**CEQA DOCUMENT DECLARATION**

**ENVIRONMENTAL FILING FEE RECEIPT**

**PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:**

1. **LEAD AGENCY:** County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department

2. **PROJECT TITLE:** Motorcycle County Park Site Improvements Project

3. **APPLICANT NAME:** County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department  
   **PHONE:** (408) 355-2200

4. **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** 298 Garden Hill Drive, Los Gatos, CA 95032

5. **PROJECT APPLICANT IS A:**  
   - [ ] Local Public Agency  
   - [ ] School District  
   - [ ] Other Special District  
   - [ ] State Agency  
   - [ ] Private Entity

6. **NOTICE TO BE POSTED FOR**  
   [ ] 20 DAYS.

7. **CLASSIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT**

   **a. PROJECTS THAT ARE SUBJECT TO DFG FEES**
   - [ ] ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE §21160) $3,078.25
   - [ ] NEGATIVE DECLARATION (PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE §21060(C)) $2,216.25
   - [ ] APPLICATION FEE WATER DIVERSION (STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD ONLY) $850.00
   - [ ] PROJECTS SUBJECT TO CERTIFIED REGULATORY PROGRAMS $1,046.50
   - [ ] COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEE (REQUIRED FOR a-1 THROUGH a-4 ABOVE) $50.00

   **b. PROJECTS THAT ARE EXEMPT FROM DFG FEES**
   - [ ] NOTICE OF EXEMPTION ($50.00 COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEE REQUIRED) $60.00

   **c. NOTICES THAT ARE NOT SUBJECT TO DFG FEES OR COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEES**
   - [ ] NOTICE OF PREPARATION NO FEE
   - [ ] NOTICE OF INTENT NO FEE

8. **OTHER:**  
   [ ] NOTICE OF INTENT NO FEE ($ IF APPLICABLE): $0.00

9. **TOTAL RECEIVED:** $0.00

**NOTE:** "SAME PROJECT" MEANS NO CHANGES. IF THE DOCUMENT SUBMITTED IS NOT THE SAME (OTHER THAN DATES), A "NO EFFECT DETERMINATION" LETTER FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR THE SUBSEQUENT FILING OR THE APPROPRIATE FEES ARE REQUIRED.

**Fees Effective 01-01-2017**
Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21,000, et seq.) 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>729-57-001, 729-57-002, 627-11-017</td>
<td>April 12, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Name**
Motorcycle County Park Site Improvements Project

**Project Type**
Park Site Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 Garden Hill Drive, Los Gatos, CA 95032-7669</td>
<td>298 Garden Hill Drive, Los Gatos, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**
Motorcycle County Park, 300 Metcalf Road, San Jose, CA 95138

**Project Description (attach additional pages as necessary)**
The proposed Project consists of improvements to two areas of the Park: 1) the Quarter Midget shared parking area (QM parking area) and 2) park office area.

Due to the popularity of the Park, the QM parking area is overcrowded and difficult to navigate on weekends and during regional events, especially for large vehicles pulling trailers. While the Parks Department coordinates with QM staff on using areas of the Park’s main parking lot for overflow parking, it does reduce the available parking for Park users and visitors will often park on the shoulders of Metcalf Road, creating a potentially dangerous situation. Site improvements to the QM parking area include expansion and improvements of the existing QM parking lot to better accommodate existing users and improve parking configurations. The Project will increase the existing parking lot by approximately 5,562 square feet primarily towards the eastern property boundary in order to improve usable space to serve the parking demand within the QM parking area. The improvements will include regrading for better drainage and paving with permeable gravel base rock surface, creating a vegetated swale along the northern side of the parking area and planting five shade trees, and improving the existing vegetated swale to the east which captures and filters intermittent drainage from the site and from the surrounding hills. The parking lot itself is in an upland area and the project will not increase overland sheet flows from the parking area to the vegetated swale to the east or to the existing channel, which has formed at the entrance to the culvert under Metcalf Road. A field survey was conducted of the existing vegetated swale and the proposed parking lot extension; and particularly along the eastern edge of the existing parking area to determine whether the project would require authorization from the federal or state government under the Clean Water Act or Porter Cologne Water Quality Act or Fish and Game Code. The survey determined that the project site does not contain wetlands or waters of the U.S. and does not contain a defined bed, bank or channel and therefore would not require a Federal or State permit.

Existing perimeter fencing includes a degraded chain-link fence along Metcalf Road, barbed wire fence along the park boundary to the east, and wood post and wire, and T-post and wire fence along the edge of the existing Natural Resource area to the south. There is a 16-foot long chain-link entrance gate on Metcalf Road with a degraded, partially paved entrance apron. The existing fencing will be upgraded to a sleeved, black vinyl coated chain link. The sleeved fencing will allow for segments of the fence to be removed, if necessary, and replaced while not damaging the fence. Wire fencing will be installed at the base of the hill of the Natural Resource area located to the south of the parking lot. The existing entrance apron will be repaved with asphalt, the entrance gate widened, and the parking area will be replaced with permeable gravel base rock surface to create a safer vehicular entrance.

Site improvements to the park office area include construction/installation of a new 1,200 square foot Butler type metal shop building, reconfiguration of the area to accommodate the new shop, and relocation of existing metal storage containers. A safety eyewash station will be installed on the exterior of the shop building. The eyewash station’s discharge line will be connected to the existing sanitary system, however this upgrade will not require approval from the County Health Department. The two existing 40-foot long metal storage containers currently located on the lower and middle terraces behind the park office building will be relocated to the lower area site parallel to an existing park trail and to Metcalf Road. The lower and middle terraces will be regraded to create one flat building pad on one terrace for
the new shop building. The new building pad will be ADA compliant, and will be graded so that vehicular and pedestrian access remains below 10% for vehicles and 5% for pedestrians. Additional work includes regrading of the existing steep slopes, removal of existing retaining walls, and the installation of new retaining walls on the east and west side of the new shop building. Improvements to the lower area site include minor regrading to prepare the area for the relocation of the two 40 foot long metal storage containers and repositioning of the 20 foot long container currently located at the lower area site. While these improvements will not require trail relocations, the existing motorcycle start gate currently located near the western border of the motorcycle parking lot will be relocated.

The Project will also consist of relocating of a utility pole, a transformer, and possibly utility lines, which will require coordination with PG&E. The addition of miscellaneous signage completes the Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of this notice is to inform you that the County of Santa Clara Parks &amp; Recreation Department Staff has recommended that a Negative Declaration be adopted for this project. Action is tentatively scheduled on this proposed Negative Declaration before the County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors on May 9, 2017, in the Board Chambers, 70 W. Hedding, San Jose. It should be noted that the adoption of a 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 <a href="http://www.sccgov.org">www.sccgov.org</a> under Board Agendas or contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (408) 299-5001.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public review period for this document begins April 17, 2017, and ends May 7, 2017. Public comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of this 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) 355-2362, attention Michael Hettenhausen, Associate Planner or by email at <a href="mailto:Michael.Hettenhausen@prk.sccgov.org">Michael.Hettenhausen@prk.sccgov.org</a>. 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. A file containing additional information on this project and the full text of the Initial Study/Negative Declaration is available for review at the following locations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department 298 Garden Hill Drive Los Gatos, CA 95032-7669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Clara Clerk Recorders Office County Government Center, 70 West Hedding, E. Wing, 1st Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department website <a href="http://www.parkhere.org">www.parkhere.org</a> under Plans and Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When requesting to view this file, please refer to the project title appearing at the top of this form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Agencies sent copy of this document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no responsible agencies for this project however, the Project will require coordination or permits from Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency (reporting on project impacts under the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan); and County Roads and Airports Department (an encroachment permit).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case since the mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project.

This finding is based on the following considerations (see note below):

**Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions**
During construction, standard Best Management Practices to protect air quality will be implemented. The existing degraded gravel and compacted soil parking lot surface will be replaced with permeable gravel baserock surface, which will reduce dust generation currently produced from the park. The proposed project will not increase vehicular emissions, generate excessive dust that would trigger CEQA thresholds, violate any ambient air quality standard, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The proposed Project would not alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate.

**Biological Resources**
The project site is located within the study area for the Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) where future development of the project site would be considered a covered activity with other County Parks projects in the HCP/NCCP. As a covered activity, the project would be consistent with the conservation strategies of the HCP/NCCP. A report on project impacts under the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan will be filed.

**Cultural/Historic/Archaeological Resources**
The proposed Project is located in an area that has already been developed as a park, and the project area is heavily disturbed. The proposed Project activities will occur in previously disturbed areas and are not expected to encounter human remains. In the unlikely event that human remains or archaeological sites are discovered during ground disturbing activities, the measures outlined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, the County Ordinance (Ordinance NS-508.2, § 3, 10-7-75; Ord. No. NS-508.3, § 1, 8-11-87 Sections B6-16 through 23, Section B6-18), and the Parks and Recreation Departments' policy "Protection of Cultural and Archaeological Resources in County Parks" will be incorporated into the Project specifications.

**Geology and Soils**
The Project site includes an existing park office building and an existing QM parking area. The proposed Project does not propose any new habitable structures as part of the parking area expansion or park office improvements. The risk of loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault (e.g., Silver Creek Fault), seismic shaking, liquefaction, or landslides is less than a significant impact. Also, the proposed Project will not cause substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill. The QM Parking Lot will be regraded to improve drainage, while the park office area will be regraded to reduce two tiers into one with the addition of a retaining wall.

**Stormwater Runoff**
The new shop building roof will be approximately 1,200 square feet, which will not substantially increase runoff. The total development footprint is less than 0.5 acre and will not require a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction. To minimize the mobilization of sediment to creeks and other water bodies, erosion- and sediment-control measures would be included in a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the project after final design. All proposed paving will be permeable gravel baserock surface.

**Utilities**
The site's water service is provided by an existing well, and wastewater is discharged into an existing septic system. The increase in water use from the shop building's emergency eye wash station will not trigger a leach field expansion or upgrade.

**Vegetation**
A non-irrigated hydroseed mix of native plant material will be applied to the vegetated buffer area along, the existing vegetated swale along the eastern boundary, and the disturbed areas around the new shop building and the relocated storage containers. These native plants will replace the existing non-native annual grasses and forbes in the
parking area. Five shade trees, whose species will be determined at a later date with assistance from Parks and Recreation Department Natural Resource Management staff, will be planted along Metcalf Road, adjacent to the QM Parking Area.

Water Quality
A biological field survey of the vegetated swale, including the area east of the parking lot, determined the swale functions solely as a swale and not habitat for any threatened or endangered species.

Note: Those measures necessary to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects are identified by an asterisk. A reporting or monitoring program must be adopted for measures to mitigate significant impacts at the time the Negative Declaration is approved, in accord with the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code.

Prepared by:
Michael Hettenhausen, Associate Planner
Santa Clara County Parks

Approved by:
Don Rocha, Deputy Director
Santa Clara County Parks

Revised 11/16/11
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INTRODUCTION

Introduction and Regulatory Guidance

Motorcycle County Park is a 459-acre off-highway vehicle (OHV) park located on Metcalf Road in Santa Clara County. Motorcycle County Park (Park) is owned by the County of Santa Clara and operated by the County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department (Parks Department). Motorcycle County Park contains over 20 miles of OHV trails and tracks including 12 miles of main trails (beginning and intermediate) and 8 miles of single-track expert trails. Other park facilities include a motocross competition track, mini-motocross track, beginner’s oval track, shaded picnic areas, public restrooms, paved and unpaved parking areas, and a park office/visitor’s center. The Park also includes a Quarter Midget racetrack, which is owned and operated by Baylands Quarter Midget Racing Association in an area leased from the Parks Department.

In 2013, the Parks Department prepared a site plan (Motorcycle County Park Final Site Plan Report) which focused on improvements to two areas of the Park: the Quarter Midget shared parking area (QM parking area), and park office area. The Parks Department proposes to undertake the improvements identified in the site plan. Site improvements to the QM parking area include expansion and improvements of the existing QM parking lot to better accommodate existing users. Site improvements to the park office area include construction/installation of a new shop building, reconfiguration of the area to accommodate the new shop, and relocation of existing metal storage containers. Improvements to both areas will require site regrading. The project area and project details are described within the Project Description of this document and are included in the Motorcycle County Park Final Site Plan Report dated August 16, 2013.

Lead Agency

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15367, the lead agency, the public agency with primary approval authority over the proposed project, must prepare an Initial Study as part of the environmental review for a project’s proposed action. The Parks Department, considered the lead agency per CEQA Guidelines, prepared an Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) to identify and evaluate any potential environmental impacts as a result of the project.

The IS/ND provides information to the public and permitting agencies on the potential environmental effects of the project. This document has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, Public Resources Code section §21000 et seq., and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, section §15000 et seq.

Decision to Prepare a Negative Declaration

An Initial Study is conducted by the lead agency to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15063(a)). If there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15064(a). However, if the lead agency determines the impacts are to a less than significant level, a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared instead of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines §15070(a)).

The Initial Study completed for this project identified no potentially significant impacts on the environmental, and therefore, a Negative Declaration has been prepared consistent with the CEQA Guidelines §15070 and §15701.
Public Review Process
The CEQA review process is intended to inform the public, government agencies and responsible agencies about the potential environmental effects of the proposed project and provide them with an opportunity to comment. There are no responsible agencies for this project as defined by CEQA §15381.

This IS/ND will be circulated to local agencies, interested organizations and individuals who may wish to review and provide comments on the project description or other aspects of the report. The publication will commence the 20 day public review period per CEQA Guidelines §15105(b).

Written comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of the negative declaration should be submitted to the name and address indicated below. Such comments should be based on specific environmental concerns and must be received on or before the close of the public review period.

Submittal of written comments via e-mail would greatly facilitate the response process.

Michael Hettenhausen, Associate Planner
County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department
298 Garden Hill Drive
Los Gatos, CA 95032-7669
(408) 355-2362
Email: Michael.Hettenhausen@parks.sccgov.org

The IS/ND is available for review at the following locations:

County of Santa Clara
Parks and Recreation Department
Administrative Office
298 Garden Hill Drive
Los Gatos, CA 95032-7669

Motorcycle County Park
Park Ranger’s Office
300 Metcalf Rd
San Jose, CA 95138

The IS/ND is also posted on the County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department’s website: http://www.parkhere.org/ under Plans and Projects.
**Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses**

The proposed Motorcycle County Park Site Improvements Project (Project) is located within Motorcycle County Park (Park). The Park is a 459-acre off-highway vehicle (OHV) park located on Metcalf Road in unincorporated central Santa Clara County in the foothills of the Diablo Range east of State Highway 101 (see Location Map). At 1,240 feet above mean sea level, the project area is approximately 1,000 feet above the Santa Clara Valley floor.

The Park is bound to the southwest by County of Santa Clara property and to the east and southeast by Santa Clara County Open Space Authority property. United Technologies Corporation property is the northern boundary, and Metcalf Road is the western boundary.

**History of the Park**

In 1971, the County of Santa Clara purchased 914 acres, and transferred 227 acres of that acreage to the County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department (Parks Department) for the creation of the Park in 1974. An additional 215 acres were added to the Park’s boundaries in 1982. The Park is the Parks Department’s only off-highway vehicle park. Operation of the Park is funded in part, by a grant from the State of California’s Off-Highway Vehicle Grant Fund.

From its inception, the popularity of the Park has risen dramatically. From 1971 to 1986, approximately 7,500 visitors a year enjoyed the Park. The number of visitors increased from 2001 to 2004, where approximately 45,000 visitors a year utilized the Park’s motorcycle and all-terrain vehicle (ATV) dirt trails as well as the QM track. The off-highway trails are used for Motocross races, Timekeepers Hare Scramble Races and other events. The Quarter Midget racetrack and associated facilities are owned and operated by Baylands Quarter Midget Racing Association under a lease from the Parks Department. The adjoining parking lot (QM parking area) is a shared parking lot with primary use for the QM track and secondarily, as an overflow parking area for the Park. The QM track hosted the Quarter Midgets West Coast Grand National races in 2015.

**Project Description**

The Project consists of improvements to two areas of the Park: 1) the Quarter Midget shared parking area (QM parking area) and 2) park office area.

Due to the popularity of the Park, the QM parking area is overcrowded and difficult to navigate on weekends and during regional events, especially for large vehicles pulling trailers. While the Parks Department coordinates with QM staff on using areas of the Park’s main parking lot for overflow parking, it does reduce the available parking for Park users and visitors will often park on the shoulders of Metcalf Road, creating a potentially dangerous situation. Site improvements to the QM parking area include expansion and improvements of the existing QM parking lot to better accommodate existing users and improve parking configurations. The Project will increase the existing parking lot by approximately 5,562 square feet primarily towards the eastern property boundary in order to improve...
usable space to serve the parking demand within the QM parking area. The improvements will include regrading for better drainage and paving with permeable gravel base rock surface, creating a vegetated swale along the northern side of the parking area and planting five shade trees, and improving the existing vegetated swale to the east which captures and filters intermittent drainage from the site and from the surrounding hills. The parking lot itself is in an upland area and the project will not increase overland sheet flows from the parking area to the vegetated swale to the east or to the existing channel, which has formed at the entrance to the culvert under Metcalf Road. A field survey was conducted of the existing vegetated swale and the proposed parking lot extension; and particularly along the eastern edge of the existing parking area to determine whether the project would require authorization from the federal or state government under the Clean Water Act or Porter Cologne Water Quality Act or Fish and Game Code. The survey determined that the project site does not contain wetlands or waters of the U.S. and does not contain a defined bed, bank or channel and therefore would not require a Federal or State permit.

Existing perimeter fencing includes a degraded chain-link fence along Metcalf Road, barbed wire fence along the park boundary to the east, and wood post and wire, and T-post and wire fence along the edge of the existing Natural Resource area to the south. There is a 16-foot long chain-link entrance gate on Metcalf Road with a degraded, partially paved entrance apron. The existing fencing will be upgraded to a sleeved, black vinyl coated chain link. The sleeved fencing will allow for segments of the fence to be removed, if necessary, and replaced while not damaging the fence. Wire fencing will be installed at the base of the hill of the Natural Resource area located to the south of the parking lot. The existing entrance apron will be repaved with asphalt, the entrance gate widened, and the parking area will be replaced with permeable gravel base rock surface to create a safer vehicular entrance.

Site improvements to the park office area include construction/installation of a new 1,200 square foot Butler type metal shop building, reconfiguration of the area to accommodate the new shop, and relocation of existing metal storage containers. A safety eyewash station will be installed on the exterior of the shop building. The eyewash station’s discharge line will be connected to the existing sanitary system, however this upgrade will not require approval from the County Health Department. The two existing 40-foot long metal storage containers currently located on the lower and middle terraces behind the park office building will be relocated to the lower area site parallel to an existing park trail and to Metcalf Road. The lower and middle terraces will be regraded to create one flat building pad on one terrace for the new shop building. The new building pad will be ADA compliant, and will be graded so that vehicular and pedestrian access remains below 10% for vehicles and 5% for pedestrians. Additional work includes regrading of the existing steep slopes, removal of existing retaining walls, and the installation of new retaining walls on the east and west side of the new shop building. Improvements to the lower area site include minor regrading to prepare the area for the relocation of the two 40 foot long metal storage containers and repositioning of the 20 foot long container currently located at the lower area site. While these improvements will not require trail relocations, the existing motorcycle start gate currently located near the western border of the motorcycle parking lot will be relocated.

The Project will also consist of relocating of a utility pole, a transformer, and possibly utility lines, which will require coordination with PG&E. The addition of miscellaneous signage completes the Project.

Environmental Setting

QM Parking area: The Project site is located in a disturbed environment with existing vegetation limited to a few trees at the western edge of the site and non-native annual grasses and forbes on the QM parking surface. East of the existing QM parking lot is a vegetated swale composed of non-native annual
grasses. This vegetated swale absorbs the runoff water from the surrounding hills and the parking lot however there is rarely any standing water or water flow in the swale. The Park Natural Resource Area, a hill located behind a fence to the south of the parking lot, has been planted with native plants to promote revegetation. The fence along the boundary of the Natural Resource Area will be replaced where necessary with similar type of fencing.

Park Office Area: The project site is located in a disturbed area and includes the Park office, three storage containers located on three terraces, access to the equipment storage shed, start gate for the motorcycle races, and entrance to existing trails. The area is minimally landscaped in front of the park office with shrubs but additional grasses and forbes is limited.

Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan
The project site is located within the study area for the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (Valley Habitat Plan) where future development of the project site would be considered a “covered activity” with other County Parks projects in the Valley Habitat Plan. The 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." The Valley Habitat Plan, which is a Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan, was developed in collaboration with the US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW). The Valley Habitat Plan’s study area encompasses 519,506 acres or approximately 62 percent of Santa Clara County.

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.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): The Project will require coordination or permits from:

- Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency (reporting on project impacts under the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan); and
- County Roads and Airports Department (an encroachment permit).
INITIAL STUDY
Environmental Evaluation Checklist for Santa Clara County

Project Title: Motorcycle County Park Site Plan Improvements          Date: April 11, 2017

File Number: None          APN(s): 729-57-001, 729-57-002, and 627-11-017

500" Map #: 131

Zoning: HS-sr (Hillside with a scenic road)

General Plan Designation: Regional Park, existing

Project Type: Implementation of Site Plan          USA (if any): N/A

Lead Agency Name & Address: County of Santa Clara
                            298 Garden Hill Drive, Los Gatos, CA 95032-7669

Applicant Name & Address: County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department
                          298 Garden Hill Drive, Los Gatos, CA 95032-7669

Owner Name & Address: County of Santa Clara, Parks and Recreation Department
                       298 Garden Hill Drive, Los Gatos, CA 95032-7669

Telephone: (408) 355-2200

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses:
The proposed Motorcycle County Park Site Improvements Project (Project) is located within Motorcycle County Park (Park). The Park is a 459-acre off-highway vehicle (OHV) park located on Metcalf Road in unincorporated central Santa Clara County in the foothills of the Diablo Range east of State Highway 101 (see Location Map). At 1,240 feet above mean sea level, the project area is approximately 1,000 feet above the Santa Clara Valley floor.

The Park is bound to the southwest by County of Santa Clara property, to the east and southeast by Santa Clara County Open Space Authority property and to the north by United Technologies Corporation property. Metcalf Road is the western boundary and is the access road to the Park.

Project Description:
The Project consists of improvements to two areas of the Park: 1) the Quarter Midget shared parking area (QM parking area) and 2) park office area.

Due to the popularity of the Park, the QM parking area is overcrowded and difficult to navigate on weekends and during regional events, especially for large vehicles pulling trailers. While the Parks
Department coordinates with QM staff on using areas of the Park's main parking lot for overflow parking, it does reduce the available parking for Park users and visitors will often park on the shoulders of Metcalf Road, creating a potentially dangerous situation. Site improvements to the QM parking area include expansion and improvements of the existing QM parking lot to better accommodate existing users and improve parking configurations. The Project will increase the existing parking lot by approximately 5,562 square feet primarily towards the eastern property boundary in order to improve usable space to serve the parking demand within the QM parking area. The improvements will include regrading for better drainage and paving with permeable gravel base rock surface, creating a vegetated swale along the northern side of the parking area and planting five shade trees, and improving the existing vegetated swale to the east which captures and filters intermittent drainage from the site and from the surrounding hills. The parking lot itself is in an upland area and the project will not increase overland sheet flows from the parking area to the vegetated swale to the east or to the existing channel, which has formed at the entrance to the culvert under Metcalf Road. A field survey was conducted of the existing vegetated swale and the proposed parking lot extension; and particularly along the eastern edge of the existing parking area to determine whether the project would require authorization from the federal or state government under the Clean Water Act or Porter Cologne Water Quality Act or Fish and Game Code. The survey determined that the project site does not contain wetlands or waters of the U.S. and does not contain a defined bed, bank or channel and therefore would not require a Federal or State permit.

Existing perimeter fencing includes a degraded chain-link fence along Metcalf Road, barbed wire fence along the park boundary to the east, and wood post and wire, and T-post and wire fence along the edge of the existing Natural Resource area to the south. There is a 16-foot long chain-link entrance gate on Metcalf Road with a degraded, partially paved entrance apron. The existing fencing will be upgraded to a sleeved, black vinyl coated chain link. The sleeved fencing will allow for segments of the fence to be removed, if necessary, and replaced while not damaging the fence. Wire fencing will be installed at the base of the hill of the Natural Resource area located to the south of the parking lot. The existing entrance apron will be repaved with asphalt, the entrance gate widened, and the parking area will be replaced with permeable gravel base rock surface to create a safer vehicular entrance.

Site improvements to the park office area include construction/installation of a new 1,200 square foot Butler type metal shop building, reconfiguration of the area to accommodate the new shop, and relocation of existing metal storage containers. A safety eyewash station will be installed on the exterior of the shop building. The eyewash station's discharge line will be connected to the existing sanitary system, however this upgrade will not require approval from the County Health Department. The two existing 40-foot long metal storage containers currently located on the lower and middle terraces behind the park office building will be relocated to the lower area site parallel to an existing park trail and to Metcalf Road. The lower and middle terraces will be regraded to create one flat building pad on one terrace for the new shop building. The new building pad will be ADA compliant, and will be graded so that vehicular and pedestrian access remains below 10% for vehicles and 5% for pedestrians. Additional work includes regrading of the existing steep slopes, removal of existing retaining walls, and the installation of new retaining walls on the east and west side of the new shop building. Improvements to the lower area site include minor regrading to prepare the area for the relocation of the two 40 foot long metal storage containers and repositioning of the 20 foot long container currently located at the lower area site. While these improvements will not require trail relocations, the existing motorcycle start gate currently located near the western border of the motorcycle parking lot will be relocated.
The Project will also consist of relocating a utility pole, a transformer, and possibly utility lines, which will require coordination with PG&E. The addition of miscellaneous signage completes the Project.

Environmental Setting
The Project site is located in a disturbed environment with existing vegetation limited to a few trees along the north boundary (Metcalf Road) and non-native annual grasses and forbes on the QM parking surface. East of the existing QM parking lot is a vegetated swale composed of non-native annual grasses. This vegetated swale absorbs the runoff water yet there is rarely any standing water or water flow in the swale. The Park Natural Resource Area, a hillside beyond the Project location that has been revegetated with native plants by park staff, is located behind a fence to the south of the parking lot.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): The Project will require coordination or permits from the:

- Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency (reporting on project impacts under the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan); and
- County Roads and Airports Department (an encroachment permit).
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Geology / Soils
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Cultural / Historical / Archaeological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use & Planning
- Population / Housing
- Transportation / Traffic
- Air Quality
- Energy
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services / Utilities
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. AESTHETICS</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</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 night?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. AESTHETICS

<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>nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:
The Project involves the expansion of the existing parking lot and configuration of the park office area at the Park. Existing perimeter fencing includes a degraded chain-link fence along Metcalf Road, barbed wire fence along the park boundary to the east, and wood post and wire and T-post and wire fence along the edge of the Natural Resource area to the south. There is a 16-foot long chain-link entrance gate on Metcalf Road with a degraded, partially paved entrance apron.

The proposed parking area design will improve the aesthetics from Metcalf Road by upgrading the to a sleeved, black vinyl coated chain link.

The Project, as proposed, would have no impacts related to Aesthetics.
1. The proposed Project is not subject to ASA. No Impact

2. The proposed Project would result in no impact on public views. No Impact

3. There are no State-designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the Park. Therefore, the proposed Project would not cause damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway. No Impact

4. The proposed Project would not obstruct scenic views from residential or public facilities. The project involves improvements to existing park facilities would not obstruct scenic views. No Impact

5. The proposed Project is not located on or near a ridgeline. No Impact

6. The proposed Project would not adversely affect the architectural appearance of an established neighborhood, as the proposed Project would be consistent with park boundaries and recreational uses identified in the Approved Project. No Impact

7. The proposed Project does not include any new source of substantial light or glare that would affect views in the area. No Impact

MITIGATION: None
**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>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>3,20, 21,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>23,24,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>9,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict with an existing Williamson Act Contract or the County’s Williamson</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>3,4,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>5, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Resources Code section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined by Government Code section 51104(g)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The Project site does not contain any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Unique importance and is not under the Williamson Act. The Project would not impact Forest Resources. There would be no conversions of land designated for agricultural use or forestland.

The Project, as proposed, would have no impacts related to Agriculture or Forest Resources. **No Impact.**

**MITIGATION:** None
C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violate any ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>No</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create objectionable dust or odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

Sources of air pollution in the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay Area, including the Santa Clara County, where the project site is located, are regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The 2000 Clean Air Plan (CAP) and the 2005 Ozone Attainment Plan, developed by BAAQMD, apply in the San Francisco Bay Area to attain pollution concentrations in the area lower than the federal and state standards for Ozone (O₃), and state standards for respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀), and fine particulate matter (PM₂.₅) concentration. According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the District’s approach to CEQA analyses of construction impacts is to emphasize implementation of effective and comprehensive control measures rather than detailed quantification of emissions. Hence, standard control measures, as stipulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), will be employed to ensure that air quality impacts from construction activity remain less than significant.

The Proposed Project would generate emissions during construction from dust and operation of construction equipment. However, the impacts would be short term and temporary. Implementation of the County’s construction BMPs that are included in the project construction documents would reduce potential impacts to less than significant. These BMPs are in accordance with BAAQMD’s Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for All Proposed Projects.

Construction activities associated with the relocation of existing structures and construction of the new shop building, including concrete foundation work and building delivery, will generate increased emissions; however, these will be temporary and short term.
The Project will not increase vehicular emissions nor generate excessive dust that would trigger CEQA thresholds. Best Management Practices (BMP's) will be implemented during construction to protect air quality. Improvements to the parking lot area with the installation of permeable gravel base rock surface will reduce dust currently existing from the current compacted soil surface. The grading may require imported soil, which, in addition to importing other construction materials such as base rock material, will generate truck traffic. During construction, which will be temporary, standard BMP's will be implemented, which will reduce environmental impacts to less than significant.

**Long Term Air Quality Impacts:**
The proposed project involves the expansion of the existing parking lot and improvement to the park office area. Since the use of the site is the same as already exists, vehicular traffic associated with the project over the long term will not significantly increase. The proposed project does not entail installation of any new on-site stationary sources of air pollutants. As such, the subject project will not result in the creation of any increased air pollutants over the long term.

**Short Term Air Quality Impacts:**
The nine county San Francisco Bay area, including the Santa Clara County, where the project site is located, is considered “nonattainment” for state standards for PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$.

The Project, as proposed, would have no impacts or less than significant impact related to Air Quality.

1. The Proposed Project would not conflict with the applicable air quality plan or implementation of control measures contained in the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan. **No Impact**

2. The Proposed Project would not violate any ambient air quality standard, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **Less than significant Impact**

3. The Bay Area is considered a non-attainment area for ground-level ozone and fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) and for PM$_{10}$. The area has attained both State and Federal ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide. The short-term construction related activities would be minor and would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment. **No Impact**

4. Construction activities for the proposed Project could result in short-term air quality impacts generated primarily by particulates (i.e., dust). Construction-related impacts will be intermittent and temporary and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Construction related dust and diesel emissions will be minor and will not exceed the BAAQMD significance thresholds. Project and construction BMPs would be included in the project design and construction documents and implemented during construction would ensure that the proposed project impacts would be less than significant. **No Impact**

5. During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use onsite may create localized dust and odors. Construction related activities would be intermittent and temporary and with implementation of construction BMPs these impacts would be less than significant. In addition, park users will be blocked from construction areas and trail users will be provided with detours which will minimize the impact and the number of people potentially affected. **Less than significant Impact**
6. The proposed Project would not alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate. **Less than significant Impact**

**MITIGATION:** None

### D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</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>1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1, 7, 17, 17, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>3, 7, 8a, 17, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 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>3, 7, 17, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 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>1, 3, 30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 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>1, 7, 17, 17o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 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>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 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>1, 2, 3, 10b, 11, 12d, 11e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Impact a watercourse, aquatic, wetland, or riparian area or habitat?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2, 3, 12b, 39, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Adversely impact unique or heritage trees or a large number of trees over 12” in diameter?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:

The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) identifies the following species with the potential to occur in the area surrounding the park: Bay Checkerspot Butterfly (Euphydryas editha bayensis) (federally endangered), Opler’s longhorn moth (Adela oplerella), San Joaquin kit fox (Vulpes macrotis mutica) (listed as threatened by the state but federally endangered), Hall’s bush mallow (Malacothamnus hallii) and serpentine bunchgrass. However, within the heavily used project area, (i.e., the QM parking lot and park office sites, which are currently disturbed and composed of gravel parking areas or compressed dirt), presence of these threatened and/or endangered species is unlikely.

The vegetation surrounding both the QM parking lot and the park office area is California annual grassland. Within the QM parking lot and park office area, the land cover is mainly dirt, without much vegetation on the edges. A biological field survey and report prepared by TRA Environmental Sciences, Inc. on February 28, 2013, for the proposed parking lot expansion area (including the existing vegetated swale) found that although the site overlays serpentine bedrock, the soils do not support serpentine habitat associated with rare plant and animal species, such as the Bay checkerspot butterfly. The report also found that the site does not contain breeding habitat for California red-legged frog or California Tiger Salamander.

The Project, as proposed, would have no impact related to Biological Resources.

1. The project area does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service. No impact.

2. The biological field survey and report prepared by TRA Environmental Sciences, Inc. identified no 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. No impact.

3. The proposed Project area does not contain oak woodland habitat as defined by Oak Woodlands Conservation Law. No Impact.

4. As the project site is located in a currently disturbed area, the proposed improvements will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. No native wildlife nursery sites exist within the project site. No Impact.

5. The project site is located within the study area for the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (Valley Habitat Plan) where future development of the project site would be considered a “covered activity” with other County Parks projects in the Valley Habitat Plan. The Valley Habitat Plan will cover several of the potential species that may occur at the project site, such as the Bay Checkerspot Butterfly, the San Joaquin kit fox, and serpentine bunchgrass. Furthermore, the Project is considered a covered activity under 2.3.5 Rural Capital
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Projects, County Parks Projects, Capital Improvement of the Valley Habitat Plan. This section (found on Page 2-87 of the Plan) states expansion or rehabilitation of existing facilities including, but not limited to, parking, entry and gateway sites (e.g., trailheads, park entrances, and kiosks), buildings, fencing, interpretive signage, sewer, water, and other utilities are considered covered activities. As such, the project is considered a covered activity and would not impact a local natural community, such as a fresh water marsh, oak forest or salt-water tideland. No Impact.

6. Based on the biological field survey and report prepared by TRA Environmental Sciences, Inc., the project area does not include a watercourse, wetland or riparian area or habitat. More specifically, the biological field survey and report determined that the vegetated swale on the eastern side of the QM parking lot area does not contain wetland or riparian vegetation and is not considered a wetland. No Impact.

7. The project site does not contain unique or heritage trees or trees over 12” in diameter. The project proposes to plant five trees and therefore would have a positive impact. No Impact.

8. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources:
   i) Tree Preservation Ordinance? No Impact.
   ii) Wetland Habitat? No Impact.
   iii) Riparian Habitat? No Impact.

MITIGATION: None

<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. 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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Be located in a Historic District (e.g., New Almaden Historic District)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Disturb potential archaeological resources?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:
1. The Project area does not contain any known historical resources. **No Impact.**

2. There are no known archeological resources within the proposed Project area. The Project is located in an area that has already been developed. The proposed Project activities will occur in previously disturbed areas. **No Impact.**

3. The Project is located in an area that has already been developed as a park, and the project area is heavily disturbed. The proposed Project activities will occur in previously disturbed areas and are not expected to encounter human remains. In the unlikely event that human remains are discovered during ground disturbing activities, the following measures will be incorporated into the Project specifications and the following procedures shall be followed.

   Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California and in accordance with County Ordinance (Ordinance NS-508.2, § 3, 10-7-75; Ord. No. NS-508.3, § 1, 8-11-87 Sections B6-16 through 23. Section B6-18), in the event human remains, including skeletal remains, graves, or Native American burial sites or graves, are discovered, all work in the area shall immediately cease and there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or area in the vicinity of the discovery.

   The Santa Clara County Medical Examiner/Coroner shall be notified (County Ordinance No. B6-18) and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are or maybe of a Native American, the Coroner shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission pursuant to subdivision (c) of the State Health and Safety Code. The Native American Heritage Commission has various powers and duties to provide for the ultimate disposition of Native American remains. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are not those of a Native American, the Coroner would make recommendations for the treatment and disposition of the remains. **Less than significant Impact.**

4. The Park is not located in a Historic District. **No Impact.**

5. The Project will not impact 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. **No Impact.**

6. There are no known archeological resources within the proposed Project area. Proposed Project activities will occur in previously disturbed areas and it is unlikely that unknown archaeological resources will be disturbed. In the unlikely event that unknown archaeological resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, measures outlined in the Parks and Recreation Departments’ policy “Protection of Cultural and Archaeological Resources in County Parks” would be followed. **Less than significant Impact.**

7. The project site is not located in an area of any known or recorded paleontological resources or unique geologic features and no impact to such resources is anticipated. **No Impact.**
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**DISCUSSION:**

1. The proposed Project will not increase existing energy use. Energy use at the Park is nominal, and the proposed improvements will not increase energy use. **No Impact.**

2. No trees or vegetation capable of providing summer shade will be removed. The project proposes to plant trees to provide shade, this would be a positive impact. **No Impact.**

**MITIGATION:** None
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? X X X X X X 2, 3, 17, 23, 24, 42

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? X X X X X 14, 20, 21, 23, 24, 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? X X X X X 3, 6, 23, 24, 48

6. Cause substantial compaction or over-covering of soil either on-site or off-site? X X X X X 3, 6

7. Cause substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? X X X X X 2, 3, 6, 42

8. Be located in an area designated as having a potential for major geological hazard? X X X X X 9b, 10c, 11a, 12a, 17, 18

9. Be located on, or adjacent to a known earthquake fault? X X X X X 9c, 10c, 11a

10. Be located in a Geologic Study Zone? X X X X X 9c, 11a

11. Involve construction of a building, road or septic system on a slope of:
   a. 30% or greater? X X X X X 1, 3, 10j, 11c
   b. 20% to 30%? X X X X X 1, 3, 10j, 11c
   c. 10% to 20%? X X X X X 1, 3, 10j, 11c

DISCUSSION:

The underlying soils are Maxwell Clay of 0-5% slopes, and soil liquefaction (a condition whereby a saturated or partially saturated soil substantially loses strength and stiffness in response to an applied stress, usually earthquake shaking or other sudden change in stress condition, causes the soil to behave like a liquid) could occur along the Silver Creek Fault, a known fault which runs through the project site.

1. The project site includes an existing park office building and an existing QM parking area. The proposed project does not propose any new habitable structures as part of the parking area expansion or park office improvements. The risk of loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault (e.g., Silver Creek Fault), seismic shaking, liquefaction, or landslides is less than a significant impact. **Less than significant Impact.**

2. The Project includes improvements to an already disturbed site. There could be limited potential for soil erosion during construction activities. Adherence to the County's construction BMPs which include standard erosion control methodologies/practices during construction will ensure less than significant impacts would occur with respect to soil erosion. In addition, to minimize the mobilization of sediment to creeks and other water bodies, erosion- and sediment-control measures would be included in a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the project after final design. **Less than significant Impact.**

3. The proposed Project area is not on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project. **No Impact.**
4. The proposed Project is not located on expansive soil, as defined in the report, *Soils of Santa Clara County* or California Building Code. **No Impact.**

5. The proposed Project does not include septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems. **No Impact.**

6. The proposed Project will not cause substantial compaction or over-covering of soil either on-site or off-site. **No Impact.**

7. The proposed Project will not cause substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill. The QM Parking Lot will be regraded to improve drainage, while the park office area will be regraded to reduce two tiers into one with the addition of a retaining wall. **Less than significant Impact.**

8. The proposed Project is not located in an area designated as having a potential for major geological hazard. **No Impact**

9. The proposed Project is located over the northwest-trending Silver Creek Fault, a 40-kilometer long strike-slip fault in eastern Santa Clara Valley. The proposed project will not have an impact on this fault. **Less than significant Impact.**

10. The proposed Project is not located in a Geologic Study Zone. **No Impact,**

11. The proposed Project includes the installation of a pre-fabricated Butler-type building yet placement will not occur on a 10-30% slope. No new roads or septic systems will be installed as part of the project. **No Impact.**

**MITIGATION:** None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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)?

**DISCUSSION:**

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

In addition, the adoption of Senate Bill 97 (SB 97) in 2007 mandated that the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) prepare CEQA Guidelines, which establish standards for evaluating greenhouse gas emissions including the creation of feasible mitigation measures. OPR recently adopted the CEQA guidelines for GHG. These guidelines do not identify a threshold of significance for greenhouse gas emissions or prescribe assessment methodologies or specific mitigation measures. They encourage lead agencies to consider many factors in performing a CEQA analysis but rely on them in making their own determinations based upon substantial evidence.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has proposed Air Quality Guidelines to provide guidance in evaluating greenhouse gas emissions. Long term, the thresholds proposed by BAAQMD for GHG emissions are 1,100 Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide (CO2) per year. BAAMQD does not have an adopted threshold of significance for constructed-related GHG emissions. However, it recommends that lead agencies quantify and disclose GHG emissions from construction.

1. The proposed Project, once completed, will not generate additional greenhouse gas emissions. During construction, vehicular trips and construction activities will generate additional emissions, but are anticipated to be well below CEQA thresholds. **Less than significant Impact.**

2. The proposed Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. **No Impact.**

3. The proposed Project will not 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). **No Impact.**

**MITIGATION:** None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Provide breeding grounds for vectors?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Be located within 200' of a 230KV or above electrical transmission line</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Create any health hazard?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Be located in an Airport Land Use Commission Safety Zone?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Increase fire hazard in an area already involving extreme fire hazard?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Be located on a cul-de-sacs over 800 ft. in length and require secondary access which will be difficult to obtain?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Employ technology which could adversely affect safety in case of a breakdown?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:
1. The proposed Project does not include the transport or disposal of hazardous materials. The future storage of hazardous materials will not occur in greater quantities than currently exist on site. Less than significant impact.

2-8. The proposed Project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No Impact.

9. The proposed Project will expand the driveway apron from Metcalf Road to the QM parking lot. This expansion will provide a safer area for motorists to enter the parking lot and reduce queuing along Metcalf Road. This part of the project will have a positive impact on the park and the adjacent road. No Impact.

10. 11. The proposed Project includes the installation of a pre-fabricated Butler-type building yet placement will not occur on a 10-30% slope. No new roads or septic systems will be installed as part of the project. No Impact.

12. The proposed Project is not located within 200 feet of a 230KV or above electrical transmission line. No Impact.

13, 14. The project site is located in a currently disturbed area and will not create or expose the public to a health hazard. No Impact.

14. A 42-inch high-pressure gas line runs under the northeast edge of the proposed QM parking lot expansion area. Easement location, depth and restrictions for development will need to be discussed with PG&E prior to finalizing construction details. The improvements to the parking lot will not impact this gas line. No Impact.

15. The project site is not located in an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Safety Zone. No Impact.

16. The proposed Project does not increase fire hazard in an area already involving extreme fire hazard. No Impact.

17. The proposed Project is located in an existing county park and not on a cul-de-sac over 800 feet in length. No Impact.

18. The proposed Project does not employ technology which could adversely affect safety in case of a breakdown. No Impact.

The Project, as proposed, would have less than significant or no impact related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

MITIGATION: None
J. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Be located in an area of special water quality concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Result in use of well water previously contaminated by nitrates, mercury, asbestos, etc. existing in the groundwater supply?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISCUSSION:

The Park is located in the 322 square mile Coyote Watershed, the county's largest watershed. This watershed extends from the urbanized valley floor upward to the vast natural areas of the Mt. Hamilton range. Coyote Creek, its main waterway, is the longest creek in the county.

The QM parking lot expansion area drainage will be improved by the regrading and installation of permeable gravel base rock surface, making the existing dirt parking lot suitable for all-weather use. The regrading will modify the direction of drainage flows within the existing vegetated swale towards the eastern park boundary to allow sheet flow water to percolate through the vegetated swale and, when present, direct flow to the boundary fence towards the culvert to accommodate the parking lot expansion. The regrading will also smooth irregularities and eliminate depressions, and retain the existing ridge along the center of the parking lot expansion area to avoid increasing drainage volume on either side as compared to the current conditions.

1. The proposed Project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. **No Impacts.**

2. The proposed Project will not 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. **No Impact.**

3. The proposed Project involves regrading the QM parking area to improve drainage and regrading the park office area to create a level building pad for the new Butler-type building. However, neither of these activities will 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. **Less than significant Impact.**
5. An existing building is located in the area of the proposed Butler-type building; therefore, the proposed project will not result in any new impervious cover. Installation of permeable gravel base rock over the entire parking lot expansion area surface will allow percolation and reduce runoff. Installation of the vegetated buffer along Metcalf Road will capture and filter sheet flow/stormwater runoff from the parking lot expansion area. **No Impact.**

7-9. The Project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain. **No Impact.**

10-12: The proposed Project will not result in any discharges of pollution to surface or groundwater. **No Impact.**

13-16: The proposed Project does not include the installation of a new septic system or any modifications to the existing septic facility. **No Impact.**

17. The proposed Project's footprint is not greater than one acre in area. **No Impact.**

6, 18-21. The proposed Project does not increase quantity or degrade surface or groundwater quality. **No Impact.**

22. The proposed Project involves a natural drainage channel; however, the regrading of the parking and the installation of permeable gravel base rock will not negatively impact the channel. **Less than significant Impact.**

**MITIGATION:** None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K. LAND USE AND PLANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Physically divide an established community?</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conflict with special policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. San Martin and/or South County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Los Gatos Specific Plan or Lexington Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. East Foothills Policy Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:

The Project is not included in any of the above listed special plan areas and thus not subject to special policies pertaining to these areas. The project will not divide an established community or be incompatible with existing surrounding land uses. As previously indicated, the project site is situated within an existing county park. The Project is an expansion and renovation of an existing use; therefore, no impacts will be experienced related to Land Use and Planning. No Impact

MITIGATION: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>NO IMPACT</th>
<th>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</th>
<th>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</th>
<th>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 19</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>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Result in substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

The Project is not located in a known mineral resource site or delineated as a mineral resource recovery site in the County General and Land Use Plan. The project site is owned by the County Parks and Recreation Department and is used for public recreational use. The proposed site improvements will not adversely impact any mineral resources. The Project is an expansion and renovation of an existing use; therefore, no new negative impacts will be experienced.

MITIGATION: None
## M. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACTS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO Impact</td>
<td>Less Than 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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increase substantially the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas during and/or after construction?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✕</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION:

As a very popular Off-Highway Vehicle facility, the Park exhibits a noisy environment. The proposed Project, once completed, will not generate additional noise. During construction, vehicular trips and construction activities will generate additional noise, but are anticipated to be well below CEQA thresholds.

1. The proposed project will not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. **No Impact.**

2. Construction activities may increase ground-bourne vibration or ground-bourne noise levels; however, these activities are short term and not permanent. **Less than significant impact.**

3, 4. No adverse long-term transportation and traffic impacts are anticipated as a result of the Project because the current land use of the site will not change. This project will not increase the existing noise levels. **No Impact.**

5. Construction activities may increase noise levels in the Park; however, they will not exceed allowable levels and would be intermittent and temporary. **Less than significant impact.**

The Project, as proposed, would have **less than significant or no impact** related to Noise.

### MITIGATION: None
N. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

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)?  
   - No impact  
   - Less than significant impact  
   - Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated  
   - Potentially significant impact  
   - Cumulative  
   - 2, 3, 4

2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  
   - No impact  
   - Less than significant impact  
   - Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated  
   - Potentially significant impact  
   - Cumulative  

3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  
   - No impact  
   - Less than significant impact  
   - Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated  
   - Potentially significant impact  
   - Cumulative  

DISCUSSION:
The Project does not propose new homes or businesses and would not induce additional population growth. There are no existing housing units or residents on the project site, which is in Motorcycle County Park. Thus, the project would not displace substantial number of existing housing or people. No significant population and housing impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

The Project, as proposed, would have no impacts related to Population and Housing.

MITIGATION: None

N. PUBLIC SERVICES

<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>
</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?  
   - No impact  
   - Less than significant impact  
   - Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated  
   - Potentially significant impact  
   - Cumulative  
   - 1, 3, 5
   ii) Police Protection?  
   - No impact  
   - Less than significant impact  
   - Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated  
   - Potentially significant impact  
   - Cumulative  
   - 1, 3, 5
   iii) School facilities?  
   - No impact  
   - Less than significant impact  
   - Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated  
   - Potentially significant impact  
   - Cumulative  
   - 1, 3, 5
   iv) Parks?  
   - No impact  
   - Less than significant impact  
   - Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated  
   - Potentially significant impact  
   - Cumulative  
   - 1, 3, 5
   v) Other public facilities?  
   - No impact  
   - Less than significant impact  
   - Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated  
   - Potentially significant impact  
   - Cumulative  
   - 1, 3, 5

2. Induce substantial growth or concentration of population? (Growth inducing?)  
   - No impact  
   - Less than significant impact  
   - Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated  
   - Potentially significant impact  
   - Cumulative  
   - 1, 3, 5

3. Employ equipment which could interfere with existing communications or broadcast systems?  
   - No impact  
   - Less than significant impact  
   - Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated  
   - Potentially significant impact  
   - Cumulative  
   - 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  
   b. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities  
   c. Local or regional water supplies  
   d. Sewage disposal  
   e. Storm water drainage  
   f. Solid waste or litter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**
The proposed Project would not require any expansion or alteration of government facilities, or require additional public services.

1. The proposed Project would not exceed the ability of fire, police, and emergency medical responders to serve the site to such an extent that new or expanded facilities would be needed. Furthermore, the Park is staffed by Park Rangers trained to handle emergencies. **No Impact.**

2. The proposed Project would have no impact on population or induce growth. **No Impact.**

3. The proposed Project would not affect existing communication or broadcasting systems nor increase the need for or alter utilities. **No Impact.**

4. The proposed Project would have less than significant to no impact on the need for new systems or supplies, or cause the substantial alterations to the following utilities: electricity or natural gas, local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities, local or regional water supplies, sewage disposal, storm water disposal, and solid waste or litter. As mentioned previously, the proposed Project is the expansion of an existing parking area and the installation of a new Butler-type building. **No Impact.**

**MITIGATION:** None

### P. RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOULD THE PROJECT:</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>⨗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>⨗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Be on, within or near a public or private park, wildlife reserve, or trail (includes those proposed for the future) or affect existing or future recreational opportunities?</td>
<td>⨗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:
The Project is located within Motorcycle County Park. The Project, the expansion of an existing parking area and the installation of a new Butler-type building, is consistent with the Parks and Recreation Element of the County General Plan and the General Plan designation of Regional Parks, Existing. The project will provide a positive impact to the Park by extending the life of the QM parking area through improved drainage and reducing traffic congestion during large events.

The Project, as proposed, would have no impact related to Recreation.

MITIGATION: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</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>
<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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Increase traffic hazards to pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:
Construction activities associated with the parking lot expansion, relocation of existing structures and construction of the new shop building, including concrete foundation work and building delivery, will temporarily generate increased traffic on Metcalf Road and State Highway 101; however, these traffic increases will be short term.

Long Term Impacts:
1-7, 9: No adverse long-term transportation and traffic impacts are anticipated as a result of the Project because the current land use of the site will not change. No impact.

Short Term Impacts:
8: Short term traffic impacts could potentially result from construction vehicles coming to the site. However, vehicular traffic associated with the construction activity will be predominantly generated on a county road, and will lead to a negligible increase in truck traffic on existing well-traveled routes, namely Highway 101 and Metcalf Road. Less than significant Impact.

MITIGATION: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:
The Project will consist of relocating a utility pole, a transformer, and possibly utility lines, which will require coordination with PG&E. These activities will not have a negative impact. The Project will not generate a need for the construction of new or expansion of existing water and wastewater treatment facilities and storm drainage facilities.

The Project, as proposed, would have no impacts related to Utilities and Service Systems. No impact

MITIGATION: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOES THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>X</td>
<td></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>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have environmental impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

Discuss on attached sheet(s) all “yes” answers and any “no” answers that are potentially controversial or require clarification. Describe any potential impacts and discuss possible mitigations. For source, refer to attached “Initial Study Source List”. When a source is used that is not listed on the form or an individual is contacted, that source and/or individual should be cited in the discussion.

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 NEGATIVEDECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because 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.

Signature: [Signature]

Print name & title: Michael Hettenhausen, Associate Planner

Date: 4/13/17
### INITIAL STUDY RECOMMENDED SOURCE LIST

1. Field Inspection  
2. Project Plans  
3. Planner's Knowledge of Area  
4. Experience With Other Project of This Size and Nature  
5. County General Plan  
6. The South County Joint Area Plan  
7. County Zoning Regulations [Ordinance]  
8. Second Amendment to Agreement [with San Jose] for Allocation of Tax Increment Funds  
9. **MAPS (various scales)**  
   a. County Zoning (500' or 1,000')  
   b. ABAG "On Shaky Ground"-Santa Clara County Map Set (2 miles)  
   c. Barclay's Santa Clara County Locale Street Atlas (2631')  
   d. County Regional Parks, Trails and Scenic Highways Map (10,000')  
10. **5000' or one mile Scale MAPS**  
    a. County General Plan Land Use  
    b. Natural Habitat Areas  
    c. Relative Seismic Stability  
    d. Archaeological Resources  
    e. Water Resources & Water Problems  
    f. Viewshed and Scenic Road  
    g. Fire Hazard  
    h. Parks and Public Open Space  
    i. Heritage Resources  
    j. Slope Constraint  
    k. Serpentine soils  
11. **2000' Scale MAPS**  
    a. State of California, Special Studies Zones [Revised Official Map]  
    b. Water Problem/Resource  
    c. USGS Topo Quad (7-1/2 minutes)  
    d. Dept. of Fish & Game, Natural Diversity Data Base Map Overlays & Textual Reports  
    e. Natural Resources [Key to map found in: Natural Resource Sensitivity Areas-Locality Data, Harvey & Stanley Associates-Contact County staff]  
12. **1000' Scale MAPS/Air Photos**  
    a. Geologic Hazards  
    b. Color Air Photos (MPSI)  
    c. Santa Clara valley Water District-Maps of Flood Control Facilities & Limits of 1% Flooding  
    d. Soils Overlay Air Photos  
    e. "Future Width Line" map set  
13. County Lexington Basin Ordinance Relating to Sewage Disposal  
14. Los Gatos Hillsides Specific Area Plan  
15. Stanford University General Use Permit and Environmental Impact Report [EIR]  
17. County Geologist  
18. Site Specific Geologic Report  
19. State Department of Mines and Geology, Special Report #146  
20. USDA, SCS, "Soils of Santa Clara County"  
21. USDA, SCS, "Soil Survey of Eastern Santa Clara County"  
22. County Environmental Health/Septic Tank Sewage Disposal System - Bulletin "A"  
23. San Martin Water Quality Study  
24. County Environmental Health Department Tests and Reports  
25. Santa Clara County Heritage Resource (including Trees) Inventory [computer database]  
26. Official County Road Book  
27. County Transportation Agency  
28. County Standards and Policies Manual (Vol. i - Land Development)  
29. Public Works Departments of Individual Cities  
30. County Off-street Parking Standards  
31. ALUC Land Use Plan for Areas Surrounding Airports [1992 version]  
32. County Fire Marshal  
33. California Department of Forestry  
34. BAAQMD Annual Summary of Contaminant Excesses & BAAQMD, "Air Quality & Urban Development-Guidelines for Assessing Impacts of Projects & Plans"  
35. Architectural and Site Approval Committee Secretary  
36. County Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval  
37. County Development Guidelines for Design Review  
38. Riparian Inventory of Santa Clara County, Greenbelt Coalition, November 1988.  
40. Site Specific Archaeological Reconnaissance Report  
41. State Archaeological Clearinghouse, Sonoma State University  
44. Southwest San Martin Area Interim Development Guidelines  
45. 2009 NPDES Storm Water Discharge Permit  
46. 2002 Clean Water Act Section 303(d)  
48. County of Santa Clara Ordinance Code  
49. Santa Clara Countywide Trails Master Plan Update, November 1995  
50. Santa Clara Valley Water District Water Resources Protection Collaborative Guidelines and Standards for Land Use near Streams