitness and swim center building was analyzed from the key observation points (KOPs) 6 and 7, the locations of which are shown on Figure 5.

As disclosed in the Draft EIR, although the proposed building site could be visible from most of the surrounding areas on the Almaden Valley floor if the terrain only consisted of bare earth, existing buildings and vegetation screens visibility of the site from most valley floor areas, limiting visibility to a handful of public vantage points. Using photos taken at KOPs 6 and 7—new photo simulations of a west-facing rendering of the revised building on the site were prepared to simulate what it would look like from the Almaden Valley floor if it were constructed. These photo simulations have been recreated using a west-facing rendering of the revised design (see Figures 6 and 7). The photo simulations show that the redesigned fitness and swim center would be significantly less prominent than the original design and also less prominent than the existing clubhouse. Thus, the revisions to the fitness and swim center would further reduce visual impacts beyond those evaluated in the Draft EIR.
In addition, the recontouring of the driving range using excess fill from construction of the fitness and swim facilities would involve only minor alterations in existing slope (maximum depth of fill of 6 feet, which would not be visually prominent because it would occur below the ridgeline. Visual changes as a result of grading of excess fill and installation of septic drainfields in the driving range would be less than significant because these construction activities would be short term and the area would be relandsced with irrigated turf and landscaping to be consistent with the existing visual.
appearance of the golf course. In that basis, it can be concluded that all of the aesthetic impacts evaluated in the Draft EIR would remain **less than significant**. Thus, with respect to the issue of Aesthetics, changes to the proposed project do not constitute significant new information that would require recirculation of the document because no new significant or substantially more severe environmental impacts have been identified.

**Figure 6:** Photo simulation of the Revised Fitness and Swim Center from KOP 6 at Redmond Avenue near Firefly Road

**Figure 7:** Photo simulation of the Revised Fitness and Swim Center from KOP 7 at Zinfandel Way near McAbee Road
In terms of Design Review findings, it should be noted that because the floor area of the main building is between 5,001 and 12,500 square feet, it would qualify as a Tier 2 building under the County’s Viewshed Ordinance, in accordance with Section 3.20.040.A.2 of the County Zoning Ordinance. Under Tier 2 of the Zoning Ordinance, a finding of “Low Visibility Siting,” is no longer required.

**Noise**

The Draft EIR evaluated noise from construction, vehicle traffic, and usage of the swimming pool during dual meets. Noise from construction of the project as originally proposed was found to be less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures (page 76 of the Draft EIR). Construction of the revised fitness and swim center would occur within approximately the same footprint (same distance from sensitive receptors), use of the same type of construction equipment, and take place during daytime hours over approximately the same duration. Therefore, the proposed changes would not alter the Draft EIR’s original conclusion that temporary construction noise would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

The Draft EIR concluded that traffic noise would be less-than-significant. It is not expected that the decrease in the square footage of the facility would affect operations; therefore, traffic volumes would remain the same as those estimated in the Draft EIR. However, based on methodologies used in traffic analysis (see discussion below under “Transportation / Traffic”), it is possible that weekday traffic volumes for the revised project would be reduced, which would further decrease project-generated traffic noise. Regardless, the traffic-generated noise impact would remain less than significant.

The Draft EIR concluded that swim facility noise would be less than significant in terms of exposures at Almaden Hills Estates (the closest sensitive receptors) and less than significant with incorporation of mitigation for exposures at the eastern property line (San Jose City limits). The proposed revisions to the facility would not change its location or alter the size or hours of operation for the six dual meets. Therefore, noise exposures at Almaden Hills Estates would remain the same, and the impact would remain less than significant.

Jeff Pack (Edward L. Pack Associates), who conducted a noise analysis of the proposed project for the Draft EIR, reviewed the revised site plan (see attached letter dated October 15, 2014) and concluded that his original findings and recommendations concerning the significant impact of noise exposure at the eastern property line remain valid. The nearest sections of the eastern property line would still be exposed to noise from the swim meets, but this impact would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation identified in the Draft EIR. This mitigation includes evaluation of the location of the starter buzzer and spectator areas by a qualified acoustical engineer prior to issuance of building permits, and evaluation by an acoustical engineer of noise exposure from the starter buzzer at the eastern property line with the purpose of calibrating the starter buzzer.
to set volumes at a level that will ensure that noise levels at the eastern property line will remain below 55 dBA.

**Transportation / Traffic**

The Draft EIR concluded that the proposed fitness and swim center would generate fewer than 100 peak-hour trips for both weekday usage and for the weekend dual swim meets. Therefore, the County was not required to prepare a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the project based on Valley Transportation Authority guidelines. For weekdays, trip generation (am / pm peak hours) was estimated using two methodologies:

1. The Institute for Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation rates per 1,000 square feet of a 20,000 square-foot standalone Health / Fitness Club, which was 28 for the am peak hour and 71 for the pm peak hour; and

2. Comparison of the proposed project with the 2011 expansion of the Palo Alto Hills Golf and Country Club, which included construction of a 20,000 square-foot fitness center and renovation of the swimming pool in addition to the existing 18-hole golf course, which had am / pm peak-hour rates of 53 and 30, respectively based on actual traffic counts.

The proposed reduction in the size of the fitness and swim center from 20,000 square feet to 14,665 square feet is not expected to affect usage of the facility. However, based on either of the two trip generation methodologies, the revised project would be expected to generate fewer vehicle trips than the project as originally proposed. For example, using the ITE trip generate rate, the reduced size fitness and swim center would generate 20 am peak-hour trips and 52 pm peak-hour trips. Therefore, the impact of weekday vehicle trips would remain *less than significant*.

The project revisions would not affect weekend usage, including the six dual youth swim meets on Saturday mornings during the summer. Therefore, weekend peak-hour trips would be the same as estimated in the Draft EIR, and the impact would remain *less than significant*. Thus, with respect to the issue of Transportation / Traffic, changes to the proposed project do not constitute significant new information that would require recirculation of the document because no new significant or substantially more severe environmental impacts have been identified.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The Initial Study and Draft EIR found cumulative impacts of the original proposal to be less than significant. As discussed above, the revised project would not change conclusions with respect to project impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts of the project would remain *less than significant*. With respect to the issue of Cumulative Impacts, changes to the proposed project do not constitute significant new information that would

---

1 The trip rates are 1.38 for the AM peak hour and 3.53 for the PM peak hour for a Health / Fitness Club as a “Stand Alone” facility with ancillary facilities, e.g., swimming pools.
require recirculation of the document because no new significant or substantially more severe environmental impacts have been identified.

**Alternatives**

The Draft EIR evaluated three alternatives to the project as originally proposed: No-Project Alternative, Reduced Building Size Alternative, and Clubhouse Expansion Alternative. The Reduced Building Size Alternative was identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative (excluding the No-Project Alternative).

Under the Reduced Building Size Alternative, a smaller building, approximately 12,500 square feet in floor area, would be constructed in the same location as the proposed fitness center. One of the intents of this alternative was to bring the floor area within the range (between 5,001 and 12,500 square feet) of a Tier 2 building under the County’s Viewshed Ordinance, in accordance with Section 3.20.040.A.2 of the County Zoning Ordinance in order to reduce building form and massing as a way to reduce its visibility from the Almaden Valley floor. It should be noted that in the revised project, the main fitness building has been reconfigured as a two-story main building of 12,442 square feet, (which is also less than 12,500) and two smaller single-story buildings of 1,705 square feet (group fitness building) and 571 square feet (pool/shower building). Therefore, the revised project is roughly equivalent to the Reduced Building Size Alternative evaluated in the Draft EIR.

**Conclusion**

Based on the analysis above, revisions to the proposed project will not result in any significant new environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of environmental impacts as originally evaluated in the Draft EIR.
Mr. Rob Eastwood  
Planning Department  
County Government Center, East Wing, 7th Fl.  
70 West Hedding Street  
San Jose, CA  95110  

Subject: Boulder Ridge Fitness Center Revised Site Plan Review  

Dear Rob:  

Upon review of the revised site plan for the Boulder Ridge fitness center and swimming pool, the addition of the second building spaced away from the main building will not have a significant effect on the swimming pool noise levels at the easterly property line. The second building will provide a small "shadow zone" at the property line, however, the nearest sections of the property line will still be impacted by swimming pool activity noise that transmits between the buildings. Therefore, the findings and recommendations contained in the latest noise assessment study remain valid.  

If you have any questions, please call me.  

Sincerely,  

EDWARD L. PACK ASSOC., INC.  

Jeffrey K. Pack  
President