INITIAL STUDY
Environmental Checklist and Evaluation for Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number:</th>
<th>8555-14BA-14DRX</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>July 14, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>Single Building Site Approval and Design Review Exemption</td>
<td>APN(s):</td>
<td>510-34-034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location / Address</td>
<td>Overlook Road, Los Gatos</td>
<td>GP Designation:</td>
<td>Hillsides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Eliyahu &amp; Tatyana Pozniansky</td>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>HS-d1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Name</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>Urban Service Area:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description

The proposed project is a Single Building Site with Architecture and Site Approval (ASA) and Design Review application for an approximately 4,032 square foot, 3-story single-family residence with a 578 square foot detached garage and associated site improvements on a vacant property. Associated site improvements include a new septic system, removal of 6 trees greater than 5-inches in diameter, 5-foot tall retaining walls, decks/stairs, and a new driveway. Water would be supplied by San Jose Water Company. Grading quantities for the project will include approximately 460 cubic yards of cut and 10 cubic yards of fill (total 470 cubic yards). The average slope of the development area is 42.6 percent.

Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is a 37,026 square foot vacant parcel (APN: 510-34-034), located in the eastern Santa Cruz mountains, in unincorporated County of Santa Clara (Figure 1). The property consists of moderate to steep southeast facing slopes with natural drainage northeastward toward Los Gatos Creek. Land cover consists of developed Open Space and Evergreen Forest and is designated Oak Woodlands (FRAP). The development area is highly disturbed from previous tree cutting and dominated by non-native plant species that include acacia, bay, and oak trees. An ephemeral drainage swale is located along the existing shared driveway on the property southeast edge. The property is not located in the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan area and no serpentine soils, creek, stream, pond, or wetland/riparian habitat is present on the property.

Surrounding properties are of similar size and developed with single-family residences to the north and south.

Other agencies sent a copy of this document:

None
Figure 1 - Project Site Location Map

Figure 2 - Site Plan
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

- [x] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture / Forest Resources
- [ ] Air Quality
- [x] Biological Resources
- [x] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology / Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [x] Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology / Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population / Housing
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Resources / Recreation
- [ ] Transportation / Traffic

### 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.

**EVIDENCE:** **Agricultural and Forest Resources:** The 37,026 square foot property is zoned Hillside in the Design Review Combining District (HS-d1) and classified as Urban and Built-Up Land (Farmland Monitoring Program 2010). Permitted uses in the HS-d1 zoning district include very low density residential and accessory uses. Minor grading would occur to establish a driveway and turnaround area to meet fire safety standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert more than 10 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses and would not affect existing agricultural operations on adjacent properties. The property is not under a Williamson Act Contract and would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 32, 36, 39)

**EVIDENCE:** **Air Quality:** Development of the proposed single-family residence and driveway will involve grading and construction activities. Fugitive dust will be created during the construction of the proposed structures and site improvements. However, dust emissions will be controlled through standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) dust control measures that will be a condition of the project. Emissions generated from a single-family residence will be well below the BAAQMD’s screening size
level for operational-related emissions from residential land uses. (Project Description; Reference # 3, 5, 58, 59, 61)

**EVIDENCE:** Geology and Soils: The proposed site is not located in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. A portion of the existing building site is located in a State Seismic Hazard Zone for earthquake induced landslides and a County Landslide Hazard Zone. The residence is located outside of the mapped landslide area and the County Geologist will determine if actual ground conditions require additional design requirements to ensure foundation stability. Best management practices used during construction will prevent substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The proposed project site is not located on expansive soils. (Project Description; Reference # 3, 6, 14, 24a-c, 32, 52, 53)

**EVIDENCE:** Greenhouse Gas: Construction of the single-family residence and driveway will involve the use of construction equipment, but greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions will be minimal and temporary. Emissions generated from a single-family residence will well below the BAAQMD’s screening size level for operational-related GHG emissions from residential land uses. (Project Description; Reference # 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 20)

**EVIDENCE:** Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The proposed project will 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. The property is located in the State Responsibility Area and the Wildland Urban Interface Area (WUI). Fire protection to the site is provided by the Santa Clara County Central Fire Protection Fire District. At the time of site development, the applicant shall meet all requirements of the County Fire Marshal's Office for fire protection and fire prevention which may include, but not be limited to, providing on-site fire flow, a fire hydrant, an automatic fire sprinkler system, and appropriate driveway turnouts and turnarounds for firefighting equipment. (Reference # 1, 3 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 19, 24b, 27, 30, 33, 40, 48, 51)

**EVIDENCE:** Hydrology: The proposed project is a new single-family residence with detached garage and associated site improvements. The subject property is not located within a Dam Failure Inundation Zone or flood zone. Almendra Creek is located more than 700 feet south of the property. Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be required as a condition to minimize erosion during construction. (Project Description; Reference # 3, 6, 32, 35a, 35b, 40, 41, 67, 68, 70, 70)

**EVIDENCE:** Land Use: The subject property has a general plan designation of Hillsides and is zoned HS-d1. A single family home is a permitted use in the HS Zoning District. The proposed single-family residence will be for private use and will not divide an established community. (Project Description; Reference # 2, 3, 4, 22, 33, 39)

**EVIDENCE:** Noise: Temporary noise will be generated by construction activities. Sensitive receptors (neighboring residences) are located more than 300 feet from the primary construction site. Construction noise will be short term and in compliance with the County noise ordinance. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 18, 79)

**EVIDENCE:** Population and Housing: The proposed project is a single-family residence with detached garage and will not induce population growth or displace existing housing or people. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 3, 4, 5, 30, 40)
EVIDENCE: Public Services: The proposed project is a new single-family residence with detached garage that includes an on-site wastewater system with domestic water provided by San Jose Water Company. The project will not require expansion of facilities related to the provision of fire, law enforcement, education, or recreation. (Project Description; Reference #1, 3, 4, 5, 6)

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 is for a single-family residence and driveway and will not involve either the use or construction of recreational facilities. (Project Description; Reference #1, 3, 5, 6, 28, 32, 52, 56)

EVIDENCE: Transportation/Traffic: The proposed single-family residence would generate between 7 and 10 daily vehicle trips. No commercial, industrial, or institutional use is proposed. 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 structures will involve a small number 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 will not have impacts on traffic and circulation. Onsite parking for the proposed single-family residence will be in conformance with the County parking requirements. (Project Description; Reference #3, 5, 6, 30, 40, 86, 87)

EVIDENCE: Utilities/Service Systems: The proposed single family residence and driveway will not require or result in the construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment or storm water drainage facilities. Water will be provided by San Jose Water Company. Construction activities will involve minimal amounts of debris that will be removed and disposed of, and existing landfill capacity is sufficient to accommodate it. (Project Description; Reference #1, 3, 5, 6, 24b, 70)
III. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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] 7/14/2076

[Printed Name] [For]
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

A. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources along a designated scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

Project Setting

The subject property is a 37,026 square foot parcel located in the County of Santa Clara Design Review Combining District (-d1). The project is for development of a new 4,032 square foot single-family residence with a 578 square foot detached garage on slopes greater than 30 percent. The residence will consist of 3 levels and not exceed 35 feet. The exterior will be finished with materials such as stucco, asphalt shingle roofing, and metal flashings. Surrounding development consists of hillside single-family residential dwellings on properties similar in size and slope.

Potential Impacts

a-b) No Impact: The property is not in the vicinity of a designated scenic vista or located along a scenic highway.

c-d) Less Than Significant: According to County GIS maps, the property and surrounding area is designated very high visibility from the valley floor. As required by the County Viewshed Ordinance, the project is subject to special design controls and review by the Architectural Site Approval Committee at a public hearing to reduce any visual impact of the proposed residence, grading, and driveway on the valley floor that include natural color, Light Reflectivity Value (LRV) restrictions, or vegetative screening. These conditions of approval would ensure that the proposed residence would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings or create a new source of substantial light or glare. Therefore, these impacts would be less than significant.

MITIGATION:

None required.
B. AGRICULTURE / FOREST RESOURCES

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

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

DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Agriculture and Forest Resources

MITIGATION: None required.
### C. AIR QUALITY

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

See Section II; Air Quality

**MITIGATION:** None required.
### Discussion:

**Project Setting**

The subject property is an approximately 37,026 square foot, vacant parcel located in the eastern Santa Cruz mountains, in unincorporated County of Santa Clara. The property is steeply sloped with land cover designated as Oak Woodlands (FRAP) and tree species consisting of blue gum eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus globulus*), green wattle acacia (*Acacia decurrens*), California live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), and California bay laurel (*Umbellularia californica*). A biological assessment (Kittleson Environmental Consulting, April 10, 2015), determined the development area consists of previously disturbed, upland habitat and construction of the residence will occur in an area dominated by non-native plant species. According to the County GIS California...
Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), no creek or watercourse, and no wetland, riparian habitat or sensitive plant or wildlife species are located on or near the property. According to the plans, 6 trees greater than 5 inches diameter will be removed to accommodate the footprint of the residence and driveway.

**Regulatory Setting**

**Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

The Federal Migratory Bird Treaty act (16 U.S.C., Section 703, Supp. I, 1989) prohibits killing, possessing, or trading of migratory birds except in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. The trustee agency that addresses issues related to the MBTA is the USFWS. Migratory birds protected under this law include all native birds and certain game birds (USFWS 2005a). This act encompasses whole birds, parts of birds, and bird nests and eggs. The MBTA protects active nests from destruction and all nests of species protected by the MBTA, whether active or not, cannot be possessed. An active nest under the MBTRA, as described by the Department of the Interior in its 16 April 2003 Migratory Bird Permit Memorandum, is one having eggs or young. Nests starts, prior to egg laying, are not protected from destruction.

**Oak Woodlands**

Pursuant to California Public Resources Code (Section 21083.4), counties are required to evaluate impacts to Oak Woodlands as part of the environmental analysis conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Oak trees that are considered a part of Oak Woodlands are considered protected under the 2005 California Oak Woodlands (SB 1334) law and mitigation is required for impacts. According to the County Planning Office Oak Woodland Evaluation Guidelines, a land development project is considered to have a significant direct impact on Oak Woodland if the project would result in 1/2 acre (21,780 square feet) or more decrease in native oak canopy on the project site.

**Potential Impacts**

a-c, f) No Impacts. According to the County GIS California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), no creek or watercourse, and no wetland, riparian habitat or sensitive plant or wildlife species are located on or near the property. The development area consists of previously disturbed, upland habitat and construction of the residence will occur in an area dominated by non-native plant species. In addition, the property is not located in the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Area. Therefore, it is anticipated there will be no impact to candidate, sensitive, or special status species, riparian habitat or wetlands, or conflict with the provisions of an adopted Conservation Plan.

d) **Less Than Significant.** According to the County GIS maps, land cover on the property is designated as Oak Woodlands (FRAP). Oak Woodland provides food sources, roosting, and nesting habitat for a wide variety of birds and wildlife. The plans identify tree species in the development area as blue gum eucalyptus (Eucalyptus globulus), green wattle acacia (Acacia decurrens), California live oak (Quercus agrifolia), and California bay laurel (Umbellularia californica).
As discussed above, a land development project is considered to have a significant impact on Oak Woodland if the project would result in ½ acre or more decrease in native oak canopy on the project site. Based on the plans, 3 bay, 2 acacia, and 1 valley oak tree with a diameter greater than 5-inches are proposed for removal. Removal of 1 valley oak tree on the site will not constitute loss of ½ acre or more in native oak canopy on the project site. Therefore, the impact on oak woodland will be considered less than significant impact.

e) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation. The project parcel contains Oak Woodland habitat, which provides food sources, roosting, and nesting habitat for a wide variety of birds and wildlife. Densely wooded areas typically provide potential nesting sites for raptors, of which many species are protected under Federal and State laws, including the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish & Game Code. Noise and dust from construction activities may disturb nesting birds, which may cause nearby nesting birds to abandon their nest and result in death of eggs or nestlings. In addition, grading and construction activities have the potential to injure or kill wildlife if they are present within the disturbance area. Therefore, any tree removal that occurs during the bird nesting season has the potential to destroy raptor nests and would be considered a potentially significant impact. Pre-construction surveys and buffer zones during construction would reduce these potential impacts on nesting raptors to less-than-significant with mitigation.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Nesting Raptors

BIO.1 MM Submit to the Planning Office evidence of a contract with a qualified ornithologist to conduct preconstruction surveys prior to issuance of grading permits.

   a. The ornithologist shall submit a preconstruction report indicating the results of the survey and any designated buffer zones to the satisfaction of the Planning Office prior to final inspection or release of the grading bond. (Mitigation Measure)

BIO.2 MM Tree removal and construction shall be scheduled between September 1 and December 31 to avoid the raptor-nesting season. If this is not possible, pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors shall be conducted by a qualified ornithologist to identify active raptor nests that may be disturbed during project implementation. Pre-construction surveys shall take place no more than 24 hours prior to the initiation of construction activities and/or tree removal. If an active raptor nest is found in or close enough to the construction area to be disturbed by these activities, the ornithologist shall contact the Planning Office and, in consultation with the California Department of Fish & Game, designate a construction free buffer zone (typically 250 feet or greater) around the nest. (Mitigation Measure)
E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

DISCUSSION:

a, c)
No Impact. No historic buildings or structures, paleontological resources, or unique geologic features are located on the property. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on historic, paleontological or unique geologic resources.

b, d)
Less Than Significant. Unknown human remains could be found during excavation or grading for the single-family residence and access driveway. The approval of the project will include the following condition, which will 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:

None required.
## F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

### a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- 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.
- Strong seismic ground shaking?
- Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
- Landslides?

### b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

### 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?

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

### 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?

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

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

## DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Geology and Soils

## MITIGATION:

None required.
## G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

### DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Greenhouse Gas Emissions

### MITIGATION:

None required.
### HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Hazards and Hazardous Materials

### MITIGATION:

None required.
### I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

See Section II; Hydrology and Water Quality

**MITIGATION:** None required.
### J. LAND USE

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

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

- YES:  
- NO: 2, 3, 4, 39

#### 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?

- YES:  
- NO: 3, 22, 33, 39

### DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Land Use

### MITIGATION:

None required.
### K. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACTS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOULD THE PROJECT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or private airstrip would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Noise

### MITIGATION:

None required.
## L. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

### DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Population and Housing

### MITIGATION:

None required.
### DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Public Services

### MITIGATION:

None required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. RESOURCES AND RECREATION</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site as delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

See Section II; Resources and Recreation

**MITIGATION:**

None required.
### O. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC

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

### DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Transportation/Traffic

### MITIGATION:

None required.
## P. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,6,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,6,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Require new or expanded entitlements in order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,6,24b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,6,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Not be able to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Be in non-compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,5,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Utilities and Service Systems

### MITIGATION:

None required.
Q. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 of, or restrict the range of, a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

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

b) **No Impact.** 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. The incremental effects of the proposed project are not cumulatively significant when viewed in context of the past, current, and/or probable future projects. No cumulative impacts would occur.

c) **No Impact.** The proposed project is a new single-family residence. As described in the environmental topic sections of this Initial Study, the proposed private structure and use would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
Initial Study Source List*

1. Environmental Information Form
2. Field Inspection
3. Project Plans
4. Working knowledge of site and conditions
5. Experience With Other Projects of This Size and Nature
6. County Expert Sources: Geologist, Fire Marshal, Roads & Airports, Environmental Health, Land Development Engineering, Parks & Recreation, Zoning Administration, Comprehensive Planning, Architectural & Site Approval Committee Secretary
7. Agency Sources: Santa Clara Valley Water District, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Midpeninsula OpenSpace Regional District, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, CA Dept. of Fish & Game, Caltrans, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Public Works Deps. of individual cities, Planning Deps. of individual cities,
8a. Santa Clara County (SCC) General Plan
8b. The South County Joint Area Plan
9. SCC Zoning Regulations (Ordinance)
10. County Grading Ordinance
11. SCC Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval
12. SCC Development Guidelines for Design Review
14. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (expansive soil regulations) [1994 version]
15. Land Use Database
16. Santa Clara County Heritage Resource (including Trees) Inventory [computer database]
17. GIS Database
   a. SCC General Plan Land Use, and Zoning
   b. USFWS Critical Habitat & Riparian Habitat
   c. Geologic Hazards
   d. Archaeological Resources
   e. Water Resources
   f. Viewshed and Scenic Roads
   g. Fire Hazard
   h. Parks, Public Open Space, and Trails
   i. Heritage Resources - Trees
   j. Topography, Contours, Average Slope
   k. Soils
   l. HCP Data (habitat models, land use coverage etc)
   m. Air photos
   n. USGS Topographic
   o. Dept. of Fish & Game, Natural Diversity Data
   p. FEMA Flood Zones
   q. Williamson Act
   r. Farmland monitoring program
   s. Traffic Analysis Zones
Base Map Overlays & Textual Reports (GIS)
18. Paper Maps
   a. SCC Zoning
   b. Barclay's Santa Clara County Locality Street Atlas
   c. Color Air Photos (MPSI)
   d. Santa Clara Valley Water District - Maps of Flood Control Facilities & Limits of 1% Flooding
   e. Soils Overlay Air Photos
   f. “Future Width Line” map set
19. CEQA Guidelines [Current Edition]

   Area Specific: San Martin, Stanford, and Other Areas

   San Martin
20a. San Martin Integrated Design Guidelines
20b. San Martin Water Quality Study
20c. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Santa Clara County & Santa Clara Valley Water District

   Stanford
21a. Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP), Community Plan (CP), Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
21b. Stanford Protocol and Land Use Policy Agreement

   Other Areas
22a. South County Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Palo Alto Airport comprehensive Land Use Plan [November 19, 2008]
22b. Los Gatos Hillsides Specific Area Plan
22c. County Lexington Basin Ordinance Relating to Sewage Disposal
22f. Monterey Highway Use Permit Area

   Soils
23. USDA, SCS, “Soils of Santa Clara County
24. USDA, SCS, “Soil Survey of Eastern Santa Clara County"

   Agricultural Resources/Open Space
25. Right to Farm Ordinance
26. State Dept. of Conservation, “CA Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model”
28. Williamson Act Ordinance and Guidelines (current version)

   Air Quality
29. BAAQMD Clean Air Plan, and BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (2010)

   Biological Resources/
   Water Quality & Hydrological Resources/
   Utilities & Service Systems"*
31. Site-Specific Biological Report
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32. Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance
   Section C16, Santa Clara County Guide to
   Evaluating Oak Woodlands Impacts, Santa Clara
   County Guidelines for Tree Protection and
   Preservation for Land Use Applications

33. Clean Water Act, Section 404
34. Riparian Inventory of Santa Clara County, Greenbelt
   Coalition, November 1988
35. CA Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water
   Quality Control Plan, San Francisco Bay Region
   [1995].
36. Santa Clara Valley Water District, Private Well Water
   Testing Program [12-98]
37. SCC Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program,
   Urban Runoff Management Plan [1997]
38. County Environmental Health / Septic Tank Sewage
   Disposal System - Bulletin "A"

39. County Environmental Health Department Tests and
   Reports

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

Geological Resources
42. Site Specific Geologic Report

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

Noise
45. County Noise Ordinance

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

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

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