

ADDENDUM TO A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of San José has prepared an Initial Study/Addendum to a Negative Declaration adopted for a previous project, because changes made to the project described below do not raise important new issues about the effects on the environment.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

File No. PP16-131 - Amending Title 23 of the San José Municipal Code (Sign Code):

The Sign Code regulates all Signs on private property within the City. This project is an ordinance amending the Sign Code to revise Chapters 23.02 and 23.04 sign provisions to allow supergraphic signs in the Downtown Sign Zone and the North San Jose Signage Area subject to specific regulations.

A. Supergraphic Signs for Large Downtown Events

The Ordinance would define supergraphic sign as *"a sign, other than a banner sign, which consists of flexible material attached flush to a building façade,"* and allow supergraphic signs associated with a Large Downtown Convention or Large Downtown Special Event to be displayed on a non-residential building that is 125 feet or greater in height. A "Large Downtown Convention" is a convention or other event held in the Downtown Core Area with 700 or more San José hotel rooms booked on a single night by the San José Convention and Visitor's Bureau or by the convention or event sponsor. A "Large Downtown Special Event" means a Downtown Special Event, as defined in Municipal Code Section 6.55.050, with a projected attendance of 10,000 people or more as determined by the City Manager designee authorized to declare such events, and a permit for such event approved pursuant Chapter 13.14 of the Municipal Code. The Ordinance would allow supergraphic signs to be displayed on qualifying buildings for a maximum of seven (7) days before and seven (7) days after a Large Downtown Convention or Large Downtown Special Event. Supergraphic signs displayed during these events would be limited to on-site or noncommercial messages. Supergraphic signs that cover windows must be located at a minimum of 75 feet above grade.

B. Supergraphic Signs for Non-Residential Buildings

The Ordinance would allow supergraphic signs that do not cover windows, doors, or interfere with other required ventilation on non-residential buildings 100 feet or greater in height, or parking garages with three or more levels of parking above grade. The Ordinance would allow such signs to be displayed for a maximum of 120 consecutive days, and no more than 120 days total in a calendar year.

C. Regulations Applicable to All Supergraphic Signs

1. Cannot be located on an Historic Building;
2. Are limited to one building façade, except that can be located on two facades if the sign area is not greater than would be allowed on a single façade;
3. May consist of non-contiguous segments;

4. Cannot be externally illuminated;
5. Cannot cover windows or doors below the second floor of the building;
6. Cannot be a roof sign;
7. Must conform to all health and safety requirements of the Municipal Code;
8. Must be maintained in good condition;
9. Such signs do not reduce otherwise allowed sign area;
10. Must comply with all State and Federal requirements; and
11. A supergraphic sign for a special event may not be displayed concurrently with a supergraphic sign for a non-residential building on the same building.

D. Other sections may be amended to include non-substantive changes such as cross references, definitions, or clarifications. The specific language of the Sign Code amendments will be written to conform and to be consistent with other applicable Sign regulations including State and Federal Laws.

CERTIFICATION

An Initial Study/Negative Declaration, File No PP-10-111 and addenda thereto, File Nos PP12-041, PP13-015, PP13-033 (previous project) as described under "Background" section below covered the environmental impacts for a broad range of Sign Code amendments. In addition, the City of San José as the Lead Agency, has prepared the attached CEQA Checklist to consider the potential impacts that could result from the proposed revisions to the Sign Code as detailed under "Project Description and Location" above. The following impacts were reviewed and found to be adequately considered:

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Traffic and Circulation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soils and Geology | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flooding | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Facilities and Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BACKGROUND

The previous project was prepared for the following revisions to the Sign Code:

First Phase Ordinance Revisions

1. Allow Freeway Signs for Shopping Center Sites of 15 acres or more in area that are located within 250 feet of a freeway up to a maximum area of 400 square feet and a maximum height of 60-80 feet. with allowance for a

Programmable Electronic Sign component of up to 240 square feet. Revise the provisions for measuring a two-sided sign to address V-shaped signs. Establish operational requirements for Programmable Electronic Signs to minimize light and glare and address traffic safety. Establish a minimum required 150-foot setback from any residential dwelling unit and specify that the sign be oriented away from residential units to the maximum extent feasible.

2. Allow Architectural Sign Clusters (signage integrated with landscape structures) in lieu of an otherwise allowed freestanding sign for parcels of 15 acres or more in area, subject to the existing overall sign area limitations and setbacks for a freeway sign.
3. Establish the San Pedro Square Signage Area with sign regulations that reflect the desire of the City to provide signage regulations specifically tailored to the unique land use pattern in this area which is typified by small-scale historic and new buildings set within open plazas and surrounded by more intense urban development. The specific regulations applicable to this proposed Signage Area allow for roof signs on single-story buildings, fin signs that extend above the cornice or parapet of a one or two-story building and an increase in the allowed area of a roof sign. Revise the provisions for measuring a roof sign.
4. Revise the requirements for Vertical Projecting Signs in the Downtown Sign Zone to allow a maximum height of 70 feet above grade, establish a minimum required height of 15 feet for a sign of 100 square feet or less, and allow signs to project above the cornice or parapet of a building by a maximum of 10 feet.
5. Revise the requirements for Fin Signs in the Downtown Sign Zone to establish a minimum required height of eight (8) feet, establish 30 feet as the maximum height limit, and allow fin signs to project above the cornice or parapet of a building a distance equal to the vertical dimension of the sign divided by four.
6. Allow Arcade signs in the Downtown Sign Zone and in the Urban Mixed Use Sign Zone subject to a minimum height of eight (8) feet above grade.
7. Expressly prohibit signs displaying off-site commercial messages.
8. Revise the methodology for calculating sign area applicable to roof signs and V-shaped signs.

Second Phase Ordinance Revisions

1. In the Downtown Sign Zone, allow temporary supergraphic signs on the blank walls of buildings (not covering windows or doors) subject to a maximum sign area of 5,000 square feet and an overall limit on the number of such signs allowed at any one time. Such signs must conform to applicable Fire and Building Code standards and may be projected light signs, subject to specific restrictions. Allow these supergraphic signs to be projected light signs subject to specific limitations.
2. In the Downtown Sign Zone, allow a supergraphic sign in lieu of an otherwise allowed skyline sign on buildings that are 75% or less occupied. Such signs are limited to a maximum area of 5,000 square feet, may cover windows of unoccupied building space, and must conform to applicable Fire and Building Code standards.
3. In the Downtown Sign Zone, allow an attached Programmable Electronic Sign (PES) or PES component for each ground floor occupancy with 100 linear feet of frontage on one street or 150 linear feet of frontage on two streets, subject to a maximum area of 50 square feet, a height limit of 25 feet above grade and specific requirements to minimize light and glare and address traffic safety. A PES cannot exceed 50% of the total sign area of any sign.
4. Allow Programmable Electronic Signs for assembly uses with a maximum building occupancy of 500 or more persons or an outdoor assembly use with a maximum of 5,000 or more permanent fixed seats. Establish maximum sign area, height, setback and other requirements to ensure that residential dwelling units are not

illuminated by these signs. Establish operational requirements to address compatibility with sensitive uses and traffic safety.

5. Establish a three (3)-year pilot program to allow large parcels or parcels with long frontages on Stevens Creek Boulevard to display Programmable Electronic Signs as components of freestanding signs within a sub-area of the Stevens Creek Boulevard Signage Area. Limit signs to 60% of the otherwise allowed area of a freestanding sign and establish setbacks and operational requirements to address compatibility with sensitive uses and traffic safety.
6. In the Downtown Sign Zone:
 - Allow flat-mounted attached signs on buildings adjacent to a freeway to be displayed higher than 30 feet above grade.
 - Eliminate restriction on attached signs facing freeways.
 - Identify additional provisions for temporary signs to accommodate art or other temporary displays.
 - Allow small animated sign components as part of a larger sign.
 - Allow architectural roof signs as an integral element of the design of a one (1) or two (2) story building.
 - Revise the boundary of the Downtown Sign Zone so that it is coterminous with the boundary of the Downtown Core Area. This involves a minor reduction in the area of the Sign Zone.
 - Allow skyline signs on buildings 50 feet or greater in height. Allow skyline signs on residential buildings.
 - Expand the allowance for signs at the entrance to parking garages.
 - Expand the allowed size of temporary projected light signs.
7. Citywide or within specified areas:
 - Allow skyline signs and roof signs on buildings 80 feet or more in height in all commercial and industrial zoning districts citywide and in the Urban Mixed Use Sign Zone.
 - Increase the allowed area of fin signs in commercial and industrial zoning districts citywide. Increase the allowed display height from 10 to 20 feet, eliminate the requirement that fin signs be located near an entrance and increase the allowed projection from a building wall.
 - Allow greater flexibility in the number of signs allowed for a multi-tenant occupancy.
 - Allow greater flexibility for relocating attached historic signs.
 - Eliminate restrictions on skyline or roof signs visible from a park or creek. Replace with a requirement for a minimum 100-foot setback from the top of bank of a creek or river or a finding by the Director of Planning that the sign will not illuminate riparian habitat.
 - Increase the total number of signs allowed for large non-residential properties located in a residential zoning district from one (1) to two (2). Allow signs on non-residential properties in residential zoning districts to be illuminated, subject to specific limitations.
 - Allow a sign at each vehicular entrance to a parking garage that provides 200 or more public parking spaces with a maximum sign area of 100 square feet per sign.

Additional Ordinance Analysis

1. Retain the existing billboard ban and explore revisions to current regulations for the relocation of existing legal non-conforming billboards to ensure that they allow for and encourage relocation of billboards from residential areas to more appropriate commercial locations. Explore measures to ensure better maintenance of existing billboards.
2. In regard to freeway signs for large shopping centers, explore allowance for off-site messages for nearby large businesses and explore alternatives for a design review process with a community meeting for freeway signs that exceed the height and area parameters.
3. Monitor the proposed Stevens Creek Boulevard Programmable Electronic Sign Pilot Program and explore the potential for Programmable Electronic Signs in the Capitol Expressway Auto Mall Signage Area, Blossom Hill Road in the vicinity of Oakridge Mall and along Capitol Corridor near Eastridge and in other appropriate commercial areas.
4. Explore regulations allowing large temporary banner/supergraphic signs limited to on-site or non-commercial messages in the North San Jose and Edenvale Industrial Areas and in the Airport Sign Zone.
5. Allow A-frame signs on public sidewalks in all of the Neighborhood Business Districts and explore a mechanism to more proactively enforce regulations for temporary signs.
6. Explore allowing supergraphics for large public assembly venues.
7. Within 24 months of the effective date of an ordinance allowing for supergraphic signs in the Downtown Sign Zone, reassess and provide revised recommendations regarding the total number of supergraphic signs allowed in the Downtown Sign Zone at any one time.
8. Develop a provision that allows Programmable Electronic Signs (PDSs) in the Stevens Creek Boulevard Programmable Electronic Sign Pilot Program Area to exceed 60% of the total area of a sign based on specific criteria regarding the design quality.
9. Explore options for allowing off-site messages for very large assembly uses.

ANALYSIS:

The current ordinance provides for supergraphic signs in the Downtown Sign Zone and the North San Jose Signage Area as addressed in the original Negative Declaration/Initial Study (ND/IS); however the current regulations differ from those addressed in the original Negative Declaration as summarized below:

1. The regulations addressed in the ND/IS limited the signs to a maximum area of 5,000 square feet. The current ordinance does not include a maximum square footage, but limits the area of the sign to a single building façade and establishes minimum heights that limit the area of the façade that can be covered;
2. The regulations addressed in the ND/IS did not allow signs to cover windows or doors. The current ordinance prohibits signs over windows or doors for non-residential buildings. It allows signs for special events to cover windows or doors, but limits these signs to a very short display period one week prior to and one week after the event and no more than 30 days per calendar year;
3. The regulations addressed in the ND/IS limited the number of signs to a total of five (5) at any one time. The current ordinance does not limit the number of signs; and
4. The regulations addressed in the ND/IS allowed supergraphic signs to be projected light signs. The current ordinance does not allow supergraphic signs to be projected light signs.

The Downtown Sign Zone and the North San José Signage Area are two of the most intensely developed areas of San José that are key centers of business activity. Downtown San José is also the city's cultural center, attracting large numbers of visitors and residents to conventions, cultural activities, and sporting events. The Goals and Policies of the General Plan encourage a more vibrant and urbanized city with emphasis on economic growth and higher density developments in in both Downtown and North San José. The regulations are intended to allow a new type of signage suitable for the taller buildings being constructed in the Downtown and North San José, and that supports business and cultural activities, adds visual interest, and minimizes visual clutter.

This project's proposed regulations are minor modifications to the previous project in that they retain limitations on the placement, size, and display time designed to prevent blight and visual clutter and ensure that the signs do not affect building safety.

Both the previous project and the Initial Study for this project analyzed that the environmental impacts would result in a less than significant impact to the environment and would not cause visual clutter or blight. Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines is not applicable to this project in that no substantial changes creating additional environmental impacts or requiring new mitigation measures are proposed nor has any substantial change occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is proposed. Therefore, the City finds that pursuant to CEQA Section 15162, no new effects will occur and no new mitigation measures would be required as a result of the project and pursuant to CEQA Section 15164 (b), an Addendum is prepared. In conformance with CEQA, the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement has determined that a substantial revision to the project has not been made, and no further environmental review or mitigation is required under CEQA.

Carol Hamilton
Project Manager

12/01/16

Date

Harry Freitas, DIRECTOR
Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

Jenny Nusbaum

Deputy

Addendum CEQA Checklist

File Number: PP16-131

City of San José

SECTION 1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

The purpose of this Checklist analysis is to evaluate whether changes to the project proposed after preparation of the Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the San Jose Sign Code Update Phases I and 2 (File No. PP-10-111) would result in any new potentially significant environmental impacts, require additional mitigation, increase the severity of a potentially significant impact, or whether substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is proposed.

1.1 PROJECT TITLE

File Number: PP16-131 - Title 23 Municipal Code Amendments Regarding Supergraphic Signs

1.2 LEAD AGENCY ADDRESS AND LEAD AGENCY CONTACT

Jenny Nusbaum, Supervising Planner
City of San José, Department of Planning, Building & Code Enforcement
200 East Santa Clara Street
San José, CA 95113

1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

Downtown Sign Zone and North San Jose Signage Area

1.4 PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS

City of San José
Attention: Jenny Nusbaum, Supervising Planner, Department of Planning, Building & Code Enforcement

1.5 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION AND ZONING DISTRICT

General Plan: Various

Zoning District: Various

1.6 SURROUNDING LAND USES

Various land uses surround the Downtown Sign Zone and the North San Jose Signage Area.

1.7 PROJECT-RELATED APPROVALS AND PERMITS

City Council adoption of an ordinance amending Title 23 of the City of San José Municipal Code.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section evaluates the potentially significant impacts and mitigation of the revised project (File No. PP16-131) as compared with the original project, the San Jose Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2, addressed in the original Negative Declaration/Study (File No. PP-10-111) for each impact category addressed in the CEQA Checklist.

Setting

The project setting has not changed significantly since preparation of the original Negative Declaration/Initial Study (PP10-111). The project area consists of the Downtown Core and the North San Industrial Area. These are two of the most intensely developed areas of San José and are key centers of business activity. Downtown San José is also the city's cultural center, attracting large numbers of visitors and residents to conventions, cultural activities, and sporting events. The Goals and Policies of the General Plan encourage a more vibrant and urbanized city with emphasis on economic growth and higher density developments in in both Downtown and North San José. Incremental development has continued to occur in these areas consistent with the City's General Plan and Zoning, but the additional development does not represent a significant change in the circumstances under which the proposed supergraphic regulations would be implemented.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Aesthetics Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

a-d. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the San Jose Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 concluded that the project would not result in any impact on a scenic vista, damage scenic resources, including historic buildings, or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and surroundings. This was based on analysis that the sign regulations were structured to control the size, placement and type of signage in a manner that prevents sign clutter and visual blight, that they provided for more intense signage in the urban core and less intense signage in the areas of the city that are suburban or rural in character, and that the proposed sign types and regulations were carefully vetted through a community outreach process to ensure consideration of the community's aesthetic values in development of the revised sign regulations. There are no officially designated State of California scenic highways within San José.

The current project makes minor modifications to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs. The currently proposed ordinance limits the size of signs based on the area of the building façade (and other placement regulations) rather than on a maximum allowed area. As a result, the regulations may allow larger signs on some buildings and may reduce the size of signs on other buildings. The current ordinance does not limit the number of signs that can be displayed at one time (the original project limited the number displayed in the Downtown to 5 at any one time); however, the current ordinance establishes minimum building heights for buildings that qualify for signs, thereby significantly reducing the number of buildings that qualify for supergraphic signs. The current ordinance allows signs for large events to cover windows or doors (signs over windows or doors were not allowed in the original project); however, the proposed display time for signs covering windows or doors is very limited to optimize the aesthetic benefit of such signs and minimize effects on views from interior building spaces. The proposed ordinance does not allow supergraphic signs on historic landmark buildings. These revised regulations would not result in any new impacts in regard to scenic vistas, scenic resources, or historic buildings, and would not degrade the physical character of the area.

The Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the San Jose Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 concluded that the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in regard to light and glare and nighttime views. The Initial Study stated that the proposed increase in sign area and allowance for additional Programmable Electronic Signs (PES) could result in a minor increase in nighttime lighting in specific locations, but that the proposed sign regulations provided separate regulations based on type of zoning district tailored to the land use characteristics and intensity of various areas of the City. The Initial Study indicated that such regulations included setbacks from residential uses, specific requirements for residential and open space zoning districts, and limitations on the operation and lighting of signs to ensure that sign illumination does not result in significant light and glare impacts in scenic areas or on sensitive uses. The current ordinance prohibits externally illumination of supergraphic signs and eliminates a feature of the prior project that allowed supergraphic signs to be projected light signs. As a result, the current ordinance would not result in any new sources of light and would not result in any new impacts in regarding to substantial light, glare, or nighttime views.

3.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Agricultural and Forestry Resources Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
d. Result in a loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

- a. - e. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use? Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? Would the project 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))? Would the project result in a loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The ND/IS concluded that the proposed Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 would affect only the size, type, number, and placement of signs within the City limits of San Jose and would not otherwise change the City's regulations regarding the development of vacant land. The size and type of signage allow by the Sign Ordinance is based on types of Zoning Districts to ensure that appropriate signage is provided for the full range of land uses, including urban and rural land uses within San Jose. The proposed changes in sign regulations will not result in the conversion of prime farmland or in any environmental impact on agricultural land. The City of San José does not contain any forest lands or timberlands suitable for timber production nor are there any

areas of the zoned Timberland Production. The proposed ordinance would not impact forest resources because the eligible sites would be located within the City's existing urban environment. The current changes in the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs are applicable only to tall buildings in the Downtown and North San Jose and would result in no new impacts on farmland or timberland.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Air Quality Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

a-e. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors? Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

The City of San José uses the threshold of significance established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to assess air quality impacts. The BAAQMD threshold of significance, projects that generate fewer than 2,000 vehicle trips per day are not considered major air pollutant contributors and do not require a technical air quality study. Based on this threshold, the ND/IS concluded that the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 would not result in any air quality

impact. The changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in additional vehicle trips or in new sources of air pollutants and would not result in any new significant air quality impact.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Biological Resources Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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, impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

- a - f. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? Would the project 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? Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phase 1 and 2 stated that the proposed project would not result in any impact on biological resources. It noted that the project only affected the development standards for signs, including their height, size, location and materials and would not have an impact on endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats or on mature trees. It stated that the proposed regulations focused primarily on permanent signage for developed sites and that these regulations require a minimum 100-foot setback from the top of bank of a creek and river for skyline signs that have the potential to illuminate riparian habitat. The current changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs do involve lighting. The new regulations do allow display of supergraphic signs over windows or doors for short periods of time. This provision has the potential to reduce bird strikes during the display period by making the windows more visible to birds. The revised regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in any new impact on biological resources.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural Resources Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

a - d. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5? Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5? Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 stated that the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on cultural resources in that the proposed Sign Ordinance amendments would affect only the size, type, number and placement of signs within the City limits of San Jose and would not impact paleontological or archaeological resources, that the proposed sign regulations included provisions to encourage the preservation of historic signs, and that the City’s development review process included discretionary review of signs associated with historic landmarks so that signage conforms to the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* and does not diminish the significance of an historic resource. The current changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not impact subsurface cultural resources or disturb human remains in that these signs would be attached to the exterior surface of a building. They would not impact historic resources in that the proposed supergraphic regulations prohibit placement of signs on historic landmark buildings. The revised supergraphic regulations would not result in any new significant impact on cultural resources.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Geology and Soils Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described 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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
4. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that will become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

- a-e. Would the project 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, ii) strong seismic ground shaking, iii) seismic-related ground failure, or iv) landslides? Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that will become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Would the project located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property? Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 stated that the proposed project applies only to signs, including their height, size, number and location, and would not alter building regulations. Signs implemented pursuant to this Ordinance would be erected in

conformance with Uniform Building Code Standards for Seismic Zone 4 to avoid or minimize potential damage from seismic shaking and liquefaction on the site and all development located in a Geologic Hazard Zone will be required to conform to the Geologic Hazards Ordinance. The Initial Study concludes that project would result in a less than significant impact. The current changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs, which are attached to buildings, are minor and would result in no new impact in regard to geology and soils. The proposed regulations require approval of a development permit that would contain conditions requiring review of individual supergraphic signs by the Building Division so that the signs conform to all applicable structural requirements. The changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in any new significant impact in regard to geology and soils.

3.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Hazards and Hazardous Materials Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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, will it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
g. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

a-h. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? Would the project 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? Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? Would the project 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? 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? 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? Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? 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?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 stated that the project affects only the development standards for signs, including their height, size, number and placement, that these regulations would not interfere with any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, would not create any potential health hazard or expose people to existing sources of health hazard, and would not result in any impact in regard to hazards or hazardous materials. The changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs are minor and will not result in new impacts in regard to emergency evacuation, hazards or hazardous materials. The proposed changes provide for Building Division review of individual supergraphic sign applications to ensure that the sign conforms to all life safety requirements. In addition, signs covering windows are required to be located a minimum of 75 feet above grade to ensure the signs do not interfere with fire-fighting and fire rescue operations.

Hydrology and Water Quality Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there will 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 will drop to a level which will not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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 will result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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 will result in flooding on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
e. Create or contribute runoff water which will exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which will impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

- a-j. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality? Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge? Would the project 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 will result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site? Would the project 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 will result in flooding on-or off-site? Would the project create or contribute runoff water which will exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? Would the project 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? Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which will impede or redirect flood flows? Would the project 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? Would the project expose people to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phase 1 and 2 indicated that the project consists of a proposed amendment to the city’s sign regulations and affects only the development standards for signs, including the size, number, type and placement of signs. This ordinance will not expose people to flooding hazards, seiches, tsunamis or mudflows and will not impede flood flows. Erection of signs pursuant to this ordinance would not affect groundwater or change drainage patterns, would result in only very minor soil disturbance or displacement and would result in no environmental impact. The minor changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in any new impacts in regard to water quality, flooding, or exposure to seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

3.9 LAND USE

Land Use Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

- a-c. Would the project physically divide an established community? Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phase 1 and 2 stated that the proposed modifications to the Sign Ordinance were applicable citywide and not site specific, that they are consistent with the purpose of the Sign Ordinance, which is to prevent blight and visual clutter, that they have been designed to achieve General Plan goals for vibrant urban develop and attractive streetscapes free of excessive clutter. The Initial Study points out that each sign permit will be required to conform to the regulations of the revised Sign Ordinance as identified for specific zoning categories. In conforming to these regulations, each sign will further the objectives of the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan. Generally, signs do not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of established communities given their scale and size; therefore the proposed amendment will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. Generally, permanent signs allowed pursuant to the proposed Sign Ordinance are located on developed sites and are not expected to conflict any applicable habitat conservation plan. The Initial Study concludes that the project would not result in any land use impact. The changes to the proposed supergraphic sign regulations are minor and would not result in any new significant land use impact.

3.10 MINERAL RESOURCES

Mineral Resources Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that will be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

- a. – b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that will be of value to the region and the residents of the state or 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?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 states that the proposed Ordinance is an amendment to the City's sign regulations and affects only the development standards for signs, including the size, number, type and placement of signs and would not affect mineral resources. The current changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in any new significant impact.

3.11 NOISE

Noise Environmental Checklist

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
b. Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

- a-f. Would the project 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? Would the project result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 states that the proposed Ordinance is an amendment to the city's sign regulations and affects only the development standards for signs, including the size, number, type and placement of signs and would not generate noise or otherwise increase in ambient noise levels. The current changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in any new significant noise impacts.

3.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Population and Housing Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

- a-c. Would the project 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)? Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 states that the proposed ordinance is an amendment to the City’s Sign regulations and affects only the development standards for Signs, including the quantity, size, number, and placement and would not induce population growth or displace housing or residents. The current changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in any new significant impacts in regard to population and housing.

3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES

Public Services Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the 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:					1,2,3,4,5
1. Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2. Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
5. Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Impacts Evaluation

- a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the 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 public services?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 states that the proposed ordinance is an amendment to the City’s Sign regulations and affects only the development standards for Signs, including the quantity, size, number, and placement and would not result in any impact on public services. The current changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in any new significant impacts in regard to public services. These changes include requirements to ensure the signs do not impede firefighting or fire rescue efforts.

3.14 RECREATION

Recreation Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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 will occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

- a-b. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated? 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?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 states that the proposed ordinance is an amendment to the City’s Sign regulations and affects only the development standards for Signs, including the quantity, size, number, and placement and would not result

in any impact on parks or recreational facilities. The current changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in any new significant impacts in regard to recreation.

3.15 TRANSPORTATION

Transportation Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

- a-f. Would the project 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? Would the project 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? 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? Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)? Would the project result in inadequate emergency access? Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 states that the proposed Ordinance is an amendment to the city's sign regulations and affects only the development standards for signs, including their size, number, type and placement and will not result in new vehicle trips and that operational requirements have been included in the proposed regulations for Programmable Electronic Signs so that these signs do not result in unsafe levels of driver distraction. The current changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in any new significant impacts in regard to traffic volumes or traffic safety.

3.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Utilities and Service Systems Environmental Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
g. Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Impacts Evaluation

a-g Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? Would the project 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? Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? Would the project 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? Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? Would the project comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The Initial Study for the Sign Code Update Phases 1 and 2 states that the proposed ordinance is an amendment to the City's Sign regulations and affects only the development standards for Signs, including the quantity, size, number, and placement and would not result in any impact on utilities. The current changes to the proposed regulations for supergraphic signs would not result in any new significant impacts in regard to utilities.

3.17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Mandatory Findings Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Checklist Source(s)
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
c. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

As discussed in the previous sections, the proposed project would not result in any potentially significant environmental impacts, and would only result in less than significant impacts.

Checklist Sources

1. Professional judgment and expertise of Planning staff, City of San José. File No PP16-083
2. *San Jose 2020 General Plan and Envision San José 2040 General Plan.*
3. City of San José. *Municipal Code* at the time of the preparation of this document.
4. City's Sign Code Amendment Initial Study/Negative Declaration, File No. PP10-133, and Addenda thereto, File Nos. PP12-041, PP13-015 and PP13-033
5. Final Environmental Impact Report, Envision San José 2040 General Plan.