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Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21,000, et sec.) that the following project when implemented will not have a significant impact on the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>APN(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>70833001; 70833005-007; 70847015; 71217014;</td>
<td>July 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71217017; 71217020; 71217021; 71217026; 71217027;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74202012; 74205015; 74206032; 74208031; 74208033;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74208057; 74208058; 74209007; 74209036; 74209037;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74209038; 74209039; 74209040; 74209041; 74209042;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74209043; 74209046; 74209049; 74209050; 74210003;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74210013; 74210015; 74210017; 74210018; 74210019;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74210020; 74210021; 74210022; 74212007; 74212009;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74213008; 74213009; 74213011; 74233003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Name                      Project Type
---------------------------------------------------
Calero County Park Trails Master Plan Trails Master Plan

Owner
County of Santa Clara

Applicant
County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department

Project Location

Calero County Park consists of approximately 4,442 acres of land located partially within the City of San Jose and partially in unincorporated Santa Clara County approximately 10 miles south of the city center and outside the urban services area. The main entrance to the park is located at 23205 McKean Road, approximately three miles southwest of U.S. Highway 101.

Project Description

The proposed Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan (Trails Master Plan) provides a framework for expansion of the existing park trail system into a multi-use trail network over 10-year time period, while supporting protection and enhancement of the sensitive cultural and environmental resources within the park. The proposed Trails Master Plan will:

- Allow 966 acres of newly acquired areas in the park to be opened for recreational trail use;
- Expand the existing trail system by approximately 14.7 miles to 35.9 miles at build-out;
- Designate 23.8 miles of trails as multi-use, to be shared by hikers, bicyclists and equestrians;
- Retain 7.5 miles of trails as limited use for equestrian and hiking only;
- Designate 1.8 miles of trails as hiking only;
- Remove 4.9 miles of existing service road and trails and restore to native landscape;
- Remove dogs on-leash restriction on most trails in the park;
- Upgrade existing in-stream creek channel crossings with bridges spanning the creek/drainage ways or other crossing techniques to minimize in-channel hiking, bicycle, and equestrian water quality disturbance;
- Expand existing trail head staging facilities at Calero Park Ranger Station;
- Create new trail head staging facility off McKean Road;
- Create new trail head staging facility off Almaden Road;
- Install new fences, gates, signage, picnic and rest facilities and pet waste stations; and
- Install surface drainage facilities at new and existing trail head facilities that will maintain or improve storm water quality.
As outlined above, the Trails Master Plan nearly doubles the mileage of the existing trail system. Equestrians and hikers currently use approximately 20 miles of trails. At final build-out, the expanded Calero County Park’s trail system will have grown to approximately 36 miles and will offer many trails for walkers with dogs on-leash and mountain bikers while still retaining historic, limited trail use for equestrians and hikers on some trails. In addition, the Trails Master Plan will provide regional trail connections as identified in the Santa Clara County Countywide Trails Master Plan (1995).

The full text of the Draft Trails Master Plan and Initial Study may be viewed at the following locations:

- County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department Administration Offices: 298 Garden Hill Drive, San Jose, CA 95132
- Calero County Park Ranger Office: 23205 McKean Road, San Jose, CA 95120
- Casa Grande: 21350 Almaden Road, San Jose, CA 95120
- Almaden Library Reference Desk: 6445 Camden Avenue, San Jose, CA 95120
- County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department website: www.parkhere.org

Purpose of Notice

The purpose of this notice is to inform you that the County of Santa Clara Parks & Recreation Department Staff has recommended that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted for this project. Action is tentatively scheduled on this proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration before the County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors on October 8, 2013 in the Board Chambers, 70 W. Hedding, San Jose. It should be noted that the adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration does not constitute approval of the project under consideration. The decision to approve or deny the project will be made separately. Meeting information will be posted on the County of Santa Clara’s website at www.sccgov.org under Board Agendas or contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (408) 299-5001.

Review Period

The public review period for this document begins on July 10, 2013 and ends August 9, 2013 at 5:00 pm. Public comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of this Mitigated Negative Declaration are invited. Such comments should be based on specific environmental concerns. Written comments must be received on or before the close of the public review period and should be addressed to the County of Santa Clara, Department of Parks and Recreation, Planning and Development Section, 298 Garden Hill Drive, Los Gatos, CA 95032, Tel (408) 355-2236, attention Elish Ryan, Park Planner or via email to Elish.Ryan@prk.sccgov.org. Oral comments may be made at the meeting. A file containing additional information on this project may be reviewed at the Department of Parks and Recreation office or online at www.parkhere.org. When requesting to view this file, please refer to the project title appearing at the top of this form.

Responsible Agencies sent copy of this document

Santa Clara Valley Water District

Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency

This document has also been distributed to various public agencies through the State Clearinghouse.

The full text of the Initial Study may be viewed at the County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department website: www.parkhere.org

Basis for Negative Declaration Recommendation

The Planning and Development Section of the Department of Parks and Recreation has reviewed the initial study for the project and, based upon substantial evidence in the record, finds that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, or although the proposed project could initially have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect on the environment because of mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the project.

This finding is based on the following considerations

The initial study indicates that the proposed project has the potential to result in significant adverse environmental impacts. However, the mitigation measures identified in the initial study would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole that the project, with mitigation measures incorporated, may have a significant effect on the environment.
See the following project-specific conditions (mitigation and avoidance) measures:

A. Air Quality

AQ-1. The Trails Master Plan will be revised to include best management practices for dust control on unpaved parking lots.

AQ-2. The following Air District basic construction mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future construction documents:

a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. Material stockpiles may be covered in accordance with Trails Master Plan Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan best management practices No. 1.

b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.

c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.

e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

f. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

g. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.

h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

AQ-3. The following measures shall be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future construction documents, applicable to areas identified as containing serpentine rock, if soil disturbance is anticipated during construction of the trail or abandonment of old trails:

a. Upon determination of a precise trail alignment, soil sampling shall be conducted in not less than one location for each one-half mile of alignment within the area identified as containing serpentine rock, and in any case, no less than one sample for any trail segment within the area identified as containing serpentine rock. California Air Resources Board Test Method 435 should be used unless otherwise directed by the Air District.

b. Soil samples shall be analyzed by an approved laboratory for asbestos materials content, and characterized as to concentration and resultant potential for adverse health effects to workers or trail users.

c. If asbestos levels are high enough to warrant precautions, County Parks shall develop a mitigation plan in accordance with Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (California Air Resources Board 2009).

B. Biology

BIO-1. To avoid impacts to special-status plants, for the impact area of each project phase, focused botanical surveys will be conducted prior to construction by a qualified biologist or County Parks Natural Resource Program staff for all special-status plant species with potential to occur in the various plant communities as identified above. The surveys will conform to current protocols established by the CDFW and CNPS, and will include surveys during the appropriate blooming periods for every target species (which will overlap for many species during spring months). Optimal survey times vary from year to year depending on temperature, rainfall amount and
timing, etc., so will be confirmed by the monitoring of known reference populations for as many target species in the project vicinity as possible. The final field positioning of each project component will avoid all observed special-status plant species occurrences.

BIO-2. To avoid potential adverse impacts to nesting birds (including raptors), trail building/construction activities (including any tree trimming/removal or generation of loud, sustained noises) should be scheduled to take place outside the breeding bird season (February 1 through August 31). If trail building/construction activities will occur during the breeding bird season, then a qualified biologist or County Parks Natural Resource Program staff will conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting birds to ensure that no nests would be disturbed during project implementation. This survey will be conducted no more than 15 days prior to the initiation of disturbance activities during the early part of the nesting season (February 1 through April 30) and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of disturbance activities during the late part of the nesting season (May 1 through August 31).

If no active nests are present within 500 feet of project activities, then activities can proceed as scheduled. However, if an active nest is detected during the survey within 500 feet of project activities, then the establishment of a protective buffer zone around each active nest (typically 250 to 500 feet for raptors but possibly 1,000 to 1,300 feet for ground-nesting and/or special-status raptors, with appropriate setback distance to be determined by a qualified biologist or County Parks Natural Resource Program staff) and 75 to 250 feet for passerines (perching and songbird species) will be clearly delineated or fenced by the qualified biologist or County Parks Natural Resource Program staff until the juvenile bird(s) have fledged (left the nest), unless the biologist determines that proposed activities would not impact nesting success or fledgling/juvenile rearing. Limited monitoring of active nests located within 500 feet of trail or facility construction is recommended in order to monitor nesting activities and to prevent nest failure or abandonment.

BIO-3. To avoid/minimize impacts to special-status animals, for each project phase, impact areas will be positioned away from high quality habitat features such as burrows or wetlands as determined prior to construction by a qualified biologist or County Parks Natural Resource Program staff through a trail location survey. In particular, new trails and facilities will be sited in the field prior to construction to avoid potential American badger den sites/active burrows, seasonal wetlands, and other features that could provide habitat for special-status species. Further, temporary exclusion barriers will be utilized to keep wildlife out of construction sites, as deemed appropriate by a qualified biologist or Parks Natural Resource Program staff. Construction monitoring will be conducted periodically by a qualified biologist or Parks Natural Resource Program staff to ensure that disturbance limits are correctly established and that avoidance/minimization measures are implemented properly.

BIO-4. To minimize/avoid impacts to Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan covered species, all applicable conditions listed in Table 7, Valley Habitat Plan Covered Species: Conditions on Covered Activities, for each covered species with potential to be impacted will be implemented during each phase of the project.

BIO-5. Mitigation will be required for the removal of any tree which measures over thirty-seven and seven-tenths (37.7) inches in circumference (twelve (12) inches or more in diameter) measured four and one-half (4.5) feet above the ground, or which exceeds twenty (20) feet in height. In compliance with the Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance, an administrative permit will be obtained from the County Planning Department prior to removal of protected trees on the project site and any stipulated mitigation will be completed, such as the planting of replacement trees in appropriate sites.
C. Cultural Resources

CR-1. County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department will ensure that the two previously unrecorded historic resources (home site and a wooden barn) noted during the archaeological survey are documented on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and recorded to the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS).

CR-2. Prior to construction, staging areas and trails plans will be finalized in consultation with a qualified historian to avoid areas of known historic sensitivity.

CR-3. Due to the possibility that significant previously unknown historic resources might be found during future construction activities, the following language will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future construction documents:

“If historic resources (i.e. historic sites, and/or isolated historic objects that appear likely to have historic or cultural significance) are discovered during construction, work shall be halted at a minimum of 200 feet from the find, County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department shall be notified, and the area shall be staked off. County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department shall retain a qualified professional historian that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Professional Qualifications in history, to evaluate and determine the significance of the find. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures shall be formulated and implemented.”

CR-4. Prior to construction, staging areas and trails plans will be finalized in consultation with a qualified archaeologist to avoid areas of known archaeological sensitivity. Where this is not feasible, archaeological monitoring shall be carried out during earthmoving activities for trail construction within sensitive areas, as defined in the Archaeological Investigation. In the event that proposed trails pass through recorded archaeological resources, an archaeological testing program will be developed for these areas consistent with professional archeological standards and State and County requirements. The nature and extent of the testing program will be dependent on the level of site disturbance, and topological and environmental factors.

CR-5. Due to the possibility that significant buried prehistoric cultural resources might be found during future construction and trail improvement activities, the following language will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future construction documents:

“If prehistoric archaeological resources (including but not limited to dark soil containing shellfish or groundstone) are discovered during construction, work within the immediate vicinity of the find will be halted at a minimum of 200 feet from the find and the area will be staked off. County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department will then determine if it is feasible to relocate the trail to avoid and/or minimize impacts. If the trail cannot be rerouted and impacts cannot be avoided, then work will cease in the area until the archaeological evaluation has been completed. The County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department will retain a qualified professional historian and/or archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Professional Qualifications in archaeology to evaluate and determine the significance of the find. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures will be formulated and implemented.”

CR-6. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remain, the following language will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future construction documents in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e):

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

D. Land Use and Planning

See BIO-4 above

E. Recreation

The potential for impacts as a result of park expansion is evaluated throughout the Initial Study. Where project implementation is identified to result in environmental impacts, mitigation is provided to ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. See mitigation measures provided in this subsection.

F. Transportation/Traffic

T-1. The tree located about 400 feet south the Ranger Station entrance on the east edge of McKean Road of the entrance shall be trimmed to increase and sight distance to a minimum distance of 430 feet. The trimming shall be regularly maintained to ensure sight distance is preserved.

T-2. The following improvements will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and implemented prior to opening the San Vicente Staging Area:

a. A Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) or other pedestrian crossing provisions to be developed in coordination with County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department prior to final design and implementation shall be installed on McKean Road at the Fortini Road intersection to alert drivers of crossing pedestrians.

b. A high-visibility crosswalk adjacent to the RRFB or other pedestrian crossing provisions to be developed in coordination with County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department prior to final design and implementation shall be installed to direct pedestrians to the proper crossing location on McKean Road.

c. Pedestrian and equestrian warning signs (W11-2 and W11-7) shall be placed approximately 20 feet in advance of the high-visibility crosswalk on McKean Road. Actual configuration to be further coordinated with County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department prior to implementation.

d. The Rancho San Vicente driveway entrance shall include one inbound and one outbound lane.

e. Remove a vehicle parking space at the trail entrance to provide adequate space to enter and exit the trail.

f. An eastbound right-turn deceleration lane and a westbound left-turn pocket shall be added on McKean Road. The deceleration lane and turn-pocket shall extend approximately 200 feet from the intersection. Actual configuration to be further coordinated with County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department prior to final design and implementation.

g. The Rancho San Vicente entrance sign shall be installed perpendicular to McKean Road to maximize its visibility.
Almaden Road Staging Area Improvements

T-3. The following improvements will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and implemented prior to completing improvements at the Almaden Road Staging Area:

a. Pedestrian and equestrian warning signs (W11-2 and W11-7) shall be installed on Almaden Road to alert drivers for pedestrians and equestrians in the roadway. Actual configuration to be further coordinated with County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department prior to implementation.

b. The Almaden Road staging driveway entrance shall include one inbound and one outbound lane.

c. The Almaden Road staging area entrance sign shall be installed perpendicular to Almaden Road to maximize its visibility.

Note: A reporting or monitoring program must be adopted for measures to mitigate significant impacts at the time the Mitigated Negative Declaration is adopted or the project is approved, in accord with the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code.

Prepared by:
Elish Ryan, Park Planner
Santa Clara County Parks

Approved by:
Julie Mark, Deputy Director
Santa Clara County Parks

Revised 5/09/10
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A. BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Calero County Park Trails Master Plan</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>July 8, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File Number</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN(s)</td>
<td>70833001; 70833005-007; 70847015; 71217014; 71217017; 71217020; 71217021; 71217026; 71217027; 74209015; 74209032; 74209031; 74208033; 74208057; 74208058; 74209007; 74209036; 74209037; 74209038; 74209039; 74209040; 74209041; 74209042; 74209043; 74209046; 74209049; 74209050; 74210003; 74210013; 74210015; 74210017; 74210018; 74210019; 74210020; 74210021; 74210022; 74212007; 74212009; 74213008; 74213009; 74213011; 74233003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Zoning</td>
<td>R-1-1</td>
<td>City General Plan Designation</td>
<td>Open Hillside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Zoning</td>
<td>A; A H: A HS-sr</td>
<td>County General Plan Designation</td>
<td>Regional Park, Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Trails Master Plan</td>
<td>USA (if any)</td>
<td>Outside of USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency Name and Address</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>298 Garden Hill Drive, Los Gatos, CA 95032-7669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name and Address</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>298 Garden Hill Drive, Los Gatos, CA 95032-7669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Name and Address</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>408-355-2200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Calero County Park consists of approximately 4,442 acres of land located partially within the City of San Jose and partially in unincorporated Santa Clara County approximately 10 miles south of the city center and outside the urban services area. The main entrance to the park is located at 23205 McKean Road, approximately three miles southwest of U.S. Highway 101. Figure 1 and Figure 2 illustrate the project location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Summary

The proposed Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan (Trails Master Plan) provides a framework for expansion of the existing park trail system into a multi-use trail network over 10-year time period, while supporting protection and enhancement of the sensitive cultural and environmental resources within the park. The proposed Trails Master Plan will:

- Allow 966 acres of newly acquired areas in the park to be opened for recreational trail use;
- Expand the existing trail system by approximately 14.7 miles to 35.9 miles at build-out;
- Designate 26.6 miles of trails as multi-use, to be shared by hikers, bicyclists and equestrians;
- Retain 7.5 miles of trails as limited use for equestrian and hiking only;
- Designate 1.8 miles of trails as hiking only;
- Remove 4.9 miles of existing service road and trails and restore to native landscape;
- Remove dogs on-leash restriction on most trails in the park;
- Upgrade existing in-stream creek channel crossings with bridges spanning the creek/drainage ways or other crossing techniques to minimize in-channel hiking, bicycle, and equestrian water quality disturbance;
- Expand existing trail head staging facilities at Calero Park Ranger Station;
- Create new trail head staging facility off McKean Road;
- Create new trail head staging facility off Almaden Road;
- Install new fences, gates, signage, picnic and rest facilities and pet waste stations; and
- Install surface drainage facilities at new and existing trail head facilities that will maintain or improve storm water quality.

As outlined above, the Trails Master Plan nearly doubles the mileage of the existing trail system. Equestrians and hikers currently use approximately 20 miles of trails. At final build-out, the expanded Calero County Park’s trail system will have grown to approximately 36 miles and will offer many trails for walkers with dogs on-leash and mountain bikers while still retaining historic, limited trail use for equestrians and hikers on some trails. In addition, the Trails Master Plan will provide regional trail connections as identified in the Santa Clara County Countywide Trails Master Plan (1995).

A complete version of the Calero County Park Trails Master Plan is available to view and download at the Santa Clara County Parks Department website: www.parkhere.org.
Figure 1

Location Map

Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan Initial Study
Figure 2
Aerial Photograph

Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan Initial Study

Source: Santa Clara County 2012, Google Earth 2011, ESRI 2009

Legend

- Project Boundary
- Water Course
Project Goals

The objective of the Trails Master Plan is to implement the directive established by the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation System’s Strategic Plan (2003) to “identify opportunities to increase multiple-use trails and to ensure consistency with the Countywide Trails Master Plan and Strategic Plan.” As such, the stated goals of the Trails Master Plan are as follows:

- Ensure consistency with 2003 Strategic Plan for the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation System to “identify opportunities to increase multiple-use trails;”
- Ensure consistency with 1995 Countywide Trails Master Plan Update to identify routes for proposed regional trails through and adjacent to Calero County Park;
- Comply with natural resource management goals and practices, including managed grazing, as were established in relevant natural resource and grazing management plans for the park;
- Comply with the Final Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (2012) (Valley Habitat Plan) requirements for defined habitat areas in Calero County Park, including the Rancho San Vicente addition;
- Incorporate site-appropriate standards and guidelines for trail design, construction and maintenance, staging areas and access points, and trail related amenities such as signage, shade, seating, water, restrooms, etc.;
- Evaluate existing trails relative to natural resources, operations needs, and maintenance considerations. Re-route trails where necessary to assure long-term sustainability;
- Evaluate opportunities for new trails to expand the variety of trail user experiences and to meet other functional park operations needs;
- Integrate with long range use and management goals of the Santa Clara Valley Water District, the City of San Jose, and the Open Space Authority for lands under their jurisdiction in or adjacent to Calero County Park;
- Identify partnership opportunities with adjacent landowners and other agencies to implement the Trails Master Plan; and
- Consider implications of the Trails Master Plan recommendations in relation to existing and future operations and maintenance resources.

New Trail User Groups

Currently Calero County Park trails are open to equestrians and hikers only, with one trail also open to horses with carts. Implementation of the Trails Master Plan will add new user groups to Calero County Park trails including people with dogs on-leash, bicyclists, and those on approved mobility devices.

Equestrian/hiking only trails will be maintained in what is considered the central core of Calero County Park i.e., areas of the park acquired prior to 1989, while expanding its user group to include dogs on-leash. All other trails will either be converted to multi-use, reconstructed to accommodate multi-use, or be
new trails designed and constructed as multi-use. Two trails have been designated for pedestrian use only, one due to steep terrain and the other to protect sensitive serpentine habitat. See Figure 3, Proposed Trails Map.

In accordance with County policy, all parks are open to dogs on-leash, except where special circumstances necessitate otherwise. However, to accommodate Open Space Authority policies which prohibit dogs on Open Space Authority preserves, trails on the south side of the park that lead to Open Space Authority facilities or connect to Open Space Authority trails will not allow dogs on-leash.

**New Uses on Trails**

The proposed Trails Master Plan identifies several new or enhanced uses of the park trails. These uses include implementation of a "Healthy Trails Program" in coordination with local health providers, Geocaching (an activity that involves the use of GPS devices to locate storage boxes hidden along trails in the shortest time possible), guided nature walks, and electronic mapping (use of smart phones and other electronic devices to guide users through the park).

**Proposed Trails**

As described in the Calero County Parks Trails Master Plan, the majority of proposed trails follow existing trail or road alignments. New trails provide users with a variety of experiences and access to new areas of the park, complete loops for specific user groups, or connect to neighboring parks and regional trails. Proposed trails are identified on Figure 3, presented earlier. Table 1, Proposed Trails, summarizes details about each of the 14 trails and Table 2, Trail Mileage and Summaries, provides a summary of trail mileage.

New multi-purpose and equestrian trails will be natural soils, compacted and sloped for drainage. Gravel or crushed fines reinforcement and stabilization may be required in some locations. Trail bed and trailside drainage will direct water off the trail to stabilized slopes, channels and outfalls. If necessary, a boardwalk or metal grating will be included to protect serpentine habitat areas above the radio tower, and turnpikes or rock causeways within permanent or seasonally wet areas. Bridges may be installed over creeks and drainage ways with supports outside the channels, or other crossing techniques. Trail widths will vary from four to six feet to six to 12 feet. See Figure 4, Limited Use Trail Design, and Figure 5, Shared-Use Trails.

**Regional Trail Connectivity**

Calero County Park is situated between two large Santa Clara County parks: Almaden-Quicksilver and Santa Teresa. It is also adjacent to other agency open spaces. As such, Calero County Park is key to providing regional connectivity between area parks and open space.
Figure 3
Calero County Park Trail Map
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Limited-Use Trails

Limited-Use Trail Routes: a trail route designed, developed, and managed for more than one, but not all types of users. See also: Shared-use Trail.

Natural Tread - Single Track Trail

Native material on Base rock

2'-0" minimum vegetation clearance on each side of trail. Prune all brush over 12" in height & 1/2" in diameter that extends into trailway.

Optimum Width Varies

Optimum 2% Cross-slope for Drainage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Designation</th>
<th>Typ. Maximum Trail Grade</th>
<th>Optimum Trail Tread Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Floor Areas</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Areas</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Areas</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4'-0&quot; to 6'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- “Optimum:” the best or most favorable conditions for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management.

- Should a situation be encountered where the optimum width indicated can not be achieved or a staged development approach is used where narrower trails precedes the optimum buildout width, mitigation measures should be used to provide for trail user safety. Such measures could include, but are not limited to: brush removal and clearing to augment lines-of-sight, trail pullouts at regular intervals, one-way trail management, signage, or dismounting requirements.

Source: Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan, Bellinger Foster Steinmetz 2013
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**Shared-Use Trails**

**Shared-Use Trail Routes:** a trail route designed, developed, and managed for all types of users. Use would be accommodated either on one Shared-Use Trail, or a combination of parallel Limited-Use and/or Single-Purpose Trails.

**Natural Tread - Double Track Trail**

Equestrians, Hikers, & Bicycles

Native material or Base rock

2'-0" minimum vegetation clearance on each side of trail. Prune all brush over 12" in height & 1/2" in diameter that extends into trailway.

12'-0" vertical vegetation clearance

Optimum width varies

Optimum 2% Cross-slope for Drainage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Designation</th>
<th>Typ. Maximum Trail Grade</th>
<th>Average Terrain Slope</th>
<th>Optimum Trail Tread Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Floor Areas</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>0-15%</td>
<td>12'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-30%</td>
<td>12'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Areas</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0-15%</td>
<td>12'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-30%</td>
<td>10'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Areas</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0-15%</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-30%</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>4'-0&quot; to 6'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- For trails typically outside of Urban Service Areas as shown on the County General Plan Land Use Map.
- "Optimum:" the best or most favorable conditions for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management.

**"Should a situation be encountered where the optimum width indicated can not be achieved or a staged development approach is used where narrower trails precedes the optimum buildout width, mitigation measures should be used to provide for trail user safety. Such measures could include, but are not limited to: brush removal and clearing to augment lines-of-sight, trail pullouts at regular intervals, one-way trail management, signage, or dismounting requirements.**

Source: Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan, Bellinger Foster Steinmetz 2013
### Table 1  Proposed Trails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail #</th>
<th>Trail Name</th>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Regional Connection</th>
<th>Special Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>Links McKean Road Staging Area to Almaden Road Staging Area</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Bridge crossing Alamitos Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>From Almaden Road Staging Area to Trail #5</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>From Trail #5 to radio tower</td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of boardwalk or metal grating to protect serpentine habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>From Bertram Road trail entrance to Trail #5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgraded bridge across Alamitos Creek required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>Both 4'-6' and 10' sections</td>
<td>Links McKean Road Staging Area to Cottle Trail and Cherry Cove Trail. Some alignment adjustments needed away from existing ranch road and existing seeps</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Part of trail to be narrowed from road width to trail width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>Creates loop with Cottle Trail and Trail #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Equestrian/Hiking</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>Connects from Javelina Loop to Chisnantuk Peak Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chisnantuk Peak Trail</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>Chisnantuk Trail topography and alignment adjustment</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Serpentine Loop Trail</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>Both 4'-6' and 10' sections</td>
<td>Trail realignment to avoid erodible soils and flooding</td>
<td></td>
<td>See discussion of erodible soils in the Geology and Soils section of this Initial Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail #</td>
<td>Trail Name</td>
<td>User Type</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Regional Connection</td>
<td>Special Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>From Ranger Station to Bald Peaks Trail</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Crosses Figueroa Trail at existing stream crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Equestrian/Hiking</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>Pena Trail reroute from Ranger Station to Figueroa Trail to avoid steep slopes and erodible soils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>From Ranger Station to Javelina Loop along southern edge of reservoir</td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires construction of several small bridges over drainages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>From Trail #13 east to park property line along existing road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires crossing of McKeans Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>From Trail #13 north to park property line</td>
<td>C19</td>
<td>Requires crossing of McKeans Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>From Ranger Station along northern side of Calero Reservoir to Cherry Cove Trail</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Requires construction of several small bridges or culverts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>4'-6'</td>
<td>Along McKean Road from Cherry Cove Trail</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Draft Calero County Park Trail Master Plan (May 2013), pages 43-44.

**Notes:** *Named trails are not numbered; **To Be Determined*
Table 2  Trail Mileage Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Mileage by User</th>
<th>Multi-Use A</th>
<th>Multi-Use B</th>
<th>Pedestrian Only</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian, Hiking,</td>
<td>(Equestrian</td>
<td>(Equestrian,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs on-leash</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Hiking, Biking,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dogs on-leash)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Mileage by Width</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Track (4'-6')</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>Drivable (10'-12')</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Mileage by Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Abandoned/ Restored*</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Proposed Calero County Park Trail Master Plan (May 2013), page 45.

Notes: *Abandoned / Restored Trail lengths are not included in total trail mileage

The Santa Clara County Countywide Trails Master Plan Update (1995), which is an element of the County’s General Plan, establishes the general routes through which the regional connections are to be made. The following routes which connect to, or transect, Calero County Park are accommodated in the Trails Master Plan:

- West Valley Trail (S6): From Almaden Lake Park to the southern county link of the Bay Area Ridge Trail;
- Guadalupe / Calero Trail (C18): Connecting Guadalupe Reservoir and Almaden-Quicksilver County Park with Calero County Park;
- Calero / Santa Teresa Trail (C19): Connecting McKean Road / Calero County Park with Santa Teresa County Park; and
- Bailey Road Trail (C20): Connecting Calero County Park with the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail and the Bay Area Ridge Trail.

These trails are illustrated on Figure 6, Regional Connectivity Plan.

Trails to Abandon and Restore

Some existing park trails have proven difficult to maintain due to erosion, topography, or hydrologic activity and are classified for abandonment and restoration. Additional trails in the Rancho San Vicente portion of the park will be rerouted to protect environmentally sensitive areas and to avoid seepage areas.

As identified in the proposed Trails Master Plan, where trails are planned for closure, the trail will be eliminated from view as much as possible, and replanted to a natural condition. Compacted ground will be
scarified and aerated to aid natural seeding and restoration. To facilitate re-growth and to blend with the natural topography, it may be necessary to re-grade heavily eroded areas. Areas will be replanted with native materials in support of park habitat values. Where existing trail widths exceed proposed width, width reduction will follow procedures established in the Santa Clara County Parks Trails Maintenance Manual (County of Santa Clara 2005). Trails to be abandoned and restored are illustrated on Figure 7, Existing Trails to be Abandoned.

**Future Trails for Consideration and Additional Study**

The Parks Master Plan has identified several possible future trail alignments including the following:

- A trail connection between boat launch ramp and Cherry Cove Trail;
- A trail between Rancho San Vicente Trail and western end of Cottle Trail;
- A trail between Bertram Road and the Almaden Calero Canal Trail; and
- A trail to connect to Coyote Valley Open Space Preserve.

While these areas have been identified for continued study and coordination, specific trail alignments are not currently proposed as part of the Calero County Parks Trail Master Plan. Therefore, these alignments are not evaluated within this Initial Study.

**Staging Areas**

There are four existing and two proposed staging areas included in the Trails Master Plan. The location of each of the staging areas is identified on Figure 3 (presented earlier) and is described below.

**Ranger Station**

The existing Ranger Station staging area is currently the primary access point to park trails for equestrians, and will likely continue to be so at final buildout of the Trails Master Plan. The existing informal equestrian staging area will be structured into eighteen trailer parking spaces and seventy-five new car spaces. To be in compliance with the Valley Habitat Plan, the staging area will be modified to keep parking out of the 150’ stream buffer and will organize parking through the use of planting islands. Staging for equestrians is sized to accommodate horse trailers which can carry up to six horses, and a corral will facilitate temporary holding of animals near the trailhead. Parking for new user groups (bicycles and dogs on-leash) will be provided to the southeast of the existing staging area. All parking surfaces will be an all weather aggregate surface on a compacted rock base. Surface storm water will be directed to swales for on site infiltration. Due to storm water contact with horse manure, storm water may be directed to a storm water detention pond. A new 1.5-acre special events and overflow parking area is proposed on the southwest side of the entrance road. This area will remain a grass surface with no improvements. A portable restroom will be removed and a new restroom building will be constructed with a leach field or pump vault for waste treatment. A picnic area will be located near the trailhead. See Figure 8, Ranger Station Staging Area, for a detail map describing the conceptual design for this staging area.
Figure 6
Regional Connectivity Plan
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Source: Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan, Bellinger Foster Steimetz 2013
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Figure 7

Existing Trails to be Abandoned

Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan Initial Study

Source: Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan, Bellinger Foster Steimetz 2013

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Abandon/Restore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Roadbed, Service Road, Unpaved Road, Unpaved Trail, Ranger Office, Park Entrance, Parking Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This side intentionally left blank.
Figure 8
Ranger Station Staging Area
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Source: Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan, Bellinger Foster Steimetz 2013
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**Casa Loma Road**

Access to the park off Casa Loma Road will be facilitated using the existing Open Space Authority staging area. A small picnic area is proposed in the meadow east of the Serpentine Loop trailhead. Signage will include dog access limitations between Open Space Authority facilities and Calero County Park.

**Boat Launch**

Minor adjustments will be made to the existing site to accommodate and regulate access to new park trails. Equestrian staging will not be permitted at this location.

**Bertram Road**

Necessary site improvements will be provided to this existing site to allow local walk-bike-ride in access. No parking is currently provided or will be provided with implementation of the Trails Master Plan.

**Rancho San Vicente**

The proposed Rancho San Vicente staging area will provide a new park entrance off McKean Road and accommodate public access with multiuse trails to a portion of the park that is currently closed to the public. It will also preserve service access for the existing cattle grazing operation, the Almaden Calero Canal (operated by the Santa Clara Valley Water District), and the radio tower leasehold.

Features of the Rancho San Vicente staging area include identifiable signage, paybooth, gates, and provisions for hikers, picnic use and equestrians. The new 30-foot wide asphalt entry road will be aligned with Fortini Road, on the north side of McKean Road. The entry road will be gated, restricting access from dawn to dusk. Fifteen “early bird” spaces will accommodate off-hours visitors. Seventy-five regular parking and 25 trailer spaces will accommodate regular park hour use with additional fenced turnout/parking overflow space. The staging area will include picnic area and restrooms that will support up to 125 park visitors at any one time. Proposed features for the equestrian area include a corral or turnout area, mounting block, hitch rail and watering trough. See Figure 9, Rancho San Vicente Staging Area, for a detail map describing the conceptual design for this staging area.

All parking areas will be on an aggregate surface on compacted rock base. Surface storm water will be directed to swales for on site infiltration. Due to storm water contact with horse manure, contact storm water may be directed to a storm water detention pond. The restroom will be either leach field or pumped vault for waste treatment. Maintenance of the equestrian area will include manure management, stormwater management, and upkeep of water troughs and other structure.

New trails will be routed to the staging area as shown on Figure 3, presented earlier. At final build-out, connections to regional trails, Almaden Quicksilver Park and Santa Teresa Park are envisioned from this staging area.

**Almaden Road**

A small staging area is proposed off Almaden Road, with parking, picnic area and trailhead access to Rancho San Vicente. An existing bridge over Alamitos Creek will require upgrades prior to use.
Additional Park Elements

Signage, fencing and gates are necessary elements of Calero County Park in guiding users and establishing park character. Signage is an important early implementation feature of the Trail Master Plan and critical to effective user way-finding. To maintain visual consistency, the Trails Master Plan directs the new directional signage to follow Santa Clara County signage standards and sign characteristics developed for Calero County Park. In addition, all signs will be easily visible, and not create user hazards or interferences.

The Trails Master Plan states the material and style of fencing will either support the park character or be practical in nature. As such, split-rail fencing should be used near staging areas and trail heads and wire-fencing will be used for cattle control.

Where trails are slated for closure, strategically placed natural debris or fencing and educational signage may be necessary to keep users out of re-vegetation areas. In areas of sensitive habitat, inconspicuous fencing such as cable rail may be provided to protect species. Lockable vehicular gates are needed to secure entry into the park and to prevent unauthorized vehicle access and use on trails. Self-closing gates are appropriate where grazing cattle need to be contained while allowing users onto trails within grazing zones.

Best Management Practices

The Santa Clara County Countywide Trails Master Plan Update, adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in 1995, and the Santa Clara County Parks Trail Maintenance Manual (County of Santa Clara 2005) establish the County Parks Departments best management practices for trail siting, trail construction, and trail maintenance that will be used to avoid or reduce impacts to natural resources and to sensitive receptors. The Calero County Park Trails Master Plan includes Best Management Practices (BMPs) identified these two documents. In addition, the Trails Master Plan identifies several other project-specific BMPs related to air quality, biology, geology, hydrology, stormwater, and removal/restoration to ensure environmental effects are minimized. Refer to the corresponding environmental issue area of Section D. Environmental Checklist and Discussion of Impacts for identification of specific proposed BMPs that address potential environmental concerns.

Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Requirements

Calero County Park is located within the permit area of the Valley Habitat Plan and identified as a “covered activity” under the Valley Habitat Plan. As such, the proposed Trails Master Plan project would be subject to the conditions of the approved Valley Habitat Plan and permits. Compliance with the Valley Habitat Plan is identified as a goal of the Trails Master Plan (see the Project Goals, presented earlier) and Valley Habitat Plan requirements and guidelines for the development of new trails, staging areas and recreational facilities within future parklands that would be enrolled in reserve system are incorporated into the proposed Trails Master Plan (see Chapter 3 of the Trails Master Plan).
Figure 9
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Source: Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan, Bellinger Foster Steimetz 2013
Implementation

The proposed Trails Master Plan will be implemented incrementally over a 10-year period. Three concurrent implementation strategies are proposed including Strategy #1: Sequential implementation of major Master Trails Plan routes; Strategy #2: Ongoing improvements to existing trails and habitat as identified in the Trails Master Plan; and Strategy #3: Long range projects, which focuses on trail segments that require major capital improvements such as bridge crossings and property acquisition that may require additional environmental review as projects are further defined.

The proposed construction phasing with simultaneous implementation approaches to facilitate new user groups and access to Rancho San Vicente early in the process is outlined below in Table 3 and illustrated in Figure 10, Trail Phasing Plan. It should be noted that while the phasing plan provides general direction for implementation, actual timing will be dependent on factors such as staff resources and available funding.

Table 3 Phasing Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Strategy</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Implementation Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy #1</strong> Sequential Implementation of major Trails Plan routes</td>
<td>Create trails in Calero County Park to open new areas of park and convert existing trails that connect to Open Space Authority trails to multi-use</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Timeline" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create new multi-use lakeside trail and increase internal loop trail options for all users</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Timeline" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete additional new trail connections to further complete plan</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Timeline" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy #2</strong> Ongoing improvements to existing trails and habitat</td>
<td>Upgrade existing trails to reduce seasonal closures, improve user experience, and enhance resource protection</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Timeline" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restore to native habitat those trails that are no longer used or that have been rerouted</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Timeline" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy #3</strong> Long Range projects</td>
<td>Implement trail segments that need additional major design, infrastructure or acquisition</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Timeline" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Draft Calero County Park Trail Master Plan (May 2013), page 72.

Note: Colors in timeline correspond to trail colors on Figure 10, Trail Phasing Plan.
Operations and Maintenance

Santa Clara County Parks currently maintains almost 300 miles of trails, distributed over 29 parks in the County. Guidance for the County Park’s primary objectives of trails maintenance activities, standards for tasks to be performed, and staffing priorities are detailed in the County’s Trail Maintenance Manual (2005).

Calero County Park is part of a staffing unit that includes Almaden Quicksilver County Park and the Casa Grande complex. Distribution of staff time between the three facilities is on an as-needed basis. With growing demands at Calero County Park and Casa Grande, the shared staff arrangement might need to be revisited in the future.

Project operating expenses developed for the Calero County Park trails system only include costs for permanently assigned staff; it does not include seasonal positions, trail construction, or project crews or equipment and supplies. To assist with the staffing needs planning, the following personnel will be necessary: trails construction crew (one trails crew lead, three trails crew staff, up to three equipment operators, as needed); special project crew (one project lead and three project staff), and parks maintenance staff. County parks staff identified the following additional personnel necessary for implementation of the Trails Master Plan as described below in Table 4.

Table 4  Permanently Assigned Staff Required for Project Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Calero Park Operations Staff Positions</th>
<th>Additional Staff needed as a result of full implementation of the Trails Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Staff</td>
<td>Position Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior Park Ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Park Ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Park Service Attendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior Park Maintenance Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Park Maintenance Worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Draft Calero County Park Trail Master Plan (May 2013), page 77.

As project improvements are being phased over time, park staffing needs will gradually increase before reaching final build-out requirements. Even at full build out, the decision to implement staff increases at Calero County Park will be dependent on a range of factors, including staffing needs of the larger Parks Department, seasonal demand, budgetary constraints, and undefined staffing needs of portions of the park to be enrolled in the Reserve System as a result of the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (ICF International 2012).
Figure 10
Trail Phasing Plan
Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan Initial Study

Legend
- Years 1-5: New Trails + OSA Multi-Use Connection
- Years 5-7: Multi-Use Lakeside Trail + Equestrian Loop
- Years 1-8: Upgrade Existing Trails
- Years 7-8: New Trail Connections
- Years 2-9: Abandoned/Rerouted Trails
- Years 1-10+: Interdivision + Interagency Improvements

Source: Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan, Bellinger Foster Steimetz 2013
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ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING / SURROUNDING LAND USES

The 4,442-acre park Calero County Park is situated in the eastern foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountains part of the rolling hill country of Santa Clara County. The proximity to U.S. Highway 101 provides easy regional access from San Jose and communities further south such as Morgan Hill and Gilroy.

The park is between two other large Santa Clara County parks: Almaden-Quicksilver with over 33 miles of trails on 3,977 acres to the west and Santa Teresa with 14 miles of trails on 1,672 acres to the north. Just beyond the western edge of Almaden Quicksilver County Park, is the Mid-peninsula Regional Open Space District’s vast 17,000-acre Sierra Azul. Adjacent to Calero Park to the south is the Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority’s 3,882-acre Rancho Canada del Oro Open Space Preserve. The 548-acre Coyote Valley Open Space Preserve (owned by the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority) is located less than a mile to the east.

With the exception of Rancho Cañada del Oro Open Space Preserve on its southwest border, Calero Park is surrounded by private small ranches and rural residences. The Cinnabar Hills Golf Course is adjacent to the southern end of the park east of McKean Road.

Two distinct areas define Calero County Park: the reservoir, which offers a host of water-oriented recreational activities, and the adjoining "back country" which contains a diversity of plant communities and associated wildlife habitats. The recently acquired Rancho San Vicente portion of the park is currently not accessible by the general public and is leased for grazing to a private operator. Specific physical and environmental features of the park are described below.

Existing Park Features

The Calero County Park system contains approximately 20 miles of trails that are open nearly year-round for hikers and equestrian uses. One trail allows for horse and cart activities, by permit only. The park’s rolling terrain and diverse ecological habitats provides users with an opportunity to enjoy a variety of trail experiences, lengths, and degrees of difficulty. Most trails are linked to create loops while others offer a specific destination such as a place or scenic lookout. The majority of trails are aligned on historic ranch roads.

The park abuts the Open Space Authority’s portion of Rancho Canada del Oro and is in proximity to Almaden Quicksilver County Park and Santa Teresa County Park. There are current trail connections between Calero County Park and the Rancho Canada del Oro Open Space Preserve. The newly acquired Rancho San Vicente portion of the park currently has no official public access.

Trail width and grades vary greatly throughout the park, ranging from flat to over 20 percent in a few spots and from three feet wide to over 12 feet wide. All trail surfaces are compacted native soil, susceptible to inclement weather impacts that trigger seasonal closure of some trails. A number of trails require significant maintenance due to layout, soil conditions, water seeps, and steep slopes, and may be periodically closed to users.

Current trail amenities include parking, equestrian staging area and portable restrooms at one trailhead, picnic areas, interpretive signs, and defined trail markers. Currently, there are no ADA-compliant trails.
The Trails Master Plan identifies the following additional park features:

- **Ranger Station/Visitor Center.** Located along the main park entry, visitors can register for activities, speak to park rangers, obtain park information, and view displays. Park maintenance activities are staged from the adjoining equipment yard. A portable restroom is located at this area.

- **The Calero Reservoir Launch Ramp.** This location offers access to many types of water-related activities, including fishing and year-round use by power and non-power water vessels. Picnic areas along its northern shore are available on a first-come first-served basis. A group picnic area is available by reservation.

- **Calero Bat Inn.** Located along the Javelina Loop Trail, visitors to the Bat Inn can observe the nightly emergence of native bats who hunt over Cherry Cove Creek and Calero Reservoir. It is estimated that thousands of bats use this roosting station.

- **Radio Transmission Tower.** Located in the middle of the Rancho San Vicente site of Calero Park a radio tower stands tall above Calero Reservoir amidst serpentine outcroppings. Accessed by a gravel ranch road off McKean Road, the site is not open to the public.

- **Water Tank.** A 100,000 gallon water tank with pump house and propane tank is located along Peña Trail, and stores water for park use and fire suppression.

- **Cottle Rest Site.** The Cottle rest site along Chisnantuk Peak Trail provides a picnic facility and horse trough.

- **Fish Camp and Los Cerritos Pond (formerly grazing stock ponds).** These areas offer picnic facilities, and at Fish Camp, a horse trough. Interpretive signs educate visitors and pond life invites nature observation.

- **Power Transmission Lines.** These lines cross the Rancho San Vicente area at two locations; one large overhead line parallels the Almaden Calero Canal and one smaller line serves the radio tower.

Location of existing trails and features of the park are identified on Figure 11, Physical Features and Park History. Figure 12, Site Photos, provides photos of several of the parks features.
Figure 11

Physical Features and Property History
Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan Initial Study
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1. Los Cerritos Pond/Fish Camp
2. Calero Batt Inn
3. Calero Reservoir
4. Calero Park Ranger Station and Visitor Center

Figure 12
Photos of Park Features
Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan Initial Study
Aesthetics and Visual Resources

The Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan identifies several scenic vistas available to trail users. Along higher elevation trails users can see the Loma Prieta Mountain, Bald Peak, and Mt. Umunhum to the west. Coyote Ridge and Mount Hamilton are visible to the east. Views to the north open upon the Calero Reservoir and the Santa Clara Valley beyond, with views of some of San Jose’s residential development approaching from the northwest. From some vista points, the Sierra Azul Mountains to the southwest may be visible. Along the lower elevation trails, intimate views of the varied landscape and habitats are available including oak woodlands, chaparral, grasslands, wetlands, ponds and freshwater marshes.

Under the Regional Parks, Trails, and Scenic Highways Element of the Santa Clara County General Plan, three main park access roads (McKean Road, Bailey Avenue, and Casa Loma Road) are designated as a Scenic Rural Routes.

Air Quality and Climate

Air Quality

The project site is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (Air Basin). Air pollutants of concern in the Air Basin are ozone, particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), and toxic air contaminants (TACs). Both the State of California and the federal government have developed ambient air quality standards for the criteria pollutants, which include ozone, CO, NO2, SO2, and PM10.

Ambient air quality in the project area is monitored by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) at eight locations in Santa Clara County. The Air Basin has been unable to meet state standards for ozone and particulate matter, and is considered to be in “non-attainment” (Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2012). Responsibility has been delegated to the Air District to implement both federal and state mandates at the local level for improving air quality in the Air Basin through an air quality plan. The Air District has adopted several plans in an attempt to achieve state and federal air quality standards. The most recent plan is the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan finalized in September 2010.

Sensitive air quality receptors (segments of the population susceptible to adverse effects of poor air quality) near the project site are residences along McKean Road, Casa Loma Road, Almaden Road, and Bertam Road.

Climate

Temperatures at nearby San Jose Airport average 59 degrees Fahrenheit annually, ranging from the low-40s on winter mornings to near 80 degrees Fahrenheit on summer afternoons. Winter, typically referred to as “the rainy season,” is characterized by offshore wind flow and occurrence of storms. Weak inversions coupled with moderate winds result in a low air pollution potential. During the summer, cool and moisture-laden air approaching the coast from the Pacific Ocean is further cooled by the presence of the cold water band resulting in condensation and the presence of fog and stratus clouds along the Northern California
coast. Wind speeds are greatest in the spring and summer and weakest in the fall and winter. Nighttime and early morning hours frequently have calm winds in all seasons, while summer afternoons and evenings are quite breezy. Strong winds are rare, associated mostly with winter storms.

**Biological Resources**

Calero County Park contains a wide-range of habitats and is considered one of Santa Clara County’s most ecologically diverse parks. Land covers, their ecosystem functions, and common wildlife associations are described in detail in the Valley Habitat Plan. The consolidated mapping available from the Valley Habitat Plan was used to depict unified land cover designations for the Calero County Park Master Plan used in the Parks Master Plan. See Figure 13, Land Cover.

As identified on Figure 13, the most prevalent land cover types are non-native annual grasslands and Coast Live Oak Woodland. Other plant communities include blue oak woodland, valley oak woodland, riparian forest, serpentine grassland and serpentine chaparral, sage-chaparral scrub and seasonal wetland, pond, and freshwater marsh. In particular, land covers associated with serpentine soils are considered sensitive and cover considerable areas of the park. As they contain rare and endangered species habitat, these serpentine areas and their habitats were carefully considered and avoided where feasible in planning new trail routes in Calero County Park.

**Cultural and Historic Resources**

The Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan identifies the following cultural or historic resources at the park:

- **The Bailey-Fellows House and Barns:** This is an historic site owned by the Santa Clara Valley Water District that is not open to the public at this time. Park Entrance Gate Pillars are the only remaining structures outside the Bailey-Fellows House that are associated with the recent history of the park before it was purchased by the County. Made of simple brick construction and painted white, they form an iconic entrance feature to the park.

- **Casa Loma Barn:** The Casa Loma Barn is an historic barn located off of Casa Loma Road and associated with the former Rancho Cañada del Oro. While the actual date of construction is unknown, it is the only remaining building on Calero County Park property associated with the former Rancho Cañada del Oro. At this time the site is not open to the public.

- **Archaeological Sites:** Before Spanish and Mexican colonization in California, the lands were inhabited by Native Americans associated with several of the Ohlone Indian tribal groups. A number of archeological sites relating to Native American site use exist within Calero County Park and in the surrounding vicinity.

- **No known structures associated with the recent habitation of Rancho San Vicente are still in existence. However, remnants of building foundations are located in areas below the Almaden Calero Canal.**
Figure 13

Land Cover
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This side intentionally left blank.
Geology and Soils

Geographic Features

The site has a rugged topography with elevations ranging from approximately 450 feet near the northwest corner of the reservoir to greater than 1,400 feet near the southern edge of the site. Slopes vary from flat (0 percent) to very steep (40 percent and above). Generally the flatter lands are found adjacent to the north and east shores of the reservoir. The majority of ridges in Calero Park run east to west, with the majority of trails following this alignment.

Geology

Calero County Park is located in a region that contains several major fault systems, including the well-known San Andreas Fault, along with many minor fault trace - both active and inactive. The park is located within the southeastern portion of the New Almaden fault block, composed primarily of highly-sheared and jumbled mix of marine sedimentary, volcanic and intrusive igneous rocks of basaltic composition. Several significant geologic units are mapped within the park boundary including: Franciscan mélange, undifferentiated (fm); metamorphosed volcanic rocks of the Franciscan mélange (fpv); metamorphosed basaltic rocks of the Franciscan mélange (fmv); Serpentinitized ultra-mafic rocks (Jos); Landslide deposits (Qls); Alluvial deposits (Qal); and Alluvial fan deposits (Qpf). Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan (May 2013) page 27 based information provided by the Soil Geographic (SSURGO) data base 2010 and summarized in Geologic and Hydrologic Opportunities and Constraints for Trail Planning, memo prepared by Balance Hydrologics in 2011.

Several large landslides are mapped in the area south of the western portion of Calero Reservoir, and northwest of the Casa Loma entrance to the park. Pleistocene alluvial fan deposits are present within the northwestern-most corner of the Park. These are unconsolidated, poorly-sorted deposits that have a greater potential for erosion than the bedrock units within the park, but because of the presence of gravel and boulders within the deposits, are not particularly prone to excessive erosion. Geologic Conditions are identified in Figure 14, Geologic Constraints.

Soils

The soils within the park are predominately well-drained, sandy loams to clay with moderate to high slopes. Some areas are more likely than others to be subject to ponding, and/or saturated conditions. These areas are identified on Figure 14, Geologic Constraints. The proposed Trails Master Plan also states that the soil survey information for the site identified that several soils in the park have a particularly high stone content which could make trail construction in these areas more difficult (SSURGO, 2010; Balance Hydrologics, 2011).
Seismic Hazards

The active San Andreas Fault System is located approximately seven miles southwest of Calero Reservoir. The shape of the reservoir and topography of the surrounding area has partially developed as a result of the northwest-trending inactive Calero Fault Zone, which crosses the site.

Hydrology

As identified in the Trails Master Plan, Calero County Park makes up more than 50 percent of the land area within the 6.9-square mile Calero Reservoir watershed. Portions of Rancho San Vicente drain west to Alamitos Creek, which also enters the Guadalupe River. Portions of the former Rancho Cañada del Oro property drain south to Llagas Creek and eventually enter the Pajaro River.

Average annual precipitation within the watershed is 24.5 inches, with a range from 20 - 28 inches. The majority of the park drains into the reservoir and down through Calero Creek to the Guadalupe River.

The northern edge of the park is defined by Calero Reservoir. The reservoir, with a maximum surface area of 347 acres and a 10,054-acre-feet capacity is fed mostly by local runoff, via Cherry Canyon Creek, Calero Creek, and a number of seasonal tributaries. The Almaden Calero supplies some water from the Almaden Reservoir.

In addition to the large reservoir, within the park are several human-made ponds, constructed primarily for cattle grazing operations. Numerous seeps and springs exist in the park and some of these springs are used to support watering troughs for cattle or horses.

The source of potable water for park facilities is limited to small wells on both Santa Clara Valley Water District and County Parks property. A 100,000 gallon water storage tank is located adjacent to the Pena trail that is used to store water for both park use and limited fire suppression.

Land Use

Much of Calero County Park lies within the limits of the City of San Jose, but is outside the boundary of the City’s Urban Service Area. More than a third of Calero County Park is defined by Calero Reservoir and facilities associated with active recreational water use. Calero Reservoir, constructed in 1935, and its surrounding shoreline is owned by the Santa Clara Valley Water District. Recreational use in this area is provided by County Parks through a long-term lease between the two agencies. However the reservoir’s primary role is as a source of safe drinking water. The remainder of the park is owned by the County and is primarily used for trails and open space.

Lands within Calero County Park are designated as Open Hillside and zoned for residential use (R-1-1) by the City of San Jose; and designated as Regional Park, Existing and zoned for Exclusive Agriculture, Exclusive Agriculture Hillside, and Exclusive Agriculture Hillside Scenic Road (A, A HS and A HS-SR) by the County of Santa Clara.
Figure 14
Geologic Constraints

Source: Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan, Bellinger Foster Steimetz 2013
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Except for the 3,882-acre Rancho Cañada del Oro Open Space Preserve to the south, land surrounding the park is designated as non-urban Open Hillside in the City of San Jose’s General Plan and much of the surrounding area is designated as Agriculture in the County of Santa Clara General Plan. The County has designated an area northwest of the park as Rural Residential. Land use surrounding the park is characterized by numerous rural residences and small ranches. As identified earlier, Calero Park is within a mile of two other large County parks and other open space lands.

The County recently acquired the Rancho San Vicente portion of the park, which is leased for grazing to a private operator. A small portion of this land is also leased to another private entity for a radio transmission tower. The Rancho San Vicente portion of the park is also bisected by the Almaden Calero Canal which is owned by the Santa Clara Valley Water District. This concrete-lined canal is part of the Santa Clara Valley Water District’s raw water distribution system and transports water from the Almaden Valley Watershed into Calero Reservoir. The canal is not fenced and no public access is allowed along its service road. Above the Almaden Calero Canal, on the western edge of the park, the San Jose Water Company has a 2.8-acre in-holding. Two power transmission lines cross the Rancho San Vicente area. The southwestern portion of Calero County Park, previously part of Cañada del Oro, is slated for grazing operations starting within the next two years.

Between 1985 and 2010, a portion of land north of the ranger office complex, in the vicinity of the Bailey-Fellows House historic complex was in operation as a public boarding stable under a lease agreement with the County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department. The Calero Ranch Stables also offered riding lessons, summer camp, and horses for rent. In 2006, the Santa Clara Valley Water District, owners of the underlying land, determined that Calero Ranch Stables operation was within the 1,000 foot setback area of the reservoir and therefore was not compatible with recently amended public health guidelines for protection of municipal drinking water sources. In October 2010, the final extension of the lease expired, at which time the property was vacated, and all facilities not related to the historic areas associated with the Bailey-Fellows house were removed. As the land is subject to potential inundation should there be a failure of the dike that surrounds the area, no new land uses for this area or long-term plans for the Bailey-Fellows House have been identified by the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

**Traffic and Circulation**

McKean Road is an undivided two-lane road that bounds Calero County Park on its northern and eastern edge, with Bailey Avenue intersecting McKean from the east, near the main park entrance. Bailey Avenue connects the park to U.S. Highway 101 and provides for easy access. To the west of the park, McKean Road connects to the Almaden Expressway, a major collector road into the City of San Jose. To the east and southeast of the Park, McKean Road remains rural and eventually becomes Uvas Road. Casa Loma Road intersects with McKean Road and provides park access along its southern edge. A number of private roadway easements not open to the general public provide access from Bertram Road from the southwest but do not penetrate the park boundary. A gravel service road leads from McKean Road to the radio tower on Rancho San Vicente and also provides access to the grazing operation. Throughout Calero Park many of the trails also function as maintenance roads.
OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Implementing Entity: As a public agency Permittee, the County of Santa Clara (which includes Santa Clara County Parks, County Roads and Airport Department and other County departments) would be subject to a project compliance process for public projects covered under the Valley Habitat Plan. The process includes the following:

- Submission of a Habitat Plan application package for the implementation of the Trails Master Plan to the new Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency.
- Payment of appropriate mitigation impact fees to the Habitat Agency, or in lieu fees.
- Review by the new Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency for consistency with Condition 9 of the Valley Habitat Plan and integrated into the applicable reserve unit management plan, which will be reviewed and approved by the Permittees (i.e. County Parks) and the wildlife agencies.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife: Prior to construction of all proposed creek crossings, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) would require notification and a Streambed Alteration Agreement under Section 1600 of the CDFW code.

San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board: Prior to construction of improvements of the trailhead staging areas and creation of new trails, the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board may require submittal of a National Pollution Discharge Elimination (NPDES) Permit and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for approval.

Santa Clara Valley Water District: Prior to construction of components of the project within lands owned by the Santa Clara Valley Water District (Water District), the Water District will require submittal of an encroachment permit application and consultation on detailed design for compliance with Santa Clara Valley Water District regulations and operations.
## B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural/ Historical/ Archaeological Resources</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology / Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology / Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Population / Housing</td>
<td>Public Services/ Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation / Traffic</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. DETERMINATION

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.

- X 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 the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) 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.

Polaris Kinison Brown, Project Manager, EMC Planning Group (Consultant) July 8, 2013

Name and Title Date
D. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

NOTES

1. A brief explanation is provided for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer is explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once it has been determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-Than-Significant Impact.” The mitigation measures are described, along with a brief explanation of how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses are used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document or negative declaration. [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)] In this case, a brief discussion would identify the following:

   a. “Earlier Analysis Used” identifies and states where such document is available for review.

   b. “Impact Adequately Addressed” identifies which effects from the checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and states whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c. “Mitigation Measures”—For effects that are “Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” mitigation measures are described which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, etc.) are incorporated. Each reference to a previously prepared or outside document, where appropriate, includes a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. “Supporting Information Sources”—A source list is attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted are cited in the discussion.

8. This is the format recommended in the CEQA Guidelines as amended January 2011.

9. The explanation of each issue identifies:
   a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b. The mitigation measure identified, if any to reduce the impact to less than significant.
A. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. If subject to ASA, be generally in non-compliance with the Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Create an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Obstruct scenic views from existing residential areas, public lands, public water body or roads?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Be located on or near a ridgeline visible from the valley floor?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adversely affect the architectural appearance of an established neighborhood?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 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/Mitigation

1. Non-compliance with the Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval

The proposed Trails Master Plan is not subject to ASA. No Impact.

2. Create an Aesthetically Offensive Site Open to Public View

Short-term Construction Impacts. Based on the construction associated with the Draft Trails Master Plan (185 new spaces plus additional size for 43 trailer spaces) and average trail disturbance, it estimated that the proposed project disturbance area would be approximately 2.5 acres (parking areas between three staging areas) and approximately 14.25 acres (total trail area throughout the park) incrementally over approximately a 10-year period. Where feasible, trail alignments follow existing trail and service roads, as such, new alignments will minimize grading. Some grading may be necessary for the new staging areas and to in some heavily eroded areas, minimal grading may be necessary to facilitate re-growth and to blend with the natural topography. However, as the proposed project would not involve large amounts of grading, short-term construction impacts will create an aesthetically offensive site open to public view.
Existing Public Views from within the Park. Existing scenic views at higher elevations such as those towards Loma Prieta Mountain, Bald Peak, Mt. Umunhum Coyote Ridge, and Mount Hamilton would not change as a result of implementing the Draft Trails Master Plan. With an overall increase in trail mileage at the park, the number of opportunities for recreationalists to view scenic vistas would increase. The impact is considered to be less than significant.

3. Substantial Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway

There are no state-designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the park. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not cause substantial damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway. **No Impact.**

4. Impact - Obstruct Scenic Views from Residential and Public Facilities

In the Regional Parks, Trails, and Scenic Highways Element of the Santa Clara County General Plan, McKean Road, Bailey Avenue, and Casa Loma Road are all designated as a Scenic Rural Routes. The new Rancho San Vicente staging area would be visible from McKean Road. However, the character of the proposed staging area will have a rural design, in keeping with the existing conditions and the park setting. It will also preserve current service access for the existing cattle grazing operation, the Almaden Calero Canal (operated by the Santa Clara Valley Water District), and the radio tower leasehold.

The new staging areas would not be visible from Calero Reservoir. Some of the new trail alignment along Calero Reservoir would likely be visible from the reservoir; however, non-paved trails along a water body are considered a compatible use in the County's General Plan and would obstruct views from Calero Reservoir.

Implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not obstruct scenic views from existing residential areas, public lands, public water body or roads. **No Impact.**

5. Be Located on or Near a Ridgeline Visible from the Valley Floor

Per Design Guidelines outlined in the *Countywide Trails Master Plan Update*, trail alignments across the face of open hillsides and top of ridgelines shall be sited to avoid creating permanent, noticeably visible lines on the existing landscape when viewed from points looking up at or perpendicular to the trail. (D-1.4) Some trails to higher elevations of the park, particularly, some segments leading to the radio tower in Rancho San Vicente may be visible from certain points within the park, but the higher elevations of the park are located more than a mile from the valley floor and therefore, could not be seen from the valley floor. **No Impact.**

6. Affect the Architectural Appearance of an Established Neighborhood

Implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not adversely affect the architectural appearance of an established neighborhood. **No Impact.**
7. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan does not include any lighting on the trails or any new source of substantial light or glare at park entrances and staging areas. **No Impact.**
## B. AGRICULTURE AND 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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict with an existing Williamson Act Contract or the County’s Williamson Act Ordinance?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion/Mitigation

#### 1. Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Use

The Santa Clara County Important Farmland Map (California Department of Conservation 2010) designates the area within and around Calero County Park as Grazing Land, which is not Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Portions of the park are currently...
used for cattle grazing; however, implementation of the project would not affect the current grazing activities. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. **No Impact.**

2. Conflict with Existing Zoning for Agricultural Use

Lands within Calero County Park are zoned for residential use (R-1-1) by the City of San Jose and Exclusive Agriculture, Exclusive Agriculture Hillside, and Exclusive Agriculture Hillside Scenic Road (A, A HS and A HS-SR) by the County of Santa Clara.

According to the County of Santa Clara County Zoning Code, the purpose of the Exclusive Agricultural Zoning district is to:

“…reserve those lands most suitable for agricultural production for agricultural and appropriate related uses. This zoning district will provide stability for ongoing agricultural operations and provide for new uses necessary to support a viable local agriculture industry. This district is also intended to retain in open space uses those lands which may be suitable for future urbanization until such time as they are included within a city’s urban service area and public facilities and services can be economically provided…” Santa Clara County Zoning Code § 2.20.010

Implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not conflict with County of Santa Clara existing zoning for agricultural use and the purpose of reserving land and retaining open space. **No Impact.**

3. Conflict with an Existing Williamson Act Contract or the County’s Williamson Act Ordinance.

There are no lands In Calero County Park protected by the Williamson Act. **No Impact.**

4. Conversion of Farmland

As discussed in question 1 above, much of the land around the park is designated as Grazing Land on the Important Farmlands Map. However, there are no aspects of the project, including new staging areas, upgrading existing trails, and creating new trails that would affect adjacent and surrounding farming operations. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of any farmland to non-agricultural use or impair the agricultural productivity of nearby prime farmland. **No Impact.**

5. Conflict with Existing Zoning of Forest Land

Lands within Calero County Park are not zoned for forestland or timberland. Therefore implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, these land types. **No Impact.**
6. Result in the Loss or Conversion of Forest Land

Calero County Park does not contain forest land. With the exception of Rancho Cañada del Oro Open Space Preserve on its southwest border, Calero Park is surrounded by private small ranches and rural residences. The Cinnabar Hills Golf Course is adjacent to the southern end of the park east of McKean Road. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of any forest land to non-forest use, or impair the agricultural productivity of nearby forest land, or convert forest land to non-forest use. **No Impact.**
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>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Violate any ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Create objectionable dust or odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

This Air Quality section is based on the Air Quality Technical Memo, prepared by EMC Planning Group in June 2013, included as Appendix A in this Initial Study. The Air Quality Technical Memo relied on traffic data provide in the Focused Transportation Analysis for Calero County Park Trails Master Plan prepared by Fehr & Peers in June 2013 which is included in this Initial Study as Appendix D.

Discussion/Mitigation

1. Conflict With or Obstruct Implementation of the Applicable Air Quality Plan

The applicable air quality plan is the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2010). The Clean Air Plan addresses ozone, particulate matter, and TACs. The Air District’s California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2012) Section 9.1 provides guidance on determining if a project is consistent with the Clean Air Plan. For consistency, a project should meet three criteria:
1) **Support the primary goals of the Clean Air Plan.** The primary goals of the Clean Air Plan are to attain air quality standards; to reduce population exposure and protect public health in the Bay Area; and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect the climate. This is considered to have been accomplished if there are no project-level significant impacts, or if significant impacts are mitigated to a less than significant level. Since the proposed project’s operational criteria air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions meet Air District standards, and the proposed project’s construction criteria air pollutant emissions are mitigated to meet Air District standards, the proposed project is considered to meet the primary goals of the Clean Air Plan.

2) **Include applicable Clean Air Plan control measures.** There are 55 control measures in the Clean Air Plan, many of which are applicable only for industrial or regional implementation, and do not apply to other types of projects. The Air Quality CEQA Guidelines do not state the extent to which a project must be consistent with potentially applicable control measures. None of the control measures are applicable to a park or open space project.

3) **Not disrupt or hinder implementation of any Clean Air Plan control measures.** Since none of the control measures are applicable to a park or open space project, the proposed project would not interfere with their implementation.

The proposed project meets the three criteria and would be consistent with the Clean Air Plan. Consistency of the proposed project with applicable Santa Clara County General Plan policies was also considered. Two air quality policies are potentially applicable:

**C-HS 12** Measures to reduce particulate matter pollution originating from quarrying, road and building construction, industrial processes, unpaved parking lots, and other sources should be encouraged.

**C-HS 13** Emissions from small scale sources such as gasoline-powered lawn equipment, consumer products, barbecue grills, and other sources should be reduced through public education, product replacement, and regulation where appropriate.

Policy C-HS 12 is applicable because the proposed project would include unpaved parking lots, which can be a source of dust, and can also result in tracking of dirt or mud onto paved roadways, where passing traffic can cause it to become airborne. The Draft Trails Master Plan does not include any guidance on parking lot design, and dust from unpaved lots could violate the intent of Policy C-HS-12. The following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure consistency with County air quality policy.

**Mitigation Measure**

**AQ-1.** *The Master Plan will be revised to include best management practices for dust control on unpaved parking lots.*

Policy C-HS 13 is applicable only in that some park users could potentially bring barbecue grills to picnic areas. Policy C-HS 13 calls for public education, product replacement, and regulation where appropriate.
to reduce emissions from barbeque grills and similar small outdoor appliances or tools. Use of barbeques within the park would not constitute an inconsistency with the Santa Clara County General Plan on the part of the proposed project. The impact is less than significant with mitigation.

2. Violate any Ambient Air Quality Standard, or Contribute Substantially to an Existing or Projected Air Quality Violation

The CEQA Guidelines state that, where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make determinations regarding violations of air quality standards. The applicable current air quality guidelines, California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines (Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2012) do not provide thresholds. However, thresholds were included in the 1999 and 2011 versions of the guidelines and the County is relying, in part, on those thresholds to evaluate potential violations in air standards. Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis, thresholds identified in the California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines (Bay Area Air Quality Management District 1999, 2011) are utilized.

Table 6 in the 1999 air quality guidelines and Table 3-1 in the 2011 air quality guidelines both present minimum sizes for typical project types, below which, that type of project is considered to have a less than significant effect from criteria air pollutant. Based on Institute of Transportation Engineers daily trip generation rates (noted in the 1999 air quality guidelines), a typical air quality screening level is a project generating fewer than 3,000 to 4,000 daily trips.

Existing Operational ADT/GHG Baseline. Under existing conditions, the primary source of air emissions associated with the park is mobile source vehicle trips taken by visitors to the park. The traffic impact analysis memo prepared for the project (see Appendix D) includes an analysis of peak vehicle trip generation to the park and found that the worst-case, maximum trip generation occurs during peak weekends in the spring. Under existing conditions, maximum use of the 28 existing parking spaces at the Ranger Station generates about 154 vehicle trips per day. Criteria air emissions are generated by each of these vehicle trips. No existing trips are listed for other trailheads.

Other existing park activities are sources of negligible volumes of air emissions. These include electricity use at the Ranger Station/Visitor Center, disposal and treatment of wastewater from several existing portable restrooms, operation of park facility maintenance vehicles and equipment, and water pumping to fill a storage tank used for park-specific water supply and fire flow. Fuel-powered water activities (boating and jet skiing) on the reservoir within the park also generate emissions. However, improvements proposed as part of the park master plan are not expected to result in an increase in boating activity.

Project Operational ADT/GHG Emissions. Under post-project conditions, vehicle trips will continue to be the dominant source of air emissions generated by the use and operation of Calero County Park. The capacity of the park to accommodate visitors arriving by vehicle will increase significantly. As identified in the Transportation Memo prepared for the project (Fehr & Peers 2013), the proposed project would generate a maximum of approximately 1,019 new Average Daily Trips per day under the most heavy park use scenario and is assumed to average 611 Average Daily Trips over the course of an entire year.
Non-mobile sources of air emissions will also increase, but continue to represent a very minor percentage of the total air emissions volume. No new sources of non-mobile air emissions are expected under post-project conditions.

Table 3-1, Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors and GHG Screening Level Sizes, contained in the Air District’s *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines* (2011) does not provide a threshold for a “park” project. However, a list of representative project types (projects of similar size intensity) provides an Average Daily Trips range of 2,620 - 4,387 Average Daily Trips (Table 5, ADT Screening Comparison).

**Table 5  ADT Screening Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Screening Project Type</th>
<th>Project Size/Intensity 1</th>
<th>Trip Generation Rate 2</th>
<th>Average Daily Trips 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>325 units</td>
<td>9.57 trips/unit</td>
<td>3,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo/Townhouse</td>
<td>451 units</td>
<td>5.81 trips/unit</td>
<td>2,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware/Paint Store</td>
<td>83,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>51.29 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office Building</td>
<td>346,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>11.01 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>3,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>42,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>102.24 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>2,613 acres</td>
<td>1.59 trips/acre</td>
<td>4,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>78,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>56.24 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Restaurant</td>
<td>47,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>89.95 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
<td>553,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6.96 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>3,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Proposed Project (County Park)      | 185 new parking spaces  | 2.5-3.0 trips/parking space x 185 new spaces x 2 trips (in and out) 3 – worst case | 1,019 - max 4
611 – avg 5  |

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2011; Institute of Traffic Engineers 2009.

**Note:**
1 Project size/intensity for is the screening threshold from the “Operational Criteria Screening Size” column in Table 3-1, Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors and GHG Screening Level Sizes, contained in the air district’s *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*, 2011.
3 A multiplier is used to convert horse trailer parking space size to average vehicle parking space size.
4 The maximum 1,019 ADT is for worst-case conditions on a peak spring weekend when all available spaces are full for the entire day. It is conservatively assumed that the average ADT over the full year is 60 percent of the maximum spring weekend day demand, or approximately 611 ADT.

As identified in Table 5, above, the Average Daily Trips for the proposed project over an entire year is well within the range of Average Daily Trips for the representative project types. Further, as described previously, the volume of air emissions generated by the project from other sources (e.g. electricity consumption) would be significantly lower than most of the representative projects listed in Table 5.
Based on this information, it can be qualitatively concluded that, like many other project types included in Table 3-1 of the Air District guidelines, the proposed project would not generate annual operational air emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment.

**Project Construction Emissions.** The proposed project would include several construction aspects: expansion of the parking lot at the Ranger Station; construction of new parking lots at Rancho San Vicente and Almaden Road; and construction of 14.7 miles of new trails. In accordance with the Air District’s 2011 air quality guidelines (pages 3-5, 8-3) a project is considered to have a less than significant impact from construction activities if the following three criteria are met.

1. The project is below the applicable screening level size shown in Table 3-1.

2. All basic construction mitigation measures would be included in the project design and implemented during construction. The following are the Air District’s basic construction mitigation measures:

   a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.

   b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.

   c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

   d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.

   e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

   f. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

   g. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.

   h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

3. Construction-related activities would not include any of the following:

   a. Demolition activities inconsistent with District Regulation 11, Rule 2: Asbestos Demolition, Renovation and Manufacturing;
b. Simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously);

c. Simultaneous construction of more than one land use type (e.g., project would develop residential and commercial uses on the same site) (not applicable to high density infill development);

d. Extensive site preparation (i.e., greater than default assumptions used by the Urban Land Use Emissions Model [URBEMIS] for grading, cut/fill, or earth movement); or

e. Extensive material transport (e.g., greater than 10,000 cubic yards of soil import/export) requiring a considerable amount of haul truck activity.

Construction emissions come from equipment exhaust and dust that is raised during grading. As such, the Air Quality Technical Memo prepared for the project evaluated construction emissions in terms of disturbance area. Based on the construction associated with the proposed project (185 new spaces including larger space to accommodate 43 trailer spaces) and average trail disturbance, it estimated that the proposed project disturbance area would be approximately 2.3 acres (parking areas) and approximately 14.25 acres (trail area).

Similar to the approach for operational air emissions, project construction was compared to sample project types in Table 3-1 in the Air District’s California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines (2011). Table 6, Project Construction Screening Comparison, presents the proposed project’s disturbance area in relation to the estimated disturbance area of the thresholds.

As identified in Table 6, Project Construction Screening Comparison, the proposed project’s total disturbance area is above the threshold equivalent calculated for two land uses, and at or below the threshold equivalent calculated for other seven sample land uses. Table 3-1 is designed for project development that typically occurs within a reasonably short timeframe, typically one year or less. The proposed project’s ground disturbance would take place incrementally over a period of ten years. Spread over the ten-year implementation period, the disturbance area would be well below the thresholds. Additionally, most of the new trails to be constructed would be developed following existing road alignments, and the level of ground disturbance, and resulting dust emissions, would be low compared to the grading that would take place for an urban development project. Therefore, the proposed project is considered to fall below the thresholds presented in Table 3 of the Air District’s 2011 air quality guidelines.

**Basic Air Quality Measures.** The Trails Master Plan includes one air quality best management practice (page 64):

The following best management practice would be implemented at all construction sites to minimize emissions during construction:

1. Sweep daily if visible soil material is carried out onto adjacent public streets, paved park access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.
### Table 6  Project Construction Screening Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Screening Project Type</th>
<th>Project Size/Intensity ¹</th>
<th>Approximate Disturbance Rate ²</th>
<th>Disturbance Area ³ ⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>114 units</td>
<td>One acre / four units</td>
<td>29 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo/Townhouse</td>
<td>78 units</td>
<td>One acre / eight units</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware/Paint Store</td>
<td>277,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>One acre /20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>14 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office Building</td>
<td>277,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>One acre /20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>14 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>277,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>One acre /20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>14 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>67 acres</td>
<td>One acre / half acre</td>
<td>34 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>277,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>One acre /20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>14 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Restaurant</td>
<td>277,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>One acre /20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>14 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
<td>11 acres</td>
<td>One acre / acre</td>
<td>11 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project (County Park)</td>
<td>185 new parking spaces and 14.7 miles of trails</td>
<td>185 new spaces plus additional size for 43 trailer spaces ³. Trails average disturbance width 8 feet x 77,600 lineal feet = 621,000 sq. ft. = 14.25 acres ⁴</td>
<td>±2.5 acres ±14.25 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2011; Institute of Traffic Engineers 2009.

**Note:**

¹ Project size/intensity for is the screening threshold from the “Construction Criteria Screening Size” column in Table 3-1, Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors and GHG Screening Level Sizes, contained in the air district’s California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, 2011.

² Disturbance area based on typical floor area ratios.

³ Square feet per standard parking space 300 square feet, inclusive of drive aisles x 185 new spaces: 300 x 185 = 55,500 square feet; trailer parking spaces add 1,200 square feet x 43 spaces. 1,200 x 43 = 51,600 square feet.

⁴ Trail widths vary from four to 12 feet, but most are 4 to 6 feet. Most trails will be developed on existing road alignments.

In addition, the Draft Trails Master Plan (pages 67-68) includes the following hydrologic best management practice and the following storm water pollution prevention plan best management practice, each of which would benefit air quality:

The following design guidelines would be followed for trails in areas of steep slopes or in areas adjacent to a creek or riparian area:

1. In order to reduce erosion and maintenance problems during construction, disturbance to the soil surface should be kept to a minimum.
To minimize the mobilization of sediment to creeks and other water bodies, the following erosion and sediment-control measures would be included in a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the project after final design. These measures are based on standard County measures and standard dust-reduction measures.

1. Enclose and cover exposed stockpiles of dirt or other loose, granular construction materials that could contribute sediment to waterways.

The best management practices presented in the Trails Master Plan do not adequately reflect the requirements of the Air District’s basic construction mitigation measures. In addition, the air quality best management practice utilizes dry sweeping, which is specifically prohibited by the Air District. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is recommended.

**Mitigation Measure**

**AQ-2.** The following Air District basic construction mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future construction documents:

a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. Material stockpiles may be covered in accordance with Trails Master Plan Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan best management practices No. 1.

b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.

c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.

e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

f. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

g. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

The proposed project, with mitigation to add several of the Air District's basic construction mitigation measures, would meet the screening criteria for projects that have a less than significant construction phase air quality impact. The impact is **less than significant with mitigation.**

3. **Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase of any Criteria Pollutant for which the Project Region is in Non-attainment**

The Air District is in non-attainment for ozone, PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$. Although the EPA is reviewing the Air District's non-attainment status for PM$_{2.5}$, even if the Air District were to be re-classified to attainment, the Air District would likely still be in non-attainment of the stricter State standard.

The proposed project’s operational ozone, PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ emissions would not exceed the Air District's thresholds for significance. Refer to the discussion above regarding air quality standards violations. The proposed project’s construction impacts could potentially exceed Air District thresholds for significance. However, the mitigation measure presented above to require additional basic construction mitigation measures would reduce potential air quality effects to a less than significant level. The impact is **less than significant with mitigation.**

4. **Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations**

Substantial pollution concentrations are typically in reference to concentrated acute emissions, such as particulate matter, or TACs such as carbon monoxide. The proposed project would not result in substantial particulate matter emissions outside of a brief construction period. There are no sensitive receptors close enough to the project sites to be affected by dust generated during construction. Carbon monoxide is generated in substantial quantities only when large numbers of vehicles are idling for a long period of time, and are significant only if there are sensitive receptors proximate to the idling vehicles. The proposed project would not result in large numbers of idling vehicles, and there are no sensitive receptors close enough to the project sites to be affected in any case.

The project site includes serpentine rock, which could have an asbestos component. Disturbance of this type of rock, or soils weathered from this type of rock, could result in the release of asbestos fibers, as is acknowledged in the Trails Master Plan (page 28-29). Several trail alignments are shown crossing areas of serpentine soils (page 31). The following mitigation measure shall be required:

**Mitigation Measure**

**AQ-3.** The following measures shall be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future construction documents, applicable to areas identified as containing serpentine rock, if soil disturbance is anticipated during construction of the trail or abandonment of old trials:
a. Upon determination of a precise trail alignment, soil sampling shall be conducted in not less than one location for each one-half mile of alignment within the area identified as containing serpentine rock, and in any case, no less than one sample for any trail segment within the area identified as containing serpentine rock. California Air Resources Board Test Method 435 should be used unless otherwise directed by the Air District.

b. Soil samples shall be analyzed by an approved laboratory for asbestos materials content, and characterized as to concentration and resultant potential for adverse health effects to workers or trail users.

c. If asbestos levels are high enough to warrant precautions, County Parks shall develop a mitigation plan in accordance with Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (California Air Resources Board 2009).

With implementation of the mitigation described above, the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial asbestos concentrations is less than significant. The impact is less than significant with mitigation.

5. Create Objectionable Odors Affecting a Substantial Number of People

The proposed project would not be a significant source of odors. The proposed project could include minor features that would result in very localized odors, such as portable toilets, but would not emit odors that were detectible at off-site sensitive receptors. The impact is less than significant.

6. Alter Air Movement, Moisture, or Temperature, or Cause any Change in Climate

The proposed Trails Master Plan will not change the climate of the project site (i.e. site air movement, moisture, or temperature). No impact.
### D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact WITH Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,4,3,4,45,46,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,4,3,4,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or tributary to an already impaired water body, as defined by section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,4,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Have a substantial adverse effect on oak woodland habitat as defined by Oak Woodlands Conservation Law (conversion/loss of oak woodlands) – Public Resource Code 21083.4?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Impact a local natural community, such as a fresh water marsh, oak forest or salt water tide land?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Impact a watercourse, aquatic, wetland, or riparian area or habitat?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,4,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Adversely impact unique or heritage trees or a large number of trees over 12&quot; in diameter?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,4,3,4,48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree Preservation Ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,6,43,44,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Habitat?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,6,43,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Habitat?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,6,43,44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

This Biological Resources section is based on the project’s Biological Resources Evaluation Report, prepared by EMC Planning Group in June 2013, included as Appendix B in this Initial Study.

EMC Planning Group biologists reviewed site maps, aerial photographs, electronic database accounts, technical reports, and relevant scientific literature describing natural resources on the project site and on adjacent lands. A search of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants for the San Jose West, San Jose East, Lick Observatory, Los Gatos, Santa Teresa Hills, Morgan Hill, Laurel, Loma Prieta, and Mount Madonna U.S. Geological Survey quadrangles was conducted in order to generate lists of potentially occurring special-status species in the project vicinity. Species listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) that occur in Santa Clara County were also reviewed. Special-status species in this report are those listed as Endangered, Threatened, or Rare, or as candidates proposed for listing by the USFWS and/or CDFW; as Species of Special Concern or Fully Protected species by CDFW; or as Rare Plant Rank 1B or 2 by the CNPS.

EMC Planning Group biologists Bill Goggin and Andrea Edwards conducted the biological reconnaissance field survey on March 28, 2013 to document existing plant communities and wildlife habitats, and to evaluate the potential for special-status species occurrence at the project site. Biological resources were documented in field notes, including species observed, dominant plant communities, and significant wildlife habitat characteristics. Qualitative estimations of plant cover, structure, and spatial changes in species composition were used to determine plant communities and wildlife habitats, and habitat quality and disturbance level were described. Additionally, observations of any potential wetlands and/or potential wildlife movement corridors were recorded. Representative site photographs were taken at several locations within the project site to document habitat conditions.

Plant community types present in the park include coast live oak, blue oak, mixed oak, interior live oak, valley oak, canyon live oak, California bay, California sycamore, California buckeye, scrub oak, black sage, coyote brush, chamise, serpentine chaparral, annual grassland, bullrush, creeping rye, purple needle grass, and foothill needle grass. The most prevalent plant communities at Calero County Park are annual grasslands and oak woodlands; these communities intermix.

Land cover throughout the park is depicted on Figure 13, Land Cover. Despite past grazing activities in some areas, Calero County Park supports extremely high quality wildlife habitat functions and values. These conditions are due mostly to the undeveloped characteristics of the site and its varied habitat types, high diversity of plant species, presence of available food and water, and provision of suitable escape cover; these factors provide optimal habitat conditions for many native species.
**Discussion/Mitigation**

1. **Special-Status Species**

Special-status plant species known to occur in the general vicinity of the project site were evaluated for potential to occur on the project site. Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan covered plant species with potential to be impacted by the proposed Trails Master Plan project include coyote ceanothus (*Ceanothus ferrisiae*); fragrant fritillary (*Fritillaria liliacea*); Loma Prieta hoita (*Hoita strobilina*); Metcalf Canyon jewel-flower (*Streptanthus albidus* ssp. *albidus*); most beautiful jewel-flower (*Streptanthus albidus* ssp. *peramoenus*); Mt. Hamilton fountain thistle (*Cirsium fontinale* var. *campyon*); Santa Clara Valley dudleya (*Dudleya abramsii* ssp. *setchellii*); smooth lessingia (*Lessingia micradenia* var. *glabrata*); and Tiburon paintbrush (*Castilleja affinis* ssp. *neglecta*). Appendix D of the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan provides detailed natural history accounts for each of these nine covered species.

In addition, the proposed project has potential to impact many plant species considered special-status by the CNPS (Rare Plant Rank 1B or 2). These species include arcuate bush-mallow (*Malacothamnus arcutaus*); bent-flowered fiddleneck (*Amsinckia lunaris*); big-scale balsamroot (*Balsamorhiza macrolepis*); bristy sedge (*Carex comosa*); chaparral harebell (*Campanula exigua*); chaparral ragwort (*Senecio aphanactis*); Congdon's tarplant (*Centromadia parryi* ssp. *congdonii*); Hall's bush-mallow (*Malacothamnus hallii*); Indian Valley bush-mallow (*Malacothamnus aboriginum*); Mt. Diablo phacelia (*Phacelia phacelioides*); pink creamsacs (*Castilleja rubicunda* ssp. *rubicunda*); round-leaved filaree (*California macrophylla*); saline clover (*Trifolium hydrophilum*); San Francisco collinsia (*Collinsia multicolor*); Santa Cruz Mountains beardtongue (*Penstemon rattanii* var. *kleei*); Santa Cruz Mountains pussypaws (*Calyptridium parryi* var. *hesseae*); showy golden madia (*Madia radiata*); and woodland woollythreads (*Monolopia gracilens*).

Finally, there is a federally listed Endangered and CNPS Rare Plant Rank 1B species with potential to be impacted by the proposed project due to the presence of suitable habitat: Contra Costa goldfields (*Lasthenia conjugens*). This species is not covered by the Valley Habitat Plan. This annual herb occurs in wet areas in cismontane woodland, alkaline playas, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pools. Although it is presumed extirpated in Santa Clara County, it still has low potential to occur in the park. It is known in the project vicinity from a historical 1958 occurrence in San Jose, west of Capitol Avenue.

Due to the extensive, high quality habitat present at the project site, especially found on serpentine soils that support endemic species, construction of proposed new trails and other facilities has the potential to impact many special-status plant species that do or may occur on the site due to the presence of suitable habitat, as shown in Table 1 of the Biological Resources Evaluation Report. The remaining special-status plant species that are known to occur in the general vicinity of the project site are not expected to be impacted by the proposed project due to lack of suitable habitat in Calero County Park. In addition to the conditions for each Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan covered plant species with potential to be impacted by the proposed project listed below in Table 7, the proposed project has potential to impact many plant species considered special-status by the CNPS, and a very low potential to impact federally listed Endangered and CNPS Rare Plant Rank 1B Contra Costa goldfields.
Mitigation Measure

BIO-1. To avoid impacts to special-status plants, for the impact area of each project phase, focused botanical surveys will be conducted prior to construction by a qualified biologist or County Parks Natural Resource Program staff for all special-status plant species with potential to occur in the various plant communities as identified above. The surveys will conform to current protocols established by the CDFW and CNPS, and will include surveys during the appropriate blooming periods for every target species (which will overlap for many species during spring months). Optimal survey times vary from year to year depending on temperature, rainfall amount and timing, etc., so will be confirmed by the monitoring of known reference populations for as many target species in the project vicinity as possible. The final field positioning of each project component will avoid all observed special-status plant species occurrences.

Special-status animal species known to occur in the general vicinity of the project site were evaluated for potential to occur on the project site. Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan covered animal species with potential to be impacted by the proposed Trails Master Plan project include Bay checkerspot butterfly (Euphydryas editha bayensis); burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia); California red-legged frog (Rana draytonii); California tiger salamander (Ambystoma californiense); foothill yellow-legged frog (Rana boylii); tricolored blackbird (Agelaius tricolor); and western pond turtle (Emys marmorata). Appendix D of the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan provides detailed natural history accounts for each of these seven covered species.

In addition, the proposed project also has low potential to impact six species that are not federally or state-listed, but considered Species of Special Concern or Fully Protected Species by the CDFW. These species include American badger (Taxidea taxus); black swift (Cypseloides niger); coast horned lizard (Phrynosoma blainvillii); golden eagle (Aquila chrysaetos); northern harrier (Circus cyaneus); and white-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus).

Finally, the federally Delisted and state-listed Endangered and Fully Protected bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) was observed on the site during the survey; however the proposed project has a low potential to impact this species. Its diet consists mainly of fish, especially salmon, but also includes waterfowl, seagulls, small mammals, and carrion. Due to its preference for salmon, the species chooses aquatic ecosystems for nesting and over-wintering. In rare instances the species may also choose prairies, if adequate food is available. Bald eagles usually choose nest sites in large trees near a relatively undisturbed shoreline. The nesting site must be able to support a very large nest that is five feet wide and three feet deep, and is often used repeatedly. Bald eagle courtship begins in late winter or early spring and lasts about a month before egg-laying. Incubation lasts about a month and fledging takes place when the young are about three months old; parental care may last between another month and three months. Bald eagles have phased plumage, with adults not gaining the distinctive white head until after the fourth or fifth season. Most bald eagles migrate from their breeding area hundreds of miles to their wintering grounds, taking several months to make the journey, while some remain near their breeding grounds, depending upon prey availability. Potential threats to bald eagles include habitat destruction, shooting, and human disturbance at nest sites. An adult bald eagle was observed during the field survey and it is possible, but not currently known if bald eagles are breeding in the park. The project site contains suitable breeding habitat and foraging opportunities for this species.
Further, vegetation on the project site provides suitable foraging and nesting opportunities for bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Human disturbance, such as proximity to the nest, excessive noise around the nest, and loss of foraging grounds, may lead to nest failure. There is a moderate to high probability that nesting birds, including raptors, could occur in and/or adjacent to proposed impact areas during the breeding bird season (February 1 to August 31).

Due to the site’s extensive high quality habitat, the construction of proposed new trails and other facilities will have the potential to impact several special-status animal species (and/or their habitats) that may occur or which are known to occur at the site. However, due to the incorporation of recommended mitigation measures (listed below), none of the proposed Trails Master Plan habitat impacts are expected generate long-term adverse affects. The conditions for each Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan covered plant species with potential to be impacted by the proposed project that will be implemented are listed in Table 7. In addition, as shown in Table 2 of the Biological Resources Evaluation Report, the proposed project has low potential to impact the state-listed Endangered and Fully Protected bald eagle, and six species that are considered Species of Special Concern or Fully Protected Species by the CDFW: American badger, black swift, coast horned lizard, golden eagle, northern harrier, and white-tailed kite. The remaining special-status animal species that are known to occur in the general vicinity of the project site are not expected to be impacted by the proposed project due to lack of suitable habitat in Calero County Park.

**Mitigation Measures**

**BIO-2.** To avoid potential adverse impacts to nesting birds (including raptors), trail building/construction activities (including any tree trimming/removal or generation of loud, sustained noises) should be scheduled to take place outside the breeding bird season (February 1 through August 31). If trail building/construction activities will occur during the breeding bird season, then a qualified biologist or County Parks Natural Resource Program staff will conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting birds to ensure that no nests would be disturbed during project implementation. This survey will be conducted no more than 15 days prior to the initiation of disturbance activities during the early part of the nesting season (February 1 through April 30) and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of disturbance activities during the late part of the nesting season (May 1 through August 31).

If no active nests are present within 500 feet of project activities, then activities can proceed as scheduled. However, if an active nest is detected during the survey within 500 feet of project activities, then the establishment of a protective buffer zone around each active nest (typically 250 to 500 feet for raptors but possibly 1,000 to 1,300 feet for ground-nesting and/or special-status raptors, with appropriate setback distance to be determined by a qualified biologist or County Parks Natural Resource Program staff) and 75 to 250 feet for passerines [perching and songbird species]) will be clearly delineated or fenced by the qualified biologist or County Parks Natural Resource Program staff until the juvenile bird(s) have fledged (left the nest), unless the biologist determines that proposed activities would not impact nesting success or fledgling/juvenile rearing. Limited
monitoring of active nests located within 500 feet of trail or facility construction is recommended in order to monitor nesting activities and to prevent nest failure or abandonment.

**BIO-3.** To avoid/minimize impacts to special-status animals, for each project phase, impact areas will be positioned away from high quality habitat features such as burrows or wetlands as determined prior to construction by a qualified biologist or County Parks Natural Resource Program staff through a trail location survey. In particular, new trails and facilities will be sited in the field prior to construction to avoid potential American badger den sites/active burrows, seasonal wetlands, and other features that could provide habitat for special-status species. Further, temporary exclusion barriers will be utilized to keep wildlife out of construction sites, as deemed appropriate by a qualified biologist or Parks Natural Resource Program staff. Construction monitoring will be conducted periodically by a qualified biologist or Parks Natural Resource Program staff to ensure that disturbance limits are correctly established and that avoidance/minimization measures are implemented properly.

Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-3 would ensure that the proposed project's potential impacts to special-status species not covered by the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (which are addressed separately below) would be reduced to a less than significant level. The impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

### 2. Sensitive Natural Communities

Special-status natural communities are those that are considered rare in the region, support special-status plant or animal species, or receive regulatory protection (i.e., wetlands under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code). In addition, the CDFW has designated a number of communities as rare; these communities are given the highest inventory priority. Special-status natural communities present on the site include oak woodlands, riparian/marsh/wetland areas, and serpentine grassland and chaparral plant communities.

Impacts to sensitive natural communities will require the enrollment of appropriate parkland areas into the proposed Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Reserve System as determined through the Valley Habitat Plan application package process. In addition, new trail segments will be aligned in the field to purposely minimize impacts to special-status natural communities present on the site, including oak woodlands, riparian/marsh/wetland areas, and serpentine grassland and chaparral plant communities. Through such avoidance and minimization as part of the phased project design, impacts to special-status natural communities will be less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required (in addition to compliance with the Valley Habitat Plan).

### 3. Wetlands/Waterways

Wetlands/waterways and associated riparian habitats are considered special-status by several regulatory agencies including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), CDFW, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and USFWS. There are wetlands and natural drainages on the project site; however,
project improvements in these areas will be limited to span bridge stream crossings installed above high water mark, and therefore, the proposed project is not to impact any potentially jurisdictional wetland features or Waters of the U.S. or State.

Because the proposed project will install span bridges above ordinary high water mark levels at the new stream crossings and avoid seasonal wetlands, there will be no impact to jurisdictional wetlands or waterways, and therefore no mitigation is required.

4. Oak Woodlands

The proposed project will not substantially convert or remove oak woodland habitat as defined by Oak Woodlands Conservation Law (Public Resource Code 21083.4). Because new trails and associated facilities will be sited in the field to purposely avoid and retain native trees, only limited oak tree removal will be necessary. Through such avoidance and minimization as part of the phased project design, impacts to oak woodlands will be less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required. However, mitigation will be required for removal of any protected oak trees, as addressed separately below.

5. Wildlife Movement

Wildlife movement includes migration (i.e., usually movement one way per season), inter-population movement (i.e., long-term dispersal and genetic flow), and small travel pathways (i.e., daily movement within an animal’s territory). While small travel pathways usually facilitate movement for daily home range activities such as foraging or escape from predators, they also provide connection between outlying populations and core populations, allowing an increase in gene flow between populations. These linkages among habitats can extend for miles and occur on a large scale throughout the greater region. Habitat linkages facilitate movement between populations located in discrete locales and populations located within larger habitat areas.

The access roads, trails, and natural drainages present at Calero County Park offer important regional wildlife movement opportunities throughout the project site. Project implementation is not expected to adversely impact wildlife movement through the park, and actually is expected to benefit wildlife movement by greatly expanding the existing trail system to better link the park to adjacent open space areas. The new trails will not be fenced and will not have night lighting.

Therefore, the creation of new regional trail linkages due to project implementation will have long-term beneficial impacts on wildlife movement. However, creation of these new trails will include an increase in human presence during daylight hours (plus the presence of horses and dogs on-leash on certain trails). This increase in human and horse/dog presence would have only less than significant adverse impacts on wildlife movement, and therefore no mitigation is required. The project will not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

6. Habitat Conservation Plans

The Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan ("Valley Habitat Plan") was designed "to protect, enhance, and restore natural resources in specific areas of Santa Clara County, while improving and streamlining the
environmental permitting process for impacts on threatened and endangered species”. Local partners for the Valley Habitat Plan include the County of Santa Clara, City of San José, City of Morgan Hill, City of Gilroy, Santa Clara Valley Water District, and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. This Valley Habitat Plan, which is a Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan, was developed in collaboration with the USFWS and the CDFW. The Valley Habitat Plan’s study area encompasses 519,506 acres, or approximately 62 percent of Santa Clara County.

“Covered activities” in the Valley Habitat Plan include projects or ongoing activities that will receive incidental take authorization for potential impacts to covered species. The Valley Habitat Plan provides conservation measures to protect and maintain habitat areas to support 18 special-status “covered species”: nine wildlife species and nine plant species within the study area. In addition, the Valley Habitat Plan sets forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and standardized mitigation and compensation program that would ensure that conservation actions, which include the creation, management, and monitoring of a new Reserve System in Santa Clara County, will be accomplished to streamline future mitigation requirements and achieve the biological goals and objectives of the Valley Habitat Plan.

The Valley Habitat Plan and its accompanying permits provide assurances that the USFWS and CDFW will not require any additional conservation or mitigation to address changed circumstances that are not identified in the Valley Habitat Plan, without the consent of the permittee, as long as the Valley Habitat Plan is found to be properly implemented. Consistent with the provisions of these assurances, the understanding is that the Valley Habitat Plan provides adequate mitigation for the effects of the covered activities, and there is no need for additional mitigation requirements beyond the provisions of the Valley Habitat Plan and associated permits nor modifications to the conservation measures. It is expected that the conservation measures provided in the Valley Habitat Plan will be sufficient to meet all CEQA mitigation standards for impacts on the special-status species and natural communities that are covered in the Valley Habitat Plan.

The Calero County Park Trails Master Plan is a covered activity as described in Chapter 2 (pages 2-91 through 2-93), County Parks Projects, of the Valley Habitat Plan. This section covers “trail and fire road development, and installation of related infrastructure such as bridges, staging areas, restrooms, parking lots, and signage” and “development of regional recreation opportunities and supporting infrastructure including … staging areas including restrooms, equestrian staging areas including water troughs, parking … gateway sites (e.g., trailheads, park entrances, kiosks), paved and dirt roads…”, etc. The County, as a Valley Habitat Plan permittee, will need to submit a Valley Habitat Plan Application Package, and receive a permit, prior to project implementation.

In support of the Valley Habitat Plan, the County park system will be enrolling portions of certain parks in the proposed Reserve System. Table 5-5 of the Valley Habitat Plan estimates that 1,690 of the 4,455 total acres of Calero County Park and up to all 966 acres of Rancho San Vicente are proposed for the Valley Habitat Plan Reserve System. However, the final number of acres to be enrolled will be based upon further refinement of areas appropriate for Reserve System designation.

The project design and analysis process included a detailed review of the conditions for covered activities under the Valley Habitat Plan (Chapter 6), ensuring that the Trails Master Plan project design practices and features would incorporate special-status resource impact avoidance and minimization measures directly into plans for new park infrastructure. This information is summarized below.
Most conditions on covered activities that are applicable to the proposed project would be met by standard Best Management Practices regularly followed by park management and maintenance staff. To protect natural resources within its parks, the County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department follows established Natural Resource Management Guidelines for different resource categories, such as wetlands, special-status species, non-native and invasive plant/pest management, etc. In addition, the Department follows refined trail maintenance and closure procedures, along with numerous detailed Best Management Practices specific to performing maintenance activities in and adjacent to water courses.

The Department also has a CDFW lake/streambed alteration agreement (No. 1600-2012-0013-3) permitting routine maintenance for 28 County park units, including Calero. It allows specific activities including culvert replacement, repair/maintenance, relocation, and removal; bridge/ford replacement and repair/maintenance; road and trail drainage/erosion control and minor relocation; dam maintenance; vegetation removal/routine clearing for water supplies and park facilities/structures; fire control; lake/pond/channel maintenance; and habitat enhancement activities. These approvals are subject to numerous measures and conditions to protect biological resources.

To protect special-status biological resources, on-the-ground alignment of each new trail segment or facility footprint will be defined in phases and determined/flagged prior to construction. For each trail/facility construction phase, focused species surveys will be conducted concurrent with the determination of trail positioning to avoid any special-status plant populations, minimize tree removals, limit impacts to sensitive communities and wildlife habitats, etc.

For example, to protect water quality, project construction in riparian areas will be scheduled to avoid the wet season (generally November through April). Regarding rural development design, new kiosks and restrooms would have low-intensity lighting and would comply with the Green Building Policy and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program requirements and the County’s Green Building Policy for Government Buildings (adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 25, 2006 and amended on September 29, 2009).

As the County (including the Parks and Recreation Department) is a Valley Habitat Plan permittee that helped to develop the detailed compliance conditions to protect natural resources, all applicable Valley Habitat Plan conditions for the Trails Master Plan project will be met through continued implementation of standard Best Management Practices and County policies employed by County Park staff.

The Valley Habitat Plan’s conditions on covered activities would apply to proposed trail routes that have potential impacts to the covered species. During project implementation, specific trail alignments will be designed to avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive habitat communities. Once further refinements in the field have been identified with these specific trail alignments, it is anticipated that the conditions will be applied if potential impacts are anticipated to the species covered under the Valley Habitat Plan.

Implementation of applicable covered species conditions required by the Valley Habitat Plan shown in Table 7 below as project design features will minimize/avoid potential project impacts to covered species.
Table 7  Valley Habitat Plan Covered Species: Conditions on Covered Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covered Species</th>
<th>Applicable Valley Habitat Plan Condition(s), Tables, and Figures</th>
<th>Species Conditions on Covered Activities Excerpted from Final Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Executive Summary (Table ES-2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coyote ceanothus</td>
<td>Condition 20: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Covered Plant Occurrences; Condition 19: Plant Salvage when Impacts are Avoidable; Condition 9: Prepare and Implement a Recreation Plan; Condition 13: Serpentine and Associated Covered Species Avoidance and Minimization; Table 6-9: Survey Periods for Covered Plant Species; Table 3-6: Covered Plant Species and Land Cover Types; Figure 3-10: Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Land Cover</td>
<td>Development guidelines will ensure that impacts from covered activities are minimized (Condition 20). Plant surveys will be required during appropriate survey period (Table 6-9) if the project site occurs in an area mapped as land cover associated with coyote ceanothus (Table 3-6; Figure 3-10). Individuals to be removed by covered activities will be salvaged to the extent possible using appropriate plant salvage techniques and a new separate occurrence will be established in suitable habitat (Condition 19). The condition of each covered plant occurrence will be documented to ensure that occurrences are protected within the Reserve System are in as good or better condition than those lost to covered activities. Exotic plants and recreational use will be controlled within reserves to benefit the species (Condition 9). Covered activities will avoid serpentine land cover types whenever feasible during project planning (Condition 13). If serpentine cannot be avoided, minimization measures described in Condition 13 will be followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragrant fritillary</td>
<td>Condition 20: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Covered Plant Occurrences; Condition 19: Plant Salvage when Impacts are Avoidable; Condition 9: Prepare and Implement a Recreation Plan; Condition 13: Serpentine and Associated Covered Species Avoidance and Minimization; Table 6-9: Survey Periods for Covered Plant Species; Table 3-6: Covered Plant Species and Land Cover Types; Figure 3-10: Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Land Cover</td>
<td>Development guidelines will ensure that impacts from covered activities are minimized (Condition 20). Plant surveys will be required during the appropriate survey period (Table 6-9) if the project site occurs in an area mapped as land cover associated with fragrant fritillary (Table 3-6; Figure 3-10). Occurrences to be removed by covered activities will be salvaged to the extent possible using appropriate plant salvage techniques and a new separate occurrence will be established in suitable habitat (Condition 19). The condition of each covered plant occurrence will be documented to ensure that occurrences are protected within the Reserve System are in as good or better condition than those lost to covered activities. Exotic plants and recreational use will be controlled in reserves to benefit the species (Condition 9). Covered activities will avoid serpentine land cover types whenever feasible during project planning (Condition 13). If serpentine cannot be avoided, minimization measures described in Condition 13 will be followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Species</td>
<td>Applicable Valley Habitat Plan Condition(s), Tables, and Figures</td>
<td>Species Conditions on Covered Activities Excerpted from Final Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Executive Summary (Table ES-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta hoita</td>
<td>Condition 20: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Covered Plant Occurrences; Condition 19: Plant Salvage when Impacts are Avoidable; Condition 9: Prepare and Implement a Recreation Plan; Table 6-9: Survey Periods for Covered Plant Species; Table 3-6: Covered Plant Species and Land Cover Types; Figure 3-10: Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Land Cover</td>
<td>Development guidelines will ensure that impacts from covered activities are minimized (Condition 20). Plant surveys will be required during the appropriate survey period (Table 6-9) if the project site occurs in an area mapped as land cover associated with Loma Prieta hoita (Table 3-6; Figure 3-10). Occurrences to be removed by covered activities will be salvaged to the extent possible using appropriate plant salvage techniques and a new separate occurrence will be established in suitable habitat (Condition 19). The condition of each covered plant occurrence will be documented to ensure that occurrences are protected within the Reserve System are in as good or better condition than those lost to covered activities. Exotic plants and recreational use will be controlled in reserves to benefit the species (Condition 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalf Canyon jewel-flower</td>
<td>Condition 20: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Covered Plant Occurrences; Condition 19: Plant Salvage when Impacts are Avoidable; Condition 9: Prepare and Implement a Recreation Plan; Condition 13: Serpentine and Associated Covered Species Avoidance and Minimization; Table 6-9: Survey Periods for Covered Plant Species; Table 3-6: Covered Plant Species and Land Cover Types; Figure 3-10: Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Land Cover</td>
<td>Development guidelines will ensure that impacts from covered activities are minimized (Condition 20). Plant surveys will be required during the appropriate survey period (Table 6-9) if the project site occurs in an area mapped as land cover associated with Metcalf Canyon jewel-flower (Table 3-6; Figure 3-10). Occurrences to be removed by covered activities will be salvaged to the extent possible using appropriate plant salvage techniques, and a new separate occurrence will be established in suitable habitat (Condition 19). The condition of each covered plant occurrence will be documented to ensure that occurrences are protected within the Reserve System are in as good or better condition than those lost to covered activities. Exotic plants and recreational use will be controlled within reserves to benefit the species (Condition 9). Covered activities will avoid serpentine land cover types whenever feasible during project planning (Condition 13). If serpentine cannot be avoided, minimization measures described in Condition 13 will be followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most beautiful jewel-flower</td>
<td>Condition 20: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Covered Plant Occurrences; Condition 19: Plant Salvage when Impacts are Avoidable; Condition 9: Prepare and Implement a Recreation Plan; Table 6-9: Survey Periods for Covered Plant Species; Table 3-6: Covered Plant Species and Land Cover Types; Figure 3-10: Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Land Cover</td>
<td>Development guidelines will ensure that impacts from covered activities are minimized (Condition 20). Plant surveys will be required during the appropriate survey period (Table 6-9) if the project site occurs in an area mapped as land cover associated with most beautiful jewel-flower (Table 3-6; Figure 3-10). Occurrences to be removed by covered activities will be salvaged to the extent possible using appropriate plant salvage techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered</td>
<td>Applicable Valley Habitat Plan</td>
<td>Species Conditions on Covered Activities Excerpted from Final Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Executive Summary (Table ES-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Condition(s), Tables, and Figures</td>
<td>techniques and a new separate occurrence will be established in suitable habitat (Condition 19). The condition of each covered plant occurrence will be documented to ensure that occurrences are protected within the Reserve System are in as good or better condition than those lost to covered activities. Exotic plants and recreational use will be controlled in reserves to benefit the species (Condition 9). Covered activities will avoid serpentine land cover types whenever feasible during project planning (Condition 13). If serpentine cannot be avoided, minimization measures described in Condition 13 will be followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hamilton thistle</td>
<td>Recreation Plan; Condition 13: Serpentine and Associated Covered Species Avoidance and Minimization; Table 6-9: Survey Periods for Covered Plant Species; Table 3-6: Covered Plant Species and Land Cover Types; Figure 3-10: Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Land Cover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley dudleya</td>
<td>Condition 20: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Covered Plant Occurrences; Condition 19: Plant Salvage when Impacts are Avoidable; Condition 9: Prepare and Implement a Recreation Plan; Condition 13: Serpentine and Associated Covered Species Avoidance and Minimization; Table 6-9: Survey Periods for Covered Plant Species; Table 3-6: Covered Plant Species and Land Cover Types; Figure 3-10: Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Land Cover</td>
<td>Development guidelines will ensure that impacts from covered activities are minimized (Condition 20). Plant surveys will be required during the appropriate survey period (Table 6-9) if the project site occurs in an area mapped as land cover associated with Mt. Hamilton thistle (Table 3-6; Figure 3-10). Occurrences to be removed by covered activities will be salvaged to the extent possible using appropriate plant salvage techniques and a new separate occurrence will be established in suitable habitat (Condition 19). The condition of each covered plant occurrence will be documented to ensure that occurrences are protected within the Reserve System are in as good or better condition than those lost to covered activities. Exotic plants and recreational use will be controlled within reserves to benefit the species (Condition 9). Covered activities will avoid serpentine land cover types whenever feasible during project planning (Condition 13). If serpentine cannot be avoided, minimization measures described in Condition 13 will be followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Species</td>
<td>Applicable Valley Habitat Plan Condition(s), Tables, and Figures</td>
<td>Species Conditions on Covered Activities Excerpted from Final Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Executive Summary (Table ES-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth lessingia</td>
<td>Table 6-9: Survey Periods for Covered Plant Species; Table 3-6: Covered Plant Species and Land Cover Types; Figure 3-10: Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Land Cover</td>
<td>Reserve System are in as good or better condition than those lost to covered activities. Exotic plants and recreational use will be controlled within reserves to benefit the species (Condition 9). Covered activities will avoid serpentine land cover types whenever feasible during project planning (Condition 13). If serpentine cannot be avoided, minimization measures described in Condition 13 will be followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiburon paintbrush</td>
<td>Condition 9: Prepare and Implement a Recreation Plan; Condition 13: Serpentine and Associated Covered Species Avoidance and Minimization; Table 6-9: Survey Periods for Covered Plant Species; Table 3-6: Covered Plant Species and Land Cover Types; Figure 3-10: Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Land Cover</td>
<td>Plant surveys will be required during appropriate survey period (Table 6-9) if a project site occurs in an area mapped as land cover associated with Tiburon Indian paintbrush (Table 3-6; Figure 3-10). The condition of any new occurrences that may be found during the permit as a result of project surveys will be documented to ensure they are not affected. Exotic plants and recreational use will be controlled in reserves to benefit the species (Condition 9). Covered activities will avoid serpentine land cover types whenever feasible during project planning (Condition 13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Species</td>
<td>Applicable Valley Habitat Plan Condition(s), Tables, and Figures</td>
<td>Species Conditions on Covered Activities Excerpted from Final Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Executive Summary (Table ES-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay checkerspot butterfly</td>
<td>Condition 13: Serpentine and Associated Covered Species Avoidance and Minimization</td>
<td>Development guidelines will ensure that impacts on this species from covered activities are minimized (Condition 13). This includes design measures to limit project footprint, buffer establishment, and landscaping restrictions. Surveys will be conducted to evaluate habitat quality and allow for development to occur as far as possible from high-quality habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrowing owl</td>
<td>Condition 15: Western Burrowing Owl Avoidance and minimization measures, including the establishment of a 250-foot buffer zone, will avoid all nest sites that could be disturbed by project construction throughout the breeding season. During the non-breeding season, active burrows will be avoided by the establishment of a 160-foot border, and exclusion doors will be put in place for 48 hours prior to excavation. All project monitoring will be conducted by a qualified biologist.</td>
<td>Development and operations and maintenance guidelines will ensure that impacts from covered activities are avoided or minimized (Condition 15). Species-specific surveys will be conducted during project planning phase, and potential impacts to occupied breeding habitat will be mapped. Preconstruction surveys will establish species presence/absence. Project monitoring will be coordinated with other regional efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California red-legged frog</td>
<td>Condition 4: Avoidance and Minimization for In-Stream Projects;</td>
<td>Development guidelines for wetlands, ponds, and streams (breeding habitat) and valley oak and blue oak woodlands (upland habitat) will ensure that impacts from covered activities are minimized (Conditions 4, 5, 11, 12, 14). Project planning guidelines include maintenance of landscape connectivity, maintenance of site hydrology to the extent possible, and establishment of buffer/setback requirements. Construction guidelines include buffer zone establishment and fencing; staking of wetlands/ponds during construction; staff training by professional biologist; erosion control measures; and restrictions on seasonality of activities, vegetative management, use of heavy machinery, access points, and ground disturbance. Recreational use guidelines include leash law restrictions and public access limitations within reserve recreational use areas to prevent potential species impacts from domestic dogs (Condition 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Species</td>
<td>Applicable Valley Habitat Plan Condition(s), Tables, and Figures</td>
<td>Species Conditions on Covered Activities Excerpted from Final Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Executive Summary (Table ES-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California tiger salamander</td>
<td>Condition 12: Wetland and Pond Avoidance and Minimization; Condition 14: Valley Oak and Blue Oak Woodland Avoidance and Minimization; Condition 11: Stream and Riparian Setbacks; Condition 9: Prepare and Implement a Recreation Plan</td>
<td>Development guidelines for wetlands and ponds (breeding habitat) and valley oak and blue oak woodlands (upland habitat) will minimize effects of covered activities (Conditions 12, 14). Stream and Riparian Setbacks, may also have ancillary benefits to this species. Although the streams themselves do not provide habitat, aquatic breeding sites and dispersal corridors may be located within the riparian areas protected by the setbacks (Condition 11). Project planning guidelines include maintenance of landscape connectivity, maintenance of site hydrology to the extent possible, and establishment of buffer/setback requirements. Construction guidelines include buffer zone establishment and fencing; staking of wetlands/ponds during construction; staff training by professional biologist; erosion control measures; and restrictions on seasonality of activities, vegetative management, use of heavy machinery, access points, and ground disturbance (Conditions 12, 14). Recreational use guidelines include leash law restrictions and public access limitations within reserve recreational use areas to prevent potential species impacts from domestic dogs (Condition 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill yellow-legged frog</td>
<td>Condition 3: Maintain Hydrologic Conditions; Condition 4: Avoidance and Minimization for In-Stream Projects; Condition 5: Avoidance and Minimization Measures for In-Stream Operations and Maintenance; Condition 7: Rural Development Design and Construction Requirements; Condition 9: Prepare and Implement a Recreation Plan; Condition 11: Stream and Riparian Setbacks</td>
<td>Development and operations and maintenance guidelines will ensure that impacts from covered activities are avoided or minimized through maintenance of hydrologic conditions and protection of water quality (Condition 3), stream avoidance and minimization for in-stream projects (Condition 4), BMPs for in-stream operations and maintenance (Condition 5), rural development design requirements (Condition 7), preparation and implementation of a Reserve System recreation plan (Condition 9), and riparian setbacks (Condition 11). Conditions include but are not limited to: creation of landscape features to maintain preproject hydograph, remove pollutants and sediments from surface runoff prior to stream entry, and reduce runoff velocity; development of construction sediment and erosion management plans; installation of fish passage mechanisms during in-stream work; and bank stabilization. Recreational use guidelines include leash law restrictions and public access limitations within reserve recreational use areas to prevent potential species impacts from domestic dogs (Condition 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Species</td>
<td>Applicable Valley Habitat Plan Condition(s), Tables, and Figures</td>
<td>Species Conditions on Covered Activities Excerpted from Final Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Executive Summary (Table ES-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricolored blackbird</td>
<td>Condition 17: Tricolored Blackbird</td>
<td>Development and operations and maintenance guidelines ensure that impacts from covered activities are avoided or minimized (Condition 17). During the project planning phase, a qualified biologist will survey and map potential species nesting habitat. Potential nesting habitat identified by these or any other surveys, will be mapped and direct impacts to potential nesting habitat avoided and other impacts minimized. Avoidance measures include relocating impacts away from the potential nesting habitat. If a project is unable to avoid impacts on species nest colonies by locating construction and staging activities at least 250 feet from the outer edge of all hydric vegetation associated with the colony, preconstruction surveys will be required. Preconstruction surveys will conclude no more than two calendar days prior to construction. Covered activities must avoid species nesting colonies (currently occupied or occupied within the past five years) and associated habitat with a 250-foot no-activity buffer zone around the outer edge of all hydric vegetation associated with the colony. Required buffers may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis as evaluated by the Implementing Entity in coordination with the Wildlife Agencies. A construction monitor will be present during breeding season construction when an active colony is present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western pond turtle</td>
<td>Condition 4: Avoidance and Minimization for In-Stream Projects; Condition 5: Avoidance and Minimization Measures for In-Stream Operations and Maintenance; Condition 11: Stream and Riparian Setbacks; Condition 12: Wetland and Pond Avoidance and Minimization; Condition 14: Valley Oak and Blue Oak Woodland Avoidance and Minimization; Condition 9: Prepare and Implement a Recreation Plan</td>
<td>Development guidelines for wetlands, ponds, and streams and valley oak and blue oak woodlands will ensure that impacts from covered activities are avoided and minimized (Conditions 4, 5, 11, 12 &amp; 14). Project planning guidelines include maintenance of landscape connectivity, maintenance of site hydrology to the extent possible, and establishment of buffer/setback requirements. Construction guidelines include buffer zone establishment and fencing; staking of wetlands/ponds during construction; staff training by professional biologist; erosion control measures; and restrictions on seasonality of activities, vegetative management, use of heavy machinery, access points, and ground disturbance. Recreational use guidelines include leash law restrictions and public access limitations within reserve recreational use areas to prevent potential species impacts from domestic dogs (Condition 9).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: All information contained in this table refers to the Final Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (ICF International 2012).*
Mitigation Measure

BIO-4. To minimize/avoid impacts to Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan covered species, all applicable conditions listed in Table 7, Valley Habitat Plan Covered Species: Conditions on Covered Activities, for each covered species with potential to be impacted will be implemented during each phase of the project.

Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-4 would ensure that potential impacts to special-status species covered by the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan due to the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation.

7. Local Natural Communities

The proposed project has been designed to result in minimal impacts to local natural communities, such as freshwater marshes and oak woodlands. Because new trails and associated facilities will be sited in the field to purposely avoid sensitive biological resources and retain existing habitat values, only limited impacts to natural communities will be necessary. In fact, beneficial impacts to local natural communities will also result from project implementation as some existing trails that are located in sensitive habitat areas will be closed and restored to native vegetation. With natural resource avoidance and impact minimization as part of the phased project design, adverse impacts to local natural communities will be less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

8. Wetlands/Waterways

As stated above in response number 3, the project will not impact any watercourse or aquatic, wetland, or riparian area or habitat. Because the proposed project will install span bridges above ordinary high water mark levels at the new stream crossings and avoid seasonal wetlands, there will be no impact to wetlands or waterways, and therefore no mitigation is required.

9. Unique/Heritage Trees

According to the Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance, a heritage tree is defined as “any tree which, because of its history, girth, height, species, or other unique quality, has been recommended for inclusion on the heritage resource inventory by the historic heritage commission and found by the Board of Supervisors to have special significance to the community.”

To the greatest extent practicable, new trails will be sited to avoid and retain native trees. However, limited tree removal will be necessary to build the new trail along the south side of the reservoir in the vicinity of Cherry Cove. Any tree removals will be subject to the County’s tree removal permitting process and will likely require mitigation, which is addressed separately below. No unique or heritage trees will be removed by the proposed project. It should be noted that the Trails Master Plan includes Best Management Practices to discourage the spread of Sudden Oak Death Syndrome (SOD), which is not currently known to occur in the park.
There will be no impact to unique or heritage trees, or to a large number of trees over 12 inches in diameter, due to project implementation and therefore no mitigation is required.

10. Local Policies/Ordinances

The Santa Clara County General Plan, Book A, Part 2, Resource Conservation section, Habitat and Biodiversity subsection contains these strategies:

- Strategy #1: Improve Current Knowledge and Awareness of Habitats;
- Strategy #2: Protect the Biological Integrity of Critical Habitat Areas;
- Strategy #3: Encourage Habitat Restoration; and
- Strategy #4: Evaluate the Effectiveness of Environmental Mitigations.

The proposed project is consistent with these local policies protecting biological resources.

The Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance is contained in the municipal code Division C16: Tree Preservation and Removal. An administrative permit must be obtained from the County Planning Department prior to removal of protected trees, which are defined as applicable to the project site as "any tree which measures over thirty-seven and seven-tenths (37.7) inches in circumference (twelve (12) inches or more in diameter) measured four and one-half (4.5) feet above the ground, or which exceeds twenty (20) feet in height". Tree removal permits typically require mitigation, usually through the planting of replacement trees in appropriate sites.

Although proposed project trail and facility impact areas will be positioned purposely to avoid trees as much as possible, some protected trees will need to be removed. As stated earlier, to the greatest extent practicable, new trails will be sited to avoid and retain native trees. However, limited tree removal will be necessary to build the new trail along the south side of the reservoir in the vicinity of Cherry Cove.

Mitigation Measure

**BIO-5. Mitigation will be required for the removal of any tree which measures over thirty-seven and seven-tenths (37.7) inches in circumference (twelve (12) inches or more in diameter) measured four and one-half (4.5) feet above the ground, or which exceeds twenty (20) feet in height. In compliance with the Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance, an administrative permit will be obtained from the County Planning Department prior to removal of protected trees on the project site and any stipulated mitigation will be completed, such as the planting of replacement trees in appropriate sites.**

Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-5 would ensure that potential impacts to trees protected by the Santa Clara County Tree Preservation Ordinance due to the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Finally, as stated earlier, no impacts are anticipated to wetland or riparian habitats due to the proposed project.
E. CULTURAL/ HISTORICAL/ ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</th>
<th>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</th>
<th>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 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 (i.e. relocation, alterations or demolition of historic resources)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>2,3,5,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,3,5,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,3,5,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Be located in a Historic District (e.g., New Almaden Historic District)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,3,5,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Disturb a historic resource or cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values or restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,3,5,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Disturb potential archaeological resources?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,3,5,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,3,5,9,15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

This section incorporates the findings of the cultural resource evaluation entitled *Archival Review and Limited Evaluation of Select Areas of the Calero County Parks Trails Master Plan Project in the County of Santa Clara Trail* (Archeological Resource Management June 2013) (Archaeological Investigation) was prepared for the project. The cultural resource evaluation was carried out to determine the presence or absence of any significant cultural resources. This report is exempt from the Public Records Act and therefore, is not included as an appendix to this initial study.

The Archaeological Investigation included a document review of previously completed archival research on record with the state archaeological office, limited surface reconnaissance including trailheads, staging areas, and areas of previously recorded archaeological sensitivity, an evaluation of the potential significance of the property according to the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), and a written report of the findings with appropriate recommendations.
The archival research revealed that there are a total of twelve previously recorded sites within the Calero County Park boundaries. These sites include: CA-SCL-209, CA-SCL-205, CA-SCL-208, CA-SCL-364H, CA-SCL-365, CA-SCL-366, CA-SCL-405H, CA-SCL-486, CA-SCL-487, CA-SCL-488H, CA-SCL-489H, and CA-SCL-570. Four additional sites are located within the immediate vicinity of the park boundaries. Surface reconnaissance was carried out in the area of proposed trail heads, staging areas, and areas of recorded archaeological sensitivity. Two additional previously unrecorded historic resources known to County staff were identified in the field.

Calero County Park as a whole contains multiple areas of archaeological sensitivity for both prehistoric and historic resources. This includes previously recorded sites, the areas immediately surrounding them, all areas within the vicinity of seasonal drainages, and other specific areas highlighted in the Archaeological Investigation. However, County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department best management practices include site-appropriate design for trail design and construction that avoid known historical or archaeological sites and areas of potential sensitivity unless specifically designed to provide access to areas for interpretation. Staff members receive certified training in the identification, avoidance, and protection of historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources.

In addition, the Trails Master Plan provides additional guidelines specific to the character and the nature of the park. Trail layouts are schematic only; trail alignments represent general routes rather than actual marked trails. As trails are scheduled for implementation, more detailed design studies will be initiated and exact trail alignments will be determined in the field at the time of construction. (Bellinger Foster Steinmetz, 2013)

Thus, while a comprehensive evaluation and recordation of all possible cultural resources has not been completed, preliminary research, field investigation, and known information were used to identify trail routes that would best avoid or mitigate any adverse effects. These resources will be reviewed again at the time of construction.

Discussion/Mitigation

1. Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Historical Resource

As identified above, there are several recorded historic resources in the project area. In addition, two previously unrecorded historic resources, a home site and a wooden barn were noted during the archaeological survey. No alterations to these sites are proposed. However, without additional cultural resource evaluations, trail construction and other ground disturbing activities have the potential to disturb known and unknown historic resources at Calero County Park. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will be required:

Mitigation Measures

CR-1. County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department will ensure that the two previously unrecorded historic resources (home site and a wooden barn) noted during the
archaeological survey are documented on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and recorded to the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS).

CR-2. Prior to construction, staging areas and trails plans will be finalized in consultation with a qualified historian to avoid areas of known historic sensitivity.

CR-3. Due to the possibility that significant previously unknown historic resources might be found during future construction activities, the following language will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future construction documents:

“If historic resources (i.e. historic sites, and/or isolated historic objects that appear likely to have historic or cultural significance) are discovered during construction, work shall be halted at a minimum of 200 feet from the find, County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department shall be notified, and the area shall be staked off. County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department shall retain a qualified professional historian that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Professional Qualifications in history, to evaluate and determine the significance of the find. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures shall be formulated and implemented.”

Implementation of mitigation measures CR-1 through CR-3 would ensure that potential impacts due to substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource would be reduced to a less than significant level by formally recording the historic sites recently identified in the Archaeological Evaluation, avoiding areas of known historic sensitivity and ensuring that in the event of accidental discovery of an historic resource, work is stopped and appropriate mitigation is formulated and implemented. The impact would be **less than significant with mitigation.**

2. Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of an Archaeological Resource

As identified above, there are several recorded archeological resources in the project area. In addition, the area as a whole is recognized possibly containing multiple, yet-undiscovered areas of archaeological sensitivity. Without additional cultural resource evaluations, trail construction and other ground disturbing activities have the potential to disturb known and unknown archeological resources at Calero County Park. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will be required:

**Mitigation Measures**

CR-4. Prior to construction, staging areas and trails plans will be finalized in consultation with a qualified archaeologist to avoid areas of known archaeological sensitivity. Where this is not feasible, archaeological monitoring shall be carried out during earthmoving activities for trail construction within sensitive areas, as defined in the Archaeological Investigation. In the event that proposed trails pass through recorded archaeological resources, an archaeological testing program will be developed for these areas consistent with professional archeological standards and State and County requirements. The nature
and extent of the testing program will be dependent on the level of site disturbance, and
topological and environmental factors.

CR-5. Due to the possibility that significant buried prehistoric cultural resources might be found
during future construction and trail improvement activities, the following language will be
incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future construction documents:

“If prehistoric archaeological resources (including but not limited to dark soil containing
shellfish or groundstone) are discovered during construction, work within the immediate
vicinity of the find will be halted at a minimum of 200 feet from the find and the area will
be staked off. County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department will then
determine if it is feasible to relocate the trail to avoid and/or minimize impacts. If the trail
cannot be rerouted and impacts cannot be avoided, then work will cease in the area until
the archaeological evaluation has been completed. The County of Santa Clara Parks and
Recreation Department will retain a qualified professional historian and/or archaeologist
that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Professional
Qualifications in archaeology to evaluate and determine the significance of the find. If the
find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures will be formulated
and implemented.”

Implementation of mitigation measures CR-4 and 5 would ensure that potential impacts due to substantial
adverse change in the significance of a archaeological resource would be reduced to a less than
significant level by avoiding areas of known archaeological sensitivity and ensuring that in the event of
accidental discovery of a buried archaeological resource, work is stopped and appropriate mitigation is
formulated and implemented. The impact would be **less than significant with mitigation.**

3. Disturb Human Remains

There is the possibility of an accidental discovery of human remains during construction activities
associated with implementation of the proposed Trails Master Plan. Therefore, implementation of the
following mitigation measure will be required:

**Mitigation Measure**

CR-6. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the
following language will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future
construction documents in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e):

“If human remains are found during construction there will be no further excavation or
disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent
human remains until the coroner of Santa Clara County is contacted to determine that no
investigation of the cause of death is required and procedures outlined in the County
Ordinance Relating to Indian Burial Grounds (County of Santa Clara, 1987) and State
Public Resources Code can be implemented. If the coroner determines the remains to be
Native American the coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission
within 24 hours.
The Native American Heritage Commission will identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may then make recommendations to County of Santa Clara or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County of Santa Clara or its authorized representative will rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance if: a) the Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a likely descendent or the likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission; b) the descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or c) the County or its authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.”

Implementation of mitigation measure CR-6 would ensure that potential impacts due to a disturbance of human remains would be reduced to a less than significant level by requiring that in the event of accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction, work will be stopped and the human remains and any associated grave goods will be treated or disposed of with appropriate dignity and not subject to future disturbance. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Additionally, a Sacred Lands Check was initiated for the project by ARM in May of 2013. The response from the Native American Heritage Commission was received on June 20th identifying the Check as negative. Letters were sent out to all of the Native American representatives June 21st. To date, no responses have been received.

4. Be Located in a Historic District

Calero County Park is not located in a Historic District. No Impact.

5. Cause a Physical Change which would Affect Unique Ethnic Cultural Values or Restrict Existing Religious or Sacred Uses within the Potential Impact Area

There are no ethnic or religious facilities located within Calero County Park. Therefore, implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan would not Affect Unique Ethnic Cultural Values or Restrict Existing Religious or Sacred Uses within the Potential Impact Area. No Impact.

6. Disturb Potential Archaeological Resources

See discussion under Impact 2 above. Less than significant with mitigation.
7. Directly or Indirectly Destroy a Unique Paleontological Resource or Site or Unique Geologic Feature

The San Jose General Plan does not identify the project site area as paleontologically sensitive (City of San Jose General Plan, Figure 3.11-1). The soils and geology report prepared for the Trails Master Plan in 2011 (Geologic and Hydrologic Opportunities and Constraints for Trail Planning, Balance Hydrologics) did not identify the presence of the geologic unit known in the County of Santa Clara to be high in paleontological resources in the project area. No Impact.
### F. ENERGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Use non-renewable resources in large quantities or in a wasteful manner?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Involve the removal of vegetation capable of providing summer shade to a building or significantly affect solar access to adjacent property?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Mitigation**

**1. Use of Non-renewable Resources**

Heavy equipment such as bulldozers and trucks could be used to create the two new staging areas and to reconfigure and expand the Ranger Station Staging area. Automobiles would also be used by construction workers to get to and from the site during construction. However, these activities would be only occur once, during the construction phase, so large quantities of fuels would not be used. No other non-renewable resources would be used. **No Impact.**

**2. Removal of vegetation capable of providing summer shade to a building or significantly affect solar access to adjacent property**

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan does not include removing trees adjacent to buildings. While there may be a few trees removed for trail construction, this removal would not affect solar access to any adjacent properties. **No Impact.**
# G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
   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.
   - No Impact [☐] [☒] [☐] [☐] [☐] 2,3,5,6,7,9,15

2. Result in substantial soil erosion or siltation or the loss of topsoil?
   - No Impact [☐] [☒] [☐] [☐] [☐] 2,3,5,6,7,9,15

3. 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, collapse, shrink/swell potential, soil creep or serve erosion?
   - No Impact [☒] [☐] [☐] [☐] [☐] 2,3,5,6,7,9,15

4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the report, _Soils of Santa Clara County or California Building Code_, creating substantial risks to life or property?
   - No Impact [☒] [☐] [☐] [☐] [☐] 15,37,48

5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
   - No Impact [☒] [☐] [☐] [☐] [☐] 15,37,48

6. Cause substantial compaction or over-covering of soil either on-site or off-site?
   - No Impact [☐] [☒] [☐] [☐] [☐] 15,37,48

7. Cause substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?
   - No Impact [☐] [☒] [☐] [☐] [☐] 15,37,48

8. Be located in an area designated as having a potential for major geological hazard?
   - No Impact [☐] [☒] [☐] [☐] [☐] 2,3,5,6,7,9,15,37,48

9. Be located on, or adjacent to a known earthquake fault?
   - No Impact [☐] [☒] [☐] [☐] [☐] 2,3,5,6,7,9,15,37,48

10. Be located in a Geologic Study Zone?
    - No Impact [☐] [☒] [☐] [☐] [☐] 2,3,5,6,7,9,15
11. Involve construction of a building, road or septic system on a slope of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Range</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>☒</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 30% or greater?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>2,3,5,6,7,9,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 20% to 30%?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 10% to 20%?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

The analysis below is based in part on the memo prepared for Calero County Park: *Geologic and Hydrologic Opportunities and Constraints for Trail Planning* (Balance Hydrologics 2011).

**Discussion/Mitigation**

1. **Expose People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Involving Earthquake Fault Rupture, Seismic Ground Shaking/Failure, or Landslides**

The project is located in a seismically active area and visitors to the park would be exposed to seismic and earthquake related hazards. However, implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not significantly increase exposure of people to these types of hazards.

The active San Andreas Fault System is located approximately seven miles southwest of Calero County Park. A major earthquake in the region could have serious impacts to the park including damage to park structures, rupture of utilities crossing the fault, earthquake-induced flooding and/or landslides and potential loss of life. However, damages would be of much smaller scale than in densely urbanized areas (where the threat from falling buildings and earthquake-induced fire is high). All trails users would be recreating outdoors, and since it is impossible to anticipate a seismic event, there are no precautions that can be taken to avoid or reduce seismic events for trail users in Calero County Park. The impact is considered to be **less than significant**.

2. **Impact - Soil Erosion, Siltation or the Loss of Topsoil**

The project would be constructed using the BMPs presented in the draft Trails Master Plan to protect areas from substantial soil erosion and loss of topsoil during and after construction. These BMPs include the following as identified on pages 65-67 of the Draft Trails Master Plan:

**Design Phase.** The following design guidelines would be followed during detailed design of the trails so that the trails avoid geologic hazards and minimize erosion.

1. All trails should be designed in accordance with the Countywide Trails Master Plan Design and Management Guidelines.
2. Trails should not follow the fall line of a slope; they should contour along side slopes. Fall-line trails become watercourses, erode easily and then are difficult to maintain. Even low-slope (less than 10 percent) fall-line trails usually become the preferential flow path for water. Trails following the contour along side slopes, versus fall-line trails, help to moderate the speed of trail users.

3. Trails should be out-sloped in most cases (except for short sections at outside bends). This encourages water to run off the side of the trail, rather than along the trail. Trails should be built to have about 3 to 5 percent outslope after trail compaction has occurred, so initial out sloping should be greater than 5 percent. After a year or two, it should be expected that maintenance would be needed to return and “deberm” sections of trail where soil compaction and displacement have exceeded the designed outslope.

4. Frequent rolling dips should be built into a trail (as a backup to outsloping), to avoid water flow along a trail. These should be placed to enhance natural grade dips. Rolling grade dips are long and gentle features (12 to 20 feet long) that avoid the short and abrupt style of traditional “water bars” (Klein, 2003; Riter and Riter, 2005). Having the outside bend of a trail as a relative high point helps reduce erosion; this is achieved because the upslope naturally slows a bicycle rider, which reduces the need to brake or skid.

5. Trail widths should be minimized to reduce the amount of bare soil subject to erosion. Contour trails should be cut on a full bench, rather than a combination of cut and fill. The cut material should be broadcast downslope, unless the trail is near a creek. Cut material can also be utilized for the ramp section of rolling dips if it is compacted one layer at a time.

6. For mountain biking trails, climbing turns or switchbacks should be located whenever possible where the side-slope is 10 percent or less, in order to create a sustainable, low-erosion trail. The actual trail gradient should be determined by site geology and terrain. The wider the turn and the lower the slope of the turn itself, the less braking and skidding (going downhill) is needed, and less wheel spinning (going uphill) is likely (Schmidt and Woolner, 2004).

7. Reduce locations where bicycles tend to brake heavily and/or have to climb steep hills, which could cause erosion. Make a conscious effort to design trails with consistent “flow” (IMBA, 2004). Exaggerate grade reversals at outside bends. Gradual flow transitions should also reduce user conflicts.

**Construction and Operational Phase.** The following BMPs would be incorporated during the construction and operational phase as appropriate:

1. If landslides or slope failure occurs, cut a temporary ramp through the edge of the scarp, have the trail traverse across the slide, and then cut another ramp to go up the scarp on the other side. This would reduce the tendency for users to create volunteer trails around the head of the landslide scarp.

2. All trails in areas with active landslides should be considered for closure during wet weather and storm events.
3. Close more erodible trails during wet weather and storm events per the County Parks Department’s trail closure policy and procedures.

4. Maintain the trail corridor by trimming encroaching vegetation; a bush leaning into a trail can lead users to travel outside the trail to avoid brushing against the bush, which would eventually widen the trail over time.

5. If a trail area is too sandy, adding clay can help the tread be more cohesive.

6. Where deemed beneficial by County Parks Department Staff, reapplication of the forest duff layer, peeled back from the site at the beginning of construction, will be used on top of the new trail bed to help reduce erosion.

7. As trails approach one another they should rise gently to the junction with other trails, which will reduce water collection at the junction, and moderate the speed of trail users.

Specific Countywide Trails Master Plan BMPs (included as Design Phase BMP 1 above) related to soil erosion during the construction phase include the following:

**D - 3.5.3 Soil Disturbance.** In order to reduce erosion and maintenance problems, disturbance to the soil surface shall be kept to a minimum. Only those rocks, stumps, and roots which interfere with safe passage shall be removed.

**D - 3.5.5 Erosion Control Plans.** Where a potential for significant soil erosion exists along a new trail alignment, specific erosion control plans shall be developed by a Registered Civil or Soils Engineer as part of the trail construction documentation. Criteria to be used in determining the erosion potential include: slope; soil type; soil composition and permeability; and the relative stability of the underlying geologic unit as identified on local General Plans or other adopted planning documents.

**D - 3.6 Planting of Disturbed Areas.** Any cut or fill slopes shall be immediately reseeded or replanted with vegetation native to the general area.

**D - 4.1.1 Drainage Crossings.** Trails crossing creeks and drainages may require a bridge or culvert. Structures over water courses shall be carefully placed to minimize disturbance. Erosion control measures shall be taken to prevent erosion at the outfalls of drainage structures.

In addition, control measures included in the Hydrological BMPs as identified to reduce erosion in areas of steep slopes or in areas adjacent to a creek or riparian area in the Hydrology and Water Quality Section of this Initial Study would be included in a SWPPP prepared for the project after final design.

Future development and operation of the site consistent with the BMPs within the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan will reduce the potential of exposure of people or structures to hazards due to soil erosion and/or the loss of topsoil. The impact is **less than significant**
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3. 4. Unstable or Expansive, Soils

With implementation of the proposed geologic BMPs (identified in the discussion under Impact 2 above) future development and operation of the site consistent with the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not expose people or structures to significant hazards due to unstable soils. **No Impact.**

5. Septic Tanks or Alternative Waste Water Disposal Systems

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan includes a new restroom at the Ranger Station and the Rancho San Vicente staging area. Table 4 of the Draft Trails Master Plan identifies the new restroom(s) as “Vault system, septic hook up, or sanitary sewer.” An existing leach field is identified on the conceptual map for the Ranger Station. County Parks has indicated that the preferred restroom option is installation of a septic system rather than sanitary sewer line hookup since they are outside of City of San Jose services. Installation of septic system would require a permit by the County of Santa Clara Health Department.

Prior to construction, County Parks will be required to submit a site-specific, design-level septic (or sanitary hookup) plan, which includes soil testing results, percolation test, and measures of compliance with all applicable state and local code requirements.

These requirements will ensure that the septic system is designed to function adequately based on site specific soils conditions **No Impact.**

6. Soil Compaction

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan includes BMPs to address the potential of soil compaction (see Hydrologic BMPs listed in the Hydrology Water Quality Section of this Initial Study and Geologic BMPs listed under Impact 1 above). In addition, the Draft Trails Master Plan includes the following BMP:

> The trail bed of the volunteer trail should also be rehabilitated, especially with volunteer trails with high historic usage. Entrenched trails must be filled and reshaped to the natural contours. If soil compaction has occurred, the soil must be scarified and aerated. The volunteer tread must be revegetated by planting native vegetation transplanted from the vicinity, or seeded with native species found in the area. Abandoned Trail Obliteration and Restoration - BMP’s, BMP 4. Draft Trails Master Plan page 68.

With implementation of these proposed BMPs, future development and operation of the site would not cause substantial compaction or over-covering of soil either on-site or off-site. The impact is **less than significant.**

7. Change in Topography or Unstable Soil Conditions from Excavation, Grading, or Fill

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan does not include large amounts of grading, excavation or fill that could cause a change in topography. Based on the construction associated with the proposed project (185 new spaces plus additional size for 43 trailer spaces) and average trail disturbance, it estimated that the proposed project disturbance area would be approximately 2.5 acres (parking areas) and approximately 14.25 acres (trail area). BMPs have been included in the Draft Trails Master Plan to ensure
construction activities and future operation does not result in unstable soil conditions (see Hydrologic BMPs listed in the Hydrology Water Quality Section of this Initial Study and Geologic BMPs listed under Impact 1. above). The impact is **less than significant**.

8. 9. 10. **Potential for Major Geological Hazard, Earthquake, Geologic Study Zone**

The project is located in a seismically active area and visitors to the park would be exposed to seismic and earthquake related hazards. See the discussion under Impact 1 above. This impact is **less than significant**.

11. **Involve Construction on a Slope of 10 Percent or Greater**

Slopes within Calero County Park vary from flat (0 percent) to very steep (40 percent+). Trail development is directly related to the limitations presented by degree of slope. As land disturbance is also directly related to potential habitat disturbance, as a component of the Draft Trails Master Plan, trail development along steep slopes will be minimized in Calero County Park.

A digital elevation model for Calero County Park has been used to create a percent slope map. The slope is divided into the following categories: 0-5 percent, 5-12 percent, 12-20 percent, 20-20 percent, 30-40 percent, and 40 percent+. Areas of steeper slope are typically less suitable for trail building, so they were given a higher constraint value. Map 5, Terrain Slope, of the Draft Trails Master Plan identifies the slope categories with the park.

Based on identified slope constraint, design guidelines would be followed as outlined in the Draft Trails Master Plan during detailed design of the trails so that the trails avoid geologic hazards and minimize erosion associated with steep slopes (refer to BMPs identified in the discussion of Impact 1 above, and Hydrological BMP’s identified in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this Initial Study). The impact is **less than significant**.
H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</th>
<th>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</th>
<th>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,3,17,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,3,17,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Would the project increase greenhouse gas emissions that hinder or delay the State’s ability to meet the reduction target (25% reduction by 2020) contained in CA Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2,3,17,18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

This section is based on the Greenhouse Gas Technical Memo, prepared by EMC Planning Group in June 2013, included as Appendix C in this Initial Study. The Greenhouse Gas Technical Memo provides a qualitative assessment of the potential greenhouse gas emission impacts of implementing the proposed Draft Calero County Park Trails Master Plan. The methodology employed includes an evaluation of the proposed project against greenhouse gas impact significance screening criteria provided by the California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines (Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2011). The Greenhouse Technical Memo also relied on traffic data provided in the Focused Transportation Analysis for Calero County Park Trails Master Plan prepared by Fehr & Peers in June 2013 (Transportation Memo) which is included in this Initial Study as Appendix D.

Discussion/Mitigation

1. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would generate greenhouse gas emissions that would contribute to global climate change.

Existing Operational ADT/GHG Baseline

Under existing conditions, the primary source of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the park is mobile source vehicle trips taken by visitors to the park. The Transportation Memo prepared for the project found that the worst-case, maximum Average Daily Trip (ADT) volume occurs during peak
weekends in the spring. Under existing conditions, maximum use of the existing 28 existing parking spaces at the Ranger Station generates about 154 ADT. GHG emissions are generated by each of these vehicle trips.

Other existing park activities are sources of negligible volumes of GHGs. These include electricity use at the Ranger Station/Visitor Center, disposal and treatment of wastewater from several existing portable restrooms, operation of park facility maintenance vehicles and equipment, and periodic water pumping to fill a storage tank used for park-specific water supply and fire flow. Fuel-powered boating activities on the reservoir within the park also generate GHGs. However, improvements proposed as part of the park master plan are not expected to result in an increase in boating activity.

Proposed Project Operational ADT/GHG Emissions

Under post-project conditions, vehicle trips will continue to be the dominant source of GHG emissions generated by the use and operation of Calero County Park. The capacity of the park to accommodate visitors arriving by vehicle will increase significantly. A net of up to 185 new parking spaces will be provided at the existing and new staging areas (65 new spaces at Ranger Station, and 115 new spaces at Rancho San Vicente, and five new spaces at Almaden Road).

Table 4 in the Transportation Memo includes a summary of the worst-case, maximum total daily volume of new daily traffic trips that would be generated with the addition of 185 new parking spaces. The 185 new spaces would enable up to a maximum total of 1,019 ADT.

It must be re-emphasized that this is the worst-case ADT volume that is assumed to occur during a limited number of weekends during a limited season of the year. The weighted average of seasonal use is about 60 percent of the maximum peak season. Therefore, it is assumed that over the course of an entire year, average ADT is 60 percent of the peak season ADT. At this average rate of use, vehicle trips would average about 611 ADT.

Non-mobile sources of GHG emissions will also increase, but continue to represent a very minor percentage of the mobile sources volume. These sources would mirror those noted under existing conditions (e.g. electricity demand at the Ranger Station, energy to dispose and treat wastewater, and energy to pump water). As noted previously, use of fuel-powered boats at the park reservoir will continue, but are not expected to intensify relative to existing conditions. No new sources of GHGs are expected under post-project conditions that do not currently exist.

Operational GHG Impact Screening Analysis

As described above, the proposed project would generate a maximum of approximately 1,019 new ADT per day under the most heavy park use scenario and is assumed to average 611 ADT over the course of an entire year. As a means to compare project ADT to the ADT of representative projects listed in Table 3-1 of the Air District guidelines, Table 8, ADT Screening Comparison, shows representative project types from Table 3-1, along with trip generation rates and estimates of ADTs for each.
Table 8  ADT Screening Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Screening Project Type</th>
<th>Project Size/Intensity(^1)</th>
<th>Trip Generation Rate(^2)</th>
<th>Average Daily Trips(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>56 units</td>
<td>9.57 trips/unit</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo/Townhouse</td>
<td>78 units</td>
<td>5.81 trips/unit</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware/Paint Store</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>51.29 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office Building</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>11.01 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>102.24 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>600 acres</td>
<td>1.59 trips/acre</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>56.24 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Restaurant</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>89.95 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>6.96 trips/1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project (County Park)</td>
<td>185 new parking spaces</td>
<td>2.5-3.0 trips/parking space x 185 new spaces x 2 trips (in and out)(^3) – worst case</td>
<td>1,019 - max(^4) 611 – avg(^5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2010 California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Table 3-1.


**Note:**

1. Project size/intensity for is from the “Operational GHG Screening Size” column in Table 3-1, Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors and GHG Screening Level Sizes, contained in the Air District’s California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, 2010.


3. A multiplier is used to convert horse trailer parking space size to average vehicle parking space size.

4. The maximum 1,019 ADT is for worst-case conditions during the peak use season when all available spaces are full for the entire day. It is conservatively assumed that the average ADT over the full year is 60 percent of the maximum peak season demand, or approximately 611 ADT.

The average ADT for the proposed project is shown as the last entry in Table 8, ADT Screening Comparisons. As shown, the daily 611 ADT for the proposed project is well within the range of ADT for the representative project types illustrated. Further, as described previously, the volume of GHG emissions generated by the project from other sources (e.g. electricity consumption) would be significantly lower than most of the representative projects listed in Table 8. Based on this information, it can be qualitatively concluded that, like many other project types included in Table 3-1, the proposed project would not generate annual operational GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment.

**Construction Phase GHG Emissions**

Construction of the proposed project will result in GHG emissions during the short-term construction period. Table 3-1 in the Air District guidelines also includes screening criteria for construction emissions.
However, due to the highly variable construction processes, and equipment types and durations of use involved in constructing the diverse types of projects listed, the construction screening criteria are not particularly useful for screening the proposed project.

The primary demand for use of construction equipment, the primary source of GHG emissions during the construction process, would be in site preparation and construction of parking facilities at the new staging areas and for expanding the existing Ranger Station parking facilities. These activities would involve use of construction equipment that is typical of most construction project types. Construction of new trails may also involve limited use of typical, fossil-fuel powered equipment. But given that many proposed trail locations are within existing fire road locations or along other previously graded/manipulated locations, extensive or intensive use of heavy, fuel-powered equipment for trail construction is not anticipated. Based on the limited improvements proposed (e.g. no construction of significant structures, above- or below-ground utilities/infrastructure, etc.), the types and duration of use of fossil-fueled construction equipment would be similar to or lower than required to construct the project types shown in Table 3-1. It can be qualitatively assumed that construction emission volume for the proposed project would be within or below that generated by the threshold project sizes shown in Table 3-1. Therefore, construction emissions for the proposed project are not anticipated to have a significant impact on the environment.

Conclusions

Based on the analyses conducted in Greenhouse Gas Technical Memo and summarized above, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on the environment from generation of GHGs during its operational phase. Greenhouse gas emissions generated during the construction phase of the proposed project would also have a less than significant impact on the environment.

2. Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Policy or Regulation Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

As discussed above, the proposed project would generate GHG emissions during the construction and operational phases; however, the emissions are considered to be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate a significant level of GHG emissions, and would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. No Impact.

3. Hinder or Delay the State’s Ability to Meet the Reduction Target Contained in AB 32

As discussed above, the proposed project would generate GHG emissions during the construction and operational phases; however, the emissions are considered to be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate a significant level of GHG emissions, and would not hinder or delay the State’s ability to meet the reduction target (25 percent reduction by 2020) contained in AB 32. No Impact.
## I. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Involve risk of explosion or release of hazardous substances (including pesticides, herbicides, toxic substances, oil, chemicals or radioactive materials?)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provide breeding grounds for vectors?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Proposed site plan result in a safety hazard (i.e., parking layout, access, closed community, etc.)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Involve construction of a building, road or septic system on a slope of 30% or greater?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Involve construction of a roadway greater than 20% slope for a distance of 300' or more?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Be located within 200' of a 230KV or above electrical transmission line</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Create any health hazard?  
14. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards?  
15. Be located in an Airport Land Use Commission Safety Zone?  
16. Increase fire hazard in an area already involving extreme fire hazard?  
17. Be located on a cul-de-sacs over 800 ft. in length and require secondary access which will be difficult to obtain?  
18. Employ technology which could adversely affect safety in case of a breakdown?

**Discussion/Mitigation**

1. **Significant Hazard through Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials**

The only hazardous materials to be used at the project site will be during construction, and include fuels, oils and lubricants associated with various on-site vehicles and construction machinery. The *Santa Clara Countywide Trails Master Plan Update*, adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in 1995, and the *Santa Clara County Parks Trail Maintenance Manual* (County of Santa Clara 2005) establish the Draft County Parks Department best management practices (BMPs) for trail siting, trail construction, and trail maintenance. Furthermore, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be prepared for the project after final design. The implementation of the BMPs and the SWPPP would minimize the risks associated with transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials to the public or the environment at the project site. This impact is less than significant.

2. **Significant Hazard through Release of Hazardous Materials**

See discussion for impact #1, above. This impact is less than significant.

3. **Hazardous Emissions, Materials, Substances, or Waste within One-Quarter Mile of a School**

There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of Calero County Park. No Impact.

4. **Located on a Site which is Included on a List of Hazardous Materials Sites**

The Calero County Park is not 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 not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No Impact.
5. Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan

The proposed project is a Trails Master Plan for Calero County Park. The Draft Trails Master Plan proposes expansion of existing park facilities including new staging areas and additional trails. A use of this nature would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The addition of trails could help to serve as evacuation routes. **No Impact.**

6. Wildland Fires

The proposed project provides additional trails for public access and travel within Calero County Park, which includes large areas that have been identified by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection as high and very high fire hazard zones. The Draft Parks Master Plan was developed according to the Santa Clara County General Plan Policies C-PR-12 and C-PR-32. Implementing these policies will avoid or reduce impacts associated with wildland fires to **less than significant** levels. The policies are listed as follows:

*C-PR-12: Parks and trails in remote areas, fire hazardous areas, and areas with inadequate access should be planned to provide the services or improvements necessary to provide for the safety and support of the public using the parks and to avoid negative impacts on the surrounding area.*

*C-PR 32: Parks and trails in remote areas, fire hazardous areas, and areas with inadequate access shall be planned to:*

a. *provide the services or improvements necessary to provide for the safety and support of the public using the parks and trails; and*

b. *avoid negative impacts on the surrounding areas.*

7. Explosion or Release of Hazardous Substances

See discussion for impact #1, above. This impact is **less than significant.**

8. Vector Breeding Grounds

Potential vectors of disease found within Calero County Park include species such as mosquitoes, ticks, and various mammal species. Project activities would likely not increase populations of these species due to the implementation of standard County maintenance practices (e.g. keeping trash containers sealed shut and cleaned out on a regular basis, constructing trails to avoid pooling of water, posting education signs regarding the dangers of ticks). The County Parks Maintenance Division has been installing wildlife-proof trashcans to prevent impact by vectors and wildlife in use areas. **No Impact.**

9. Safety Hazard

The proposed project is a Trails Master Plan for Calero County Park. The Draft Trails Master Plan proposes expansion of existing park facilities including new staging areas, improvements to existing
staging areas, and additional trail mileage. The proposed improvements, including new staging areas would reduce minor safety hazards that currently exist related to controlling access and parking. No element of the Draft Trails Master Plan would result in new safety hazards. **No Impact.**

### 10. Slopes 30 Percent or Greater

The Draft Trails Master Plan does not contain any provisions to build a habitable structure, road, or septic system on any slopes within the project site. **No Impact.**

### 11. Roadway Construction on Greater than 20 Percent Slope for a Distance of 300' or More

See discussion for impact #10, above. **No Impact.**

### 12. Location within 200' of a 230KV or Above Electrical Transmission Line

Two high voltage power lines pass through the Rancho San Vicente area, in the northwest portion of the park. Various existing and proposed trails cross within 200’ of these transmission lines. These trails include the Cherry Cove Trail and other yet to be named 4’-6’ multiuse trails. Although these trails may be within 200’ of the transmission lines, the nature of trail use is temporary. Park visitors move through the landscape and are temporarily exposed to transmission lines. This indicates that there is no significant impact to park users or power transmission. This impact would be **less than significant.**

### 13. Health Hazard

A variety of potential health hazards currently exist at the park such as exposure to seismic hazards, wild animals, toxic and poisonous plants, and exposure to weather. However, implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan would not significantly increase exposure of people to these types of potential hazards. This impact would be **less than significant.**

### 14. Exposure to Existing Sources of Potential Health Hazards

See discussion for impact #13, above. This impact would be **less than significant**

### 15. Airport Land Use Commission Safety Zone

The closest airports to the Calero County Park include the San Jose International Airport (13 miles north of the project site), the Reid Hillview County Airport (9.5 miles northeast of the project site), and the San Martin County Airport (10 miles southeast of the project site) The Calero County Park is not within any of these Airport Land Use Commission Safety Zone. **No Impact.**

### 16. Increased Fire Hazard in an Area Already Involving Extreme Fire Hazard

See discussion for impact #6, above. This impact would be **less than significant**
17. Be Located on a Cul-De-Sac over 800 Feet in

The Draft Trails Master Plan does not include any provisions to build on a cul-de-sac. **No Impact.**

18. Employment of Technology which Could Adversely Affect Safety in Case of a Breakdown

There are no elements of the Draft Trails Master Plan that would employ technology which could adversely affect safety in case of a breakdown. **No Impact.**
### J. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</th>
<th>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</th>
<th>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 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>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 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>☐</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 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>☐</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Degrade surface or ground water quality or public water supply? (Including marine, fresh and wetland waters.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Place a structure 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>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 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>☐</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Be located in an area of special water quality concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3,4,5,15 |

12. Result in use of well water previously contaminated by nitrates, mercury, asbestos, etc. existing in the groundwater supply?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3,4,5 |

13. Result in a septic field being constructed on soil with severe septic drain field limitations or where a high water table extends close to the natural land surface?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3 |

14. 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?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3 |

15. Conflict with Water Resources Protection Collaborative Guidelines and Standards for Land Uses near Streams?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3,34 |

16. Result in extensions of a sewer trunk line with capacity to serve new development?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3 |

17. Require a NPDES permit for construction [Does it disturb one (1) acre or more]?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3,4,5,9 |

18. Result in significant changes to receiving waters quality during or following construction?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3,4,5,15,39,40 |

19. Is the project a tributary to an already impaired water body? If so will the project result in an increase in any existing pollutants?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 39,40 |

20. Substantially change the direction, rate of flow, or quantity, or quality of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3,40 |

21. Interfere substantially with ground water recharge or reduce the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3 |

22. Involve a surface water body, natural drainage channel, streambed or water course such as to alter the amount, location, course, or flow of its waters?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | 2,3 |

---

**Comment**

The analysis of hydrology and water quality is based in part on the memo prepared for Calero County Park: *Geologic and Hydrologic Opportunities and Constraints for Trail Planning* (Balance Hydrologics 2011).
Discussion/Mitigation

1. Violate Water Quality Standards

Regarding construction-related impacts, projects disturbing more than one acre of land during construction are required to file a notice of intent to be covered under the State NPDES Construction General Permit for discharges of storm water associated with construction activities. Based on the construction associated with the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan (185 new spaces plus additional size for 43 trailer spaces) and average trail disturbance, it estimated that the proposed project disturbance area would be approximately 2.5 acres (parking areas between three staging areas) and approximately 14.25 acres (total trail area throughout the park) incrementally over approximately a 10-year period.

As the proposed Trails Master Plan would disturb more than one acre of land, County Parks would be required to obtain a State NPDES Construction General Permit. Specifically the Construction General Permit requires incorporation of Low Impact Design techniques to ensure that future runoff does not exceed the rate and duration of existing, and the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that details how water quality would be protected during construction activities. The SWPPP must contain a site map(s) that shows the construction site perimeter, existing and proposed buildings, lots, roadways, storm water collection and discharge points, general topography (both before and after construction), and drainage patterns across the project. Best Management Practices (BMPs), which are detailed within each permit, are to be implemented to protect water quality.

To minimize the mobilization of sediment to creeks and other water bodies potentially affecting water quality, the Draft Trails Master Plan has identified several erosion and sediment-control BMPs that would be included in the SWPPP prepared for the project after final design. The SWPPP BMPs are based on standard County measures and standard dust-reduction measures and include the following:

1. Enclose and cover exposed stockpiles of dirt or other loose, granular construction materials that could contribute sediment to waterways.

2. Contain soil and filter runoff from distributed areas by berms, vegetated filters, silt fencing, straw wattles, plastic sheeting, catch basins, or other means necessary to prevent the escape of sediment from the disturbed areas.

3. Prohibit the placement of earth or organic material where it may be directly carried into a stream, swale, ditch, marsh, pond, or body of standing water.

4. Prohibit the following types of materials from being rinsed or washed into streets, shoulder areas, or ditches: concrete, solvents and adhesives, fuels, dirt, gasoline, asphalt, and concrete saw slurry.

5. Conduct dewatering activities according to the provisions of the SWPPP. Prohibit placement of dewatered materials in local water bodies or in storm drains leading to such bodies without implementation of proper construction water quality control measures.

6. The County Parks Department and its contractors should implement a monitoring program to verify effectiveness of the best management practices implemented as part of the SWPPP. The
monitoring program would begin at the outset of construction activities and terminate upon completion of the project.

By complying with the Construction General Stormwater Permit requirements outlined above, and incorporating the BMPs outlined in the Draft Trails Master Plan, the potential water quality impacts from construction activities would be minimized and the impact of excessive runoff water or polluted runoff will be less than significant. The impact is **less than significant.**

### 2. Substantially Deplete or Interfere with Groundwater

Under existing conditions, park activities require groundwater pumping only to supply a water tank used for fire suppression purposes. The proposed project would not result in an increase in demand for groundwater as no new sources of such demand would be created. **No Impact.**

### 3. and 4. Alter Drainage Resulting in Erosion, Siltation, or Flooding On or Off Site

The floodplain of any stream or river is an important part of flow conveyance during periods of high water. In order to protect these areas, the hydrologic opportunities and constraints of Calero County Park were evaluated in a study conducted in 2011 (*Park Geologic and Hydrologic Opportunities and Constraints for Trail Planning, Calero County Park, Santa Clara County, California* Balance Hydrologics). The findings of the evaluation have been incorporated into the project’s hydrological BMPs into the plan for trails in areas of steep slopes or in areas adjacent to a creek or riparian areas. The BMPs as identified in the Draft Trails Master Plan (pages 67-68) include:

1. In order to reduce erosion and maintenance problems during construction, disturbance to the soil surface should be kept to a minimum.

2. Where a potential for significant soil erosion exists along a new trail alignment, specific erosion control plans should be developed by a Registered Civil or Soils Engineer as part of the trail construction documentation. Criteria to be used in determining the erosion potential include: slope; soil type; soil composition and permeability; and the relative stability of the underlying geologic unit as identified on local General Plans or other adopted planning documents.

3. Keep “tread watersheds” small. A tread watershed is the amount of area that drains to a specific spot off of a trail (Parker, 2004). Increasing the frequency of rolling dips is an easy way to reduce the area of each tread watershed. Reducing tread width of the trail is another way to reduce the tread watershed. Compacted trail surfaces produce more surface runoff than the uncompacted soil next to the trail; narrow trails would produce less concentrated runoff than wide trails (with all other factors being equal).

4. Frequent grade reversals should be built into a trail (as a backup to out-sloping), to avoid water flow along a trail. Also known as “rolling grade dips”, they should be placed to enhance natural grade dips. Rolling grade dips are long and gentle features (12 to 20 feet long) that avoid the short and abrupt style of traditional “water bars” (Klein, 2003; Riter and Riter, 2005).
5. Contour trails should be cut on a full bench, rather than a combination of cut and fill. The cut material should be broadcast downslope, unless the trail is near a creek. Cut material can also be utilized for the ramp section of rolling dips if it is compacted one layer at a time.

6. If trails are located in riparian zones extra precautions should be taken, such as using paving stones or other rock work to armor the trail surface. Provide settling areas for trail drainage where water can infiltrate and sediment can settle out, such as brush boxes.

7. Rock drains and gravel surfaces should be used where trails cross seep areas. This is better than having trail users bypass the soggy area in ever-increasing arcs. Use soil amendments such as sand, crushed rock, or gravel to make a trail less prone to compaction and displacement; amendments can also help the tread drain better.

8. Constructed creek crossings should not greatly alter the cross-sectional shape of the channel or floodplain.

9. The approach to a creek crossing should slope downward toward the creek, and climb when traveling away from the creek, so that in the event of a blockage in the channel, the creek water would not be diverted to flow along the trail.

10. The source of water for horse troughs will only come from seeps and springs; water will not be diverted from creeks or other waterways.

The Countywide Trails Master Plan requires the preparation of an erosion control plan where there is potential for significant erosion along a new trail alignment and this has been included in the BMPs for this project. Adherence to these policies as part of the implementation of the Hydrological BMPs, and erosion control measures as part of the SWPPP (see discussion under Impact 1 above) would avoid or reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. The impact is considered to be less than significant.

5. Increase Impervious Surfaces and Associated Runoff Exceeding the Capacity of Drainage Systems or Provide Substantial Additional Sources of Polluted Runoff

Implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan will not create large amounts of impervious surfaces that would change absorption rates, drainage patterns or the rate and amount or quality of surface runoff. All parking surfaces will be an all weather aggregate surface on a compacted rock base. Surface storm water will be directed to swales for on-site infiltration. Due to storm water contact with horse manure, storm water may be directed to a storm water detention pond. Trails are constructed of native soils, compacted and sloped for drainage. Gravel or crushed rock reinforcement and stabilization may be required in some locations. Some existing trails which have proven difficult to maintain due to erosion or hydrologic activity are classified for abandonment and restoration. Restoring almost five acres would increase absorption rates and result in a beneficial effect.

As described above under water quality impacts (Impact 1) and drainage and flooding impacts (Impact 3 and 4), the Construction General Stormwater Permit requires that measures are incorporated to ensure that post-development runoff does not exceed the rate and duration of pre-development runoff. Prior to
construction, County Parks will be required to submit a site-specific, design level drainage and hydrology plan, which includes a SWPPP in compliance with all applicable state and local code requirements.

These requirements will ensure that the proposed project would not create or contribute run-off water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the impact is **less than significant.**

6. **Degrade Surface or Ground Water Quality or Public Water Supply**

The requirements outlined under Impact 1-5 above, will ensure that implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan will not result in substantial additional sources of polluted runoff that would have the potential to degrade water quality. The impact is **less than significant.**

7. **Place Structures within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area**

Based on Flood Insurance Rate Maps of the area prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, a small portion of Calero County Park is within the 100-year Flood Zone. This is the area along Calero Creek below the Calero Reservoir. One existing trail is located below the reservoir; however no structures are proposed to be constructed in the 100-Flood Zone. **No Impact.**

9. **Expose People or Structures to Flooding**

The only dam that would potentially cause flooding is the Calero Park Reservoir Dam. The implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan would not add new residents or structures downstream of this dam. One existing trail is located below the dam on a service road. A seismic event could cause localized flooding as a result of dam failure at the Calero Reservoir. Localized flooding of trail crossings is also possible during heavy storms. When deemed necessary due to public safety, trails in areas of localized flooding will be temporarily closed per the County Parks Department’s trail closure policy and procedures. This impact is **less than significant.**

10. **Increase in Pollutant Discharges to Receiving Waters**

The impact is **less than significant.** See Discussion under Impacts 1, 3, and 6 above.

11. **Area of Special Water Quality Concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)**

The project is not within an area of special water concern. **No Impact.**

12. **Use of Previously Contaminated Well Water**

Implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan would not involve the use of a previously contaminated well. **No Impact.**
13. Construction of a Septic Field with Field Limitations or in Proximity of a Water Feature

The Draft Trails Master Plan identifies that new restrooms will be provided at the Ranger Station and the new Rancho San Vicente staging area. County Parks has indicated that the preferred restroom option is installation of a septic system rather than sanitary sewer line hookup since they are outside of City of San Jose services. Installation of septic system would require a permit by the County of Santa Clara Health Department.

Prior to construction, County Parks will be required to submit a site-specific, design-level septic plan, which includes percolation test and measures of compliance with all applicable state and local code requirements. The septic plan will be required to identify location and proximity of any water features and ensure that the septic field is not 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. It is unlikely that field limitation will be an issue as the Park has ample open space and options for septic system location and design.

These requirements will ensure that the proposed project would not create or contribute to potential impacts associated with septic with field limitations or proximity of water features. Therefore, there is no impact.

15. Conflict with Water Resources Protection Collaborative Guidelines and Standards for Land Uses Near Streams

The Draft Trails Master Plan will not conflict with Water Resources Protection Collaborative Guidelines and Standards for Land Uses near Streams (Santa Clara Valley Water District. 2007). No Impact. Please also see response to Impact 1, 3 and 4 above.

16. Sewer Trunk Extension

The Draft Trails Master Plan will not result in extensions of a sewer trunk line with capacity to serve new development. No Impact.

17. Require a NPDES Permit

See discussion under Impact 1. Water Quality, above. The proposed Trails Master Plan will disturb more than one acre and will be required to secure an NPDES permit. Upon obtaining the permit and implementing required permit conditions, the impact would be considered less than significant.

18. Changes to Receiving Waters Quality

See discussion under Impact 1, 3 and 4 above. The impact is considered less than significant.
19. Tributary to an Already Impaired Water Body

The Draft Trails Master Plan area is not a tributary to an already impaired water body. **No Impact.**

20. Substantially Change the Direction, Rate of Flow, or Quantity, or Quality of Ground Waters

Implementation of the Draft Calero Trails Master Plan will not substantially change the direction, rate of flow, or quantity, or quality of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations. See also discussion under Impact 2 above. **No Impact.**

21. Interfere Substantially with Ground Water

This impact was discusses earlier as Impact 2. The impact is **less than significant.**

22. Alter the Flow of Water

The Draft Calero Trails Master Plan does not involve the alteration of the amount, location, course, or flow of a surface water body, natural drainage channel, streambed, or water course. **No Impact.**
### K. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 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, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conflict with special policies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. San Martin and/or South County</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Los Gatos Specific Plan or Lexington Watershed</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. East Foothills Policy Area</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. New Almaden Historic Area/Guadalupe Watershed</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Stanford</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. San Jose</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Mitigation**

1. **Divide an Established Community**

The project is the implementation of a Trails Master Plan within an existing County Park. The proposed improvements would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. **No Impact.**
2. Conflict with Applicable Plans or Policies Adopted by Agencies with Jurisdiction over the Project

The Draft Trails Master Plan project involves trail design and construction, infrastructure modification and park improvements within an existing park within Santa Clara County’s jurisdiction. These activities do not conflict with any applicable County’s General Plan, policies, or regulations. However, the proposed project is located within the permit area of the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (Valley Habitat Plan) and identified as a "covered activity" under the Valley Habitat Plan.

The project design and analysis process included a detailed review of the conditions for covered activities under the Valley Habitat Plan (Chapter 6), ensuring that the Trails Master Plan project design practices and features would incorporate special-status resource impact avoidance and minimization measures directly into plans for new park infrastructure.

Mitigation measure BIO-4 (Biological Resources section of this Initial Study) requires that applicable covered species conditions required by the Valley Habitat Plan be incorporated as project design features. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-4 will ensure that the proposed Trails Master Plan will be consistent with the Valley Habitat Plan and will minimize/avoid potential project impacts to covered species. The impact is less than significant with mitigation.

2. Conflict with General Plan Designation or Zoning

The Draft Trails Master Plan project involves trail design and construction, infrastructure modification and park improvements within an existing park within Santa Clara County’s jurisdiction. These activities do not conflict with any applicable general plan designation or zoning. No Impact.

3. Conflict with Special Policies

a. San Martin and/or South County

The project is not located in San Martin or South County. No Impact.

b. Los Gatos Specific Plan or Lexington Watershed

The project is not located in an area covered by the Los Gatos Specific Plan. The project also does not propose alteration or new sewage facilities as regulated by the County Lexington Basin Ordinance relating to sewage disposal. No Impact.

c. East Foothills Policy Area

The project is not located in the East Foothills Policy Area. No Impact.

d. New Almaden Historic Area/Guadalupe Watershed

The project is not located in the New Almaden Historical Area or in the Guadalupe Watershed. No Impact.
e. Stanford

The project is not located on Stanford-owned land. **No Impact.**

f. San Jose

Much of Calero County Park lies within the limits of the City of San Jose, but is outside the boundary of the City’s Urban Service Area. The park is within the County’s jurisdiction. The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan does not conflict with any special Policies of the City of San Jose. **No Impact.**

4. Incompatibility with Existing Land Use

The majority lands in Calero County Park have been open to the public for recreation for many years. The recently acquired Rancho San Vicente portion of the park is leased for grazing to a private operator. Access for the grazing operation is from McKean Road, near the intersection of Fortini Road. Atop the major knoll within Rancho San Vicente, a small portion of land is leased to another private entity for a radio transmission tower. Access to the radio tower is provided by the same service road as the grazing operation. The Rancho San Vicente portion of the park is also bisected by the Almaden Calero Canal. Owned by the Santa Clara Valley Water District, this concrete-lined canal is part of the District’s raw water distribution system and transports water from the Almaden Valley Watershed into Calero Reservoir. The canal is not fenced and no public access is allowed along its service road. San Jose Water Company has a 2.8 acre in-holding on the western edge of the park, above the Almaden Calero Canal. Two power transmission lines cross the Rancho San Vicente area.

The proposed Rancho San Vicente staging area will provide a new park entrance off McKean Road. Aligned with Fortini Road, it will accommodate public access to a portion of the park that is currently closed to the public. It will also preserve service access for the existing cattle grazing operation, the Almaden Calero Canal (operated by the Santa Clara Valley Water District), and the radio tower leasehold. The southwestern portion of Calero County Park, previously part of Cañada del Oro, is slated for grazing operations starting within the next two years.

The proposed Trails Master Plan complies with natural resource management goals and practices, including managed grazing, as were established in relevant natural resource and grazing management plans for the park.

Proposed improvements associated with the Draft Trails Master Plan will open the Rancho San Vicente area to the public, but historic uses such as grazing, the canal, and the radio tower will continue. This does not represent a significant change in land use and is compatible with existing land uses, and uses in surrounding parks and open space preserves. Where trails leave Calero County Park and pass into the parks of neighboring agencies, signage will be erected to inform park users of changes in permissible trail uses and regulations. The impact is **less than significant.**
L. MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESULT IN...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Result in substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion/Mitigation

1. Loss of Availability of a Known Mineral Resource

Calero County Park is not currently mined for minerals and the proposed project does not propose any mining activities. The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not preclude future mining operations should the County decide to do so. No Impact.

2. Loss of Availability of a Locally Important Mineral Site Delineated on a Land Use Plan

There are no mineral recovery sites delineated within Calero County Park. No Impact.

3. Result in Substantial Depletion of any Non-Renewable Natural Resource

Heavy equipment such as bulldozers and trucks would be used to create the two new staging areas and to reconfigure and expand the Ranger Station Staging area. However, this equipment would be only used once, during the construction phase, so large quantities of fuels would not be used. No other non-renewable resources would be used. No Impact. See also Section F, Energy, of this Initial Study.
**M. NOISE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>IMPACTS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase substantially the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas during and/or after construction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

Calero County Park is located in a rural setting. With the exception of Rancho Cañada del Oro Open Space Preserve on its southwest border, Calero Park is surrounded by private small ranches and rural residences. The Cinnabar Hills Golf Course is adjacent to the southern end of the park east of McKean Road.

The only potential sensitive noise receptors would be residences along McKean and Almaden Road. The majority of the trails in Draft Trails Master Plan are situated away from these homes. However, there are several single-family homes located along Fortini Road north of McKean Road in the vicinity of the proposed new San Vicente Staging Area. There are also single-family homes along Almaden Road in the vicinity of the proposed new staging area.

Santa Clara County has a noise ordinance (Chapter VII of the code). Under the ordinance, construction activities are allowed from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, Monday through Saturday.

**Discussion/Mitigation**

1. **Exposure of Persons to, or Generation of, Excessive Noise**

There would be temporary and periodic increases in the ambient noise levels at Calero County Park resulting from project construction. However, because the noise would be temporary, and would be
limited to daytime hours per the County’s noise ordinance, the impact is considered **less than significant**. Once construction is completed, the project would not affect ambient noise levels.

2. **Exposure of Persons to, or Generation of, Excessive Noise Groundborne Vibration or Noise**

Since the County would comply with the Santa Clara County noise ordinance, which limits construction noise to the hours of 7:00 am and 7:00 pm Monday through Saturday, the effect of the machine noise would be less than significant. Construction vibration is considered a less than significant impact because of the temporary nature of the noise and the remoteness of the locations where the construction activity would take place.

3. **4. Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise in Vicinity and Adjoining Areas**

As presented in the transportation/traffic section of this initial study, the proposed project could result in additional park visitors, which would result in a small increase in vehicle trips. The additional vehicle trips are considered minimal and any changes in the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the staging areas are not anticipated to be noticeable. This impact is considered **less than significant**.
## N. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Induce substantial population 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>2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

#### 1. Induce Substantial Population Growth

Implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not result in substantial population growth either directly or indirectly. No new residential development will occur as a result of the project as the proposed improvements. **No Impact.**

#### 2. Displace Housing

Implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not displace housing necessitating the development of new residential development elsewhere. **No Impact.**

#### 3. Displace People

Implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan will not displace the local population or necessitate the construction of replacement housing. **No Impact.**
## O. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

1. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5
   ii) Police Protection? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5
   iii) School facilities? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5
   iv) Parks? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5
   v) Other public facilities? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5

2. Induce substantial growth or concentration of population? (Growth inducing?) ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5

3. Employ equipment which could interfere with existing communications or broadcast systems? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5

4. Increase the need for new systems or supplies, or cause substantial alterations to the following utilities:
   a. Electricity or Natural gas ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5
   b. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5
   c. Local or regional water supplies ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5
   d. Sewage disposal ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5
   e. Storm water drainage ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1, 3, 5
   f. Solid waste or litter ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 2, 31

### Discussion

1. **Adverse Physical Impacts Associated with the Provision of New or Physically Altered Government Facilities**

   a. **Fire Protection**

   Implementation of the Draft Trails Master would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts requiring new or physical alterations to existing governmental fire protection facilities. **No Impact.**
b. Police Protection

The Draft Trails Master Plan recommended a new full-time Park Ranger position be added for implementation of the plan. But it also identified that Partnership opportunities with volunteers and docents to assist in trails watch and education programs may offset additional ranger staffing needs for the Trails Master Plan (Draft Trails Master Plan, page 77). Regardless, this minor staffing addition will not require new or physical alterations to existing police protection facilities. **No Impact.**

c. School Facilities

The proposed project does not include the construction of any new housing units or induce population growth and therefore would not increase the need for additional schools. **No Impact.**

d. Parks

The redesign of the Ranger Station staging area and the two new Staging areas have been planned to increase the efficiency of parking spaces that will maximize the carrying capacity of several parking lots. A significant benefit will result from the improved parking areas including accessibility to the park. Implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan will not increase the use of the park such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. **No Impact.**

e. Other Government Facilities

The Draft Trails Master Plan will not require new or physical alterations other government facilities. **No Impact.**

2. Growth Inducement

Implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan would not result in substantial population growth either directly or indirectly. No new residential development will occur as a result of the project as the proposed improvements. **No Impact.** Also see Section N. Population and Housing, above.

3. Equipment which Could Interfere with Existing Communications or Broadcast Systems

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan does not employ any equipment that would interfere with existing communications or broadcast systems in the plan implementation. **No Impact.**

4. Increase the Need for New or Altered Utilities

a. Electricity or Natural Gas

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan does not contain new facilities that would use electricity or natural gas. **No Impact.**
b. Local or Regional Water Treatment or Distribution Facilities

No Impact. The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan does not propose additional facilities that would generate water requiring water treatment or distribution facilities. **No Impact.**

c. Local or Regional Water Supplies

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan does not contemplate new water fountains, or water uses that would affect Calero County Park water entitlements. **No Impact.**

d. Sewage Disposal

The project would not increase demand on existing public services providers. The need for and potential effects of installation of a new septic system are described in Section G. Geology, Section J. Hydrology and Water Quality above. **No impact.**

e. Storm Water Drainage

The Draft Trails Master Plan includes new staging areas, including parking areas with all weather aggregate surface on a compacted rock base surface. Surface storm water will be directed to swales for on-site infiltration. Due to storm water contact with horse manure, contact storm water may be directed to a storm water detention pond. All drainage from surface areas would be retained on-site, therefore, implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan would not result in the need to construct new storm water treatment facilities. **No Impact.**

f. Solid Waste or Litter

The Kirby Canyon Landfill, located at 910 Coyote Creek Golf Drive in Morgan Hill is the closest landfill, approximately 5.5 miles east of the project site. According to a study by the California Integrated Waste Management Board, in 2004, the Kirby Canyon Landfill had a remaining lifespan of 29 years. Post-project solid waste volumes generated at the project site are expected to increase; however, this increase is negligible. Therefore, of the Draft Trails Master Plan would not affect the ability of the local landfill to serve Calero County Park and would not require the construction of new solid waste facilities. **No Impact.**
## Discussion

1. **Increase the Use of Recreational Facilities**

It is anticipated that expanding the trail system, increasing trail mileage, and providing access to additional types of users, including walkers with dogs on-leash will accommodate the public demand for multiple-use trails and increase park attendance. The Trails Master Plan provides a framework for encouraging increased use of the park while supporting protection and enhancement of the sensitive cultural and environmental within the park and ensuring that park facilities are adequate and sufficiently maintained over a ten-year time frame.

Implementation of the proposed Draft Trails Master Plan will not increase the use of the park such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Removing the dogs on-leash restriction on most trails in the park will not increase the use of the park such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. It will create compliance with current County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation policies that allow dogs in parks and on trails under the provisions outlined in County of Santa Clara Ordinance Code (Section B14-34.1 Pets in Parks). The impact is **less than significant**.
2. New or Expanded Recreational Facilities that Have an Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment

The proposed project is a Trails Master Plan for Calero County Park. The Draft Trails Master Plan proposes expansion of existing park facilities including opening public access to the newly acquired Rancho San Vicente portion of the park, new staging areas and additional trail mileage. The potential for impacts as a result of park expansion is evaluated throughout this Initial Study. Where project implementation is identified to result in environmental impacts, mitigation is provided to ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. **Less Significant with Mitigation.**

3. Be on an Existing Recreation Area or Affect Existing or Future Recreational Opportunities

The project is the implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan at an existing County park. Implementation of the project would improve accessibility, open public access to the newly acquired Rancho San Vicente portion of the park, expand the trail system within the park and provide regional trail linkages. The Draft Trails Master Plan would increase recreational opportunities at Calero County Park resulting in a significant beneficial impact. **Less than Significant.**

4. Result in Loss of Open Space Rated as High Priority for Acquisition in the “Preservation 20/20” Report

Implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan will not result in the loss of Open Space. **No Impact.**
### Q. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOULD THE PROJECT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 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 freeway, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 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>3. 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>4. 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>6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Not provide safe access, obstruct access to nearby uses or fail to provide for future street right of way?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment

This section is based on the Focused Transportation Analysis for Calero County Park Trails Master Plan prepared by Fehr & Peers in June 2013 (Transportation Memo) which is included in this Initial Study as Appendix D. The traffic analysis focuses on the operations of Almaden Road and McKean Road at the access points to the two new proposed staging areas. Methodology employed includes: traffic counts to determine the existing vehicle volumes; estimates of maximum traffic generated by the proposed project; estimates of future traffic conditions with the proposed project; an evaluation of sight distance; an evaluation of bicycle, pedestrian and equestrian travel; and an evaluation of the staging area site plans.

Discussion/Mitigation

1. Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Ordinance or Policy Establishing Measures of Effectiveness for the Performance of the Circulation System

Existing Vehicle Volumes

Five-day traffic counts (Wednesday through Sunday) were conducted on Almaden Road and McKean Road adjacent to the proposed staging areas to determine the existing vehicle volumes. The data survey results indicate an average of 1,930 vehicles per day (vpd) use Almaden Road and 5,092 vpd use McKean Road on a typical weekday, and 2,182 vpd use Almaden Road and 3,953 vpd use McKean Road on a typical weekend day. The peak hours vary by direction. Almaden Road has the highest volume of traffic at 7:45am (125 vehicles) and 5:00pm (155 vehicles) on weekdays, and 10:30am (186 vehicles) and 12:15pm (187 vehicles) on weekend days. McKean Road has the highest volume of traffic at 7:30am (396 vehicles) and 4:30pm (398 vehicles) on weekdays, and 11:15am (327 vehicles) and 2:15pm (344 vehicles) on weekend days. These counts represent the maximum total combined number of vehicles traveling in both directions within a one hour period. The 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) states that a two-lane highway has the capacity of up to 1,700 vehicles per hour in a peak direction. The average peak hour volumes on Almaden Road and McKean Road are well within their capacity.

The Transportation Memo prepared for the project also evaluated peak vehicle trip generation to the park and found that the worst-case, maximum trip generation occurs during peak weekends in the spring. Under existing conditions, maximum use of the 28 existing parking spaces at the Ranger Station generates about 154 vehicle trips per day.

Maximum Traffic Generated by the Proposed Project

In total, the proposed staging areas will provide approximately 185 net new automobile and trailer parking spaces: five at Almaden Road, 115 at Rancho San Vicente, and 65 at the Ranger Station. As identified in Table 4 of the Transportation Memo, the proposed new parking spaces would enable up to a maximum total of 1,019 new daily traffic trips (28 on Almaden Road, and 990 on McKean Road). Of these trips, three are expected on Almaden Road and 99 on McKean Road during the peak AM hour. It is noted that this is the worst-case condition that is assumed to occur during a limited number of weekends during a limited portion of the year.

Future Traffic Conditions with the Proposed Project
The trip generation estimates were added to the existing traffic volumes to arrive at the future vehicle volumes, which are shown in Table 5 of the Transportation Memo. On an average weekday, peak morning hour traffic volumes are estimated to be 128 trips (25 existing + 3 future) on Almaden Road, and 495 trips (396 existing + 99 future) on McKean Road. On an average weekend, peak morning hour traffic volumes are estimated to be 189 trips (186 existing + 3 future) on Almaden Road, and 426 trips (327 existing + 99 future) on McKean Road. The roadway volumes with the staging area projects are still well within the roadway’s peak hour capacity of 1,700 trips per peak direction on both Almaden Road and McKean Road.

Conclusion

The amount of traffic generated by the proposed new and modified staging areas is not expected to substantially affect the traffic operations of the surrounding roadway system. Therefore the proposed project would not conflict with any plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. **No Impact.**

2. Conflict with an Applicable Congestion Management Program

The *Valley Transportation Plan 2040* (Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, 2013) is the countywide long-range transportation plan for Santa Clara County. As the Congestion Management Agency for the county, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority periodically updates this 25-year plan. The Valley Transportation Plan 2040 provides a planning and policy framework for developing and delivering future transportation projects and provides input to the Regional Transportation Plan for the Bay Area that is prepared by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

As discussed above, the proposed project is expected to generate three peak hour trips on Almaden Road and 99 on McKean Road during the peak AM hour. It is re-emphasized that this is the worst-case condition that is assumed to occur during a limited number of weekends during a limited portion of the year. As identified in the Transportation Memo, because the project would generate fewer than 100 peak-hour trips, a comprehensive Congestion Management Plan analysis, or Transportation Impact Analysis consistent with requirements of the *Valley Transportation Plan 2040* and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority is not required. As such, future development and operation of the site consistent with the proposed Trails Master Plan would not conflict with the Congestion Management Program. **No Impact.**

3. Result in a Change in Air Traffic Patterns

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip and therefore would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. **No Impact.**

4. Substantially Increase Hazards Due to a Design Feature or Incompatible Uses

Due to the increase in vehicles with trailers accessing the staging area locations, the Transportation Memo included an analysis of stopping sight distance. As defined by the Caltrans Highway Design manual, sight distance is the continuous length of highway ahead, visible to the highway user. Stopping
sight distance is the minimum sight distance for a given design speed to be provided on multilane highways and on 2-lane roads. The available stopping sight distance was measured in the field.

The Highway Design Manual requires a stopping sight distance of 250 for roadways with a design speed of 35 MPH, and 300 feet for roadways with a design speed of 40 mph. However, sight observations indicate that vehicles on McKean Road typically exceed the posted speed limit. Therefore, a design speed of 50 mph was used, which corresponds to a minimum stopping sight distance of 430 feet. The results of the sight distance review are presented in Table 6 of the Transportation Memo.

As identified in Table 6 of the Transportation Memo, the sight distance from the Ranger Station entrance south on McKean Road is approximately 400 feet, which is less than the required sight distance of 430 feet. This is considered a significant impact. All other sight distances were determined to be adequate.

**Mitigation Measure**

The following mitigation measure shall be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and/or all future construction documents:

\[
T-1. \quad \text{The tree located about 400 feet south the Ranger Station entrance on the east edge of McKean Road of the entrance shall be trimmed to increase and sight distance to a minimum distance of 430 feet. The trimming shall be regularly maintained to ensure sight distance is preserved.}
\]

Implementation of this mitigation measure shall ensure that adequate sight distance to the Ranger Station entrance is established and maintained. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**5. Result in Inadequate Emergency Access**

Implementation of the proposed Trails Master Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access. **No Impact.**

**6. Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Public Transit, Bicycle, or Pedestrian Facilities, or Otherwise Decrease the Performance or Safety of Such Facilities**

The Santa Clara Countywide Trails Master Plan Update (1995) proposes bicycle facilities for both McKean Road and Almaden Road. An on-street bicycle route is proposed for Almaden Road and an on-street bicycle route with a parallel trail is proposed for McKean Road. The project will not conflict with adopted alternative transportation plans or facilities related to alternative transportation (bus/train routes or facilities, bicycle routes, etc.), but will enhance alternative transportation opportunities as the regional trail linkages are implemented. **No Impact.**
7. Not provide safe access, obstruct access to nearby uses or fail to provide for future street right of way.

Providing access and connectivity is a key component in the Trails master Plan. No future street rights-of-way are needed to implement the Draft Trails Master Plan. **No Impact.**

8. Increase Traffic Hazards to Pedestrians, Bicyclists and Vehicles

As identified above under Impact 6, the Santa Clara Countywide Trails Master Plan Update (1995) proposes bicycle facilities for both McKean Road and Almaden Road. Currently bicyclists typically traveled on the right side of the travel lane, or in the shoulder when space allowed. As noted in the Transportation Memo, the existing daily volumes indicate that the number of conflicts with bicycles and vehicles are low. Due to the minimal amount of traffic added by the proposed staging areas, the number of conflicts between these two modes would not substantially increase.

The Transportation Memo also identified that pedestrian activity on McKean Road is very low. McKean Road is a rural roadway and there are no pedestrian facilities near the staging areas. The proposed Rancho San Vicente staging area is expected to generate cross traffic to Fortini Road as pedestrians access Santa Teresa County Park. Due to the high speed limit on McKean Road and the low pedestrian volumes, the Transportation Memo recommend installing a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB), a device which includes small rectangular yellow flashing lights that are deployed with pedestrian crossing warning signs. The lights are actuated by a pedestrian pushbutton and flash for a predetermined about of time to allow the pedestrian to cross the roadway. RRFBs help warn drivers of crossing pedestrians ahead. The Transportation Memo also recommended that a high-visibility crosswalk be placed adjacent to the RRFB to direct pedestrians to the proper place to cross the street. In addition, a pedestrian and equestrian warning sign (W11-2 and W11-7) should be provided to warn drivers of the potential for pedestrians and equestrians in the roadway. In addition, to further ensure safety, the entrance should separate inbound/outbound traffic and deceleration lanes should be added along McKean Road. While these measures may be recommended, County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department may require additional or alternative provisions to provide safe pedestrian crossing prior to final design and implementation.

Almaden Road runs through a rural residential neighborhood and field observations indicated very low pedestrian activity. However, because the staging area will be located within vicinity of several residences, it is expected that some pedestrians will walk to the staging area and the appropriate signage (W11-2 and W11-7) should be provided to warn drivers of the potential for pedestrians and equestrians in the roadway.

**Mitigation**

To ensure that potential hazards to pedestrians, equestrians, bicyclists and vehicles associated with the proposed new San Vicente Staging Area and improvements at the Almaden Road Staging area are reduced, the following mitigation measure is required.

**New San Vicente Staging Area**
T-2. The following improvements will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and implemented prior to opening the San Vicente Staging Area:

a. A Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) or other pedestrian crossing provisions to be developed in coordination with County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department prior to final design and implementation shall be installed on McKean Road at the Fortini Road intersection to alert drivers of crossing pedestrians.

b. A high-visibility crosswalk adjacent to the RRFB or other pedestrian crossing provisions to be developed in coordination with County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department prior to final design and implementation shall be installed to direct pedestrians to the proper crossing location on McKean Road.

c. Pedestrian and equestrian warning signs (W11-2 and W11-7) shall be placed approximately 20 feet in advance of the high-visibility crosswalk on McKean Road. Actual configuration to be further coordinated with County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department prior to implementation.

d. The Rancho San Vicente driveway entrance shall include one inbound and one outbound lane.

e. Remove a vehicle parking space at the trail entrance to provide adequate space to enter and exit the trail.

f. An eastbound right-turn deceleration lane and a westbound left-turn pocket shall be added on McKean Road. The deceleration lane and turn-pocket shall extend approximately 200 feet from the intersection. Actual configuration to be further coordinated with County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department prior to final design and implementation.

g. The Rancho San Vicente entrance sign shall be installed perpendicular to McKean Road to maximize its visibility.

Almaden Road Staging Area Improvements

T-3 The following improvements will be incorporated into the Trails Master Plan and implemented prior to completing improvements at the Almaden Road Staging Area:

a. Pedestrian and equestrian warning signs (W11-2 and W11-7) shall be installed on Almaden Road to alert drivers for pedestrians and equestrians in the roadway. Actual configuration to be further coordinated with County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department prior to implementation.

b. The Almaden Road staging driveway entrance shall include one inbound and one outbound lane.

c. The Almaden Road staging area entrance sign shall be installed perpendicular to Almaden Road to maximize its visibility.
Implementation of the mitigation identifies above will reduce potential safety impacts to pedestrians, equestrians, and bicyclists to a less than significant level by incorporating necessary safety mechanisms and facilities identified in the Transportation Memo. The impact is less than significant with mitigation.

9. Increased Demand for On or Off-street Parking Because of Inadequate Project Parking

A net of up to 185 new parking spaces will be provided at the existing and new staging areas (65 new spaces at Ranger Station, 115 new spaces at Rancho San Vicente, and five new spaces at Almaden Road). Implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan will not require additional parking beyond what has been proposed therefore, there will be no increased demand for additional project parking. Parking has not been identified as an impact in the Transportation Memo Reference Transportation Memo. No Impact.
## R. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Not be able to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion/Mitigation

#### 1. Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan includes a new restroom at the Ranger Station and the Rancho San Vicente staging area. Table 4 of the Draft Trails Master Plan identifies the new restroom(s) as “Vault system, septic hook up, or sanitary sewer.” A leach field is identified on the conceptual map for the Ranger Station. County Parks has indicated that the preferred restroom option is installation of a septic system rather than sanitary sewer line hookup since they are outside of City of San Jose services. Installation of septic system would require a permit by the County of Santa Clara Health Department. In the unlikely event of sanitary sewer hookup, permits would be required from the City of San Jose. The County or City permits would require that the Permitee agrees to operate in accordance with all applicable state and local regulations, laws, and inspection procedures needed to ensure compliance.
Prior to construction, County Parks will be required to submit a site-specific, design-level septic (or sanitary hookup) plan, which includes a percolation test and measures of compliance with all applicable state and local code requirements. These requirements will ensure that the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements. **No impact.** Also refer to Section J. Hydrology and Water Quality and Section O. Public Services.

### 2. Result in Construction of New Water or Wastewater Facilities

The proposed project is a Trails Master Plan. The project does not propose additional facilities that would generate water requiring new or expanded water treatment or distribution facilities. **No Impact.** Also refer Section G. Geology, Section J. Hydrology and Water Quality and Section O. Public Services.

### 3. Result in the Construction of New Storm Water Facilities

The Draft Trails Master Plan includes new staging areas, including parking areas with all weather aggregate surface on a compacted rock base surface. Surface storm water will be directed to swales for on-site infiltration. Due to storm water contact with horse manure, contact storm water may be directed to a storm water detention pond. All drainage from surface areas would be retained on-site. Therefore, implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan would not result in the need to construct new storm water treatment facilities. **No Impact.**

### 4. Sufficient Water Supplies to Serve the Project

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan does not contemplate new water fountains, or other water uses that would affect Calero County Park water entitlements. **No Impact.**

### 5. Adequate Wastewater Treatment Capacity

The proposed project is a Trails Master Plan. The project does not propose additional facilities that would generate water requiring new or expanded water treatment facilities. **No Impact.**

### 6. Sufficient Landfill Capacity

The Kirby Canyon Landfill, located at 910 Coyote Creek Golf Drive in Morgan Hill is the closest landfill, approximately 5.5 miles east of the project site. According to a study by the California Integrated Waste Management Board, in 2004, the Kirby Canyon Landfill had a remaining lifespan of 29 years. Post-project solid waste volumes generated at the project site are expected to increase; however, this increase is negligible. Therefore, implementation of the Draft Trails Master Plan would not affect the ability of the local landfill to serve Calero County Park. **No Impact.**

### 7. Comply with Solid Waste Statutes and Regulations

The proposed Draft Trails Master Plan does not contemplate new solid waste practices. **No Impact.**
### DOES THE PROJECT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have the potential to substantially 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have environmental impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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 probably future projects.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

The mitigation measures listed in this document will ensure that the project does not substantially degrade the quality of the environment or sensitive habitats or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Best management practices and mitigation measures have been incorporated that short-term as well as long-term environmental impacts are avoided or reduced to a less than significant level.

The project will not have environmental impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable because it does not cause any long-term or growth-related impacts.

Best Management Practices (BMPs) and mitigation measures contained in this document will avoid substantial adverse impacts on human beings or reduce them to less than significant levels.

### 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.
- [x] 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 mitigation measures are included as part of the proposed project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- [ ] I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- [ ] I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- [ ] 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.
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