# CITY OF CUPERTINO RECOMMENDATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE December 1, 2016

As provided by the Environmental Assessment Procedure, adopted by the City Council of the City of Cupertino on May 27, 1983, as amended, the following described project was reviewed by the Environmental Review Committee of the City of Cupertino on December 1, 2016.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

Application No.:

EXC-2014-15, TR-2014-70 (EA-2014-08)

Applicant:

Amy Cheng

Location:

22823 San Juan Rd

### DISCRETIONARY ACTION REQUEST

Hillside Exception to allow the development of a 3,202 square foot single family residence on slopes greater than 30%;

Tree Removal Permit to allow the removal and replacement of six specimen size Oak trees

### FINDINGS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Environmental Review Committee recommends the granting of a Mitigated Negative Declaration finding that the project is consistent with the General Plan and is determined to be insignificant.

/s/Aarti Shrivastava Aarti Shrivastava Assistant City Manager

g/erc/REC EA-2014-08



### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

CITY HALL

Case File No. EXC-2014-15, TR-2014-70

# 10300 TORRE AVENUE • CUPERTINO, CA 95014-3255 TELEPHONE: (408) 777-3308 • FAX: (408) 777-3333 Staff Use Only CUPERTINO EA File No. EA-2014-08 PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Attachments Project Title: Cheng Residence Project Location: 22823 San Juan Rd., Cupertino CA 95014 Project Description: EXC-2014-03 (EA-2014-08): Hillside Exception to allow the construction of a new 3,245 square foot single family residence on slopes greater than

30%. TR-2014-70: Tree Removal Permit to allow the removal and replacement of 6 specimen size Oak trees to facilitate the construction of a new residence.

### **Environmental Setting:**

The project site is a steep (55%), undeveloped, roughly rectangular parcel bordered to the east, north by residential property, and by San Juan Road to the south. A religious retreat center is located to the west. Approximately thirty (30) native Coast Live Oaks are located on the parcel.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Site Area (ac.) - .34 Building Coverage - 11% Exist. Building - 0 s.f. Proposed Bldg. -3,245 s.f. Zone - RHS-21 G.P. Designation - Very Low Density (1/2 Acre Slope Density Formula)

Assessor's Parcel No. - 342-22-078

If Residential, Units/Gross Acre - .201

	Total#	Rental/Own	Bdrms	Total s.f.	Price
Unit Type #1					
Unit Type #2					
Unit Type #3					
Unit Type #4					
Unit Type #5					

	L				Control to Manager Control			
Unit Typ	e #5							
Applica	ble Sp	ecial Are	a Plans: (Chec	k)				
	Monta	Vista Des	ign Guidelines		S.	. De Anza	Conceptual	
	N. De	Anza Con	ceptual		S.	. Sara-Sun	nny Conceptua	
	Heart	of the City	Specific Plan		St	tevens Cre	eek Blvd. SW 8	Landscape
lf Non-F	Reside	ntial, Bui	lding Area		s.f.	FAR	Max.	

Employees/Shift - \_\_\_\_Parking Required \_\_\_\_\_ Parking Provided \_\_\_\_\_

Project Site is Within Cupertino Urban Service Area - YES ☒ NO ☐

### **INITIAL STUDY SOURCE LIST**

### A. CUPERTINO GENERAL PLAN SOURCES

- 1. Land Use and Community Design Element
- 2. Health & Safety Element
- 3. Housing Element
- 4. Mobility Element
- 5. Environmental Resources Element
- 6. Appendix A- Hillside Development
- 7. Land Use Map
- 8. Recreation, Parks, and Community Service Element
- 9. City Ridgeline Policy
- 10. Constraint Maps

#### B. CUPERTINO SOURCE DOCUMENTS

- 11. Tree Preservation ordinance 778
- 12. City Aerial Photography Maps
- 13. "Cupertino Chronicle" (California History Center, 1976)
- 14. Geological Report (site specific)
- 15. Parking Ordinance 1277
- 16. Zoning Map
- 17. Zoning Code/Specific Plan Documents
- 18. City Noise Ordinance

### C. CITY AGENCIES Site

- 19. Community Development Dept. List
- 20. Public Works Dept.
- 21. Parks & Recreation Department
- 22. Cupertino Water Utility

# D. OUTSIDE AGENCIES

- 23. County Planning Department
- 24. Adjacent Cities'
  Planning
  Departments
- 25. County
  Departmental of
  Environmental
  Health

### D. OUTSIDE AGENCIES (Continued)

- 26. Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
- 27. County Parks and Recreation Department
- 28. Cupertino Sanitary District
- 29. Fremont Union High School District
- 30. Cupertino Union School District
- 31. Pacific Gas and Electric
- Santa Clara County Fire Department

- 33. County Sheriff
- 34. CALTRANS
- 35. County Transportation Agency
- 36. Santa Clara Valley Water District

# E. OUTSIDE AGENCY DOCUMENTS

- 37. BAAQMD Survey of Contaminant Excesses
- 38. FEMA Flood Maps/SCVWD Flood Maps
- 39. USDA, "Soils of Santa Clara County"
- 40. County
  Hazardous
  Waste
  Management
  Plan
- 41. County Heritage Resources Inventory
- 42. Santa Clara Valley Water District Fuel Leak Site
- 43. CalEPA
  Hazardous
  Waste and
  Substances Site

### F. OTHER SOURCES

- 44. Project Plan Set/Application Materials
- 45. Field Reconnaissance
- 46. Experience w/project of similar scope/characteri stics
- 47. ABAG Projection Series
- 48. BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines
- 49. Arborist Reports (Nigel Belton/Michael Bench)

#### INSTRUCTIONS

- A. Complete <u>all</u> information requested on the Initial Study Cover page. **LEAVE BLANK SPACES ONLY WHEN A SPECIFIC ITEM IS NOT APPLICABLE.**
- B. Consult the Initial Study Source List; use the materials listed therein to complete, the checklist information in Categories A through O.
- C. You are encouraged to cite other relevant sources; if such sources are used, job in their title(s) in the "Source" column next to the question to which they relate.
- D. If you check any of the "YES" response to any questions, you must attach a sheet explaining the potential impact and suggest mitigation if needed.
- E. When explaining any yes response, label your answer clearly (Example "N 3 Historical") Please try to respond concisely, and place as many explanatory responses as possible on each page.
- F. Upon completing the checklist, sign and date the Preparer's Affidavit.
- G. Please attach the following materials before submitting the Initial Study to the City.
  - ✓ Project Plan Set of Legislative Document
  - ✓ Location map with site clearly marked (when applicable)

BE SURE YOUR INITIAL STUDY SUBMITTAL IS COMPLETE - INCOMPLETE MATERIALS MAY CAUSE PROCESSING DELAYS

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? [5,9,24,41,44]				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? [5,9,11,24,34,41,44]				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? [1,17,19,44]				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? [1,16,44]				
(a) – (d) Less Than Significant/No Impact. To f similar sizes. The architecture of the home Cupertino's Residential Hillside Ordinance (19 are located within the vicinity of the project site protect the majority of the Coast Live Oaks on of substantial light or glare. The residence will for security, safety and convenience. However proposed structures will be properly shaded of adjacent properties to eliminate glare on exist.	will follow ( 0.40). No S e. The prop site. The p have an ap r, all extericated to	closely with that tate "designate cosed developn project will not o opropriate level or lighting asso to the property a	of the City descended scenic high nent will retain the control of outdoor lead of a way from the control of a way from the control of the con	of hways" ain and v source ighting the
II. AGRICULTURE 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		-		

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? [5,7,39]				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? [5,7,23]				
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? [5,7,39]				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? [5,7,39]				$\boxtimes$
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? [5,7,39]				
<b>a- e)</b> No impact. The project site is currently r is not located on property with an existing Will project site and the surrounding area is RHS-	iamson Ac	t contract. The		
III. 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. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? [5,37,42,44,48]				
			$\boxtimes$	

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? [5,37,42,44,48]				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? [4,37,44, 48]				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? [4,37,44, 48]			$\boxtimes$	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? [4,37,44, 48]				

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a-d) Less Than Significant Impact. Constructerm and temporary in duration. Typically projethat could represent a significant impact with rechange. However, BAAQMD recommends impon all construction projects:	ects of this espect to a	size do not gen ir quality and/or	erate emiss global clim	ions ate
Mitigation Measure AIR-1:				
1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, and unpaved access roads) s				raded
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, s be covered.	and, or o	ther loose mate	erial off-site	e shall
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out or removed using wet power vacuum s use of dry power sweeping is prohib	treet swe	entra secreta 🖷 es como como como secreta de considere, ser en la visca de sucreta de considera		ıy. The
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved ro	ads shall i	be limited to 15	mph.	
5. All roadways, driveways, and side soon as possible. Building pads sha grading unless seeding or soil binde	II be laid	as soon as pos		
6. Idling times shall be minimized eig in use or reducing the maximum idli California airborne toxics control me Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear s workers at all access points.	ng time to easure Tit	5 minutes (as le 13, Section 2	required b 2485 of Cal	y the ifornia
7. All construction equipment shall accordance with manufacturer's specified visible emissions.	ecification	s. All equipme		
8. Post a publicly visible sign with the contact at the lead agency regarding respond and take corrective action and take corrective action and take corrective action are gulations.	g dust cor within 48	nplaints. This ր hours. The Air	person sha District's p	II
e) No impact. This type of development is typ odors that would be considered objectionable adjacent residences.				
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:	16444-44-44-44-44-44-44-44-44-44-44-44-44			Newpowers of the control of the cont
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				

or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
[5,10,27,44]				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? [5,10,27,44]				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? [20,36,44]				
d) 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? [5,10,12,21,26]				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? [11,12,41, 49]				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? [5,10,26,27, 49]				

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
a) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project area is residential and surrounded by existing development. Further it is lacking the open fields, grasses essential for foraging and water sources for wildlife survival. The vast majority of trees on site will be maintained and protected.						
b-d) No Impact. The project site is not community, wetland, or located within designate				natural		
e-f) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project scope includes the removal and replacement of six protected Coast Live Oak trees. The City of Cupertino Municipal Code Chapter 14.18 <i>Protected Trees</i> establishes standards for the removal and replacement of protected species, including Coast Live Oaks. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO- 1 for tree removal and Mitigation Measure BIO- 2 for tree protection would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.						
Mitigation Measure BIO-1:						
1. The applicant shall plant replacements requirements of the label be planted prior to final occupancy of	Protected	Tree Ordinand				
Mitigation Measure BIO-2:						
<ol> <li>A qualified arborist be required the time of footing excavation to de preserved.</li> </ol>						
2. The existing trees to remain shall City's Protected Tree Ordinance (City's standard tree protection means) shall be listed on the plans, and put the trees to remain prior to issuance the good health of these trees sho	Chapter 14 sures (Cit protective e of buildi	1.18 of the Mur y of Cupertino fencing shall b ng permits. A r	nicipal Cod Standard e installed eport asce	de). The Detail 6- around ertaining		
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:						
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? [5,13,41]						
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? [5,13,41]						
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? [5,13,41]						
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?						

[1,5]

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

**a-d)** Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. A search of the National Register Information System and Office of Historic Preservation list of California Historical Landmarks revealed no find within the vicinity of the project. No historical or archaeological sites were identified within the proposed project area or in the vicinity of the site. In the event that Native American archaeological resources are encountered during construction activities, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CR-1** below would provide the necessary protocol should a resource be discovered during construction:

### Mitigation Measure CR-1

In the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work should be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers should avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations. Project personnel should not collect cultural resources. The City of Cupertino (or its representative) shall consult with a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, the City of Cupertino (or its representative) and the archaeologist and/or paleontologist would meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum duration, and a report prepared by the qualified archaeologist according to current professional standards.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:		
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. [2,14,44]		
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? [2,5,10, 14, 44]		
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? [2,5,10, 14, 39,44]		
iv) Landslides? [2,5,10, 14, 39,44]		
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the		

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
loss of topsoil? [2,5,10, 14, 44]				
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? [2,5,10,14, 39]				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property? [2,5,10, 14]				
e) 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? [6,9, 14, 36,39]				

a-d) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. A Geologic and Geotechnical Peer Review was prepared for the project site by Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc. A Geotechnical Study was also prepared for the project site by Earth Investigations Consultants. The proposed development is potentially constrained by steep slopes with the potential for shallow surficial sloughing and land sliding, expansive surficial soil materials, surficial soil creep, potential settlement and creep of non-engineered fill, and the susceptibility of the site to very strong seismic to violent seismic ground shaking. The City Geologic Hazards Map indicates that the building site is located within an "F" zone, which is defined as ""Area of potential fault rupture hazard within 300 feet east and 600 feet west of the Monta Vista and Berrocal faults". The site is also partially located within a CGS designated "Earthquake-induced landslide" hazard zone. The active San Andreas fault is located approximately 1.75 miles southwest of the project site, and the potentially active Monta Vista fault is mapped approximately 275 feet northeast of the site. The residence is proposing to be supported on a pier and grade beam foundation system with minimum 18inch diameter piers embedded 15 feet below ground surface, which is supported by the consultants. Implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1 - GEO-5 below would reduce the likelihood of landslides, erosion, and impacts from seismic-related ground failure during construction and beyond:

### Mitigation Measure GEO-1

Recommended a minimum of 2 discharges along this slope, and that the applicant should consider carrying water in a tightline pipe to drainage facilities downslope, with the neighbor's approval. We would prefer to see all drainage directed to San Juan Road, or to Mercedes Road with neighboring cooperation. If this is not possible, then we recommend, at a minimum, that two discharge locations be identified by the Project Geotechnical Consultant, with widely dispersed (minimum 20 feet) dissipation pipes.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
All retaining and residential struction consultant should review the plant deemed appropriate.		reference - " a consiste a consiste de la consiste		
Mitigation Measure GEO-3				
Due to the steepness of this lot, winter rainy season.	grading sł	nall not be per	mitted du	ring the
Mitigation Measure GEO-4				
Prior to issuance of Building Perm should review and approve all good Drainage Plan and the Developments ite drainage improvements and retaining walls) to ensure that the incorporated. The results of the Design Criteria, and Geotechnical City for review and approval by the Engineer.	geotechnic nt Plans (i. design p eir recomi Drainage Plan Rev	al aspects of e., site prepara arameters for nendations ha Consideration iew should be	the Grad ation and of foundation we been p s, Retaini submitted	ing and grading ons and oroperly ng Wal d to the
Mitigation Measure GEO-5				
Prior to final (as-built) project applianspect, test (as needed), and applicant construction. The inspections shoto: site preparation and grading improvements and excavations for the placement of steel and concrete.  The Project Geologist should be given to downhow bedrock conditions are as a The results of these inspections should be described by the geotect to the City Engineer for review prior	rove all geo g, site sur g, site sur e. ould be o iers are en materials a le logging s nticipated. and the a chnical cor	otechnical aspense, but not necestate and substants and retained notes are as anticipal aspect pier excess-built conditions and the aspect of	ects of the essarily be osurface on the pier ompetent ted. Considerations to the ons of	e projece e limited drainage prior to drilling bedroce deration o assure projece
e) No Impact. The proposed residence District. No septic systems or alternative was			7	
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? [5,37,42,44]				

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? [5,37,42,44]				
<b>a- b) Less Than Significant Impact.</b> Constructorm and temporary in duration. Typically prothat could represent a significant impact with change.	jects of th	nis size do not g	generate er	missions
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? [32,40,42,43,44]				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? [32,40,42,43,44]				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? [2,29,30,40,44]	,		7	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? [2,42,40,43]				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? [1,2,44]				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? [1,2,44]				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency				

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
response plan or emergency evacuation plan? [2,32,33,44]				
h) 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?[1,2,44]				
<b>a-b)</b> Less Than Significant Impact. Routing landscaping for single family residences will applicable codes and ordinances, laws, or other	be stored	in a manner th		
<b>c-f) No Impact.</b> The residences will not en or acutely hazardous materials, substances, schools within one quarter mile of the site, the hazardous waste, within 2 miles of an airport of	or waste. e site has r	There are no not handled haz	existing or ardous mat	planned erials or
g) Less Than Significant. The project emergency access. Some temporary road consite will have a short term impact to the immediate.	onstruction	propose to alt to bring neces		
h) Less Than Significant. The project site foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountain Range. I project site is composed of residences of similifires pose no greater threat to this project site residences nearby.	However, t lar size on	he immediate a similar size pa	rea surroun rcels. Thus	ding the wildland
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? [20,36,37]				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? [20,36,42]				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? [20,36,42]				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? [20,36,37]				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? [2,38]				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? [2,38]				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? [2,36,38]				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? [2,36,38]				
feet; therefore. the project is not required to Provisions. Pervious paving stones will be use	comply wi ed to meet	this threshold.	upertino Pe	ermit C.3
<b>b)</b> Less Than Significant Impact. The water service to the project site, and there ar to serve the project site and proposed project.	e adequat	e Water Compa e groundwater s	10.50	•
<b>c-f)</b> Less Than Significant Impact. The significantly alter drainage patterns or the radiate located near the project site; therefore, neerosion will occur.	te and am	ount of surface	runoff. No	streams
g- j) No impact. The project site is not locat the Stevens Creek Reservoir inundation zo mudflows on the property or in the area it is un	ne, and i	s not a locatio	n with a h	istory of
	7		1	

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community? [7,12,22,41]				
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?  [1,7,8,16,17,18,44]				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? [1,5,6,9,26]				
a-c) No impact. Although the project site Cupertino General Plan land use designation Formula)), the proposed project consists of coparcel in an area of like-sized residences Cupertino General Plan does not indicate communities' conservation plan area in the vice	n (Very Lo onstructing on like-si any hab	w Density (1/2), g one single fam ized parcels. F itat conservatio	Acre Slope nily residenc further, the	Density ces on a City of
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?  [5,10]				
b) 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? [5,10]				
<b>a- b) No impact.</b> According to Figure 5- B, M General Plan, the project site is in an area desunsuitable for extraction.			1.5%	
XII. NOISE Would the project result in:				
a) 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? [8,18,44]				

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? [8,18,44]				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? [8,18]				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? [8,18,44]				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? [8,18,44]				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? [8,18]	,			

	1			
ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Less Than Significant with Mitigation I family home, is not anticipated to generat established in the City of Cupertino Genera However, construction noise can cause some	e noise le l Plan or d	evels in excess of existing resid	of the st ences in the	andards ne area.
Implementation of <b>Mitigation Measure NOI-</b> than significant level.	1 will redu	ice the impact f	rom noise t	o a less
Mitigation Measure NOI- 1:				n A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
<ul> <li>Construction activities shall pm on weekdays and 9:00 a activities are prohibited on h</li> </ul>	m to 6:00			Department of the control of the con
<ul> <li>All construction equipment s no less effective than those no noise- reduction featu contractor shall require tha equipment.</li> </ul>	originally res were	installed by the originally in	e manufad stalled, th	turer. If en the
<ul> <li>No individual device will produce a noise level more than 87 dBA at a distance of twenty-five feet or the noise level on any nearby property does not exceed 80 dBA.</li> </ul>				
<b>b-c)</b> Less Than Significant Impact. Construction equipment that would most likely be used on the site would cause vibration levels that are within typical standards. Once constructed and occupied, the proposed project would not generate ambient noise levels over those typical of current uses.				s. Once
d) Less Than Significant Impact. Short-term reduced to a less than significant level with im				
e-f) No impact. The project site is not locate private airstrip.	ed in the vi	cinity of an airp	ort, or on c	r near a
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:				
a) 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)? [3,16,47,44]				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? [3,16,44]				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? [3,16,44]				

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>a-c) No Impact.</b> The proposed project corvacant land and is surrounded by similar resiproposed new residences do not substantially or displace existing populations.	dences on	similar sized p	arcels of la	nd. The
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES			¥3	
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection? [19,32,44]				
Police protection? [33,44]				
Schools? [29,30,44]			$\boxtimes$	
Parks? [5,17,19,21,26,27,44]			$\boxtimes$	
Other public facilities? [19,20,44]			$\boxtimes$	
a) Less Than Significant Impact. The proportion residence on vacant land and is surrounded to fland. The area is already served by all agent	oy similar ı	residences on s	imilar sized	parcels
XV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project 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? [5,17,19,21,26,27,44]				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? [5,44]				

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a- b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proby existing parks and open space areas. Due not increase the use of existing parks and deterioration would occur or be accelerated, n	to its sma	all size, the prop al facilities such	osed proje that a su	ct would bstantial
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? [4,20,35,44]				
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? [4,20,44]				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? [4,?]			7	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? [20,35,44]				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? [2,19,32,33,44]				
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? [4,34]				
<ul><li>a-b) Less Than Significant. The project residential roads. Considering the small scale on the area roads will be minimal.</li><li>c) No Impact. The project site is not located</li></ul>	of the pro		he increase	in traffic

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Therefore, the proposed project would not inte	rfere with	existing air traff	ic patterns.	
d-f) Less Than Significant. The proposed produced Juan Road. Although there will be minimal in residence, the project design includes onsite project Significant.	ncrease ir parking for	traffic typical six (6) vehicles	with a singl , consistent	le family
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS  - Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? [5,22,28,36,44]				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? [36,22,28,36]				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? [5,22,28,36,44]				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? [5,22,28,36,44]				
e) 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? [5,22,28,36,44]				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? [5,22,28,36,44]				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? [5,22,28,36,44]				
a-f) Less Than Significant. The proposed wastewater and generate typical water demar Cupertino Sanitary District and San Jose Wat as part of the proposed project. The proposed	nd. The pro er District,	and service line	rently serve es will be co	d by nnected

ISSUES: [and Supporting Information Sources]	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporatio	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

production but the increase will be negligible. The proposed project will use pervious surfaces where possible. Solid waste collection for the City of Cupertino is provided by Recology. The amount of waste that would be generated by the new residences would not have a significant impact on the operation or the life expectancy of the landfill.

g) Less Than Significant Impact. Both during and after construction, the proposed project will follow City policies for solid waste recycling and disposal.

XVIII. MANDATORY FIND (To be complete			NCE	
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				
PREPARER'	S AFFID	AVIT		
I hereby certify that the information provided best of my knowledge and belief; I certify that accurately to all questions herein, and have of when necessary to ensure full and complete hereby acknowledge than any substantial error delay or discontinuance of related project revenues the City of Cupertino, its staff and a such delay or discontinuance.  Preparer's Sig	t I have u consulted disclosur ors dated riew prod authorize	used proper d I appropriate re of relevant d within this li edures, and l	liligence in re source refere environment nitial Study m hereby agree	esponding ences al data. I nay cause e to hold
Print Preparer		GiAN Pro	6 Untire	

G:\Planning\MISCELL\Template\Initial Study Checklist.doc

# ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (To be Completed by City Staff)

### **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project,
involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the
checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources	$\boxtimes$	Air Quality
	Biological Resources	$\boxtimes$	Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	$\boxtimes$	Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		
DETERMINATION:					
On the basis of this initial evaluation the Environmental Review Committee (ERC) finds that:					
	The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.				
	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.				
	The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.				
	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.				
	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.				
12/1/16					
Staff Evaluator				Date	9

ERC Chairperson

