

**Doyle Road General Plan Amendment Project
Final Negative Declaration
Responses to Comments/Errata
City of San José, Santa Clara County, California
GP22-004/ER23-055**

Prepared for:



City of San José
Planning Division
200 East Santa Clara Street
Tower, 3rd Floor
San José, CA 95113
408.535.3555

Contact: Cort Hitchens, Environmental Project Manager

Prepared by:

FirstCarbon Solutions
2999 Oak Road, Suite 250
Walnut Creek, CA 94597
925.357.2562

Contact: Mary Bean, Project Director
Alison Rondone, Senior Project Manager

Report Date: November 15, 2023

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

The Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration (Draft IS/ND) for the proposed Doyle Road General Plan Amendment Project (proposed project) was prepared in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The 20-day public circulation period for the Draft IS/ND started October 16, 2023 and ended November 6, 2023. During the circulation period, the City of San José received two comment letters.

In summary, the comments received on the Draft IS/ND did not raise any new issues about the proposed project's environmental impacts or provide information indicating the proposed project would result in new environmental impacts or impacts substantially greater in severity than disclosed in the Draft IS/ND. Minor clarifications were added to the text of the Draft IS/ND (refer to Section 3, Errata). The text revisions do not constitute a "substantial revision" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5 and recirculation of the ND is not required.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5, the recirculation of the ND is required when the document must be "substantially revised" after public notice of its availability. A "substantial revision" is defined as:

- A new, avoidable significant effect is identified and mitigation measures or project revisions must be added in order to reduce the effect to insignificance; or
- The lead agency determines that the proposed mitigation measures or project revisions will not reduce potential effects to less than significant and new measures or revisions must be required.

The incorporation of information in the Final IS/ND that clarifies, amplifies or makes insignificant modifications does not require recirculation (CEQA Guidelines § 15073.5 (c)(4)). CEQA does not require formal responses to comments on an IS/ND and the decision-making body shall adopt the proposed ND only if it finds on the basis of the whole record before it, that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment and the ND reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis (CEQA Guidelines § 15074(b)).

This document is organized into three sections:

- **Section 1—Introduction.**
- **Section 2—Responses to Written Comments:** Provides a list of the agencies, organizations, and individuals who commented on the Initial Study. Copies of all of the letters received regarding the Initial Study and responses thereto are included in this section.
- **Section 3—Errata:** Includes an addendum listing refinements and clarifications on the Initial Study, which have been incorporated.

The Final IS/MND includes the following contents:

- Initial Study (provided under separate cover)
- Initial Study appendices (provided under separate cover)
- Responses to Written Comments and Errata (Sections 2 and 3 of this document)

SECTION 2: RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

2.1 - LIST OF AUTHORS

A list of public agencies, organizations, and individuals that provided comments on the Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration (Draft IS/ND) is presented below. Each comment has been assigned a code. Individual comments within each communication have been numbered so comments can be cross-referenced with responses. Following this list, the text of the communication is reprinted and followed by the corresponding response.

Author	Author Code
Regional and Local Agencies	
Pacific Gas and Electric Company	PG&E
Santa Clara Valley Water District	VALLEY WATER

2.2 - RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

2.2.1 - Introduction

Although a lead agency is not required to provide written responses to comments on proposed Negative Declarations (NDs) or Mitigated Negative Declarations (MNDs) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of San José has evaluated the comments received on the Doyle Road General Plan Amendment Project (proposed project) IS/ND and has elected to provide responses to the following significant environmental comments. None of the comments received results in the need to recirculate the Initial Study or to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

2.2.2 - Comment Letters and Responses

The comment letters reproduced in the following pages follow the same organization as used in the List of Authors.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



October 17, 2023

Cort Hitchens
City of San Jose
200 E Santa Clara St, 3rd Flr
San Jose, CA 95113

Ref: Gas and Electric Transmission and Distribution

Dear Cort Hitchens,

Thank you for submitting the GP22-004 plans for our review. PG&E will review the submitted plans in relationship to any existing Gas and Electric facilities within the project area. If the proposed project is adjacent/or within PG&E owned property and/or easements, we will be working with you to ensure compatible uses and activities near our facilities.

Attached you will find information and requirements as it relates to Gas facilities (Attachment 1) and Electric facilities (Attachment 2). Please review these in detail, as it is critical to ensure your safety and to protect PG&E's facilities and its existing rights.

Below is additional information for your review:

1. This plan review process does not replace the application process for PG&E gas or electric service your project may require. For these requests, please continue to work with PG&E Service Planning: https://www.pge.com/en_US/business/services/building-and-renovation/overview/overview.page.
2. If the project being submitted is part of a larger project, please include the entire scope of your project, and not just a portion of it. PG&E's facilities are to be incorporated within any CEQA document. PG&E needs to verify that the CEQA document will identify any required future PG&E services.
3. An engineering deposit may be required to review plans for a project depending on the size, scope, and location of the project and as it relates to any rearrangement or new installation of PG&E facilities.

Any proposed uses within the PG&E fee strip and/or easement, may include a California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) Section 851 filing. This requires the CPUC to render approval for a conveyance of rights for specific uses on PG&E's fee strip or easement. PG&E will advise if the necessity to incorporate a CPUC Section 851 filing is required.

This letter does not constitute PG&E's consent to use any portion of its easement for any purpose not previously conveyed. PG&E will provide a project specific response as required.

Sincerely,

Plan Review Team
Land Management



Attachment 1 – Gas Facilities

There could be gas transmission pipelines in this area which would be considered critical facilities for PG&E and a high priority subsurface installation under California law. Care must be taken to ensure safety and accessibility. So, please ensure that if PG&E approves work near gas transmission pipelines it is done in adherence with the below stipulations. Additionally, the following link provides additional information regarding legal requirements under California excavation laws: <https://www.usanorth811.org/images/pdfs/CA-LAW-2018.pdf>

1. Standby Inspection: A PG&E Gas Transmission Standby Inspector must be present during any demolition or construction activity that comes within 10 feet of the gas pipeline. This includes all grading, trenching, substructure depth verifications (potholes), asphalt or concrete demolition/removal, removal of trees, signs, light poles, etc. This inspection can be coordinated through the Underground Service Alert (USA) service at 811. A minimum notice of 48 hours is required. Ensure the USA markings and notifications are maintained throughout the duration of your work.

2. Access: At any time, PG&E may need to access, excavate, and perform work on the gas pipeline. Any construction equipment, materials, or spoils may need to be removed upon notice. Any temporary construction fencing installed within PG&E’s easement would also need to be capable of being removed at any time upon notice. Any plans to cut temporary slopes exceeding a 1:4 grade within 10 feet of a gas transmission pipeline need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

3. Wheel Loads: To prevent damage to the buried gas pipeline, there are weight limits that must be enforced whenever any equipment gets within 10 feet of traversing the pipe.

Ensure a list of the axle weights of all equipment being used is available for PG&E’s Standby Inspector. To confirm the depth of cover, the pipeline may need to be potholed by hand in a few areas.

Due to the complex variability of tracked equipment, vibratory compaction equipment, and cranes, PG&E must evaluate those items on a case-by-case basis prior to use over the gas pipeline (provide a list of any proposed equipment of this type noting model numbers and specific attachments).

No equipment may be set up over the gas pipeline while operating. Ensure crane outriggers are at least 10 feet from the centerline of the gas pipeline. Transport trucks must not be parked over the gas pipeline while being loaded or unloaded.

4. Grading: PG&E requires a minimum of 36 inches of cover over gas pipelines (or existing grade if less) and a maximum of 7 feet of cover at all locations. The graded surface cannot exceed a cross slope of 1:4.

5. Excavating: Any digging within 2 feet of a gas pipeline must be dug by hand. Note that while the minimum clearance is only 24 inches, any excavation work within 24 inches of the edge of a pipeline must be done with hand tools. So to avoid having to dig a trench entirely with hand tools, the edge of the trench must be over 24 inches away. (Doing the math for a 24 inch

1
CONT



wide trench being dug along a 36 inch pipeline, the centerline of the trench would need to be at least 54 inches [$24/2 + 24 + 36/2 = 54$] away, or be entirely dug by hand.)

Water jetting to assist vacuum excavating must be limited to 1000 psig and directed at a 40° angle to the pipe. All pile driving must be kept a minimum of 3 feet away.

Any plans to expose and support a PG&E gas transmission pipeline across an open excavation need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

6. Boring/Trenchless Installations: PG&E Pipeline Services must review and approve all plans to bore across or parallel to (within 10 feet) a gas transmission pipeline. There are stringent criteria to pothole the gas transmission facility at regular intervals for all parallel bore installations.

For bore paths that cross gas transmission pipelines perpendicularly, the pipeline must be potholed a minimum of 2 feet in the horizontal direction of the bore path and a minimum of 24 inches in the vertical direction from the bottom of the pipe with minimum clearances measured from the edge of the pipe in both directions. Standby personnel must watch the locator trace (and every ream pass) the path of the bore as it approaches the pipeline and visually monitor the pothole (with the exposed transmission pipe) as the bore traverses the pipeline to ensure adequate clearance with the pipeline. The pothole width must account for the inaccuracy of the locating equipment.

7. Substructures: All utility crossings of a gas pipeline should be made as close to perpendicular as feasible ($90^\circ \pm 15^\circ$). All utility lines crossing the gas pipeline must have a minimum of 24 inches of separation from the gas pipeline. Parallel utilities, pole bases, water line 'kicker blocks', storm drain inlets, water meters, valves, back pressure devices or other utility substructures are not allowed in the PG&E gas pipeline easement.

If previously retired PG&E facilities are in conflict with proposed substructures, PG&E must verify they are safe prior to removal. This includes verification testing of the contents of the facilities, as well as environmental testing of the coating and internal surfaces. Timelines for PG&E completion of this verification will vary depending on the type and location of facilities in conflict.

8. Structures: No structures are to be built within the PG&E gas pipeline easement. This includes buildings, retaining walls, fences, decks, patios, carports, septic tanks, storage sheds, tanks, loading ramps, or any structure that could limit PG&E's ability to access its facilities.

9. Fencing: Permanent fencing is not allowed within PG&E easements except for perpendicular crossings which must include a 16 foot wide gate for vehicular access. Gates will be secured with PG&E corporation locks.

10. Landscaping: Landscaping must be designed to allow PG&E to access the pipeline for maintenance and not interfere with pipeline coatings or other cathodic protection systems. No trees, shrubs, brush, vines, and other vegetation may be planted within the easement area. Only those plants, ground covers, grasses, flowers, and low-growing plants that grow unsupported to a maximum of four feet (4') in height at maturity may be planted within the easement area.

1
CONT



11. Cathodic Protection: PG&E pipelines are protected from corrosion with an “Impressed Current” cathodic protection system. Any proposed facilities, such as metal conduit, pipes, service lines, ground rods, anodes, wires, etc. that might affect the pipeline cathodic protection system must be reviewed and approved by PG&E Corrosion Engineering.

12. Pipeline Marker Signs: PG&E needs to maintain pipeline marker signs for gas transmission pipelines in order to ensure public awareness of the presence of the pipelines. With prior written approval from PG&E Pipeline Services, an existing PG&E pipeline marker sign that is in direct conflict with proposed developments may be temporarily relocated to accommodate construction work. The pipeline marker must be moved back once construction is complete.

13. PG&E is also the provider of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E’s facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs which may endanger the safe operation of its facilities.

1
CONT

Attachment 2 – Electric Facilities

It is PG&E's policy to permit certain uses on a case by case basis within its electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) provided such uses and manner in which they are exercised, will not interfere with PG&E's rights or endanger its facilities. Some examples/restrictions are as follows:

1. Buildings and Other Structures: No buildings or other structures including the foot print and eave of any buildings, swimming pools, wells or similar structures will be permitted within fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) areas. PG&E's transmission easement shall be designated on subdivision/parcel maps as **"RESTRICTED USE AREA – NO BUILDING."**
2. Grading: Cuts, trenches or excavations may not be made within 25 feet of our towers. Developers must submit grading plans and site development plans (including geotechnical reports if applicable), signed and dated, for PG&E's review. PG&E engineers must review grade changes in the vicinity of our towers. No fills will be allowed which would impair ground-to-conductor clearances. Towers shall not be left on mounds without adequate road access to base of tower or structure.
3. Fences: Walls, fences, and other structures must be installed at locations that do not affect the safe operation of PG&'s facilities. Heavy equipment access to our facilities must be maintained at all times. Metal fences are to be grounded to PG&E specifications. No wall, fence or other like structure is to be installed within 10 feet of tower footings and unrestricted access must be maintained from a tower structure to the nearest street. Walls, fences and other structures proposed along or within the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) will require PG&E review; submit plans to PG&E Centralized Review Team for review and comment.
4. Landscaping: Vegetation may be allowed; subject to review of plans. On overhead electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s), trees and shrubs are limited to those varieties that do not exceed 10 feet in height at maturity. PG&E must have access to its facilities at all times, including access by heavy equipment. No planting is to occur within the footprint of the tower legs. Greenbelts are encouraged.
5. Reservoirs, Sumps, Drainage Basins, and Ponds: Prohibited within PG&E's fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) for electric transmission lines.
6. Automobile Parking: Short term parking of movable passenger vehicles and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) is allowed. The lighting within these parking areas will need to be reviewed by PG&E; approval will be on a case by case basis. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications. Blocked-up vehicles are not allowed. Carports, canopies, or awnings are not allowed.
7. Storage of Flammable, Explosive or Corrosive Materials: There shall be no storage of fuel or combustibles and no fueling of vehicles within PG&E's easement. No trash bins or incinerators are allowed.

1
CONT



8. Streets and Roads: Access to facilities must be maintained at all times. Street lights may be allowed in the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) but in all cases must be reviewed by PG&E for proper clearance. Roads and utilities should cross the transmission easement as nearly at right angles as possible. Road intersections will not be allowed within the transmission easement.

9. Pipelines: Pipelines may be allowed provided crossings are held to a minimum and to be as nearly perpendicular as possible. Pipelines within 25 feet of PG&E structures require review by PG&E. Sprinklers systems may be allowed; subject to review. Leach fields and septic tanks are not allowed. Construction plans must be submitted to PG&E for review and approval prior to the commencement of any construction.

10. Signs: Signs are not allowed except in rare cases subject to individual review by PG&E.

11. Recreation Areas: Playgrounds, parks, tennis courts, basketball courts, barbecue and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) may be allowed; subject to review of plans. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications.

12. Construction Activity: Since construction activity will take place near PG&E's overhead electric lines, please be advised it is the contractor's responsibility to be aware of, and observe the minimum clearances for both workers and equipment operating near high voltage electric lines set out in the High-Voltage Electrical Safety Orders of the California Division of Industrial Safety (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Title8/sb5g2.html>), as well as any other safety regulations. Contractors shall comply with California Public Utilities Commission General Order 95 (http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/gos/GO95/go_95_startup_page.html) and all other safety rules. No construction may occur within 25 feet of PG&E's towers. All excavation activities may only commence after 811 protocols has been followed.

Contractor shall ensure the protection of PG&E's towers and poles from vehicular damage by (installing protective barriers) Plans for protection barriers must be approved by PG&E prior to construction.

13. PG&E is also the owner of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E's facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs that may endanger the safe and reliable operation of its facilities.

1
CONT

Regional and Local Agencies

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)

Response to PG&E-1

This letter is acknowledged and no ND text revisions have been requested. No further response is required.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

From: [Hitchens, Cort](#)
To: ["Andrew Quan"](#)
Cc: [Lisa Brancatelli](#)
Subject: RE: Valley Water Comments for the NOI to the IS/ND for the Doyle Road General Plan Amendment Project
Date: Friday, November 3, 2023 2:13:57 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Andrew,

Thanks for these comments on the Doyle Road General Plan Amendment CEQA document, they have been received.

Thank you,

Cort Hitchens, Planner
Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
200 E. Santa Clara St. – 3rd Floor
San José, CA 95113
Direct: 408.794.7386

From: Andrew Quan <AQuan@valleywater.org>
Sent: Friday, November 3, 2023 1:39 PM
To: Hitchens, Cort <Cort.Hitchens@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: Lisa Brancatelli <LBrancatelli@valleywater.org>
Subject: Valley Water Comments for the NOI to the IS/ND for the Doyle Road General Plan Amendment Project

[External Email]

Afternoon Cort Hitchens –

The Santa Clara Valley Water District (Valley Water) has received the Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt the Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) for the Doyle Road General Plan Amendment Project located at the corner of Lawrence Expressway and Doyle Road in the City of San Jose, received by Valley Water on October 16, 2023.

Per our review, Valley Water has the following comments on this NOI to the IS/ND:

1. **Page 50 – Impact Discussion (3)** – “The nearest State or federally protected water and wetland resource is San Tomas Aquino Creek/Saratoga Creek, located approximately 140 feet to the west across Lawrence Expressway.” San Tomas Aquino Creek and Saratoga Creek are two separate creeks. San Tomas Aquino Creek is located approximately 1.7 miles to the east of the project site. If the text is intent on keeping

San Tomas Aquino Creek, please revise the text to clearly show they are two different creeks and to include the distance from the project site to San Tomas Aquino Creek.	1 CONT
2. Page 78 – Impact Discussion (1c) – The text states “...and the mapped groundwater depth is greater than 560 feet below ground surface.” Valley Water records identify the depth to first groundwater at the project site as 50 to 100 feet. Please revise text for accuracy.	2
3. Page 95 – Section 4.10.1 – Environmental Setting – “The Flood Insurance Rate Maps... project site is located within Zone D, which is defined as an area of high to moderate flood risk, but the probability has not yet been determined.” According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 06085C0236H, effective May 18, 2009, the entire Project site is located within Zone D, representing areas of undetermined flood hazard. The text needs to be revised to state the correct definition of Zone D.	3
4. Page 96 – Section 4.10.1 – Municipal Regional Stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit – The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) was re-issued on May 11, 2022, and became effective on July 1, 2023. Discussions in the Draft IS/ND should note consistency with the new MRP. If the project qualifies for coverage under the old MRP, the discussion should clearly note that and explain why it is covered under the old MRP.	4
5. Page 98 – Impact Discussion (2) – The document needs to be revised to note that the project site is located within the Santa Clara Subbasin and is within the Santa Clara Plain Recharge Area.	5
6. Page 99 – Impact Discussion (3d) – “Based on a review of FEMA flood maps, the project site is located within Flood Zone X defined as the area of minimal flood risk. Because the potential for flooding is minimal, the impact would be less than significant.” As the NOI had it correct as Zone D on Page 95, please revise the text to identify the correct Flood Zone and Flood Zone definition.	6
7. Page 99 – Impact Discussion (4) – The project site is not located within any dam inundation zone. Please remove the text about the project site being within the inundation area for the Anderson Dam.	7
8. Page 136 – Checklist Sources (34) - Valley Water’s 2016 Groundwater Management Plan is outdated and is superseded by the 2021 Groundwater Management Plan, which was released in November 2021. Please update for accuracy.	8
9. Page 136 – Checklist Sources (35) – The text needs to be revised to include a reference to FEMA FIRM 06085C0236H, effective May 18, 2009, per Comment 3.	9

Thank you for the opportunity to review the NOI to the ISND. If you have any questions, or need further information, you can reach me at (408) 630-1667, or by e-mail at AQuan@valleywater.org. Please reference Valley Water File No. 35030 on future

correspondence regarding this project.

Thank you,

ANDREW QUAN

ASSISTANT ENGINEER II - CIVIL
Community Projects Review Unit
Tel. (408) 630-1667

Santa Clara Valley Water District is now known as:



Clean Water • Healthy Environment • Flood Protection

VALLEY WATER

5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose CA 95118

www.valleywater.org

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Santa Clara Valley Water District (VALLEY WATER)

Response to VALLEY WATER-1

Text has been revised on page 50 of the IS/ND to reflect accurate and consistent descriptions of the project site's location relative to San Tomas Aquino/Saratoga Creek, as noted in the above comment. The revision does not change the analysis or result in any changes to significance determinations and no further revisions are required.

Response to VALLEY WATER-2

Text has been revised on page 78 of the IS/ND to reflect an accurate and consistent description of the depth to groundwater at the project site. The revision does not change the analysis or result in any changes to the significance determinations and no further revisions are required.

Response to VALLEY WATER-3

Text has been revised on page 95 of the IS/ND to reflect an accurate and consistent description of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone designation of Zone D. The revision does not change the analysis or result in any changes to the significance determinations and no further revisions are required.

Response to VALLEY WATER-4

Text has been revised on page 96 of the IS/ND to reflect the reissued NPDES permit effective July 1, 2023. The revisions do not change the analysis or result in any changes to the significance determinations and no further revisions are required. The impact discussion on page 98-99 of the IS/ND determined that the project would be consistent with the City of San José Grading Ordinance, applicable provisions of the City Council Policy 6-29 Post-Construction Urban Runoff Management, and City Council Policy 8-14 Post-Construction Hydromodification Management and the impact would be less than significant.

Response to VALLEY WATER-5

Text has been revised on page 98 of the IS/ND to identify that the project is located within the Santa Clara Subbasin and is within the Santa Clara Plain Recharge Area. The revision does not change the conclusions in the analysis and no further revisions are required.

Response to VALLEY WATER-6

Text has been revised on page 99 of the IS/ND to reflect the correct flood zone designation. The revision does not change the conclusions in the analysis and no further revisions are required.

Response to VALLEY WATER-7

Text has been revised on page 99 of the IS/ND to eliminate the statement concerning the project site being located in the Anderson Dam inundation area. The revision does not change the conclusions in the analysis and no further revisions are required.

Response to VALLEY WATER-8

Text has been revised on page 136 of the IS/ND to reflect Valley Water's 2021 Groundwater Management Plan. The revision does not change the conclusions in the analysis and no further revisions are required.

Response to VALLEY WATER-9

Text has been revised on page 136 of the IS/ND to include reference to FEMA FIRM 06085C0236H, effective May 18, 2009, per Comment 3.

SECTION 3: ERRATA

The following are revisions to the Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration (Draft IS/ND) for the Doyle Road General Plan Amendment Project.

These revisions are minor modifications and clarifications to the document, and do not change the significance of any of the environmental issue conclusions within the Draft IS/ND. The revisions are listed by page number. All additions to the text are underlined (underlined) and all deletions from the text are stricken (~~stricken~~).

3.1 - CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Section 4.4 Biological Resources

Page 50, text has been revised as follows:

The nearest State or federally protected water and wetland resource is ~~San Tomas Aquino Creek~~/Saratoga Creek, located approximately 140 feet to the west across Lawrence Expressway. No direct runoff from the project site into the creek is anticipated, and the proposed project would be tied into the municipal stormwater system.

Section 4.7, Geology and Soils

Page 78, threshold c) text has been revised as follows:

The project site soil consists of very dense sands and fine-grained clayey soils and the mapped groundwater depth is greater than ~~560~~ 50 to 100 feet below ground surface. Therefore, the Geotechnical Exploration concluded that the potential for liquefaction at the project site during seismic shaking is low.

Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality

Page 95, Section 4.10.1, Environmental Setting, text has been revised as follows:

The Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) indicate that the project site is located within Zone D, which is defined as an area of undetermined flood risk ~~high to moderate flood risk, but the probability has not yet been determined~~. The City does not have any floodplain restrictions for development in Zone D.

Page 96, text has been revised as follows:

In 2022, the San Francisco Bay RWQCB issued a regional NPDES permit (Order No. R2-2022-0018 NPDES Permit No. CAS612008) for stormwater, consolidating requirements for all Bay Area municipalities and flood control agencies that discharge directly to San Francisco Bay. Some provisions require regional action and collaboration, but others relate to specific municipal activities over which the municipalities have individual responsibility and control. The Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (MRP) was re-issued on May 11, 2022, and became effective on July 1, 2023.

Under the ~~Municipal Regional Stormwater MRP, NPDES Permit (also referred to as MRP),~~ development projects that create, add, or replace 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area are required to control post-development stormwater runoff through source control, site design, and treatment control BMPs. Additional requirements must be met by certain large projects that create one acre or more of impervious surfaces (see Hydromodification discussion below). Beginning December 1, 2011, the impervious surface threshold for Regulated Projects ~~will be~~ was decreased from 10,000 square feet to 5,000 square feet for special land use categories (e.g., auto services facilities, gas stations, restaurants, parking lots) and most Regulated Projects will have to treat stormwater runoff with additional treatment measures, such as harvesting and reuse, infiltration, evapotranspiration, or biotreatment.

Page 98, the following text has been revised:

Less than significant impact. The project site is located within the Santa Clara Subbasin and the Santa Clara Plain Recharge Area. The proposed project does not include any physical changes to the environment. Future development under the proposed project would not be expected to affect groundwater supplies unless it involved major excavation that accesses groundwater. Individual project(s) proposed for the site would be subject to CEQA review to ensure that no significant impacts would occur to groundwater. For these reasons, the impact would be less than significant.

Page 99, threshold d), the following text has been revised:

Less than significant impact. The proposed project does not include any physical development. Future development under the proposed project could redevelop the project site. Based on a review of FEMA flood maps, the project site is located within Flood Zone ~~X D~~, defined as the an area of undetermined ~~minimal~~ flood risk. Because the potential for flooding is expected to be minimal, the impact would be less than significant.

Page 99, threshold 4, the following text has been revised:

Less than significant impact. Based on a review of the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) California Dam Breach Inundation Maps, the project site is not located within the inundation area for the Anderson Dam- or within any other dam inundation zone.

Section 5, Checklist Sources

Page 136, the following source has been revised:

34. Santa Clara Valley Water District (Valley Water). ~~2016~~ 2021. ~~2016~~ 2021 Groundwater Management Plan. November.

Page 136, the following source has been revised:

35. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2019. National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette. FEMA FIRM 06085C0236H, effective May 18, 2009.