SECTION 4.0 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

The CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR discuss the ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in a surrounding area. Projects which could remove obstacles to population growth (such as a major public service expansion) must also be considered in this discussion.

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d), it must not be assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment. Negative impacts resulting from induced growth occur only where the projected growth would cause significant adverse environmental effects. To evaluate growth inducement under CEQA, it is necessary to distinguish between the growth (and the impacts from that growth) that is part of the project itself and "induced" growth which may be caused by the project but is not part of the project. This PEIR explicitly identifies all of the impacts that result from the project itself, even its later phases of growth, and identifies mitigation for significant impacts from the proposed project. The Guidelines require that an EIR discuss "the ways" in which a project could foster or induce economic or population growth or construction of new housing, not provide a detailed impact analysis, as must be done for the project itself.

Examples of induced growth would include development that is likely to occur if a major constraint on utility capacity were removed, such as expansion of a wastewater treatment plant. Growth could also be induced by construction of a new freeway through an undeveloped area. Both direct and indirect impacts must be discussed. An example of indirect impacts is the need for housing generated as a result of job growth allowed by approval of a specific plan.[225]

4.1 DIRECT IMPACTS

This PEIR describes the environmental effects of the proposed project, the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*. The project includes construction and/or expansion of the infrastructure needed to serve the amount of growth envisioned under this update of the General Plan. The analyses in this PEIR evaluate the impacts of that proposed growth.

The City of San José is not, however, proposing extensive infrastructure that either substantially exceeds the capacity required to serve the growth proposed within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and Urban Service Area (USA), or includes oversized elements that end or are located at the edge of the currently proposed urban envelope. A key concept of the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* is the "Focused Growth" strategy, which is embodied in multiple General Plan policies and the Land Use/Transportation Diagram. One intended outcome of this strategy is to minimize growth potential in areas within or outside of the City which have not been planned for growth. Accordingly, the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* policies do not allow the expansion of municipal services to serve new development outside of the USA.

In order to achieve the project's objectives of making the City more integrated and providing a variety of services in close proximity to all of the neighborhoods, some streets are being redesigned to accommodate fewer cars and more bicycles, pedestrians and transit facilities and to better align their design with General Plan goals and policies and to better align their capacity with the planned amounts of growth. In some instances streets within the City are planned for expansion to more efficiently serve existing and planned growth within the City's planning area. This *Envision San*

[225] *Napa Citizens for Honest Government v Napa County Board of Supervisors* (2001). 91 CA4th 342, 368, 110 CR2d 579.

José 2040 General Plan does not contemplate developing the Urban Reserves on the City's southern edge and does not propose extending infrastructure into the foothills or farmlands outside the current UGB.

The updated policies that ensure the adequacy of infrastructure capacity for growth proposed, such as the Sanitary Sewer Level of Service Policy, are structured to ensure that adequate infrastructure is available to serve the growth capacity supported within the General Plan, but does not encourage or serve development beyond that limit.

Because growth planned and proposed as part of the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* will consist entirely of development within the City's existing Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Service Area, and given that the proposed Plan includes policies and actions to minimize or avoid indirect growth induced by infrastructure capacity and location, or by otherwise creating a condition that allows growth at specific locations other than where proposed by the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*, the potential for direct growth inducing impacts from this project is minimal. **(Less Than Significant Impact)**

4.2 INDIRECT IMPACTS

In the region, each jurisdiction is obligated to accommodate its fair-share housing need allocated by ABAG. ABAG also develops projections for job and housing growth for the nine-County Bay Area through the year 2035 which are used as the basis for long-term traffic modeling. As part of the *Envision* process, the City completed traffic modeling of several potential growth "Study Scenarios" in order to better evaluate the transportation conditions that result from different proposed mixes of job and housing growth. For each Study Scenario, the amount of employment and housing growth planned in other jurisdictions throughout the region was modified in order to maintain overall totals consistent with the ABAG projections. Two different methods were employed to balance the region's job and housing growth. The initial analysis of "Study Scenarios" used a worst case assumption that all changes in housing and job growth to "balance" the regional total would occur proportionately in jurisdictions outside of Santa Clara County. Evaluation of a more neutral scenario, in which employed residents were redistributed from the ABAG projections proportionately to all jurisdictions within the ABAG region, including those within Santa Clara County, indicated that this parameter had a less than 2 percent impact upon traffic model results.

Currently, San José is housing rich and provides a substantial amount of housing for people who work outside the City. Under the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* (Preferred Scenario), new housing and new jobs planned for within the City's UGB and USA would meet the City's currently identified fair-share housing obligation and allow for a substantial increase in jobs above the ABAG projection in order to support the City's goals of economic sustainability, as explicitly described in the Project Objectives. The proposed General Plan would allow, at full development of planned job and dwelling unit capacity, 1.3 jobs for each employed resident, based on estimated household sizes, which is a substantial change beyond the existing 0.8 jobs/housing ratio and a modest increase over the "No Project" alternative (i.e., continued use of the *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan*, which supports a 1.1 jobs/housing ratio). Per the methodology described above, for the modeling of future traffic impacts for the Preferred Scenario, more housing growth and less job growth was added than had been projected by ABAG for other jurisdictions within the region in order to maintain the overall total for the region which is used for traffic modeling purposes. Similar adjustments were made for all of the Study Scenarios. (Note that the

"ABAG Projections" Study Scenario generally aligned with *ABAG Projections 2009*, while traffic modeling was based on *ABAG Projections 2007*, the most recent year for which traffic modeling data was available. Full build-out of the amounts of job and housing growth in *ABAG Projections 2009* approximately would result in a 1.0 jobs/housing ratio for San José.)

Should the proposed growth occur as planned, including substantial new employment uses beyond the needs of the local workforce, an indirect effect of that job growth would be inducing population growth elsewhere. If the planned jobs are realized within San José, workers will need to commute from other jurisdictions where housing is available within an acceptable commute distance. Approximately 130,000 additional dwelling units will be needed in outside jurisdictions in order to provide housing for the surplus employees represented by a 1.3 jobs/housing ratio in San José. In the Bay Area, commute distance includes all of the nine counties in the Bay Area, and the central San Joaquin Valley. Because the proposed project includes more employment growth capacity than the demand projected by ABAG for San José, the project could reduce potential impacts from employment growth in other jurisdictions.

Achieving the proposed General Plan job growth by 2035 will thus require additional residential development elsewhere in the region to provide adequate housing opportunities for future workers. Full build-out of the proposed General Plan capacity would also reverse San José's current jobs shortage, resulting in a jobs concentration within San José, if not otherwise corrected by those cities or others, and exacerbating the existing regional imbalance of jobs to employed workers, created by other cities in the County. Other jurisdictions within the County could provide a greater share of the region's housing need, but the cities with the current imbalances are not proposing to bring their own ratios into balance at the present time.

The Study Scenarios did not include an alternative that sought to remedy this regional jobs/housing imbalance, but did include an alternative that represented job and housing growth within San José that would result in a 1.0 jobs/housing ratio for the city. As discussed in the Alternatives section of this PEIR, analysis of the 1.0 jobs/housing scenario found that such a scenario was projected to have a lower VMT/capita than was the Preferred Scenario by a factor of 12.3 percent and a lower VMT per service population by a factor of 2.5 percent. The VMT per service population takes into account employees within San José while the VMT per capita measure only considers the city's resident population. While the City of San José considers the latter to be a more accurate representation of the environmental quality of a land use plan, the former is the measure recommended by the local air pollution control district (BAAQMD) for regional pollutants. Further analysis of these two scenarios indicated similar levels of projected traffic congestion for various roadway segments with the difference in VMT per capita primarily a result of not taking the employee population into account. The Preferred Scenario was found to have some advantages over the 1:1 or "balanced" scenario in terms of regional transportation, including a higher level of projected transit ridership.

The City cannot predict exactly where the housing growth will occur outside of the City because that growth would be under the discretion of other jurisdictions and influenced by factors such as housing cost and marketability. Some of the new workers will probably live in Santa Clara County, but as noted above, the transportation modeling done for this PEIR evaluated a worst case scenario in which all of the new workers in excess of the number projected by ABAG to live in San José instead live in other counties while a greater share of the region's job growth takes place within San José rather than within those jurisdictions. As discussed in the transportation analysis, other elective traffic modeling

parameters such as the number of employed residents per household, also contribute to a worst case approach for the purpose of estimating the magnitude of potential impacts.

The proposed ratio of jobs/housing, when compared with analysis of a scenario comparable to ABAG projections, is projected through traffic modeling to generate a higher VMT (e.g., 12.3 percent greater VMT/capita or 2.5 percent greater VMT/service population (refer to Table 8.5-1 for additional data), and therefore cause a substantial contribution to a significant unavoidable impact (See also Sections 6.3.2, 6.3.3 and 6.3.4).

As discussed in greater detail in the Transportation, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Cumulative Impact sections of this PEIR, the proposed growth capacity for jobs and housing supported by the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*, will ultimately contribute to significant air pollutant emissions (including greenhouse gas emissions) and significantly increased congestion on area freeways, roadways and intersections (resulting in significant unavoidable impacts in each of these areas for the reasons stated in those sections of this PEIR). In terms of indirect induced impacts, should the proposed job growth occur as planned, it would result in more housing growth in neighboring jurisdictions than currently planned and that housing growth could result in a range of environmental effects depending on its location (e.g., impacts to biological resources, air quality, cultural resources or construction of new facilities that cause significant environmental effects).

The specific environmental effects of growth outside the City of San José and any mitigation measures to offset those effects will be best addressed at the time resulting development is proposed. Identification of environmental impacts (and mitigation measures) for future housing growth in other cities and counties is speculative at this time and will not be addressed further.

4.3 IMPACTS OF RANCHO DEL PUEBLO AND ISTAR RESIDENTIAL OPTIONS

As discussed in Section 2.2.8 in the Project Description, this PEIR also evaluates options for residential land use designations and anticipated future development on two properties; the Rancho del Pueblo Golf Course in the Alum Rock Planning Area and the iStar property in the Edenvale Planning Area (Residential Option Sites). Under these options one or both of these properties would be designated for residential uses instead of the industrial uses assumed on the iStar property and the park/open space on the existing Rancho del Pueblo Golf Course. Because these options also include modifications to other growth areas, adjusting the assumed dwelling units or jobs, the overall amount of development capacity assumed under the Preferred Scenario would not change citywide.

A comparison and summary of population and housing impacts for the residential options is shown in Table 4-1. Implementation of an updated General Plan that includes one or both of the residential options for the Rancho del Pueblo and iStar sites would have impacts similar to those from the proposed project.

Table 4.3-1
Growth Inducing Impacts of Residential Options Compared to Proposed Project

Environmental Issue	Basis	Significance [1]
Direct Impacts	The overall amount of development capacity assumed would be the same as the proposed General Plan and new infrastructure capacity would development within the City's existing UGB and Urban Service Area.	same (LTS)
Indirect Impacts	Like the proposed project, the anticipated level of job growth by 2035 will outpace housing development within the City, resulting in a new jobs/housing imbalance. Indirect induced impacts, should the proposed job growth occur as planned, could result in significant environmental effects.	same (S)

4.4 SIGNIFICANCE CONCLUSIONS

4.4.1 Proposed General Plan

Implementation of the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* in accordance with proposed policies and existing regulations would result in significant unavoidable indirect impacts from growth inducement of housing in other cities and counties. **(Significant Unavoidable Impact)**

4.4.2 Rancho del Pueblo and iStar Residential Options

Like the proposed project discussed above, implementation of the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* with the Rancho del Pueblo and iStar Residential Options, indirect impacts from induced growth is significant and unavoidable. **(Significant Unavoidable Impact)**

SECTION 5.0 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the extent to which a proposed project will commit nonrenewable resources to uses that future generations will be unable or unlikely to reverse. An example of such an irreversible commitment is the construction of highway improvements that would provide public access to previously inaccessible areas. A project would generally result in a significant irreversible impact if:

- Primary and secondary impacts would commit future generations to similar uses.
- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources.
- The project would involve uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project.

5.1 CHANGES IN LAND USE THAT COMMIT FUTURE GENERATIONS

Development under the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* would result in the intensification of underutilized areas and development of a proportionately small number of vacant sites within the City's planned Urban Growth Boundary. This development would constitute a long-term commitment (i.e., likely to exist for the next 50 to 100 years) to residential, commercial, industrial, parking and other urban uses. Most of the vacant sites within the UGB have been developed before or are small, isolated parcels surrounded by established urbanized areas. However, because most of the growth in San José has occurred after 1945, many of the proposed intensification locations have been developed for less than 50-100 years.

5.2 COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Development allowed under the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* would commit nonrenewable resources to the construction and maintenance of buildings, infrastructure and roadways. These non-renewable resources include mining resources such as sand, gravel, iron, lead, copper and other metals and fabrication of other building materials, such as steel. Build-out of the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* also represents a long-term commitment to the consumption of fossil fuels, natural gas and gasoline. Increased energy demands would be used for construction, lighting, heating, and cooling of businesses and residences, and transportation of people within, to, and from the City. Proposed General Plan policies associated with Measurable Sustainability, Recycling, Energy Conservation and Renewable Energy Use, Water Conservation, and Energy Security would promote energy conservation and conservation of resources used as building materials, which could minimize or incrementally reduce the consumption of these resources. Growth within San José would also meet projected population and economic growth demand, accommodating that demand within an established, urbanized area.

Implementation of the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* would also result in an irreversible commitment of limited, renewable resources such as lumber and water. General Plan policies associated with Recycling/Zero Waste, Water Conservation and Water Recycling would result in some savings of renewable resources.

Proposed General Plan Policies That Reduce or Avoid Irreversible Environmental Changes Impacts

The proposed General Plan includes updated policies that address conservation of nonrenewable and limited renewable resources. Proposed General Plan Policies that provide program-level mitigation

for these resources are listed in Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Quality, Section 3.10 Utilities and Service Systems, Section 3.13 Energy, and Section 3.15 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Policies and Actions that provide program measures for the conservation of energy, increased use of renewable energy in the built environment, and conservation of water or building materials include, but are not limited to the following.

Green Building Policy Leadership	
Policy MS-1.1	Continue to demonstrate leadership in the development and implementation of green building policies and practices. Ensure that all projects are consistent with or exceed the City's Green Building Ordinance and City Council Policies as well as State and/or regional policies which require that projects incorporate various green building principles into their design and construction.
Energy Conservation and Renewable Energy Use	
Policy MS-2.2	Encourage maximized use of on-site generation of renewable energy for all new and existing buildings.
Policy MS-2.3	Utilize solar orientation (e.g., building placement, landscaping, design and construction techniques) for new construction to minimize energy consumption
Action MS-2.11	Require new development to incorporate green building practices, including those required by the Green Building Ordinance. Specifically target reduced energy use through construction techniques (e.g., design of building envelopes and systems to maximize energy performance), through architectural design (e.g., design to maximize cross ventilation and interior daylight) and through site design techniques (e.g., orienting buildings on sites to maximize the effectiveness of passive solar design).
Waste Diversion	
Policy MS-5.5	Maximize recycling and composting from all residents, businesses, and institutions in the City.
Waste Reduction	
Policy MS-6.5	Reduce the amount of waste disposed in landfills through waste prevention, reuse, and recycling of materials at venues, facilities, and special events.
Policy MS-6.8	Maximize reuse, recycling, and composting citywide.
Water Recycling	
Policy MS-19.4	Require the use of recycled water wherever feasible and cost-effective to serve existing and new development.
Infrastructure Management	
Policy IN-2.1	Utilize the City's Infrastructure Management System Program to identify the most efficient use of available resources to maintain its infrastructure and minimize the need to replace it.

Solid Waste Materials Recovery/Landfill	
Policy IN-5.3	Use solid waste reduction techniques, including source reduction, reuse, recycling, source separation, composting, energy recovery and transformation of solid wastes to extend the life span of existing landfills and to reduce the need for future landfill facilities and to achieve the City's Zero Waste goals.

Other Policies and Actions

The General Plan also includes policies that encourage, but do not directly require measures that could reduce the commitment of resources to new development. These policies include:

- Green Building Policy Leadership Policies: MS-1.3 and MS-1.7
- Energy Conservation and Renewable Energy Use Policies: MS-2.1, MS-2.7 and MS-2.8
- Water Conservation and Quality Policies: MS-3.2, MS-3.3, and MS-3.4
- Waste Reduction Policies: MS-6.12
- Environmental Stewardship Policies: MS-8.2, MS-8.3, MS-8.7
- Responsible Management of Water Supply Policy: MS-17.1
- Water Conservation Policies and Actions: MS-18.1, MS-18.2, MS-18.3, MS-18.12, MS-18.13, and MS-18.17
- Water Recycling Policy: MS-19.3

Existing Regulations and Adopted Plans and Policies

Existing federal, state and local laws, regulations, and programs that would reduce the commitment of resources for new development allowed under the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* include:

- Federal EnergyStar™ Program
- California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24 California Code of Regulations)
- City of San José Building Codes (including CALGreen) and Green Building regulations
- City of San José Water Efficient Landscape Standards for New and Rehabilitated Landscaping
- Senate Bill X7 – 7
- Urban Environmental Accords
- San José Green Vision

5.3 IRREVERSIBLE DAMAGE FROM ENVIRONMENTAL ACCIDENTS

Irreversible changes to the physical environment could occur from accidental release of hazardous materials associated with development activities. However, compliance with federal, state and local hazardous materials and life safety regulations, as discussed in Section 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, are designed to minimize this risk and would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. No other irreversible changes are expected to result from the adoption and implementation of the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan.*

SECTION 6.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Cumulative impacts, as defined by CEQA, refer to the combined effects of two or more individual projects (e.g., programs, developments, etc.) which when considered together are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. Cumulative impacts may result from individually minor, but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time. The CEQA Guidelines state (§15130) that an EIR should discuss cumulative impacts and consider them significant when the project's contribution is "cumulatively considerable." The discussion does not need to be in as great detail as is necessary for project impacts, but is to be "guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness" [CEQA Guidelines §15130(b)]. The purpose of the cumulative analysis is to allow decision makers to better understand the impacts that might result from approval of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, in conjunction with the proposed project (the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*) addressed in this PEIR.

The CEQA Guidelines advise that a discussion of cumulative impacts should reflect both their severity and the likelihood of their occurrence. To accomplish these two objectives, the analysis should include either a list of past, present and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts or a summary of projections from an adopted local, regional or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect. Such plans may include: a general plan, regional transportation plan, or plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. A summary of projections may also be contained in an adopted or certified prior environmental document for such a plan. Such projections may be supplemented with additional information such as a regional modeling program.

The effects of past projects which have been built or implemented are generally reflected in the existing conditions described in the specific sections of this PEIR.

The analysis must then determine what the project's contribution to any cumulatively significant impact is and whether it is cumulatively considerable, as defined by §15065(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines. The definition in that section is as follows: "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

In the case of analysis of a citywide, long-term planning document such as a General Plan, and particularly when that analysis is prepared for the largest city in the region, the projected effects from cumulative changes over the long planning horizon may influence conditions throughout the region. Tracking the cause-and-effect of such influence (which could be indirect and even tertiary) would be highly speculative, however, and well beyond the scope of this PEIR.

For each environmental issue, cumulative impacts may occur over different geographic areas. For example, emissions of regional air pollutants affect pollutant concentrations within the regulatory limits of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, but the influence will be more substantial downwind of the sources and "downwind" for San José is a small percentage of the air basin. Cumulative hazardous materials effects would be much more localized. Based on physical constraints, regulatory limits, and service delivery areas, Table 6.1-1 provides a summary of the different geographic areas used to evaluate cumulative air quality, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, greenhouse gas emissions, public facilities and services, population and housing, and utilities and services impacts. For all other cumulative impacts, the cumulative impacts discussion reflects

impacts from past, future and pending development within the City of San José, its Sphere of Influence (SOI), and immediately adjacent areas in bordering cities or County areas as described.

Table 6.1-1
Geographic Considerations in Cumulative Analysis

Environmental Issue	Geographic Area
Air Quality	San Francisco Bay Air Basin (CAP area)
Biological Resources	City of San José, Sphere of Influence (SOI), and draft HCP/NCCP area
Hydrology and Water Quality	City of San José, Santa Clara Valley and Coyote Valley Groundwater Sub-basins, South San Francisco Bay
Public Facilities and Services	City of San José and service area for each School District. For parks and recreation, City of San José and SOI.
Utilities and Service Systems	The service areas of the three water purveyors in San José, local and regional landfills; and the San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant.
Energy	City of San José, SOI, [State of California]
Population and Housing	City of San José and the nine ABAG Bay Area counties
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Regional, State of California, Global

6.2 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

The analysis of cumulative impacts is based upon consideration of a list of approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable projects known to the City of San José as of the date of circulation of this PEIR. The list of these projects is provided in Table 6.2-1. Information on individual projects follows.

Table 6.2-1
Cumulative Projects List

Project	
1.	BART Extension to Silicon Valley[1]
2.	California High Speed Rail
3.	Diridon Station Plan
4.	San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant Master Plan
5.	San José International Airport Master Plan
6.	Heritage Oaks General Plan Amendment (Calero and Coyote Valley Planning Areas)
7.	City of Santa Clara General Plan Update
8.	City of Sunnyvale General Plan Update
9.	San José City and Evergreen Valley College Master Plans
10.	San José State University Master Plan

Table 6.2-1 Cumulative Projects List	
Project	
11.	School District Projects
12.	Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan
13.	Newby Island Landfill Expansion
14.	South Bay Salt Ponds Restoration Project
15.	Valley Medical Health System Measure A Improvements
16.	Morgan Hill Downtown Plan and Circulation Element Update
17.	Morgan Hill Southeast Quadrant Project
18.	U.S. 101 Improvements between Monterey Road in Gilroy and State Route 129
[1]The BART Extension to Berryessa in San José was considered in the transportation analysis of the proposed General Plan.	

The City of San José is bounded by eight communities (Milpitas, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Saratoga, Campbell, Los Gatos, and Morgan Hill) and areas of unincorporated Santa Clara County. All of these jurisdictions have adopted General Plans that direct growth and development within these communities. General Plans listed in the cumulative projects list are those that have been recently adopted or are currently being updated. To the degree that it can be identified at this time, planned growth in adjacent jurisdictions is considered, as appropriate, in this section.

6.2.1 Overview of Cumulative Projects

6.2.1.1 *BART Extension to Silicon Valley*

The BART to Silicon Valley Project is an extension of the existing BART regional heavy rail system from its current terminus in Fremont to Milpitas, San José and Santa Clara. The BART Extension to Silicon Valley will extend over 16 miles along the existing Union Pacific Railroad alignment south of the planned BART Warm Springs Station in Fremont. When completed, this fully grade-separated project will include: six stations – one in Milpitas, four in San José and one in Santa Clara; a 5-mile tunnel in Downtown San José; and a new maintenance and storage facility in Santa Clara. The BART extension from Fremont to Warm Springs is now under construction. This project is being managed by the Valley Transportation Authority on behalf of BART. The 5-mile extension to Warm Springs is planned to be complete by 2014.

The Berryessa Extension is the 10-mile, two-station, first phase of BART Silicon Valley. The Berryessa Extension project is being implemented in cooperation with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts Program. The Berryessa Extension Project is a fully operable extension of the existing BART system with service to the cities of Milpitas and San José in Santa Clara County. FTA issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for the Berryessa Extension Project on June 24, 2010. This extension of the BART system will begin south of the future BART Warm Springs Station in Fremont and proceed alongside the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) through Milpitas and end in the Berryessa area of San José at Las Plumas Avenue. Engineering on the project is advancing, and full construction activities are scheduled to begin in 2012. The BART extension to Berryessa was included in the transportation analysis for the proposed General Plan.

The remaining gap in the BART to Silicon Valley project is the six-mile, $4 billion link from Berryessa to Downtown San José, Diridon Station, and the Santa Clara station near the Mineta San José International Airport. This section includes five miles of tunnel construction. The project is at 65 percent design completion, but is "on hold" until construction funding is secured. The financing strategies are based on: improvement in the local economy (sales tax revenues are the source of local BART funds); seeking additional Federal funds (once the Berryessa extension funds are secured); increased Federal funding opportunities for urban transit as part of new Federal transportation policy bill (expected in 2011); and increased BART ridership projections based on connectivity with HSR service at Diridon Station (not accounted for in current BART studies). Overall, the goal is to secure funding to allow the Berryessa-Downtown San José-Santa Clara Station BART segment to be complete sometime between 2025 and 2035.

6.2.1.2 *High-Speed Rail (HSR)*

The California High-Speed Rail project is proposed to run from San Francisco to Los Angeles/Anaheim via the Central Valley, and later to Sacramento and San Diego. Trains would travel at speeds of up to 220 mph, and interconnect with other transportation alternatives, providing an option to traveling by plane or car. The San Francisco to San José section of the 800-mile system is 50 miles long and is being developed in partnership with Caltrain. The San Francisco-San José section extends through the San Mateo Peninsula and into Silicon Valley, where it connects with the San José to Merced section at San José's Diridon Train Station. Stations are planned for San Francisco, Millbrae and San José. South of San José's Diridon Train Station, the HSR is proposed to roughly follow existing rail lines south through Coyote Valley to the next station in the City of Gilroy.

The project-level EIR/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the northern California segment of the HSR that would serve San José is under preparation by the California High-Speed Rail Authority and anticipated to be complete in 2011. The EIR/EIS for the HSR would address the environmental effects of the project, including noise, vibration, light, and visual impacts of the HSR.

While the likelihood of HSR being developed through San José is acknowledged in the EIR text, it was not reflected in the transportation modeling done for this PEIR.

6.2.1.3 *Diridon Station Plan*

The Diridon Station Plan is a development strategy proposed to transform the existing Downtown site on Autumn Street and Santa Clara Street into "the Grand Central Station" of the West Coast, linked to nearby offices, retail uses and housing. The area includes Diridon Station -- which serves Caltrain, VTA light rail and Amtrak -- as well as HP Pavilion and, potentially, a BART station and a major league ballpark.

Options that will be evaluated in the Plan include an aerial and underground high-speed rail track. A goal of the Plan is to integrate the existing downtown core and alternative modes of transportation (such as transit, bicycles, and pedestrian facilities) with the Diridon Station expansion. An EIR for the Station Plan is expected to begin public circulation in 2012.

6.2.1.4 *San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant Master Plan*

The San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant Master Plan is being prepared to guide the Plant's development over the next 30 years. The Plant's entire property totals 2,600 acres including a 175-acre operations area, 800-acre sludge lagoons and drying beds, 856-acre former salt production pond, (Pond A18), and 769-acre riparian habitat and grasslands, adjacent to the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge. The Master Plan includes long-range upgrading of the Plant facilities and equipment, planning for the current and future peak flows likely to result from the expected population and job growth within the Plant's service area that currently includes almost 1.4 million residents and 600,000 workers in eight cities, and changes to Plant land uses. The land use changes may include creating habitats and natural corridors to support wildlife, community parks and amenities, and commercial, retail, light industrial, and office/R&D development.

The Draft Master Plan is scheduled to be completed in 2011 and the Final Master Plan is anticipated to be completed shortly after preparation and certification of the CEQA/NEPA environmental review in early 2013. Development of employment lands on some of the Plant's lands was assumed in the transportation modeling done for this PEIR since this job growth is proposed as a part of the General Plan.

6.2.1.5 *San José International Airport Master Plan*

The Airport Master Plan for Mineta San José International consists of a program of facility improvements designed to fully accommodate commercial aviation demand (passengers and cargo) projected for the year 2017, with development phased as demand warrants and is determined to be financially feasible. The Master Plan was originally adopted by the City of San José in June 1997 and approved by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in December 1999. Subsequent to its 1997 approval, the Airport Master Plan has been revised through a series of City-approved amendments and construction of various capital improvement projects has been completed or is currently underway. Most of the airfield improvement projects have been completed along with improvements to the on-Airport roadway system, a new Federal Inspection Services (FIS) building for international flights, and a new jet fuel storage and distribution facility. Recent construction includes a new passenger terminal and adjacent parking garage with associated roadway improvements. Since the City last updated the Airport Master Plan in 2010, improvements covered in the Plan have been implemented on a project by project basis and the City will continue to implement improvements as demand warrants.

6.2.1.6 *Heritage Oaks General Plan Amendment (Pending)*

The pending Heritage Oaks General Plan amendment and Planned Development rezoning (File Nos. GP-04-10-001 and PDC 04-041) cover portions of an approximately 443 acre site in the Calero and Coyote Valley Planning Areas, outside the UGB. The site is located on the southerly side of Bailey Avenue, approximately 3,300 feet westerly of Santa Teresa Boulevard. As originally filed in 2004 and updated in 2006, the General Plan amendment and Planned Development rezoning would allow consideration of cemetery uses on lands currently designated as *Private Recreation and Non-Urban Hillside.* The proposed General Plan potentially allows development of a cemetery and related uses outside of the UGB provided that the project is designed to avoid environmental impacts upon biotics, the visual environment and hazard avoidance. The current Heritage Oaks project proposal, however, has not been designed to avoid these impacts and would therefore be inconsistent with the

proposed General Plan. The project site is currently used for livestock grazing and supports non-native grassland and oak woodland. Limited areas of season wetlands are found along the drainage channels on the site.[226] For the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that future development on the site could potentially consist of a cemetery and associated uses including a crematorium and columbarium as those uses have been proposed as part of the pending project. Developed areas, including cemetery plots, would be concentrated in the western portion of the site (APNs 712-03-100 and 712-03-102). Much of the total site area would remain as open space (i.e., not developed with buildings, parking, roadways or other impervious surfaces) but substantial areas could be irrigated and planted with turfgrasses.

6.2.1.7 *City of Santa Clara General Plan Update*

The City of San José shares portions of its western boundaries with the City of Santa Clara. The City of Santa Clara updated its General Plan in November 2010. The General Plan addresses short-term, intermediate and long-term strategies for growth in the City between 2010 and 2035. The development potential planned for in its General Plan includes an additional 46,180 jobs and 39,490 residents within the City of Santa Clara by 2035.

Growth under this General Plan would be focused in specific areas of the City, called "Focus Areas". The Santa Clara Station, Stevens Creek Boulevard, De la Cruz and Tasman East Focus Areas are located adjacent to or near the shared city boundary with San José. The Santa Clara Station Focus Area is adjacent to the northwestern boundary of a proposed transportation Village (VT3) within San José. The vision for the Santa Clara Station Focus Area is to establish a new gateway into the City of Santa Clara, as well as to expand the City's economic base with new office, hotel, and retail uses and add high density residential development near existing and planned transit. The Stevens Creek Boulevard Focus Area is located on the opposite side of the street from a planned Transit Village and Corridor (CR-32) and Commercial Center Village (C35, Valley Fair) in the proposed San José General Plan. Redevelopment in the Stevens Creek Boulevard Focus Area is expected to be of higher intensity to maximize the use of smaller parcels and minimize conflicts with surrounding neighborhoods. Professional offices could be a secondary use to the primary retail commercial uses. Pedestrian facilities would be improved along Stevens Creek Boulevard, however the corridor is planned to retain its auto dominant character. The De La Cruz and Tasman East focus areas, which are planned for intensification during intermediate and long-term horizons, are located adjacent to North San José Employment Lands. Changes to the land use designations will occur in the context of a future comprehensive planning process.

6.2.1.8 *City of Sunnyvale General Plan Update*

The City of Sunnyvale is located west of the City of San José and the only common boundary is in the Baylands. Portions of Sunnyvale are within a mile of the City of San José (near the intersection of Stevens Creek Boulevard and Lawrence Expressway), however. The southeastern corner of Sunnyvale is located approximately one mile from Stevens Creek Boulevard in San José and the Sunnyvale boundary at Calabazas Creek and SR 237 is approximately 1.2 miles southwest of the Guadalupe River at SR 237. The City of Sunnyvale is currently in the process of updating several elements of its General Plan.

[226] WRA Environmental Consultants. *Preliminary Determination of Waters of the U.S. Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act – Memorial Park Study Area San José, Santa Clara County, California.* July 19, 2006

In 2011, the City of Sunnyvale will continue the process of updating the Land Use and Transportation Element of the General Plan (LUTE). In addition the City will be developing its first Climate Action Plan (CAP). The link between land use and transportation planning with climate policy will be explored during preparation of the LUTE and CAP. The Sunnyvale City Council has also directed staff to consolidate the General Plan into a single document. The consolidated General Plan will be tiered off the Community Vision of the General Plan and will be the first step in creating a Comprehensive General Plan. The City is anticipating an additional 18,000 persons, 7,300 new housing units and 24,807 new jobs by the year 2025.

6.2.1.9 *San José City and Evergreen Valley College Master Plans*

San José City College and Evergreen Valley College are two public community colleges located within the City of San José.

The San José City College campus is located in central San José, on Moorpark Avenue and South Bascom Avenue. San José City College is in the process of updating its Education/Facilities Master Plan for 2010-2025. The Plan provides specific direction and parameters for the implementation of programs, along with activities relating to the educational and support service programs of the College. In its Five-Year Capital Construction Plan, the College lists four future building projects; the Applied Science Center, Main Gym Replacement, Visual and Performing Arts Building, and the General Education Building Modernization.

Evergreen Valley College is located in southeast San José, north of the intersection of San Felipe Road and Yerba Buena Road. Evergreen Valley College updated its Education/Facilities Master Plan 2025 in 2010. In its Five Year Capital Construction Plan, the College lists four future building projects to meet anticipated student needs; the Arts Complex, Cluster Acacia, P.E. Expansion and the Cluster Roble.

6.2.1.10 *San José State University Ten Year Capital Plan*

The San José State University (SJSU) campus is located on 88 acres in Downtown San José and occupies a roughly eighteen-block area bounded by Fourth, Tenth, San Fernando, and San Salvador Streets. The current SJSU Master Plan provides an overall evaluation of existing conditions, assesses the influence of enrollment growth, and recommends capacity limits for future construction. It includes guidelines and recommendations for future projects on the SJSU campus and gives special emphasis to the process of establishing public-private partnerships for funding new capital projects. The SJSU Master Plan identifies redevelopment sites within the campus for academic and housing purposes. Redevelopment of on-campus buildings will be an on-going process to support the over 25,000 full-time and part-time students at SJSU. The entire San Fernando Street edge east of the new Joint-use Library has been identified as a replacement area to upgrade campus facilities and within the interior of the campus, there are a number of buildings that are in need of repair, are inefficient, and/or low density and are likely to be redeveloped to better serve the University. The entire southeast quadrant of the campus contains housing; the older remaining residential buildings will be replaced with denser, more varied, and up-to-date housing over time.

6.2.1.11 *School District Projects Bond and Other Capital Improvement Projects*

The City of San José includes 22 school districts that currently operate 222 public schools serving San José students (see Section 3.9 Public Facilities and Services for a description of school districts serving San José students). The Santa Clara Unified School District is currently planning for one additional K-5 elementary school, one additional K-8 elementary school, and one additional high school to serve planned residential development in North San José. The Franklin-McKinley School District is planning to construct a new K-8 elementary school on Communications Hill to serve students of proposed residential development in the Specific Plan area. Other districts have closed and/or leased school sites that may be reopened or redeveloped in the future to accommodate additional students or other uses, although no specific redevelopment is currently proposed. Several school districts, including, but not limited to, the Alum Rock Union, Campbell Union, Los Gatos Union, San José Unified, Santa Unified and Los Gatos Union School Districts have passed School Facilities Bonds that fund on-going facility improvements, such as classroom renovation projects, over specific periods.

6.2.1.12 *Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan (Draft)*

Portions of the City are covered by the proposed Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), which is a conservation program to promote the recovery of endangered species while accommodating planned development, infrastructure and maintenance activities. A draft HCP/NCCP has been developed through a partnership between Santa Clara County, the Cities of San José, Morgan Hill, and Gilroy, the Santa Clara Valley Water District, the Valley Transportation Authority, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Fish and Game. The HCP/NCCP seeks to protect and enhance ecological diversity and function within more than 500,000 acres of southern Santa Clara County. If adopted, the final HCP/NCCP will provide a framework for the Local Partners and landowners to complete projects while protecting at-risk species and their essential habitats, some of which only occur in Santa Clara County. The Public Draft Habitat Plan, the Draft EIR/EIS and Draft Implementing Agreement were released on December 17, 2010. The release of these documents initiated a 120-day public review and comment period, with comments due in April 2011.

There are six local partners participating in drafting an HCP/NCCP. The Gilroy City Council voted on March 28, 2011 to notify the other partners that they would withdraw from the Santa Clara Valley HCP/NCCP process but on May 16, 2011, at a subsequent Gilroy City Council meeting, voted to resume participation in the plan process. Based upon public input received on the first Draft HCP/NCCP (December 2010) the advisory board representing these six local partners is assessing potential changes to the structure and contents of the HCP. Adoption of a final HCP/NCCP is anticipated no earlier than late 2012.

6.2.1.13 *Newby Island Landfill Expansion*

The Newby Island Sanitary Landfill and the Recyclery is currently in the process of seeking authorization from the City of San José to expand its permitted landfill capacity to accept an additional 15 million cubic yards. The proposed additional capacity would allow the landfill to continue receiving waste at existing levels at least until the estimated closure date of 2025. In addition to the expansion of the landfill, the project includes land use changes on the site that would

allow more recycling and other waste management, recycling, and waste diversion activities and associated land uses such as a corporation yard.

The landfill operator anticipates accepting waste quantities such that the landfill, even if granted the additional requested capacity, may reach capacity by 2025. However, depending upon the annual tonnages accepted by the landfill operator going forward, it is possible that the landfill, if granted additional capacity, could close at a later date, beyond 2025. Newby Island is the landfill at which municipal solid waste (MSW) from residences in San José and several other communities in Santa Clara County is currently buried.

A project-level Draft EIR that disclosed the reasonably foreseeable environmental effects of the proposed expansion of the Newby Island Landfill circulated in September 2009. A Final EIR is currently being prepared by the City of San José.

6.2.1.14 *South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project*

The South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project covers three different managed pond complexes along the South Bay shoreline; Alviso (near San José, Sunnyvale, and Mountain View), Ravenswood (near East Palo Alto), and Eden Landing (near Hayward and Union City). The South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project has three project goals: wetland habitat enhancement and restoration; improved flood management; and improved public access and recreation. This project plans to restore thousands of acres of vegetated tidal marsh, channels, and mudflats (in addition to upland transitional habitat) to the South Bay, including many of the managed ponds within the Alviso Planning Area. The South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project also incorporates a monitoring and adaptive management program and is currently planning for a second phase of restoration activities.

6.2.1.15 *Santa Clara Valley Health and Hospital System Facilities Improvements*

In November 2008, the voters of Santa Clara County approved County Measure A. Measure A provides funding to upgrade and replace the public hospital facilities at the Santa Clara Valley Medical Center (SCVMC), located on Bascom Avenue between Moorpark Avenue and Fruitdale Avenue. Measure A also allocated $50 million for the construction of health facilities in the Downtown San José area. The Seismic Safety Project at SCVMC will be completed in two phases. The first phase includes the demolition of old buildings, construction of a new hospital building and parking structure, and seismic upgrades to other hospital buildings on the SCVMC campus. In 2009, the County of Santa Clara purchased the former San José Hospital site on Santa Clara Street and a portion of the site is anticipated to be used as a Downtown Clinic as a part of the County's health care system.

6.2.1.16 *Morgan Hill Downtown Plan and Circulation Element Update*

In 2009, the City of Morgan Hill adopted an updated Specific Plan for its downtown area. The Specific Plan contains a number of strategies designed to further invigorate Downtown Morgan Hill. Implementation of the Specific Plan is anticipated to result in a net increase of 93,490 square feet of retail space, 1,192 residential units, and 85,591 square feet of office space in the Downtown by 2030.

An update of the City's Circulation Element in its General Plan was completed in 2010. The updated Circulation Element modified the City's planned future roadway network as well as the City's Level

of Service (LOS) policies for roadways. It also includes new policies related to smart growth principles and a multimodal system including providing for balanced pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities along with vehicular facilities.

6.2.1.17 *Southeast Quadrant Project (Morgan Hill)*

The Morgan Hill City Council is proposing establishing two new land use designations for the area commonly referred to as the Southeast Quadrant (SEQ): Sports-Recreation-Leisure and Agriculture. The approximately 1,300-acre Southeast Quadrant area adjacent to the City of Morgan Hill is located east of US 101 and generally bounded by Condit Road and US 101 to the west, San Pedro Avenue to the north, Carey Avenue to the east, and Maple Avenue to the south. The SEQ area consists of lands that are currently not located within the City. Under the proposed project, a portion of the Southeast Quadrant would be annexed into the Morgan Hill City limits, an Urban Limit Line would be established, the Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Service Area would be extended, a new Sports-Recreation-Leisure General Plan land use designation would be established and a new Sports-Recreation-Leisure Zoning District implemented. An Agriculture land use designation over the remainder of the area would help support long-term agriculture within the SEQ area. The City is also considering six project applications proposing future development within the SEQ. These applications include a private high school, outdoor sports fields, recreation retail/restaurant, rural residential, and agriculture.

6.2.1.18 *U.S. 101 Improvements between Monterey Road in Gilroy and State Route 129*

Caltrans is considering roadway widening and interchange improvements to a 7.6-mile segment of U.S. 101 that is located in southern Santa Clara County and northern San Benito County. The improvements would be located along segments of roadway bordered by agricultural lands, in an area considered a scenic gateway to Santa Clara County.

6.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

For each subject area, the following two aspects of cumulative impacts are discussed:

- Would the effects of the proposed project (in this case the General Plan), when combined with the effects of all past, present, and pending development result in a cumulatively significant impact on the resources in question?

- If a cumulative impact is likely to be significant, would the contribution of the proposed project to that impact be cumulatively considerable?

6.3.1 Cumulative Land Use Impacts

Development is planned to occur in surrounding cities and in the central and southern Santa Clara County region. Implementation of pending or approved plans and projects in the neighboring cities of Milpitas, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Campbell, Los Gatos, Saratoga and Morgan Hill would result in new residential, commercial and office development. New development and redevelopment proposed by the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* in conjunction with other planned development could create land use conflicts with existing development that will be adjacent to or near the new development in San José, such as nuisance issues from early morning noise from

loading docks and dust or odors from trash enclosures. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Policies and Actions for planning and implementation described in Section 3.1 Land Use and conformance with the identified ordinances and policies, would substantially limit or preclude land use conflicts, including impacts to residential development and existing businesses in adjacent cities because incorporation of standards in City design guidelines and the Municipal Code are designed to limit land use conflicts between uses. Development in San José and adjacent cities is planned to take place in areas of the Santa Clara Valley that are already urbanized and combined with the effects of the proposed project would not create substantial new land use conflicts or divide an established community in that new development would consist of infill and no major expansions of roadways or similar facilities that could divide neighborhoods are proposed.

Proposed General Plan policies for development within areas outside the UGB (e.g., Policies LU-17.1 through LU-17.9, LU-18.1 through LU-18.8, and LU-19.1 through LU-19.10) would avoid or limit the City's contribution to cumulative land use impacts in areas adjacent to rural, unincorporated areas of Santa Clara County, especially those designated for agricultural or open space land uses because new growth in these areas would be limited in size and density and policies call for maintaining a rural character with limited disturbance of existing landforms.

Conversion of irrigated farmland to urban land in Santa Clara County is an on-going process monitored by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Between 2006 and 2008 (the most recent reporting available) approximately 775 acres of Prime Farmland in Santa Clara County was committed to nonagricultural use, including 238 acres to urban and built up land for housing, commercial buildings and sports fields. [227]

Impacts to farmland from cumulative projects include approximately 300-400 acres within the 1,300 acre proposed Southeast Quadrant project[228], build-out allowed under the Morgan Hill and Gilroy General Plans (including approximately 120 acres of Prime Farmland in Morgan Hill east of US 101 on Cochrane Road for housing and several hundred acres in the City of Gilroy designated for urban uses[229]), rural residential development allowed under the County of Santa Clara General Plan, over 50 acres for US 101 roadway improvements along a 7.6 mile alignment south of Gilroy, and 900-1,000 acres of agricultural land in north Coyote Valley. Although the future loss of agricultural land in north Coyote Valley has been anticipated for many years in the City's General Plan, this impact combined with other planned or possible impacts to farmland would be substantial and implementation of the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* would contribute to a significant cumulative loss of agricultural land in southern Santa Clara County.

---

[227] California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. "Santa Clara County 2006-2008 Land Use Conversion". Accessed May 3, 2011. Available at: <http://redirect.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/county_info_results.asp>.

[228] *City of Morgan Hill Southeast Quadrant General Plan Amendments and Agricultural Mitigation and Preservation Program, Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report*, October 2010.

[229] The EIR for the Gilroy General Plan identified approximately 1,333 acres of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance added to the City's Planning Area in 2001, including over 400 acres for the South County Regional Wastewater Authority (Source: City of Gilroy. *Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Gilroy Revised Draft General Plan.* 2001. Table 4.4-5. Available at: <http://www.ci.gilroy.ca.us/cityofgilroy_files/city_hall/community_development/planning/general_plan/Draft_EIR_COG_Revised_Draft_General_Plan-Sept_2001.pdf>) . Some of this land has already been converted to urban and public facility uses.

Impact C-LU-1: Build-out of the proposed General Plan in the north Coyote Valley area in conjunction with other planned or proposed development would be a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts to agricultural resources. **(Significant Cumulative Impact)**

Mitigation Measures for
Cumulative Impacts to Agricultural Land

While conservation easements or strengthened zoning protections for agriculture could be used to limit future loss of Prime Farmland in other parts of the County, no feasible mitigation measures are available to offset the cumulative loss of agricultural land, especially prime agricultural land, within areas previously planned and designated for development within the City's UGB or areas of the County already planned and approved for development. Conversion of developed rural or suburban areas (e.g., "ranchettes" or residences on lots of five to 20 acres) back to farmland may be possible in limited areas as housing stock ages; however opportunities to convert sizeable areas back to prime farmland are limited by the challenges of assembling a sizeable group of properties, removing physical improvements (such as buildings, pavement, and underground utility lines), and cost. Therefore, the cumulative loss of agricultural land would remain significant. **(Significant Unavoidable Cumulative Impact)**

6.3.2 Cumulative Transportation Impacts

Section 3.2 Transportation includes a detailed analysis of the cumulative conditions related to transportation and build-out of the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*. The City's travel demand model has been developed within the framework of the VTA's Santa Clara County model, which in turn is based on the MTC's Bay Area regional travel model. Projected traffic volumes take into account future Bay Area regional growth in population and employment as projected by ABAG, modified to accommodate the specific amounts of job and housing growth capacity supported by the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*.

Given the integrated nature of the transportation network in northern Santa Clara County, and the close proximity of jobs and housing in adjacent jurisdictions, the predominant travel pattern is for trips to move between jurisdictions, as reflected by the fact that only 53 percent of San José's employed residents work in San José.[230] Although the percentage of residents employed in San José is anticipated to increase under the proposed General Plan, it will continue to be common for employee trips to cross jurisdictions.

A list of arterial roadways in surrounding cities that would be significantly impacted by 2035 is provided in Section 3.2.4.5 and includes, but is not limited to: Hamilton Avenue, Campbell Avenue and Winchester Boulevard in Campbell; Homestead Road, Stevens Creek Boulevard, De Anza Boulevard and Pruneridge Avenue in Cupertino; Winchester Boulevard and Lark Avenue in Los Gatos; Dixon Landing Road, McCarthy Boulevard, Abel Street, Great Mall Parkway, Tasman Avenue, and Calaveras Boulevard in Milpitas; Cochrane Road, Dunne Avenue and Monterey Street in Morgan Hill; Monroe Street, Homestead Road, The Alameda, Scott Boulevard, and Great America Boulevard in Santa Clara; and Mathilda Avenue, Evelyn Avenue, Mary Avenue, Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road, South Wolfe Road, and Oakmead Parkway in Sunnyvale. Segments of regional facilities maintained by Caltrans and Santa Clara County along SR 237, US 101, SR 85, I-680, I-280, SR 17,

[230] Source: American Community Survey for San José (2009).

Central Expressway, Lawrence Expressway, San Tomas Expressway, Foothill Expressway, and Montague Expressway also would be adversely affected.

The CEQA process provides an opportunity for adjoining cities to work cooperatively to address the traffic impacts of new development that crosses jurisdictional lines. However, in many situations, roadways have been built out to their ultimate planned configurations and further capacity enhancing improvements cannot be implemented without substantial land use impacts to developed properties along the rights-of-way. Policies in this General Plan acknowledge that roadways cannot be expanded infinitely. Many of the cities adjacent to San José are also planning for multimodal transportation, and for less dependency on single-occupant automobile travel. In combination with the City's policies reflected in this General Plan, those cumulative impacts linked to VMT can be reduced to the extent residents and employees shift from passenger vehicles to transit or other modes of transportation as a result of intensifying land uses along transit corridors, introducing a mix of land uses, and improvements to the multimodal transportation network so that it becomes an integral part of the City.

Under cumulative conditions, which assumes build-out of all planned growth in the region, including the City's proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan,* regional roadways and highways would experience levels of service in excess of those standards identified by responsible agencies, for which no feasible mitigation exists because roadways cannot continue to be expanded without adversely impacting adjacent land uses, and other transportation modes. The City of San José can and will work with adjacent jurisdictions including VTA and Caltrans to improve roadway operations and to expand capacity of alternate transportation modes. These cumulative transportation impacts, and the City's contribution to them under the proposed General Plan, are significant and unavoidable.

Impact C-TRANS-2: Build-out of the proposed General Plan in conjunction with other planned development in the South Bay would cause a substantial contribution to cumulatively significant regional transportation impacts. **(Significant Cumulative Impact)**

Mitigation Measures for
Cumulative Transportation Impacts

While ultimately the only way to reduce the significant local and regional transportation impacts is to reduce dependency on the automobile, near term efforts by local and regional agencies to facilitate multimodal facilities, including bicycle paths and trails and mass transit, will be an increasingly vital component of the regional transportation system. As discussed in Section 3.2.5, it may not be possible to offset cumulative transportation impacts given physical constraints for improvements within existing roadways. Also, given the degree of right-of-way acquisition that would be required along streets and regional roadway facilities, roadway widening would not be economically or physically feasible. **(Significant Unavoidable Cumulative Impact)**

6.3.3 Cumulative Noise and Vibration Impacts

Cumulative traffic noise impacts are considered as part of the General Plan analysis since the traffic noise analysis is based on the regional traffic model where input included planned and approved projects in the City of San José plus traffic anticipated by General Plan build out projections for other jurisdictions. To the extent that traffic from build-out of the proposed Santa Clara and Sunnyvale

General Plans could be greater than that assumed in the transportation model, cumulative traffic noise impacts could be somewhat greater than the impacts identified in Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration.

The build-out of the San José International Airport Master Plan and increasing air transportation levels is also considered in the evaluation of future noise conditions in Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration.

Other reasonably foreseeable projects that could contribute to the future noise and vibration environment in the City of San José include the California High Speed Rail project, the BART extension to San José project, and the Caltrain electrification project. Each of these projects currently are undergoing design and environmental review but have not received final approvals or funding. The scope of each of these projects is such that there is a reasonable expectation that noise and vibration levels in the City of San José will change along these transportation corridors. In some cases, noise and vibration impacts may occur. These impacts would be disclosed during the environmental review process and mitigated where feasible. These projects also have the potential to benefit land uses along the alignments (e.g., the Caltrain electrification project) or as mitigation measures are implemented.

While effective measures exist to protect interior noise levels (such as installation of acoustically rated windows and walls), and are required in most communities in the Bay Area, the ambient exterior noise levels will still exceed community standards at some locations due to the factors set forth above.

Impact C-NV-3: Increased development in the South Bay Area will result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels on roadway segments throughout the region, beyond accepted thresholds in various communities. **(Significant Cumulative Noise Impact)**

Mitigation Measures for
Cumulative Noise Impacts

While implementation of noise attenuation measures as a part of the design of new development (as required under local building codes and ordinances) would reduce interior noise levels, feasible mitigation measures for all outdoor areas and existing development near busy transportation corridors may not be feasible to implement without constructing high walls that would block light and exterior views from both interior and outdoor areas. This impact, and the City's contribution to it with build-out of the draft *Envision San José 2040 General Plan,* will be significant and unavoidable because there are not feasible measures to mitigate noise levels for all outdoor areas and existing development. **(Significant Unavoidable Cumulative Impact)**

6.3.4 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

Air pollution is a regional issue affected by climate, land uses, and topography. Past, present and future development projects contribute to the region's adverse air quality impacts on a cumulative basis because air pollutants, once emitted at a particular location, move throughout the atmosphere and air basin. If a project's contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable, then the project's

impact on air quality would be considered significant.[231] Section 3.4 Air Quality includes an analysis of the air quality conditions related to build-out of the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*, as well as the proposed General Plan's conformance with the *2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan*. As previously described in Section 3.4.4, while the City proposes to implement measures to reduce VMT and associated air pollutant emissions, there is no assurance that these measures would reduce the VMT per capita to a level at or below the current rate. The increased growth in VMT per capita could result in emissions beyond those anticipated in the region's Clean Air Plan. These cumulative impacts are also identified as Impact AQ-1 and Impact AQ-8 in *Section 3.4 Air Quality*. **(Significant Unavoidable Cumulative Impacts)**

6.3.5 Cumulative Biological Resources Impacts

Cumulative impacts to sensitive habitats and special status plants and animals would be avoided or offset by measures included in the draft Santa Clara Valley HCP/NCCP, if the Santa Clara Valley HCP/NCCP was adopted. The proposed General Plan includes policies that would reduce the City's contribution to regional impacts to sensitive habitats, special status species populations, and trees from new development that could be independent of the Santa Clara Valley HCP/NCCP. In addition, implementation of future individual projects within the City of San José in conformance with existing regulations and proposed policies in the General Plan would reduce impacts related to wildlife roadway crossings and trees to a less than significant level. Through implementation of these measures, the City's contribution to these cumulative biological resources impacts from new development would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* in accordance with proposed policies and actions would reduce nitrogen oxide emissions from vehicle trips through planned multi-modal improvements, trip reduction programs, and local land use strategies; however, with the projected increase in vehicle miles traveled, beyond or above the growth in population and employment, implementation of the General Plan would contribute to increase nitrogen oxide emissions in the San Francisco Bay Area Basin.

As discussed in Section 3.5 Biological Resources, regional nitrogen deposition impacts to serpentine habitat in southern San José and Santa Clara County is a cumulative issue being addressed by local partner agencies participating in the Santa Clara Valley HCP/NCCP. If the Santa Clara Valley HCP/NCCP is not adopted, San José intends to implement a program of managed serpentine grassland preserves to off-set the projected effects of nitrogen deposition from new development as City resources allow (Action ER-2.10). Given current City resources, however, there is no timeline or assurance that serpentine grassland preserves would be established through such a unilateral program.

Impact C-BIO-4: Cumulative development would result in emissions of nitrogen compounds that could affect the species composition and viability of sensitive serpentine grasslands. Implementation of existing regulations and proposed policies for VMT reduction would reduce or offset indirect effects to serpentine grassland communities; however there currently is no assurance that a system of managed preserves would be established to offset new nitrogen deposition impacts from vehicular emissions. **(Significant Cumulative Biological Resources Impact)**

[231] BAAQMD. *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.* June 2010.

Mitigation Measures for
Cumulative Biological Resources Impacts

The draft Santa Clara Valley HCP/NCCP and various power plant projects in Santa Clara County[232] identify acquisition and management of serpentine grassland habitats (including grazing to remove non-native grasses) as suitable mitigation to offset nitrogen deposition impacts to these sensitive habitats. The timeline for adoption of an HCP/NCCP that covers southern Santa Clara County, including portions of San José, has been delayed and the scope of the draft HCP/NCCP may be modified. While it is the City's intent to address nitrogen deposition impacts from development within the City (refer to Actions ER 2.9 and ER 2.10 in the proposed General Plan), given current resources, the City cannot commit to designing and implementing an independent system of serpentine grassland preserves. Therefore, this impact, and the City's contribution to it with build-out of the draft *Envision San José 2040 General Plan,* will be significant and unavoidable because there is no assurance that a program of managed serpentine preserves will be established as a part of implementation of an adopted Santa Clara Valley HCP or an independent program designed and implemented by the City of San José. **(Significant Unavoidable Cumulative Impact)**

6.3.6 Cumulative Geology and Soils Impacts

Geologic conditions are localized and implementation of the proposed General Plan, when considered with the other cumulative projects, would not result in a cumulative geologic impact or exacerbate a regional cumulative geologic issue (e.g., building in a fault zone, massive landslide) covering multiple jurisdictions since individual developments would be subject to environmental review and permitting processes whereby the design and construction of structures will be reviewed for conformance with safety requirements under the California Building Code.

Construction activities associated with cumulative projects would disrupt soils, including some in areas with steep slopes. Implementation of local and state requirements for erosion and sediment control measures would reduce possible erosion impacts from construction to a less than significant level.

6.3.7 Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts

New development in San José and surrounding jurisdictions may alter local drainage and runoff characteristics in the Guadalupe River, Coyote Creek and San Tomas Aquino watershed. In urban settings, stormwater drainage systems are provided by local governments for areas within their jurisdictions, and are not provided on a regional basis. On a local and regional basis, requirements for limiting hydromodification under the Municipal NPDES program avoid or reduce cumulative regional impacts from modifications to local drainage and runoff in these watersheds.

Development of the cumulative projects would increase impermeable surfaces, thereby reducing surface infiltration and decreasing groundwater recharge. This would be a greater factor in southern San José, County of Santa Clara unincorporated areas, and Morgan Hill where there are more undeveloped areas and underlying soils and geologic material are most suitable for groundwater percolation. In addition, the proposed General Plan includes policies that require the consideration of groundwater percolation, including groundwater quality and protecting infiltration potential along

[232] Power plant projects that have included mitigation for nitrogen deposition on serpentine grasslands include the Metcalf Canyon Power Plant in San José and the Donald Von Raesfield Power Plant in Santa Clara.

creeks and riparian areas. Through these measures, the proposed General Plan's contribution to possible effects on groundwater infiltration would not be cumulatively considerable.

Increased urbanization on a cumulative basis would be expected to increase vehicle traffic and release of automobile-related pollutants, including petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and sediment and stormwater drainage from roads and parking lots could have a cumulative impact to water quality in local watersheds. Development in San José, adjacent cities and northern and central Santa Clara County are required to comply with applicable NPDES permits for stormwater controls, as discussed in Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Quality. Current and future projects are required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to treat stormwater runoff prior to its discharge to the maximum extent practicable. Compliance with applicable industrial, municipal and construction NPDES permits, as the permits are amended over the course of the proposed General Plan's planning horizon, will reduce cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

6.3.8 Cumulative Hazardous Materials and Hazards Impacts

The proposed General Plan, along with other cumulative projects, would result in additional residential and institutional development (such as hospitals) that could increase the potential for exposure of sensitive populations to hazardous materials or hazards. Hazardous materials used by commercial and industrial facilities and hazards (such as those associated with aircraft safety near airports) affect localized areas and hazards would not be significantly increased by other existing or planned development in northern and central Santa Clara County. In addition, proposed General Plan policies and local, state and federal regulations call for or require appropriate handling of hazardous materials and/or setbacks between uses to provide for public safety. Therefore, the City's contribution to regional cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials and hazards would be less than significant.

Cumulative hazardous materials impacts associated with contaminated soils and groundwater would be reduced through implementation of local policies and state and federal regulations for characterizing and remediation of known accidental releases. Like hazardous materials use, hazards from contamination are generally localized and the proposed General Plan would not result in a cumulative hazardous materials and hazards impact associated with groundwater or soil contamination.

6.3.9 Cumulative Public Facilities and Services Impacts

Public services are generally provided by local governments for areas within their jurisdictions and are not provided on a regional basis. Law enforcement and fire protection and emergency services are provided by local governments or fire protection districts for areas within their jurisdiction, supplemented by mutual aid agreements between agencies to pool resources. Public schools are provided by school districts to residential areas within their jurisdictions. While districts may cross city jurisdictional boundaries, school services are still provided at the local, rather than regional, level. The attendance boundaries and projected student population trends of the several school districts serving San José are discussed in Section 3.9 Public Services**.**

Future regional growth could result in increased demand for additional school facilities within the various school district boundaries. These facilities would likely be located within an urban area close to residential uses; however, it is unknown exactly where school facility expansions would occur. In

several San José Planning Areas (such as North San José, West Valley) school district boundaries cross City limits and new growth in the adjacent cities of Santa Clara, Campbell, and Cupertino would contribute to the need to construct new school facilities. However, future projects in all jurisdictions would be required to pay development impact fees, which, under state law, must be considered "full and complete mitigation" of their potential impacts to school capacity. As a result, a less than significant cumulative impact to schools would occur. It is important to note that as specific school expansion or improvement projects are identified in local school districts, additional project-specific, environmental analysis and coordination with local jurisdictions would be completed.

As with the other public services described here, libraries are also generally provided by local governments for areas within their jurisdiction, and services are not provided on a regional basis. Social services are generally provided by counties, and not on a regional basis. Neighborhood parks and recreational services are generally provided by local governments for areas within their jurisdiction. The new growth allowed under the proposed General Plan would not substantially impact the use of the other jurisdiction's libraries, parks and recreation facilities in the region, although San José residents are also residents of Santa Clara County and would continue to take advantage of County parks, trails, and other recreational facilities, funded in part by San José resident taxes. Therefore, the cumulative regional impacts of the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* associated with law enforcement, fire services, schools, library, social, and neighborhood parks and recreation services are considered less than significant.

6.3.10 Cumulative Utilities and Services Systems Impacts

6.3.10.1 *Water Supply*

The water supply discussion in Section 3.10 Utilities and Services Systems considered the cumulative water demand and supply issues for all water retailers that rely upon the Santa Clara Valley Water District's integrated wholesale water supply program. The City's contribution to cumulative water supply impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the identified policies and mitigation. Therefore, no further discussion of cumulative water supply issues is warranted in this section.

6.3.10.2 *Wastewater Treatment and WPCP Cumulative Influent/Effluent*

The San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP), which is located in the Alviso area of San José, provides wastewater treatment for the cities of San José, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Campbell, Cupertino, Los Gatos, Saratoga, and Monte Sereno.

Currently, the WPCP has a capacity to treat an average of 167 million gallons per day (mgd) of dry weather influent flow (ADWIF). Of this total capacity, the City of San José is allocated approximately 108 mgd. The NPDES permit identifies a design peak hour wet weather flow (PHWWF) of 271 mgd for the WPCP.

The National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program limits the amount of treated wastewater that can be discharged to the San Francisco Bay to 120 mgd average dry weather effluent flow (ADWEF). The NPDES limit is due to potential impacts of additional freshwater discharges to saltwater marsh habitat, as well as pollutant loading to the San Francisco

Bay. The NPDES permit requirement is a trigger that, if the 120 mgd ADWEF is exceeded, the WPCP is required to engage in specific mitigation activities such as increases in recycled water. This trigger has led to the development of conservation programs to reduce the volume of wastewater generated at the WPCP, including the South Bay Water Recycling (SBWR) program. The SBWR system includes over 100 miles of pipe serving the cities of Santa Clara, San José, and Milpitas. During the summer months, an average of 15 million gallons of recycled water are produced and distributed to over 550 customers per day.

In addition, the City of San José, which operates the WPCP, has prepared a Clean Bay Strategy (CBS) and the South Bay Action Plan. The CBS details the City of San José's control strategy to reduce effluent discharges to the South San Francisco Bay as required by the NPDES permit. The Clean Bay Strategy promotes an integrated watershed protection approach and considers all factors influencing water quality in the South Bay, including point and non-point sources of pollution, water supply issues and improving plant performance. The South Bay Action Plan describes the conservation, reuse and diversion activities designed to reduce effluent flow from the WPCP to below 120 mgd. A contingency plan of additional flow reduction activities will be implemented if the ADWEF were to reach a planning trigger of 115 mgd.

The WPCP treated 135 mgd ADWIF in 2000, 118 mgd ADWIF in 2002, and 117 mgd ADWIF in 2004. The sewer flow from San José between 2000 and 2007 was approximately 98 mgd (ADWIF). In recent years, the WPCP treated an average dry weather flow (ADWF) of 113 mgd in 2005, 118 mgd in 2006, and 112 mgd in 2007 (most recent data available). In the last decade, the amount of discharge has been declining in part due to a decline in manufacturing uses in Santa Clara County, a general decline in industrial activity, and continued implementation of water conservation measures. Another factor in the reduction in activity is due to the economic conditions that resulted in high vacancy rates in the industrial areas of Santa Clara County.

A Master Plan is currently being prepared for the WPCP. The Master Plan is a cumulative project and considered in this cumulative analysis. The Master Plan will guide the Plant's development over the next 30 years. The purpose of the Master Plan is to identify technology options for the Plant's continued operations and land use scenarios for the Plant's 2,600-acre property. An important part of the Master Plan is to ensure that there will be sufficient treatment capacity in the future.

The projected 2035 flows are based on county and city population projections by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Department of Finance, and Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy. For the City of San José, it was estimated that the total population in the City would increase by approximately 40 percent from 974,000 people in 2007 to 1,367,000 people in 2035. For the City of Santa Clara, implementation of the proposed General Plan and 'in process' growth under the current 2002-2010 General Plan would result in a population of 155,000 residents in 2035, up from 115,500 in 2008.

As shown in Table 6.3-1, the implementation of the cumulative projects, including the build-out of the proposed San José and Santa Clara General Plan updates, are projected to increase the amount of sewer/wastewater that would need to be treated compared to existing conditions and the existing WPCP inflow capacity of 167 mgd ADWIF . It is estimated that the ADWIF in 2035 would be six mgd greater than the WPCP's existing treatment capacity.

Table 6.3-1
Projected Wastewater Flows to the WPCP in 2035
(million gallons per day)

Average Dry Weather Influent Flow (ADWIF)	Peak Hour Wet Weather Flow (PHWWF)
173	427

Source: Matt Krupp, City of San José, Environmental Services Department, Project Manager for the WPCP Master Plan, April 2010.

It is difficult to estimate the future average dry weather effluent amount (i.e., discharge to San Francisco Bay) because the effluent flows are dependent on the use of recycled water and recycled water projections. As part of the WPCP Master Plan, process measures are being evaluated, including an effluent pond to regulate the amount and time of discharge and possibly the addition of a polishing wetland that would modify the impact of the WPCP's discharge to the Bay. It is anticipated that the future average dry weather effluent flow would not exceed 120 mgd.[233]

As mentioned previously, technology options are being explored in the Master Plan to ensure the WPCP's continued operation in the future. In order to accommodate future projected flows, the WPCP would need to change its current secondary treatment process of Biological Nutrient Removal (BNR) to nitrification. By changing the secondary treatment process from BNR to nitrification, capacity would increase because processes would occur in parallel rather than in a series.

The improvements required to change the secondary treatment process at the WPCP from BNR to nitrification are proposed as part of the Master Plan. The implementation of the WPCP Master Plan is part of this cumulative analysis, therefore, the improvements necessary to accommodate projected 2035 flows are assumed in this cumulative analysis. The WPCP Master Plan is undergoing its own environmental review process and it is anticipated that the EIR process for the Master Plan will begin in 2011.

In addition to the improvements associated with the Master Plan, there are other strategies that can be implemented to address increased demand on the WPCP, including conservation measures such as reducing water usage to reduce the overall flow of wastewater to the WPCP. These programs will also reduce sewer/wastewater discharge, which reduces the demand for treatment capacity.

Increased use of recycled water for irrigation and recharging groundwater supplies will reduce the amount of discharge from the WPCP to the Bay; however, indoor uses will not reduce sufficient wastewater flow to the WPCP. Active implementation of aggressive strategies to facilitate use of recycled water could reduce the actual amount of discharge from the WPCP to the Bay. By connecting new users to SBWR pipelines and by expanding the SBWR system, San José can increase the amount of recycled water delivered to major businesses, City parks and landscaping, and school grounds. Over the next 15 years, the WPCP plans to achieve 100 percent beneficial reuse of the wastewater captured and treated through a combination of water conservation, expanded use of recycled water, and habitat protection.

[233] Matt Krupp, City of San José, Environmental Services Department, Project Manager for the WPCP Master Plan, personal communications, April 2010.

With the build-out of the cumulative projects, the flows to the WPCP are anticipated to exceed the existing capacity of the treatment plant. However, the cumulative projects include the implementation of the WPCP Master Plan, which includes improvements (e.g., changing the secondary treatment process from BNR to nitrification) that will increase the treatment capacity at the facility and allow the WPCP to accommodate projected future flows. In addition, mandatory water conservation efforts and increased use of recycled water could be imposed by the City to reduce flow levels, event without implementation of the WPCP Master Plan. As discussed previously, San José's future flows would remain within its allocation, therefore future flows exceeding current WPCP capacity would be attributable to increased flows from other jurisdictions beyond their current allocation, and San José's contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable by staying within its current allocation. Also, every land use permit issued by the City of San José includes the following standard permit condition:

> *Sewage Treatment Demand.* Chapter 15.12 of Title 15 of the San José Municipal Code requires that all land development approvals and applications for such approvals in the City of San José shall provide notice to the applicant for, or recipient of, such approval that no vested right to a Building Permit shall accrue as the result of the granting of such approval when and if the City Manager makes a determination that the cumulative sewage treatment demand of the Water Pollution Control Plant represented by approved land uses in the area served by said Plant will cause the total sewage treatment demand to meet or exceed the capacity of the Water Pollution Control Plant to treat such sewage adequately and within the discharge standards imposed on the City by the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region. Substantive conditions designed to decrease sanitary sewage associated with any land use approval may be imposed by the approval authority.

For the above reasons, the implementation of the cumulative projects would not result in the need for construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities beyond the improvements assumed in the WPCP Master Plan.

6.3.11 Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts

Future regional growth and urban redevelopment would be facilitated by the cumulative projects, specifically local General Plans and Specific Plans. Significant cultural resources sites have been identified within each of the communities in the South Bay area, including significant archaeological sites and buildings on local historic registers, the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. Paleontological resources also have been identified in localized valley and hillside areas in the County. New growth and redevelopment will increase the likelihood that challenges to the protection and preservation of cultural resources could be encountered.

The City's existing General Plan, proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*, and the General Plans of surrounding cities include policies that call for avoiding or reducing significant impacts to cultural resources and characterization and protection of archaeological and historic resources as required by local historic preservation ordinances and state law. Conformance with these policies

and regulations would reduce cumulative impacts to cultural resources in San José and surrounding communities to a less than significant level.[234]

6.3.12 Cumulative Aesthetics Impacts

Visual and scenic resources are generally localized, although specific resources can be regional in nature, such as vistas of a mountain range. Build-out allowed under the proposed General Plan generally would be limited to redevelopment of existing urbanized areas within San José, and identified local visual impacts from build-out or development of Communications Hill and northern Coyote Valley would not substantially contribute to a regional, cumulative impact. Cumulative development within San José by other public agencies (e.g. public school districts, local colleges, or in adjacent communities) would also largely consist of 'recycling' of existing developed parcels for new urban land uses or intensification of existing land uses. Implementation of the proposed General Plan, including implementation of the design review process and incorporation of applicable policies regulating the appearance of new development, would not result in impacts to regional visual and scenic resources (such as the Valley's surrounding hillsides) in that new and redevelopment would not be of a scale or density to affect regional visual and scenic resources. Policies that apply to areas outside the UGB would tend to keep larger scale development (such as golf courses or retreat centers) closer to the valley floor or sheltered from view. Therefore the City's contribution to cumulative regional aesthetic impacts would be less than significant.

6.3.13 Cumulative Energy Impacts

Build-out of the cumulative projects listed in Table 6.2-1 along with the proposed General Plan will result in increased energy use in the form of electricity, natural gas and other fuels. Implementation of energy efficiency requirements in building codes, including the recently adopted CALGreen requirements, local Green Building ordinances and program measures in local General Plans and various sustainability and conservation policies would avoid the wasteful and inefficient use of energy. Local programs of Pacific Gas & Electric and the Santa Clara Valley Water District also are improving energy and water conservation in the South Bay and Northern California, which ultimately will reduce energy demand per capita. Through these measures, the proposed General Plan and cumulative projects will not result in significant cumulative energy impacts associated with the built environment.

6.3.14 Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts

The cumulative scenario includes new population and employment growth planned by cities in the South Bay Area. With the exception of the Southeast Quadrant project in Morgan Hill, all cumulative population and employment growth would occur within the cities' existing urban growth boundaries, with no expansion of urban services to rural undeveloped areas. While some new development will occur through development of the relatively few remaining vacant infill parcels found in each city, the cumulative trend will continue to predominantly be redevelopment of existing low-intensity, underutilized parcels with new urban uses. Most new housing accommodated within

[234] The analysis in this PEIR assumes that future projects in the City of San José will avoid or reduce impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level through measures included in Urban Village Plans or as conditions of approval in other projects. In the event a future project proposes demolition or modification of a significant archaeological, historical or paleontological resource, additional environmental review and detailed evaluation of resources will be required.

the cumulative jurisdictions will be in a medium- or high-density attached or mixed-use format. New job growth will largely occur on previously developed parcels in intensified forms (i.e. more employees per acre compared to existing development patterns, often with structured parking). Given the interconnected nature of the cities and the regional transportation network, most workers will travel to jobs in a city different from where they live.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan, along with other pending or adopted General Plans in Santa Clara County would allow an increase to both population and housing in the region. Santa Clara County as a whole is projected to have both increased employment opportunities and population growth by 2035. To the extent more new employment and/or more total employment is proposed in San José, Santa Clara and other communities than housing for employees, implementation of the cumulative General Plans would result in induced housing growth in other areas. This housing growth would result in air quality, noise, and traffic impacts from increased vehicle miles traveled by people between jobs and housing. This induced growth represents a significant cumulative impact.

While redevelopment allowed under local General Plans would involve some displacement of housing or persons, new housing would be constructed so that substantial numbers of housing or persons would not be displaced or construction of replacement housing would be provided elsewhere. State law also requires jurisdictions to adopt policies and programs that help preserve and maintain housing opportunities while encouraging the development of new housing, which in the long term limits displacement within communities. Therefore, the cumulative impact associated with displacement of housing or persons in the overall region would be less than significant.

Impact C-PH-5: Build-out of the proposed General Plan in conjunction with other planned development would contribute cumulatively to impacts arising from a regional jobs-housing imbalance. **(Significant Cumulative Population and Housing Impact)**

Mitigation Measures for Cumulative Impact

Mitigation for a jobs-housing imbalance and associated physical environmental effects could use one of several approaches. The amount of employment in a community could be limited so that each community is in balance with the housing it provides. This approach is not proposed in any of the General Plans in Santa Clara County. A second approach is to reduce the physical effects of a jobs-housing imbalance. An example of this approach would be providing services and increasing housing near transit that could reduce environmental effects associated with commuting between housing and jobs for those residents employed locally.

As discussed in detail in the Transportation, Air Quality, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions sections of this PEIR, the proposed shift in the City's jobs/housing imbalance from jobs deficient within the City to more jobs than employed residents will contribute to air pollutant emissions (including greenhouse gas emissions) and congestion on area freeways, roadways and intersections. While the City proposes to implement measures to reduce VMT and associated air pollutant emissions, there is no assurance that these measures would reduce air emissions and transportation congestion impacts to a less than significant level. Residential development outside San José, especially outside of Santa Clara County and southern Alameda County, could contribute to regional growth inducing impacts that are not reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, the identified cumulative population

and housing impact related to the jobs/housing balance and induced growth is significant and unavoidable. **(Significant Unavoidable Cumulative Impact)**

6.3.15 Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Impacts

Of the cities adjacent or near the City of San José, most have adopted energy and water conservation and efficiency policies and several are currently preparing Climate Action Plans (e.g., the cities of Sunnyvale and Santa Clara).

Section 3.15 Greenhouse Gas Emissions provides a Plan-level analysis that places the proposed General Plan's growth within the cumulative context for California's 2020 and 2050 GHG emission goals. Anticipated build-out by 2020 under the City's proposed General Plan would be consistent with California's 2020 emissions targets and would contribute a less than cumulatively considerable amount toward future GHG levels.

Citywide 2035 GHG emissions are projected to exceed efficiency standards necessary to maintain a trajectory to meet long-term California 2050 climate change reduction goals. Achieving the substantial emissions reductions required to meet the 2050 goal will require policy and regulatory decisions at the federal and state level and new and substantially advanced technologies that cannot be anticipated or predicted at this time. A number of policies and measures are included in the proposed General Plan that provide for land uses and transportation in the City to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions (e.g., Land Use (LU) Policies: 6.4, 10.5, 10.8, 10.10 and Transportation (TR) Policies: 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.5, 9.2, 10.5). Given that new technologies and the adoption of new and as yet unidentified measures under the City's *Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy* and the feasibility of achieving the substantial 2035 emissions reductions are uncertain, the City's contribution to GHG emissions for the 2035 timeframe is conservatively determined to be cumulatively considerable. This impact is also identified as Impact GHG-1 in Section 3.15 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

SECTION 7.0 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

A significant unavoidable impact is an impact that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level if the project is implemented, because no feasible mitigation has been identified. While most impacts from the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* would be reduced to a less-than-significant level, adoption and implementation of the General Plan would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- Land Use (Agricultural Resources)

  Build-out under the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* would result in impacts to Prime Farmland remaining within the City's UGB.

- Transportation

  Implementation of the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* would have significant transportation impacts, including a significant increase in vehicle miles traveled, significant increased congestion along transit priority corridors and along local and regional screenlines, significantly increased congestion on roadways in surrounding cities and on freeways and expressways.

- Noise

  New development and redevelopment under the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* would result in increased traffic noise, and in some cases, the increases would be substantial.

- Air Quality

  While the proposed General Plan includes policies that would reduce VMT and emissions from vehicle trips, the projected increase in vehicle miles traveled by 2035, beyond or above the growth in population would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan.

- Biological Resources (Indirect Nitrogen Deposition on Serpentine Habitats)

  New development and redevelopment allowed under the proposed General Plan would result in emissions of nitrogen compounds that could affect the species composition and viability of sensitive serpentine grasslands. There currently is no assurance that a system of managed preserves would be established to offset new nitrogen deposition impacts from vehicular emissions.

- Aesthetics

  Build-out of the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area and the North Coyote Valley Area would result in substantial impacts to local scenic views.

- Population and Housing/Growth Inducement

  Since implementation of the proposed General Plan could induce substantial population growth at other locations by 2035, the impact of developing new housing at distance locations could be significant.

- Greenhouse Gas Emissions

  Citywide 2035 GHG emissions are projected to exceed efficiency standards necessary to maintain a trajectory to meet long-term 2050 state climate change reduction goals. Achieving the substantial emissions reductions to achieve and maintain that trajectory will require policy decisions at the federal and state level and new and substantially advanced technologies that cannot today be anticipated, and are outside the City's control, and therefore cannot be relied upon as feasible mitigation strategies. Given the uncertainties about the feasibility of achieving the substantial 2035 emissions reductions, the City's contribution to climate change for the 2035 timeframe is conservatively determined to be cumulatively considerable.

Significant Unavoidable Impacts of Rancho del Pueblo and iStar Residential Options

As discussed in Section 2.2.8 in the Project Description, this PEIR also evaluates options for residential land use designations and anticipated future development on two properties; the Rancho del Pueblo Golf Course in the Alum Rock Planning Area and the iStar property in the Edenvale Planning Area (Residential Option Sites). Under these options one or both of these properties would be designated for residential uses instead of the industrial uses assumed on the iStar property and the park/open space on the existing Rancho del Pueblo Golf Course.

The significant unavoidable impacts for the Rancho del Pueblo and iStar Residential Options would be the same as the proposed project with the exception of impacts to sensitive receptors for the Rancho del Pueblo Residential Option site, as noted below.

Adoption and implementation of the General Plan with the Rancho del Pueblo Residential would result in the following additional significant and unavoidable impact:

- Air Quality (Community Risk/Toxic Air Contaminants)

  Within approximately 980 feet of US 101 on the Rancho del Pueblo site, future residents would be exposed to substantial toxic air contaminant (TAC) pollutant concentrations. There is no assurance that TAC impacts at this location on the southeast side of US 101 for single family residences (e.g., townhouse or small lot single-family residences) can be reduced to a less than significant level given projected traffic volumes and predominant wind direction.

SECTION 8.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

8.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA requires that an EIR identify alternatives to a project as it is proposed. The CEQA Guidelines specify that the EIR should identify alternatives that "will feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but will avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project." The purpose of this section is to determine whether there are alternatives of design, scope or location that will substantially lessen the significant impacts, even if those alternatives "impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives," or are more costly. [Section 15126.6(b)]

In order to comply with the purposes of CEQA, it is important to identify alternatives that reduce the significant impacts that are anticipated to occur if the project is implemented and to try to meet as many of the project's objectives as possible. The Guidelines emphasize a common sense approach -- the alternatives should be reasonable, "foster informed decision making and public participation," and must focus on alternatives that avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts.

The discussion of alternatives shall include enough information to allow a meaningful evaluation and comparison with the proposed project. The CEQA Guidelines state that if an alternative would cause one or more additional impacts, compared to the proposed project, the discussion should identify the additional impact, but in less detail than the significant effects of the proposed project.

The three critical factors to consider in selecting and evaluating alternatives are: (1) the significant impacts from the proposed project which should be reduced or avoided by an alternative; (2) the project's objectives; and (3) the feasibility of the alternatives available. Each of these factors is discussed below.

8.2 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

As mentioned above, the CEQA Guidelines advise that an alternatives analysis in an EIR should be limited to alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and would achieve most of the project objectives. As discussed previously in this PEIR, the project has significant unmitigated or unavoidable impacts associated with loss of prime farmland, transportation, roadway noise, air quality, biological resources (nitrogen deposition on sensitive serpentine habitats), aesthetics, climate change/greenhouse gas emissions in 2035, and growth inducement. Much of the impacts discussion in this PEIR revolves around the direct or indirect effects of automobile travel, characterized as Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), which contribute to or cause almost all of the significant unavoidable impacts, including air quality, transportation, roadway noise, nitrogen deposition on sensitive serpentine habitats, and greenhouse gas impacts.

8.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15124, the EIR must include a statement of objectives, including the underlying purpose of the project. The underlying purpose of this proposed project is a comprehensive update of the City's General Plan.

A General Plan Update provides the City with an opportunity to comprehensively review land use policies and the City's standards for the delivery of municipal services for consistency with the current social, economic, and environmental context, including anticipated cultural and demographic changes. The General Plan is one of the City's primary policy documents, playing a significant role in shaping the City's growth over the course of many years, and so it is important that this document

align closely with community values, goals, and aspirations. Because San José last completed a General Plan Update in 1994, the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* update process included extensive opportunity for community engagement and consideration of the entire document as a cohesive expression of the community's vision for its future. Priorities expressed through this community engagement process directed the formulation of policies within the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* and embodied within the Land Use/Transportation Diagram.

The first objective identified by the community was a desire to promote economic growth to support San José's emergence as a more important employment center within North America. Other primary objectives identified by the community were to promote a healthier fiscal situation for the City, to demonstrate leadership in environmental sustainability, to promote transit use, and to foster the development of "Urban Villages" throughout San José. The Urban Village objective is to promote a key development type that is more compact, urban, and attractive in character. The Urban Village strategy is supported by considerable evidence suggesting that such urban environments are environmentally and fiscally beneficial, while also being more attractive to and better meeting the needs of both an aging population and a young, innovative workforce.

This four-year General Plan Update process has occurred in a time of unprecedented fiscal challenges for San José, and all cities across California and the nation. Ten years of annual budget deficits have highlighted ongoing challenges in San José's ability to achieve sufficient and sustained revenues to enable the City to provide a desired level of quality and quantity of services to residents, businesses and visitors to San José. Within this context of fiscal constraints and uncertainty, the City Council, *Envision* Task Force, and community stakeholders developed key principles to guide the General Plan Update, chief among them the importance of economic development and attracting many new jobs and businesses to San José, and the need to focus the *Envision San José 2040* planning process to create land use policies which would work to improve and sustain the fiscal health and future service delivery ability of the City.

The *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* represents significant modifications to many of the City's goals and policies. The City's basic objectives for the proposed General Plan are provided below.

1. Shift the focus of the City's growth to establish San José as a regional employment center to enhance the City's leadership role in North America, increase utilization of the regional transit systems, and support the City's fiscal health. Promote job growth within San José's Downtown and on employment lands located at the center of regional transportation systems in order to counter the negative impacts of the region's traditional low-intensity, sprawling land use pattern.

2. Create an interconnected city where the activities of and services required for daily life are in close proximity and easily accessible by walking, bicycling and public transit.

3. Provide a mixed variety of commercial and industrial employment lands in a wide range of locations to support an innovative economy with job opportunities for a demographically diverse population. Promote the expansion of commercial activity throughout the City, and in small mixed use "villages" in order to fully meet the needs of the City's residents and enhance quality of life in existing residential neighborhoods.

4. Provide residents and businesses with a broad range of high quality public facilities and services, including educational and cultural opportunities, and distribute these facilities equitably throughout the city.

5. Establish a Land Use Planning Framework to promote the right balance of fiscal revenue and costs to allow the City to deliver high-quality municipal services. Improve the City's current revenue and cost structure, including the fiscal effects of its land development, to allow the City to provide municipal services consistent with community needs and expectations.

6. Provide for an innovative economy with job opportunities for a demographically diverse population and ample fiscal resources to support a vibrant community and the City's emerging leadership role as the Silicon Valley region's employment center.

7. Continue environmental leadership as a sustainable and healthy city, a leader in green technology, and a steward of San José's natural resources and open space areas in part through maintenance of the Urban Growth Boundary and enhancement of riparian corridors and respect for a variety of open spaces both within and outside of the Urban Growth Boundary.

8. Promote public health through a Land Use/Transportation Diagram that promotes walking, biking, and public transit use, facilitating access to parks and recreation, creating community gathering spaces, providing retail and services near residential areas, and developing a sustainable food system with locations for locally grown produce.

9. Preserve and enhance neighborhoods and other areas of the City that provide San José with a sense of identity and a historic and cultural richness.

10. Promote the development of Urban Villages, Corridors and Regional Transit Hubs to provide active, walkable, bicycle-friendly, transit-oriented, mixed-use, urban settings for new housing and job growth attractive to an innovative workforce and consistent environmental goals. Focus significant growth, particularly to increase employment capacity, in areas surrounding the City's regional transit hubs in order to support the City's continuing emergence as a Regional Employment Center bringing in workers from throughout the Region to move San José toward the goal of 1.3 jobs for each employed San José resident, and to maximize the use of these transit systems within the region to show the City's support for future regional transit system investment.

11. Distribute and preserve a wide variety of housing types, both throughout the city as well as within individual communities, which meet the needs of an economically, demographically and culturally diverse population.

12. Strategically channel new growth into areas of San José that will best enable the City to achieve its goals for economic growth, fiscal sustainability and environmental stewardship, and support the development of new, attractive urban neighborhoods through the redevelopment of centrally-located, underutilized properties.

13. Design streets for people, not just cars, and to support a diverse range of urban activities and functions. Develop important roadways as Grand Boulevards to connect multiple

neighborhoods and act as urban design elements at a citywide scale. Promote the ongoing development of Main Streets to foster community identity and walkability, recognizing that they serve as important destinations for retail and other activities within neighborhood areas.

14. Support continued growth in the Downtown as the City's cultural center and as a unique and important employment and residential neighborhood. Promote growth within the Downtown to support economic, fiscal, environmental and urban design/placemaking goals, and to strengthen the position of Downtown as a priority location for continued investment in all types of local and regional-serving transit services, including bus, bus rapid transit, light rail, standard passenger rail, BART, and high speed rail, and enhanced connectivity amongst modes.

15. Advance the City's Green Vision through 2040 and establish measurable sustainability indicators consistent with Green Vision Goal #7. Use the Plan as the basis for the City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

8.4 FEASIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVES

CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and case law on the subject concur that feasibility can include a wide range of factors and influences. The Guidelines advise that such factors can include (but are not necessarily limited to) the suitability of an alternate site, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, consistency with a general plan or with other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the project proponent can "reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site". [Section 15126.6(f)(1)]

Given that this PEIR evaluates the proposed General Plan for the entire City of San José, it would not be feasible or meaningful to evaluate an alternative location (i.e., development in another city) for purposes of informing a decision about the City of San José General Plan. Therefore, this PEIR evaluates the environmental effects of various alternatives to the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* in the City of San José.

Several of the alternatives described below include modifications of how much new growth would or should occur within the City, and variations on the intensity and mix of development within Urban Village areas, commercial corridors, and some Specific Plan and Employment Lands areas. Some of these alternatives were developed as part of the *Envision* General Plan update process and considered by the *Envision* Task Force prior to the selection of a preferred scenario for the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan.*

8.5 SELECTION OF CEQA ALTERNATIVES

Consideration of a "No Project" alternative is mandatory under CEQA. When a project is the revision of an existing land use plan, the "no project" alternative is the continuation of the existing plan into the future [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)(3)(A)]. The discussion of "No Project" below is based on continued use of the existing General Plan, including the current Land Use/Transportation Diagram, assumed with available infrastructure and community services.

Because VMT is associated with or is a contributing source to almost all of the significant unavoidable impacts, other logical CEQA alternatives are those that would limit the increase in

VMT, such as a different mix of land uses, total growth (how much of all kinds of growth will occur), and a more balanced ratio of jobs to employed residents. When using VMT to evaluate potential environmental impacts it is important to also consider travel speed and congestion levels, which also significantly contribute to traffic-related impacts.

During a 30-month public process, the *Envision San José 2040* Task Force developed and considered a number of alternative scenarios prior to selecting the currently proposed land use and transportation diagram for the General Plan. Because the scenarios developed during the Task Force process were formulated to meet the basic objectives of the project (the *Envision* General Plan), and used for the *Envision* process to test the potential environmental impacts of different land use plans, they were all considered as possible CEQA alternatives with one exception (Scenario 6) which was deemed to be infeasible. Key demographic and transportation metrics for five of these scenarios and the No Project Alternative are listed in Table 8.5-1. Including these alternatives in this PEIR provides the public with a clear picture of the Task Force's consideration as well as a range of project variations and information on how the different land use options they proposed relate to the environmental impacts.

As shown in Table 8.5-1, the alternative scenarios are defined by two primary growth variables; the number of new dwelling units and the number of new jobs. In combination with existing development that would remain, each scenario is also defined by a jobs-housing balance, presented as a ratio of jobs per employed resident (J/ER). The distribution of new dwelling units and jobs throughout the City was similar for all scenarios with a focus on identified growth areas (vacant or underutilized parcels with the potential for infill or redevelopment) located in proximity to transit and other infrastructure within the City's Urban Growth Boundary.

As discussed in Section 3.2 Transportation, it is important to recognize that the currently available tools for projecting VMT in San José have limits in terms of capturing internalization of trips and reductions from people working at home or some multimodal improvements and do not address behavioral changes related to proposed policy changes, quality of the urban environment or other influences beyond the planned land uses and transportation network.

Much of the current work being done in studying atmospheric impacts and energy use is analyzing and understanding the relationships between population, vehicle travel, and the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions and other air pollutants. Related to that work, the total number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a result of a land use plan or land use-related decision is frequently expressed as a ratio with either resident population of a community (per capita) or as a ratio with a combined "service population" number that represents the resident population *and* the number of jobs (employees) in the community (i.e., the people doing much of the commuting). Since a great many of the travel-related impacts in the Bay Area are a function of the commute travel patterns (home to job and back again), both categories of land use (residential and employment) contribute to the source of impacts and the driving distance between the two locations is a major cause of the impacts. The number of miles assumed in these VMT ratios is typically adjusted, however, with only one-half of the trip distances outside a city attributed to the city (i.e., one-half the distance of a trip *to* a job in San José *from* a residence outside San José and one-half the distance of a trip *from* a San José job to a dwelling outside San José) with the intention of more equitably dividing the responsibility for the trip between the cities at both ends.

Table 8.5-1
Land Use Summaries of General Plan Scenarios

Category	Existing Conditions	2035 Conditions						
		Proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*	**No Project/ Retain San José 2020 GP**	**Scenario 1 Low Growth**	**Scenario 2 More Housing/ Fewer Jobs**	**Scenario 3 ABAG Assumptions**	**Scenario 4 More Jobs/Less Housing**	**Scenario 5 Slightly More Housing/ Less Jobs**
Housing, Population, Jobs, and VMT								
Dwelling Units	309,350	429,350	391,460	398,000	445,000	468,320	398,000	445,000
Population	985,307	1,313,811	1,197,868	1,217,880	1,361,700	1,433,059	1,217,880	1,361,700
Employment	369,450	839,450	625,000	716,000	730,000	708,980	895,500	801,000
Service Population	1,354,757	2,153,261	1,822,868	1,947,880	2,091,700	2,142,039	2,113,380	2,162,700
VMT	19,806,977	34,852,957	30,916,900	31,733,000	33,298,000	33,687,000	35,050,000	34,687,000
Ratios								
VMT/capita	20.1	26.5	25.8	26.1	24.4	23.5	28.8	25.5
VMT/SP	14.6	16.2	17.0	16.3	15.9	15.7	16.6	16.0
Jobs/Employed Resident	**0.8**	**1.3**	**1.1**	**1.2**	**1.1**	**1.0**	**1.5**	**1.2**

Source: City of San José, 2010.
Refer to Appendix L for land use assumptions including projected jobs and population.

As shown in Table 8.5-1, VMT and VMT/Service Population (SP) vary between the proposed project and several of the alternative scenarios (1, 2, 3, 4, and 5); however, the magnitude of these differences is not large (less than 5 percent difference in VMT/SP by scenario). Because population growth is by far the greatest factor in determining VMT, using VMT/SP is a better index to compare scenarios in that it accounts for impacts attributable to population rather than to the proposed mix of land uses. Also, because of similarities, each of the alternatives performs well in certain aspects of performance, and may perform better for one factor and not as well for another. For example, Scenario 4 has both the highest (worst) VMT and highest VMT/SP except for the No Project alternative, while it also has the highest transit ridership and the best mode split in terms of use of transit, biking and walking and reduced vehicle use. More in-depth comparison, as shown in the Transportation section of this PEIR and Appendix B, further indicates that each scenario will generate different degrees and types of traffic impacts at different specific locations, demonstrating the complexity of using long-range traffic modeling as a policy-making tool.

Key objectives of the project are for the city to become more of a regional job center, to increase utilization of regional transportation systems, and to support the City's fiscal health. Given the ongoing problems with providing services to a community that has had far more housing than jobs for decades and in conformance with General Plan objectives for fiscal sustainability, scenarios which would allow job and housing growth corresponding to a J/ER ratio of less than 1.0 would not meet the basic objectives of the project and were not considered as part of the *Envision* process.

An alternative which would accelerate implementation of parking strategies, such as reducing on-site parking and/or charging employees and customers for parking, to the first tier of implementation of the General Plan was considered and rejected. While it has been shown that such strategies can be highly effective in reducing congestion and motor vehicle trips at prime locations (such as attractive commercial areas and institutions), implementation of these strategies by the City of San José alone within the South Bay Area would put the city at a substantial disadvantage in attracting industrial and commercial employers in the near term. As discussed previously in Section 3.2 Transportation, while local employers have commonly implemented TDM programs, especially in North San José and most of the high tech areas of Silicon Valley, measures such as parking cash out or reducing on-site parking have not been used because of challenges with construction financing and/or corporate "exit strategies". As an acceleration of parking strategy implementation would not be consistent with several of the basic objectives of the project (e.g., increasing the J/ER ratio for fiscal sustainability in the near term of the Plan), this alternative is not addressed further. Current long-term traffic modeling methods also do not readily accommodate the analysis of the effects of such policies. Although not considered further as a CEQA alternative, the City recognizes that parking strategies and similar pricing measures are likely to be important tools for reducing motor vehicle travel in the future, especially as part of regional planning implementation efforts.

The following alternatives are therefore evaluated as CEQA alternatives to the proposed General Plan.

- No Project/Retain Existing General Plan
- Scenario 1 Low Growth Alternative
- Scenario 2 More Housing/Fewer Jobs Alternative
- Scenario 3 ABAG (Association of Bay Area Governments) Projections Alternative
- Scenario 4 More Jobs/Less Housing Alternative
- Scenario 5 Slightly More Housing/Slightly Fewer Jobs Alternative

One additional land use scenario, Scenario 6 "More Jobs in Alviso", was evaluated as part of the *Envision* process and initially identified as the preferred scenario, but following further analysis was deemed to be infeasible because of the limited supply of land available for employment growth in Alviso being determined through the Plant Master Plan process. It was also expected that relocation of employment growth from Alviso to sites in proximity to transit would result in a reduction in environmental impacts. A portion of the employment growth (approximately 10,800 jobs) was relocated from Alviso to various Transit Urban Village areas to create the preferred Scenario 7. Because Scenario 6 is considered infeasible, it is not further considered in this PEIR as an alternative for CEQA purposes. The basic differences between these alternatives are summarized in Table 8.5-2 and land use assumptions for each alternative are included in Appendix L.

All of these alternatives except for the No Project Alternative share some similarities. Specifically, all focus new growth within the existing UGB and exclude growth within the Urban Reserves. The five scenario alternatives also direct new growth to the identified "Growth Areas" and do not support growth within built-out single-family residential areas where regional transportation facilities are limited. They do include development in North Coyote Valley, most of which was previously entitled.

The alternatives also give highest priority to the Downtown and other sites served by existing or planned transit. Most of the housing growth capacity is assumed to be at higher densities. Existing employment lands are preserved and generally intensified in all alternatives. In addition, existing job capacity is preserved and development of jobs is generally intensified in the Village Growth Areas. Generally, all of these alternatives use the same basic transportation network, including existing and planned transit facilities.

Table 8.5-2
General Plan Alternatives Overview

CEQA Alternative	Type of Alternative					
	No Project	Less Growth	Housing		Jobs/Housing Ratio 1:1	Reduced Jobs
			More	Less		
No Project/Retain Existing General Plan	X	X		X		X
Scenario 1: Low Growth		X		X		X
Scenario 2: More Housing/Fewer Jobs			X			X
Scenario 3: ABAG Projections			X		X	X
Scenario 4: More Jobs/Less Housing				X		
Scenario 5: Slightly More Housing/Less Jobs			X			X

Much of the San Francisco Bay Area has depended on San José as a supplier of regional housing, as reflected in the large existing number of residents employed outside the city and in projections of housing supply for San José by ABAG through 2035. While there are uncertainties about the city's ability to achieve the high number of jobs necessary to reach higher J/ER ratios while also providing new housing (as noted in the following discussions of alternatives), the Task Force also stated that it is important to have a General Plan with additional job capacity (beyond the projected demand) in order to provide multiple options for future job growth and to clearly communicate the City's desire to become more of a regional job center. In other words, a large number and variety of employment site choices are considered necessary to achieve the City's stated objectives 1, 3, 6 and 10 (described above in the Alternatives section), consistent with a planned number of jobs and housing units that supports a 1.3 jobs/employed resident ratio.

An important objective identified by the *Envision* Task Force was to concentrate, to the degree feasible, new employment and housing growth in proximity to transit. The Study Scenarios were developed in part to identify the feasible capacity to accommodate new growth within proximity to transit to meet multiple goals, including the minimization of environmental impacts. Table 8.5-3 identifies the percentage of new employment and housing growth that could feasibly be located near transit based upon the overall amounts of job and housing (dwelling units or DU) growth capacity provided for each scenario.

Table 8.5-3
Percentage of New Growth Near Transit by Scenario

Scenario	J/ER	New Jobs @ Transit	New DU @ Transit	VMT/SP
Preferred Scenario: *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*	1.3	62%	75%	16.2
Existing (2008) Conditions	0.8	--	--	14.6
No Project 2020 GP	1.1	59%	74%	17.0
Scenario 1: Low Growth	1.2	60%	86%	16.3
Scenario 2: More Housing / Fewer Jobs	1.1	59%	74%	15.9
Scenario 3: ABAG Projections	1.0	57%	64%	15.7
Scenario 4: More Jobs / Less Housing	1.5	59%	85%	16.6
Scenario 5: Slightly More Housing / Less Jobs	1.2	60%	74%	16.0

8.5.1 No Project/Retain Existing General Plan

The purpose of this alternative is to identify what development and associated environmental impacts would occur if the City does not adopt a comprehensive update of its General Plan; in other words, how the city would continue to grow and evolve under the current General Plan's goals and policies. This alternative would include:

1. The remaining development potential associated with the current *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan* projected through 2035;

2. All 'in process' residential and non-residential development allowed under the existing General Plan.

The No Project/Retain Existing General Plan Alternative assumes the new residential and non-residential development identified above would occur through 2035, as projected in a straight line from past growth patterns. The Urban Village and Corridor areas would remain primarily commercial areas and would not be redeveloped with as much mixed use, transit-oriented development as called for under the proposed General Plan consistent with their Land Use/Transportation Diagram designations and related policies in the *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan.* Intensification in the Alviso, Berryessa, Communications Hill, Jackson-Taylor, Midtown, Rincon South and Tamien Station Specific Plan areas and in identified Employment Lands (above what is currently allowed) would not occur because the land use designations and policies applicable in the these areas would not change. If the currently defined thresholds/triggers are met, development could occur in the Coyote Valley and Almaden Valley Urban Reserves at the edge of the city.

Utilizing the standards and land use designations in the current *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan*, the population of the city under this Alternative would be approximately 116,000 fewer people than is anticipated with the proposed General Plan in 2035, and the number of jobs would be 214,000 fewer. The service population (jobs+residents) under the No Project/Retain Existing General Plan Alternative in 2035 is projected to be 1,822,868 (residents+jobs), which is approximately 15 percent less than accommodated by the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*. This also represents substantially less new development occurring within the City than projected by ABAG through 2035 (see Scenario 3 below).

8.5.1.1 *Comparison of Environmental Impacts*

Land Use (Agricultural Resources)

Impacts to Prime Farmland remaining within the city's UGB would generally be greater under the existing *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan* (No Project/Retain Existing General Plan) than the proposed General Plan since it is assumed the existing General Plan triggers for opening the Urban Reserves for development would be met prior to 2035. Urban development of prime farmland in mid-Coyote Valley and the Almaden Valley is precluded by the proposed *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*; therefore, greater impacts would occur to farmland as a result of urban development under this Alternative.

Transportation

Like the proposed project, this Alternative would have significant and unavoidable transportation impacts, including impacts to roadways in surrounding cities and regional facilities under the jurisdiction of the County and Caltrans.

Development within the city would not be as compact as under the proposed General Plan and the projected ratio of VMT/SP, which is one of several measures of transportation efficiency, would be substantially higher (refer to Table 8.5-1). The VMT/SP would be higher for the No Project Alternative than for any of the other alternatives evaluated because the system would be less efficient. Traffic volumes on individual roadways could be somewhat less than the proposed project, however.

Noise

New development and redevelopment under the No Project/Existing General Plan would result in increased traffic noise, and in some cases (such as along Santa Teresa Boulevard in the Coyote Planning Area and Zanker Road in North San José), the increases would be substantial. To the extent that the total VMT would be less for this Alternative than for the proposed project or any of the other alternatives, impacts at some locations would likely be incrementally less.

Air Quality

Similar to the proposed project, VMT per capita under the existing General Plan is projected to increase at a rate greater than the increase in population (28 percent versus 22 percent). The projected increase in vehicle miles traveled by 2035, beyond or above the growth in population, therefore, would be inconsistent with the previously identified thresholds of significance and with the Clean Air Plan, resulting in a significant air quality impact. The absolute magnitude of the impact would be less than that of the proposed project to the extent that the projected growth in both total VMT and total population would be less than under the proposed project.

While the existing General Plan has policies that encourage increased pedestrian, bicycling, and transit use and designated corridors for transportation oriented development, it does not include new policies regarding TDM measures, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, nor does the existing Plan address the compatibility or magnitude of local community risks for new residential development near roads or other sources of air toxics or $PM_{2.5}$. Health risks from toxic air contaminants would be greater.

Biological Resources (Indirect Impacts to Sensitive Serpentine Habitats)

Similar to the proposed project, VMT and associated vehicle emissions (including nitrogen oxide emissions) would increase compared to existing conditions. Total VMT and overall emissions from on-road vehicles under the No Project/Retain Existing General Plan Alternative in 2035 would be roughly 10 percent lower based on VMT and vehicle speeds.[235]

[235] Estimate based upon the difference in projected GHG emissions from on-road vehicle emissions (refer to Appendix K).

Under the existing *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan* (No Project/Retain Existing General Plan) it is assumed the triggers for opening the Urban Reserves would be met as the level of population and job growth supported by that plan was realized consistent with other plan policies. Urban development of land in mid-Coyote Valley and the Almaden Valley would increase nitrogen oxide emissions from vehicles in proximity to serpentine habitats on Coyote Ridge and the Santa Teresa Hills (refer to Figure 3.5-4 Biotic Habitats in Southern San José). While overall VMT is lower under this Alternative, the proximity of new urban development to serpentine habitats could effectively increase indirect impacts to nearby serpentine habitats from nitrogen deposition compared to development as proposed in the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan* given the differences in development locations.

Aesthetics

Build-out of the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area and the North Coyote Valley Area under this Alternative would result in similar significant impacts to local scenic views as under the proposed General Plan. In the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area, building heights or massing could be somewhat greater on the top of the hill as more residential units are assumed under the No Project/Retain Existing General Plan. Aesthetics impacts from scenic roadways would be more extensive under this Alternative when development triggers in the Urban Reserves are met and urban development is allowed in the mid-Coyote and Almaden Valleys.

Population and Housing/Growth Inducement

Under this proposed Alternative, the General Plan would accommodate a total of 391,460 dwelling units and 625,000 jobs, with J/ER ratio projected to increase from 0.8 to 1.1, which is both less housing and employment than supported by the proposed project. Because the *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan* does not provide adequate job or housing growth capacity to meet the generally anticipated future demand as suggested by various forecasts, such as the forecasts prepared by ABAG and consultants supporting the *Envision* process, continued implementation of the existing General Plan through 2035 could induce substantial employment and population growth at other locations within the region. Because the proposed project provides both more job and housing growth capacity than the *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan* and thus would induce less growth in other locations, this Alternative would have a greater impact upon population and housing/growth inducement.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (2035 Goal)

Citywide 2035 GHG emissions for the No Project/Retain Existing General Plan Alternative were estimated by Sierra Research (refer to Appendix I). Overall modeled greenhouse gas emissions under the No Project/Retain Existing General Plan Alternative in 2035 would be 1,822,868 MMT, approximately 330,000 MMT lower than the emissions from the proposed General Plan. Business-as-usual emissions on an efficiency basis (MT CO_2e per service population) are projected to be lower than the proposed General Plan (5.7 versus 6.2/SP). Projected 2035 GHG emissions, without further reductions, would exceed the average carbon-efficiency standard necessary to maintain a trajectory to meet statewide 2050 goals as established by Executive Order S-3-05 and would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to emissions associated with global climate change. Although the existing General Plan incorporates an array of policies and goals that mandate efficient urban development and have controlled sprawl for many years, it lacks the policy direction and commitment to make the

considerable changes that will be required to meet the updated energy and GHG reduction targets for the region and the state, such as a 15 percent reduction in light vehicle miles traveled by 2035.

To the extent a given number of jobs would likely be present in California in 2035, having more of them clustered proximate to a substantial number of dwelling units in a major city, rather than scattered about the region, would create efficiencies for commuting and result in the lower VMT/SP seen in the proposed project scenario versus higher VMT/SP associated with fewer jobs in the No Project Alternative. As this Alternative also has the potential to induce housing and job growth elsewhere in order to meet the projected demand, induced growth could generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions in other locations, particularly if it occurs in a more dispersed land use pattern and in areas with lesser access to transit.

Other Impacts

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (2020 Goal)

Overall greenhouse gas emissions in 2020 under the No Project/Retain Existing General Plan Alternative would be 1,518,785 MMT, approximately 132,000 MMT less than the proposed General Plan. Business-as-usual emissions on an efficiency basis (MT CO_2e/SP) would be lower than the proposed General Plan (5.5 versus 5.8) and would not exceed the State goal of 6.6 MT CO_2e/SP.

Conclusion: In summary, the No Project/Retain Existing General Plan Alternative would incrementally reduce, but not avoid the significant impacts from the project associated with Noise, Air Quality, Biological Resources, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Impacts resulting from traffic volumes crossing screenlines and on roadways in other jurisdictions would be less. Some traffic impacts would be greater but the efficiencies of moving people to and from jobs that would come from intensified infill would not be realized, resulting in significant air quality impacts even with significantly fewer jobs. The impacts from loss of Agricultural Resources (prime farmland) would be worse when development triggers are met and urban development occurs in the Urban Reserves. Likewise, Aesthetics impacts would also be more extensive and more significant when urban development is allowed in the Urban Reserves of mid-Coyote and Almaden Valleys. Impacts related to Growth Inducement would also be worse if other jurisdictions are forced to accommodate job and housing growth demand not being accommodated within San José.

This Alternative would be somewhat superior in some areas of environmental impact, but would have greater impacts in others.

8.5.1.2 *Feasibility of the No Project/Retain Existing General Plan Alternative*

The No Project/Retain Existing General Plan Alternative is feasible from the standpoint that no changes to the General Plan would be required. However, General Plans are intended to be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of city policies. State law requires that General Plans be periodically reviewed and revised as necessary (Government Code §65040.5, §65300, §65300.5). Retaining the current General Plan, last comprehensively updated in 1994, without an update to reflect changes in the City's vision for its development would not be consistent with State planning law.

8.5.1.3 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The No Project/Retain Existing General Plan Alternative would not fully meet the basic project objectives of the City of San José in terms of creating an interconnected city where activities of daily life are in close proximity and easily accessible by walking, bicycling and public transit; or promoting public health through a Land Use/Transportation Diagram that promotes walking, biking, and public transit use. While the *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan* policies and Land Use/Transportation Diagram support this objective, they do not do so to the degree of the proposed project. The existing General Plan would fall short of the proposed General Plan in "providing for an innovative economy with job opportunities for a demographically diverse population and ample fiscal resources to support a vibrant community and the city's emerging leadership role as the Silicon Valley region's employment center." The proposed General Plan not only includes space for many more jobs, it allows those jobs in a wider range of locations and in close proximity to a substantially greater supply of potentially affordable housing connected by a more intensive transit system.

The existing General Plan provides far less opportunity for "a wide variety of housing types, both throughout the city as well as within individual communities, which meet the needs of an economically, demographically and culturally diverse population", compared to the proposed General Plan. Additionally, the existing General Plan would not "Strategically channel new growth into areas of San José that will best enable the City to achieve its goals for economic growth, fiscal sustainability and environmental stewardship" by allowing potential development within the Mid-Coyote Valley and South Almaden Valley Urban Reserves and by continuing to allow intensification through infill development in dispersed areas of the city not proximate to transit or other services.

8.5.2 Scenario 1: Low Growth Alternative

The Scenario 1: Low Growth Alternative is a reduced scale alternative. Pursuant to CEQA, the purpose of examining reduced scale alternatives is to determine if a reduction in the number of units or intensity of land use would avoid significant impacts or reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Under the Scenario 1 Alternative, San José's population could increase above existing conditions by approximately 24 percent (232,573 additional residents) to 1,217,880 persons in 2035. Employment could increase by 346,550, to 716,000 jobs. This Alternative allows somewhat less housing and substantially fewer jobs than the proposed General Plan, however (see Table 8.5-1).

This is one of the scenarios evaluated that would provide for a jobs/employed residents ratio greater than one (1.0). Under this Alternative, the J/ER ratio would be 1.2. As with the proposed General Plan, the purpose of allowing substantially more jobs than employed residents is to produce a positive economic improvement in the City's fiscal condition (e.g., to generate more fiscal resources for the City from various sources).[236] This Alternative also assumes a rate of housing growth of approximately 3,500 dwelling units per year, a rate comparable to the city's annual housing production between 1999 and 2008, while providing a modest increase in employment capacity above the amount provided in the No Project Alternative.

This Alternative has the lowest total Service Population (residents+jobs) of any alternative evaluated other than the No Project (the existing General Plan) Alternative.

8.5.2.1 *Comparison of Environmental Impacts*

Land Use (Agricultural Resources)

Impacts to Prime Farmland remaining within the City's UGB would be the same under the Scenario 1 Alternative as under the proposed General Plan in that the same areas of Prime Farmland within the City limits would be developed.

Transportation

Under the Scenario 1 Alternative, the projected total VMT is less than any of the alternatives except No Project. The projected VMT/SP for the Scenario 1 Alternative is slightly higher than the proposed General Plan, but the projected VMT per capita (looking just at the residential population) is slightly lower. Development within the City would not be as urban or efficient as under the proposed General Plan because densities in Urban Villages, Specific Plan Areas, and Employment Lands would be lower. Because this Alternative does not include new housing capacity within the identified Neighborhood Village areas, growth under this Alternative would be generally more centralized within the overall City area, but various neighborhoods would not have improved access to local services developed within a pedestrian-friendly environment. While under the Scenario 1 Alternative there is significantly less job and housing growth, the Alternative would result in a higher VMT/SP compared to existing conditions and *compared to the proposed project*. Significant

[236] Other cities in the region with a higher jobs to employed resident ratio have greater fiscal resources. It was pointed out in a report to the General Plan Task Force that San José is in the only large city in the US that currently has a J/ER less than 1.0.

transportation impacts, including increased congestion on roadways in surrounding cities and under the jurisdiction of the County and Caltrans would occur, although to a lesser degree with this Alternative than any other of those modeled since vehicle miles traveled (and roadway volumes) would be lower. Mode share is better with this Alternative than with the proposed project (less auto use, more transit use). Like the proposed project, this Alternative would have significant and unavoidable transportation impacts, including impacts to roadways in surrounding cities and under the jurisdiction of the County and Caltrans, for which no feasible mitigation, such as road widening, has been identified.

Noise

New development and redevelopment under the Scenario 1 Alternative would result in increased traffic noise, and in some cases (such as along Santa Teresa Boulevard in the Coyote Planning Area and Zanker Road in North San José), the increases would be substantial. To the extent that vehicle miles traveled would be less than the proposed project, impacts at some locations would be incrementally less.

Air Quality

The projected VMT/capita identified for the Scenario 1 Alternative is 26.1, which is lower than that resulting from the proposed General Plan (26.4). The projected VMT/SP is 16.3, compared to 16.2 for the proposed project. Since these ratios are measures of efficiency, placing more jobs and more housing in close proximity (i.e., increased density at locations near transit), as occurs with the proposed General Plan, results in fewer vehicle miles travelled (VMT) even for a greater number of residents and jobs, and therefore, the proposed project results in greater efficiency.

Nevertheless, this Alternative, which has fewer dwelling units and fewer jobs, will result in less air pollution than the proposed General Plan because it generates less total VMT.

Biological Resources
(Indirect Impacts to Sensitive Serpentine Habitats)

As under the proposed project, VMT and associated vehicle emissions (including nitrogen oxide emissions) would increase compared to existing conditions. Total emissions would be incrementally reduced in proportion to the reduced total VMT under this Alternative. Indirect impacts to sensitive serpentine habitats would be reduced, but not to a less than significant level, as new emissions would add to existing reported effects of nitrogen deposition on these habitats.

Aesthetics

Build-out of the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area and the North Coyote Valley Area under this Alternative would result in similar significant impacts to local scenic views as under the proposed General Plan. In the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area, building heights or massing could be somewhat greater on the top of the hill as more residential units are assumed under this Alternative.

Population and Housing/Growth Inducement

Under this Alternative, the jobs to employed residents ratio is projected to increase from 0.8 to 1.2, somewhat less than the ratio of 1.3 targeted by the proposed General Plan, but with 123,450 fewer jobs. The surplus of jobs to dwelling units is likely to induce growth in other communities, but because the Alternative has substantially fewer jobs than the proposed General Plan, there would be substantially less induced growth outside the city and less impact from that growth.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (2035 Goal)

The GHG emissions estimates for the proposed project and the No Project Alternative for 2035 prepared by Sierra Research show citywide efficiency ratios of 6.2 and 5.7 MT CO_2e/SP respectively (refer to Appendix K). These values are well above the projected efficiency goal of 3.04 MT CO_2e/SP necessary to maintain a trajectory to meet long-term 2050 state climate change reduction goals.

The population and employment assumptions for this Alternative are between those of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative and development would occur in roughly the same areas, with the exception of the Coyote and Almaden Urban Reserves. Based on a review of GHG emission estimates in Appendix K, Citywide 2035 GHG emissions under this Alternative are anticipated to exceed efficiency standards necessary to maintain a trajectory to meet long-term 2050 state climate change reduction goals (i.e., the emissions will be too great). As under the proposed project, achieving the substantial emissions reductions required will require policy decisions at the federal and state level and new and substantially advanced technologies that cannot today be anticipated and are outside the City's control; therefore they cannot be relied upon as feasible mitigation strategies. Given the uncertainties about the feasibility of achieving the substantial emissions reductions by 2035, the city's contribution to climate change for the 2035 timeframe under this Alternative is conservatively determined to be cumulatively considerable. To the extent that emissions from both the built environment and mobile sources would be reduced due to the lesser amount of development allowed by this Alternative, the magnitude of this significant impact could be less than under the proposed project.

Conclusion: In summary, the Scenario 1 Alternative would reduce, but not to a less than significant level the impacts from Transportation, Noise, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Growth Inducement, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The significant impacts to Agricultural Resources and Aesthetics would be the same as those from the proposed General Plan. This Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

8.5.2.2 *Feasibility of the Low Growth Alternative*

The Scenario 1 Low Growth Alternative is assumed to be a full scale General Plan considered with the same set of revised goals, policies and actions as the *Envision San José 2040 General Plan*. It is not anticipated to result in land use compatibility impacts or inconsistency with adopted plans or policies substantially different from those evaluated in this PEIR.

This Alternative is feasible, based only on the information in this PEIR.

8.5.2.3 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The Scenario 1 Alternative would meet the basic project objectives of the City of San José to promote job growth in Downtown and on employment lands at the center of regional transportation systems, promote the expansion of commercial activity throughout the city in mixed use Urban Villages, and promote public health through a Land Use/Transportation Diagram that promotes walking, biking, and public transit use, although it would not provide for the opportunity of developing Urban Villages within proximity to various neighborhoods more distant from the city center and would not support the degree of employment growth sought in order to achieve the objective of promoting San José as a regional employment center.

8.5.3 Scenario 2: More Housing/Fewer Jobs Alternative

The Scenario 2: More Housing/Fewer Jobs Alternative is a reduced scale alternative in terms of jobs with a J/ER ratio closer to one (1.0). The purpose of examining this Alternative is to determine if a reduction in projected employment and an increase in projected housing would avoid significant impacts or reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Under the Scenario 2 Alternative, San José's population could increase by approximately 38 percent over existing conditions to 1,361,700 persons in 2035. Employment could almost double compared with 2008 figures, with a projected increase of 360,550 jobs to 730,000 jobs.

This is also one of the scenarios alternatives designed to provide for a jobs/employed residents ratio greater than one (1.0). Under this scenario, the J/ER ratio would be 1.1 to 1 (the same ratio as the No Project Alternative). Although the J/ER ratio is lower for the Scenario 2 Alternative than for Scenario 1 Alternative, there are 47,000 more dwelling units allowed in Scenario 2 Alternative (12 percent) and 14,000 more jobs (2 percent) than in the Scenario 1 Alternative. The ratio and the quantity of jobs are both lower in the Scenario 2 Alternative than in the proposed project, but Scenario 2 Alternative does support more housing growth than the proposed project.

The purpose underlying a plan that produces a greater number of jobs than employed residents in the long-term is to make a positive improvement in the City's fiscal condition (e.g., generate more fiscal resources for the City compared to the higher costs of serving a proportionally greater residential population). This scenario assumes a rate of housing growth of approximately 5,400 dwelling units per year, a rate production that has historically never been sustained for any substantial period of time in San José.

8.5.3.1 *Comparison of Environmental Impacts*

Land Use (Agricultural Resources)

Impacts to Prime Farmland remaining within the City's UGB would be the same under the Scenario 2 Alternative as under the proposed General Plan in that the same areas of Prime Farmland within the City limits would be developed.

Transportation

More residential development would be allowed under this Alternative than the proposed project and 15 percent fewer jobs. Total VMT would be lower than under the proposed General Plan (both citywide and countywide VMT), but slightly higher (approximately four percent) than the No Project Alternative. The VMT/Service Population would be slightly lower (approximately two percent) than the proposed project. Traffic volumes on individual roadways would also be somewhat less than the proposed project since overall VMT would be lower. Like the proposed project, this Alternative would have significant and unavoidable transportation impacts, including impacts to roadways in surrounding cities and under the jurisdiction of the County and Caltrans, although the magnitude of these impacts would be incrementally less based on traffic volumes on individual roadways being somewhat lower.

Noise

New development and redevelopment under the Scenario 2 Alternative would result in increased traffic noise, and in some cases (such as along Santa Teresa Boulevard in the Coyote Planning Area and Zanker Road in North San José), the increases would be substantial. To the extent that vehicle miles traveled would be less than under the proposed project, impacts at some locations would be incrementally less.

Air Quality

Based upon the results of traffic modeling, VMT generated by vehicular travel under the Scenario 2 Alternative is projected to increase at a rate greater than the increase in population (68 percent versus 38 percent), although less than that for the proposed General Plan (see Table 8.5-1) since there would be fewer employees contributing to San José's overall VMT and because of the jobs/housing balance supported by the Alternative resulting in less need for regional commuting. As discussed in Section 3.4 Air Quality, it is anticipated that implementation of trip reduction policies and multimodal transportation improvements could reduce VMT by up to 20 percent. With a reduction in VMT of this magnitude applied to the Scenario 2 Alternative, the rate of VMT increase would still be more than the increase in population and identified air quality impacts generated by VMT would still be inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan and therefore significant and unavoidable.

Biological Resources (Indirect Impacts to Sensitive Serpentine Habitats)

Like the proposed project, VMT and associated vehicle emissions (including nitrogen oxide emissions) would increase compared to existing conditions under this Alternative. Total emissions would be incrementally reduced in proportion to the reduced total VMT under this Alternative. Indirect impacts to sensitive serpentine habitats would be reduced, but not to a less than significant level, as new emissions would add to existing reported effects of nitrogen deposition on these habitats.

Aesthetics

Build-out of the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area and the North Coyote Valley Area under this Alternative would result in similar significant impacts to local scenic views as under the proposed General Plan. In the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area, building heights or massing could be somewhat greater on the top of the hill as more residential units are assumed under this Alternative.

Population and Housing/Growth Inducement

For the Scenario 2 Alternative, the J/ER ratio is projected to increase from 0.8 to 1.1. This could induce population growth at other locations by 2035, although the impact of this induced housing growth would be less than what could occur as a result of the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (2035 Goal)

Citywide 2035 GHG emissions under this Alternative, as under the proposed project, are expected to exceed efficiency standards necessary to maintain a trajectory to meet long-term 2050 state climate change reduction goals. Achieving the substantial emissions reductions needed in the existing built environment while communitywide growth occurs will require policy decisions at the federal and state level and new and substantially advanced technologies that cannot today be anticipated, and are outside the City's control; therefore, they cannot be relied upon as feasible mitigation strategies. Given the uncertainties about the feasibility of achieving the substantial emissions reductions by 2035, the city's contribution to climate change for the 2035 timeframe is conservatively determined to be cumulatively considerable. To the extent this Alternative would reduce overall VMT and VMT/SP and reinforce the principles of compact, mixed use development at appropriate locations, impacts would be reduced, but not to a less than significant level.

Conclusion: In summary, the Scenario 2 Alternative would reduce, but not completely avoid those significant impacts from the proposed project identified as occurring from Transportation, Noise, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Growth Inducement, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The significant impacts to Agricultural Resources and Aesthetics would be the same as the impacts from the proposed General Plan.

8.5.3.2 *Feasibility of the More Housing/Fewer Jobs Alternative*

This Alternative assumes a rate of building and growth in the residential sector that has rarely been achieved or even approached by the City of San José. Considering that a strong housing market supported the production of approximately 3,100 housing units per year between 1999 and 2008, it may not be feasible for the residential development industry to support the level of activity necessary for housing to be developed, constructed and sold at the rate of 5,400 dwelling units per year for any protracted period of time, or to average that number for 25 years. Since the total housing proposed and the rate of housing construction are both only slightly more than would be required to implement the proposed General Plan, it is likely as feasible as the proposed project.

8.5.3.3 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The Scenario 2 More Housing/Fewer Jobs Alternative would meet the basic project objectives of the City of San José to promote job growth in Downtown and on employment lands at the center of regional transportation systems, promote the expansion of commercial activity throughout the city in mixed use Urban Villages, and promote public health through a Land Use/Transportation Diagram that promotes walking, biking, and public transit use. It does not however support the amount of employment growth sought in order to achieve the objective of promoting San José as a regional employment center.

8.5.4 Scenario 3: ABAG Projections Alternative

The Scenario 3: ABAG Projections Alternative is a reduced scale alternative in terms of jobs with a J/ER ratio of one (1.0). The purpose of examining this Alternative is to determine if a reduction in projected employment and an increase in housing would avoid significant impacts or reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels.

The Scenario 3 Alternative generally corresponds to the 2009 ABAG projected overall demand for job and housing growth for the City of San José through 2035; however, the location of that growth within the city is distributed differently than was done by ABAG for their projections. Under the Scenario 3 Alternative, San José's population could increase by approximately 45 percent to 1,433,059 persons in 2035. Employment could increase by 339,530 jobs to 708,980 jobs. As shown in Table 8.5-1, build-out of the Scenario 3 Alternative would result in a Jobs/Employed Resident ratio of 1.0, a value that is considered balanced and theoretically, in isolation of existing land use and transportation development patterns, could provide a greater opportunity for the reduction of GHG emissions, provided that development is compact and includes mixed uses, that transportation facilities allow for increased use of transportation modes such as walking, bicycling, and transit, and that a greater share of residents chose to live within the same community as their workplace.

This Alternative assumes a growth rate of approximately 6,400 dwelling units and 13,600 jobs per year for the next 25 years.

8.5.4.1 *Comparison of Environmental Impacts*

Land Use (Agricultural Resources)

The loss of Prime Farmland remaining within the City's UGB would be the same under the Scenario 3 Alternative as under the proposed General Plan in that the same areas of Prime Farmland within the City limits would be developed.

Transportation

More residential development would be allowed under this Alternative than under any of the other alternatives discussed, including the proposed project. It is therefore possible for more people working in San José and elsewhere in Santa Clara County to be housed within the City of San José. The projected VMT for the Scenario 3 Alternative, which is a significant source of air pollution, would be lower than for the proposed project (by less than 3 percent) but not as low as for the Scenario 1 Low Growth Alternative, which has a J/ER ratio of 1.2 but less housing and more jobs than the Scenario 3 Alternative. The projected VMT/Service Population, a measure of land use efficiency, is also projected to be lower by a similar percentage.

Traffic volumes on individual roadways would be somewhat less for this Alternative than for the proposed project, although they would be greater at some specific locations, particularly on the local street network within San José. Like the proposed project, this Alternative would still have significant and unavoidable transportation impacts, including impacts to roadways in surrounding cities and under the jurisdiction of the County and Caltrans, although the magnitude of these impacts would be incrementally less. Based on the outcome of traffic modeling for each of the alternatives, the Scenario 3 Alternative, results in higher degrees of traffic congestion at some locations,

particularly on streets within San José, and correspondingly does not support transit use, particularly at the regional level, to the same degree as the proposed General Plan.

Noise

New development and redevelopment under the Scenario 3 Alternative would result in increased traffic noise, and in some locations (such as along Santa Teresa Boulevard in the Coyote Planning Area and Zanker Road in North San José), the increases would be substantial. To the extent that vehicle miles traveled would be approximately four percent less than the proposed project, impacts at some locations could be reduced slightly.

Air Quality

The VMT under the Scenario 3 Alternative is projected to increase at a rate substantially greater than the increase in population due to the proportionally greater increase in jobs than in housing – and the increase in VMT is almost as great as that for the proposed project.

The projected VMT identified for the Scenario 3 Alternative is 33.7 million, which is lower than the VMT identified under the proposed General Plan (34.6 million). As discussed in Section 3.4 Air Quality, it is anticipated that implementation of trip reduction policies and multimodal transportation improvements could reduce VMT by up to 20 percent. With a reduction in VMT of this magnitude applied to the Scenario 3 Alternative, the rate of VMT increase would still be more than the increase in population and identified air quality impacts generated by VMT would still be inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan and therefore significant and unavoidable, although slightly less than those from the proposed project.

Biological Resources
(Indirect Impacts to Sensitive Serpentine Habitats)

As under the proposed project, VMT and associated vehicle emissions (including nitrogen oxide emissions) would increase compared to existing conditions. Total emissions would be incrementally reduced in proportion to the reduced total VMT under this Alternative. Indirect impacts to sensitive serpentine habitats would be reduced, but not to a less than significant level, as new emissions would add to existing reported effects of nitrogen deposition on these habitats.

Aesthetics

Build-out of the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area and the North Coyote Valley Area under this Alternative would result in similar significant impacts to local scenic views as under the proposed General Plan. In the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area, building heights or massing could be somewhat greater on the top of the hill as more residential units are assumed under this Alternative.

Population and Housing/Growth Inducement

Under the Scenario 3 Alternative, the J/ER ratio is projected to increase from 0.8 to 1.0. Since the number of jobs and employed residents would be statistically balanced, any impacts from growth inducement would be less than significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (2035 Goal)

Citywide 2035 GHG emissions under this Alternative, as under the proposed project, are expected to exceed efficiency standards necessary to maintain a trajectory to meet long-term 2050 state climate change reduction goals. Achieving the substantial emissions reductions needed in the existing built environment while communitywide growth occurs will require policy decisions at the federal and state level and new and substantially advanced technologies that cannot today be anticipated, and are outside the City's control; therefore, they cannot be relied upon as feasible mitigation strategies. Given the uncertainties about the feasibility of achieving the substantial emissions reductions by 2035, the city's contribution to climate change for the 2035 timeframe is conservatively determined to be cumulatively considerable. To the extent this Alternative would encourage more internalized trips and reduce VMT by balancing jobs and housing, impacts could be reduced, but only to a slight degree as indicated by the traffic modeling results. Less employment could also result in lower emissions projected from industrial and commercial uses. The identified significant cumulative impact from emissions in 2035 could be reduced under this Alternative but not to a less than significant level.

Conclusion: In summary, the Scenario 3 Alternative would result in slightly fewer total VMT than the proposed General Plan and would have both lower VMT/capita and VMT/SP ratios. This alternative would also avoid significant growth inducement impacts. It would incrementally reduce, the significant impacts of the project associated with Transportation, Noise, Biological Resources, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The significant impacts to Agricultural Resources and Aesthetics would be the same as those from the proposed General Plan.

8.5.4.2 *Feasibility of the ABAG Projections 2009 Alternative*

This Alternative assumes a sustained 25-year rate of building and growth in the residential sector significantly greater than the rate that was achieved during the past 20 years in the City of San José. Considering that a strong housing market supported the production of approximately 3,100 housing units per year between 1999 and 2008, it may not be feasible for the residential development industry to support the level of activity necessary for housing to be developed, constructed and sold at the rate of 6,400 dwelling units per year for any protracted period of time or to average that number for 25 years.

8.5.4.3 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The Scenario 3 Alternative would meet some of the basic project objectives of the City of San José to promote job growth in Downtown and on employment lands at the center of regional transportation systems, promote the expansion of commercial activity throughout the city in mixed use Urban Villages, and promote public health through a Land Use/Transportation Diagram that promotes walking, biking, and public transit use. The Scenario 3 Alternative does not support transit use to the same degree as the proposed General Plan. Given that the growth in jobs would be smaller and would not exceed a ratio of 1.0 jobs per employed resident, it would not fully meet the City's objectives regarding fiscal sustainability, the creation of job opportunities and the city's emerging role as the employment center for the Silicon Valley region.

8.5.5 Scenario 4: More Jobs/Less Housing Growth Alternative

The Scenario 4: More Jobs/Less Housing Alternative is a reduced scale alternative in terms of housing with a greater intensification of planned employment within the city. The purpose of examining this Alternative is to determine if a shift in the mix of land uses, including an intensification of employment with less housing, would avoid any significant impacts or reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels.

This Alternative provides lands designated for more employment than any other alternative evaluated. Both the total number of jobs (895,500) and the J/ER ratio (1.5) are higher than any of the other alternatives. As with under the Scenario 1, 2, and 5 Alternatives as well as the proposed General Plan, a higher job to employed resident ratio is expected to make a positive contribution to the City's fiscal condition and to further promote the city as a regional employment center. This Alternative also assumes a rate of housing growth of approximately 3,500 dwelling units per year, a rate comparable to the city's annual housing production between 1999 and 2008.

8.5.5.1 *Comparison of Environmental Impacts*

Land Use (Agricultural Resources)

The loss of Prime Farmland remaining within the City's UGB would be the same under the Scenario 4 Alternative as under the proposed General Plan in that the same areas of Prime Farmland within the City limits would be developed.

Transportation

Less residential development would be allowed under this Alternative than in any of the alternatives other than the Scenario 1 Alternative (which assumes the same number of dwelling units as this Alternative). This Alternative has more jobs and a higher J/ER ratio than any other Alternative. The projected VMT for the Scenario 4 Alternative, which is a significant source of air pollution, would be higher than under any other alternative likely due to an increased number of jobs (requiring employees exceeding housing provided in the city for workers), although only 1 percent higher than under the proposed project. The VMT/Service Population of 16.6 for this Alternative is 2.5 percent higher than the proposed project and 5.7 percent greater than the Scenario 3 Alternative, indicating that the higher J/ER ratio has some effect upon the VMT/Service Population. VMT/capita is higher for the Scenario 4 Alternative than for any other Alternative, but VMT/service population is less than the No Project (the existing General Plan) Alternative.

Traffic volumes on individual roadways would be greater for this Alternative than for the proposed project. As under the proposed project, this Alternative would have significant and unavoidable transportation impacts, including impacts to roadways in surrounding cities and under the jurisdiction of the County and Caltrans.

This Alternative has the lowest automobile mode split and the highest rate of transit use of any alternative modeled, reflecting increased use by employees traveling to and from work and indicating that establishment of a regional employment center will best support the use and long-term development of a regional transit system.

Noise

New development and redevelopment under the Scenario 4 Alternative would result in increased traffic noise, and in some locations (such as along Santa Teresa Boulevard in the Coyote Planning Area and Zanker Road in North San José), the increases would be substantial due to higher levels of commuter traffic associated with further intensification of employment lands in those areas. Noise impacts would be as significant as, and possibly incrementally greater than those under the proposed General Plan in that traffic volumes (and associated vehicle noise) along streets would be larger.

Air Quality

VMT under the Scenario 4 Alternative is projected to increase at a rate substantially greater than the increase in population, a greater rate than under the proposed project. The growth in population is less, making the difference even wider.

The projected VMT for the Scenario 4 Alternative is 35.1 million, which is higher than VMT identified for the proposed General Plan (34.6 million). As discussed in Section 3.4 Air Quality, it is anticipated that implementation of trip reduction policies and multimodal transportation improvements could reduce VMT by up to 20 percent. With a reduction in VMT of this magnitude applied to the Scenario 4 Alternative, the rate of VMT increase would still be more than the increase in population and identified air quality impacts generated by VMT would still be inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan; therefore, they would be significant and unavoidable, and greater than those from the proposed project.

Biological Resources (Indirect Impacts to Sensitive Serpentine Habitats)

As under the proposed project, VMT and associated vehicle emissions (including nitrogen oxide emissions) would increase compared to existing conditions. Total emissions would be incrementally increased in proportion to the increased total VMT under this Alternative. Indirect impacts to sensitive serpentine habitats would be incrementally increased, as new emissions would add to existing reported effects of nitrogen deposition on these habitats.

Aesthetics

Build-out of the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area and the North Coyote Valley Area under this Alternative would result in similar significant impacts to local scenic views as under the proposed General Plan. In the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area, building heights or massing could be somewhat greater on the top of the hill as more residential units are assumed under this Alternative.

Population and Housing/Growth Inducement

Under the Scenario 4 Alternative, the J/ER ratio is projected to increase from 0.8 to 1.5. Since the ratio of jobs to employed residents would be higher than for the proposed General Plan, impacts from growth inducement would likely be more significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (2035 Goal)

Citywide 2035 GHG emissions under this Alternative, as under the proposed project, are expected to exceed efficiency standards necessary to maintain a trajectory to meet long-term 2050 state climate change reduction goals. Achieving the substantial emissions reductions needed in the existing built environment while communitywide growth occurs will require policy decisions at the federal and state level and new and substantially advanced technologies that cannot today be anticipated, and are outside the City's control, and therefore, they cannot be relied upon as feasible mitigation strategies. Given the uncertainties about the feasibility of achieving the substantial emissions reduction by 2035, the city's contribution to climate change for the 2035 timeframe is conservatively determined to be cumulatively considerable. To the extent this Alternative would increase VMT, impacts could be greater. More employment means more job-generating land uses such as industrial and commercial development, which could also result in higher emissions due to increased truck traffic or facility emissions, for example. The identified significant cumulative impact of emissions in 2035 would likely be greater under this Alternative.

Conclusion: In summary, the Scenario 4 Alternative would generate more total VMT than the proposed General Plan and would have both higher VMT/capita and VMT/SP ratios. This Alternative could also have more significant growth inducement impacts. It would incrementally increase the significant impacts of the project associated with Transportation, Noise, Biological Resources, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The significant impacts to Agricultural Resources and Aesthetics would be the same as those from the proposed General Plan. Overall, this alternative is not environmentally superior to the proposed project.

8.5.5.2 *Feasibility of the More Jobs/Less Housing Growth Alternative*

This Alternative assumes higher job creation and a rate of building and growth in the residential sector that has occurred for limited time periods. While the city has never sustained such a high rate of growth for a protracted period, there is no basis for assuming it cannot be achieved within San José over the long-term if either San José supports a greater share than projected of regional economic growth or the regional economy as a whole grows at a greater than projected rate.

8.5.5.3 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The Scenario 4 Alternative would meet the basic project objectives of the City of San José to promote job growth in Downtown and on employment lands at the center of regional transportation systems, promote the expansion of commercial activity throughout the city in mixed use Urban Villages, and promote public health through a Land Use/Transportation Diagram that promotes walking, biking, and public transit use.

8.5.6 Scenario 5: Slightly More Housing/Slightly Fewer Jobs Alternative

The Scenario 5: Slightly More Housing/Slightly Fewer Jobs Alternative is a reduced scale alternative in terms of jobs with a J/ER ratio of 1.2. Assumptions for job growth are between those of the proposed project and the Scenario 2 Alternative, which has fewer jobs (refer to Table 8.5-1). The purpose of examining this alternative is to determine if an intermediate reduction in projected employment and an increase in housing (compared to the proposed project) would avoid significant impacts or reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels.

This is one of the alternatives with a jobs/employed residents ratio greater than one (1.0). Under this scenario, the J/ER ratio would be 1.2, which is very close to the ratio in the Scenario 1 Alternative, but with 12 percent more housing and 12 percent more jobs than would occur with Scenario 1 Alternative. This Alternative also requires a rate of housing construction of approximately 5,400 dwelling units per year, a rate that is greater than the city has ever experienced over a sustained period of time.

Under the Scenario 5 Alternative, San José's population could increase by approximately 38 percent to 1,361,700 persons in 2035, which is less than the increase assumed in the Scenario 3 Alternative (the "ABAG Projections Alternative") but more than in the proposed General Plan. Employment could more than double, with an increase of approximately 431,550 jobs to 801,000 jobs, which is still less than under the proposed General Plan.

8.5.6.1 *Comparison of Environmental Impacts*

Land Use (Agricultural Resources)

Impacts to Prime Farmland remaining within the City's UGB would be the same under the Scenario 5 Alternative as under the proposed General Plan in that the same areas of Prime Farmland within the City limits would be developed.

Transportation

Slightly more residential development would be allowed under this Alternative than under the proposed project (approximately 3 percent). There are some interesting differences that are illustrated in the statistics (see Table 8.5-1). The projected VMT per capita for the Scenario 5 Alternative would be similar, but slightly lower than that of the proposed project (16.0 versus 16.2 as shown on Table 8.5-1). However, the total VMT is incrementally greater than that of the proposed project and traffic volumes on individual roadways would be approximately the same as the proposed project.

As under the proposed project, this Alternative would have significant and unavoidable transportation impacts, including impacts to roadways in surrounding cities and under the jurisdiction of the County and Caltrans.

Noise

New development and redevelopment under the Scenario 5 Alternative would also result in increased traffic noise, and in some cases (such as along Santa Teresa Boulevard in the Coyote Planning Area

and Zanker Road in North San José), the increases would be substantial. Since vehicle miles traveled would be virtually the same or slightly greater than under the proposed project, impacts would not be reduced under this Alternative.

Air Quality

VMT under the Scenario 5 Alternative is projected to increase at a rate greater than the increase in population and is almost exactly the same as under the proposed project (34.63 million VMT for the proposed project and 34.69 million VMT for the Scenario 5 Alternative). The projected VMT/capita identified for the Scenario 5 Alternative is 25.5, which is lower than the rate projected for the proposed General Plan (26.4) but VMT per service population (using both jobs and housing in the ratio) is 16.2 for the proposed General Plan and 16.0 for the Scenario 5 Alternative. As discussed in Section 3.4 Air Quality, it is anticipated that implementation of trip reduction policies and multimodal transportation improvements could reduce impacts associated with VMT, but not below the level of significance. The air quality impacts under the Scenario 5 Alternative would still not be consistent with the current Clean Air Plan.

Biological Resources (Indirect Impacts to Sensitive Serpentine Habitats)

As under the proposed project, VMT and associated vehicle emissions (including nitrogen oxide emissions) in this Alternative would increase compared to existing conditions. VMT and total emissions from vehicle emissions would be almost exactly the same as under the proposed project. An incremental reduction in projected employment could result in lower emissions from industrial uses with stationary sources of air emissions. Indirect impacts to sensitive serpentine habitats would be similar to the proposed project.

Aesthetics

Build-out of the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area and the North Coyote Valley Area under this Alternative would result in similar significant impacts to local scenic views as under the proposed General Plan. In the Communications Hill Specific Plan Area, building heights or massing could be somewhat greater on the top of the hill as more residential units are assumed under this Alternative.

Population and Housing/Growth Inducement

The ratio of jobs to employed residents in the Scenario 5 Alternative is projected to increase from 0.8 to 1.2. The number of dwelling units added would be greater under this Alternative scenario than under the proposed General Plan and more persons employed in San José and Santa Clara County could live in San José. Despite the increase in housing within the city, implementation of the Scenario 5 Alternative could induce substantial population growth at other locations by 2035, although the number of new dwelling units needed to house employed workers from San José outside the city would be less than under the proposed project. The impact of growth inducement would be reduced under this Alternative, but not to a less than significant level.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (2035 Goal)

Citywide GHG emissions by 2035 under this Alternative, as under the proposed project, are expected to exceed efficiency standards necessary to maintain a trajectory to meet long-term 2050 state climate change reduction goals. Achieving the substantial emissions reductions needed in the existing built environment while communitywide growth occurs will require policy decisions at the federal and state level and new and substantially advanced technologies that cannot today be anticipated, and are outside the City's control; therefore they cannot be relied upon as feasible mitigation strategies. Given the uncertainties about the feasibility of achieving the substantial emissions reductions by 2035, the city's contribution to climate change for the 2035 timeframe is conservatively determined to be cumulatively considerable. To the extent this Alternative could allow for more internalized trips and reduce VMT by a change in J/ER from 1.3 (proposed project) to 1.2 (more balanced jobs and housing), impacts could be incrementally reduced. An incremental reduction in projected employment could also result in lower emissions projected from industrial and commercial uses. The identified significant cumulative impact emissions in 2035 could be reduced under this scenario but not to a less than significant level.

Conclusion: In summary, the Scenario 5 Alternative would reduce, but not completely avoid the significant impacts of the project associated with Transportation, Noise, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Growth Inducement, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The significant impacts of Land Use (Agricultural Resources) and Aesthetics would be the same as under the proposed General Plan and Biological Resources impacts would be similar.

8.5.6.2 *Feasibility of the Slightly More Housing/Slightly Fewer Jobs Alternative*

This Alternative assumes a rate of building and growth in the residential sector that has rarely been achieved or even approached by the City of San José. While it may not be feasible for the housing market to support housing to be developed, constructed, and sold at the rate of 5,400 dwelling units per year for a protracted period of time there is no definitive proof that it cannot be done.

8.5.6.3 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The Scenario 5 Alternative would meet the basic project objectives of the City of San José to promote job growth in Downtown and on employment lands at the center of regional transportation systems, promote the expansion of commercial activity throughout the City in mixed use Urban Villages, and promote public health through a Land Use/Transportation Diagram that promotes walking, biking, and public transit use, although it would not support the regional employment objective to the same degree as the proposed project.

8.6 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

When reviewing the various alternatives, it is important to keep in mind that the consideration of each alternative by decision-makers includes the evaluation of three basic questions:

1. Would the alternative avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project? In other words, is the alternative environmentally preferable compared to the project?

2. Is the alternative infeasible from a land use, economic, physical, or regulatory standpoint?

3. Does the alternative meet or not meet the stated project objectives? If it does not meet any objective, which one or ones?

Because the project is so broad (a substantial update of a general plan for a large city), the comparison of impacts is necessarily broad also. A difference of three percent in total traffic volumes would result in imperceptible differences in noise and congestion in virtually all locations, for example, but might make a measurable difference in certain air pollutants or greenhouse gases. It is not, however, always possible to narrowly define the location or limits of the differences.

Table 8.6-1
Comparison of Impacts from Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Significant Impacts of the Proposed General Plan	Level of Impact					
	No Project[1]	**Scenario 1**	**Scenario 2**	**Scenario 3**	**Scenario 4**	**Scenario 5**
Land Use (Agricultural Resources)	More	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same
Transportation	Same	Less	Less	Same	More	Same
Noise	Less	Less	Same	Same	More	Same
Air Quality	Less	Less	Less	Same	More	Same
Biological Resources (Indirect Impacts)	Less	Less	Less	Less	More	Same
Aesthetics	More	N. Coyote: Same Comm. Hill: Slightly More	N. Coyote: Same Comm. Hill: Slightly More	N. Coyote: Same Comm. Hill: Slightly More	N. Coyote: Same Comm. Hill: Slightly More	N. Coyote: Same Comm. Hill: Slightly More
Population and Housing/ Growth Inducement	Less	Less	Less	LTS	More	Same
Greenhouse Gas Emissions (2035 Goal)	Less/ More[2]	Less	Less	Less	More	Less

[1]Existing General Plan (extended through 2035)
[2]Projected total emissions would be less while the emissions per service population would increase.
LTS: Less Than Significant Impact
Less = Substantial impact reduction compared to the proposed project, but not to a less than significant level.
More = Substantially greater impact than proposed project.

8.6.1 Environmentally Superior Alternative(s)

The CEQA Guidelines specify that an EIR must identify the environmentally superior alternative among those alternatives discussed. If the environmentally superior alternative is the "No Project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. [Section 15126.6(e)(2)]

Based upon the previous discussion, the Scenario 1 Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it provides for a lower amount of total growth capacity, which in turn would produce lesser amounts of vehicle traffic (VMT) and lesser air quality impacts. Based on the information provided in previous subsections of this discussion, this Scenario 1 Alternative overall is environmentally superior since transportation, noise, air quality, biological resources (indirect effects), and GHG emissions in 2035 impacts would be reduced, although not to a less than significant level.

SECTION 9.0 REFERENCES

Aesthetics

California Department of Transportation. "California Scenic Highway Program." Accessed May 5, 2010. <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/scenic_hwy.htm>

City of San José. *Coyote Valley Research Park Rezoning Final Environmental Impact Report.* 2000.

City of San José, Department of Transportation. "Services/Streetlights." Accessed May 6, 2010. <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/transportation/s_streetlights.htm>

H.T. Harvey and Associates. *Envision San José 2040 General Plan Update Biological Resources Report*. August 2010.

University of California Observatories / Lick Observatory. *Santa Clara Valley Lighting and Lick Observatory*. Available at: <http://mthamilton.ucolick.org/public/lighting/Pollution2.html>

Air Quality

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.* May 2011. Available at: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_May%202011_5_3_11.ashx>

BAAQMD. *2009 Air Monitoring Network Report*. July 1, 2010. Available at: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Technical% 20Services/2009_Network_Plan.ashx>

---. *Draft Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan.* March 2010.

---. *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.* Table 3-3 Odor Screening Distances. May 2011.

---. Citywide Odor Complaint Data 2007-2009.

---. Air Quality Summaries for 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009. Available at: <http://gate1.baaqmd.gov/aqmet/AQSiteYearly.aspx>

California Climate Action Team. *Climate Action Team Draft Biennial Report*. March 2009.

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. "CalRecycle Facilities Directory." Accessed August 9, 2010. <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/Search.aspx>

Fehr & Peers, Inc. *Trip Frequency Distribution Summary*. July 2010.

Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. *Air Quality Existing Conditions Report, San José, California*. June 12, 2009.

Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. *Rancho del Pueblo and iStar General Plan Amendment Sites, San José, CA: Air Quality Community Risk Impact Analysis.* April 6, 2011.

US Environmental Protection Agency. *About Air Toxics*. Accessed May 3, 2010. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/allabout.html#effects>

Biological Resources

Bay Delta Conservation Plan. "Plan Development Schedule." Accessed October 13, 2010. <http://bdcpweb.com/Schedule/PlanDevelopmentSchedule.aspx >

Beier, P. "Dispersal of Juvenile Cougars in Fragmented Habitat." *Journal of Wildlife Management*. 59:228-237. 1995.

California Department of Fish and Game, Natural Diversity Database. *Special Vascular Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List*. Quarterly publication. April 2010. 71 pp.

California Department of Fish and Game. *Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program List of California Vegetation Alliances and Rarity Ranking*. 2007.

California Department of Water Resources, Bay-Delta Office. *Draft State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report, 2009*. Available at: <http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/swpreliability/>

Bay Delta Conservation Plan. "Bay Delta Conservation Plan." Accessed October 13, 2010. <http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/default.aspx >

City of San José. *Heritage Trees Website*. Accessed July 13, 2010. <http://www.sanJoséca.gov/tree/trees_heritage.asp>

City of San José. *Airport West Stadium and Great Oaks Place Project Final EIR (SCH # 2009052053)*. 2010.

Geocities. "Fishing Bytes". Available at: <http://www.geocities.com/lakecunninghamregionalpark/fishingx/fishing.htm.> Accessed March 9, 2009.

ICF Jones & Stokes. *Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan 2nd Administrative Draft*. Prepared for the County of Santa Clara Planning Office. June 2009. Available at: <http://www.scv-habitatplan.org/www/site/alias__default/documents_draft_hcp_chapters/292/draft_hcp_chapters.aspx>

Philip Williams & Associates, Ltd. *South Bay Salt Ponds Restoration Project South Bay Geomorphic Assessment*. 2006.

Rottenborn, S. C. *The impacts of urbanization on riparian bird communities in central California*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University. 1997.

Santa Clara Valley Water District. *Fish Functions and Values Analysis 2006*. 2007. Available at: <http://scv-habitatplan.org/www/site/alias__default/documents_science_advisors_report/336/science_advisors_report.aspx>

Santa Clara Valley HCP/NCCP. *2nd Administrative Draft Valley HCP -Appendix F (Nitrogen Deposition Contribution)*. Available at <http://www.scv-habitatplan.org/www/site/alias__default/documents_draft_hcp_chapters/292/draft_hcp_chapters.aspx>. Accessed July 14, 2010.

South Coast Wildlands. "South Coast Missing Linkages: A Wildland Network for the South Coast Ecoregion." Produced in cooperation with partners in the South Coast Missing Linkages Initiative. 2008.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. "Formal Endangered Species Act Consultation on the Proposed Coordinated Operations of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP)." 2008. <http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/documents/SWP-CVP_OPs_BO_12-15_final_OCR.pdf>. Accessed July 14, 2010.

U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. "Biological Opinion and Conference Opinion on the Long-term Operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project." 2009. Available at: <http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/ocap/NMFS_Biological_and_Conference_Opinion_on_the_Long-Term_Operations_of_the_CVP_and_SWP.pdf>

Cultural Resources

Archives & Architecture. *Historical Overview and Context for the City of San José*. 1992.

Basin Research Associates. *Cultural Resources Existing Setting, Envision San José 2040 General Plan, Santa Clara County, California*. July 2009.

---. *Cultural Resources Impacts, Envision San José 2040 General Plan, Santa Clara County, California*. November 2010.

C. Bruce Hanson. *Paleontological Evaluation Report for the Envision San José 2040 General Plan, Santa Clara County, California.* September 2010.

Carey and Company. *San José Japantown Historic Context and Survey Phase II*. October 10, 2006.

City of San José. *Revised Guidelines for Historic Reports – 2/26/10*. 2010. Available at: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/historic/pdf/revised_historic_report_guidelines.pdf>

City of San José. *Airport West Stadium and Great Oaks Place Project Final EIR (SCH # 2009052053)*. 2010.

City of San José. *Draft Initial Study/Application for Environmental Clearance Thunderbird Golf Course*. 1996.

City of Santa Clara. *City of Santa Clara Draft 2010-2035 General Plan Environmental Impact Report.* 2010.

PAST Consultants. *San José Modernism Historic Context Statement.* June 2009.

University of California Museum of Paleontology. "Mammoth Discovery in San José–bones found near Guadalupe River levee, north of airport – June 9, 2005". Accessed October 28, 2010. Available at: <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/mammal/mammoth/index.html>

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. *National Register Bulletin Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties.* Revised 1998. Available at: <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb38/ >

Wentworth, C.M., M.C. Blake, Jr., R.J. McLaughlin, and R.W. Graymer, compilers. "Preliminary geologic map of the San José 30x60-minute quadrangle. (Open-file report 98-795)." 1999. Available at: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/1998/of98-795/ >

Energy

California Air Resources Board. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reported to the California Air Resources Board for 2008.* Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/reporting/ghg-rep/facility_summary.xls>. Accessed July 19, 2010.

California Energy Commission. *2007 Integrated Energy Policy Report, Commission Final Report*. Adopted December 5, 2007. Publication # CEC-100-2007-008-CMF. Available at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/energy_action_plan/index.html>.

---. *2009 Integrated Energy Policy Report*. CEC-100-2009-003-CMF. December 2009.

---. *California Energy Demand 2008-2018 Staff Revised Forecast*. CEC-200-2007-015-SF2. November 2007.

---. *California Energy Demand 2010-2020 Adopted Forecast*. CEC-200-2009-012-CMF. December 2009.

CH2MHill. *Low-Effect Habitat Conservation Plan for Bay Checkerspot Butterfly and Serpentine Endemic Plant Species in Santa Clara County, California Los Esteros Critical Energy Facility San José, California*. 2010. Available at: <http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/documents/Los_Esteros_Draft_HCP_2010/LECEF_Low-effectHCP.pdf >

City of San José. *Energy Resources*. Available at: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/esd/natural-energy-resources/energyresources.htm>

---. *Green Vision Annual Report 2009 Including Tips For A Greener Community*. Adopted March 9, 2010. Available at.: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/greenvision/>

---. *San José's Green Vision Annual Report (2008)*. Adopted March 9, 2009. Available at: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/greenvision/pdf/GV_Report_2008FINAL_3-17-09.pdf>

Kavalec, Chris and Tom Gorin. *California Energy Demand 2010-2020, Adopted Forecast*. California Energy Commission. CEC-200-2009-012-CMF. 2009.

National Energy Policy Development Group. *National Energy Policy*. 2001. Available at: <http://www.ne.doe.gov/pdfFiles/nationalEnergyPolicy.pdf>

Pacific Gas and Electric Company. *Company Profile*. Available at: <http://www.pge.com/about/company/profile/ >

Poon, Alfred. "Land Rights Protection, Southern Area, Pacific Gas and Electric." Written communication to Andrew Crabtree, City of San José. November 23, 2010.

Sierra Research. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Estimates.* September 2010.

Vision California. "Charting Our Future Statewide Scenarios Report." Available at: <www.visioncalifornia.org/Vision%20California%20-%20Charting%20Our%20Future%20-%20Report.pdf>

Weiner, Carolyn. Pacific Gas & Electric. Greenhouse Gas Data Request. Written communication to Lee Butler, Planner II, City of San José. June 28, 2010.

Geology and Seismicity

Association of Bay Area Governments. *Tsunami Inundation Emergency Planning Map for the San Francisco Bay Region.* Accessed July 27, 2010. Available at: <http://gis.abag.ca.gov/Website/Tsunami-Maps/viewer.htm>

California Department of Conservation, State Mining and Geology Board. *A Report of Mineral Land Classification and Designation Under the State Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMGB Information Report 2008-05).* July 2008. Available at: <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/smgb/reports/Documents/SMGB%20IR%202008-05.pdf>

---. *Designation of Regionally Significant Construction Aggregate Resource Areas (SMARA Designation Report No. 7)*. January 1987. Available at: <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/smgb/reports/Designation/Documents/Table%201.pdf>

---. *California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures: Guidelines For Classification and Designation of Mineral Lands*. Available at: <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/smgb/Guidelines/Documents/ClassDesig.pdf>

California Geological Survey (CGS). *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California*. Special Publication 117A. September 11, 2008.

---. *SR 146 (PART I) Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the San Francisco-Monterey Bay Area [Central California].* 1986.

---. *SR 146 (PART II) Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the South San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region [Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, California]*. 1983.

---. *Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the South San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region [Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties]*. OFR 96-03. 1996. Scale: 1:125,000.

Cooper-Clark & Associates. *Geotechnical Investigation, City of San José's Sphere of Influenc*e. 1974.

Leake, S.A. "Land subsidence from ground-water pumping." U.S. Geological Survey. 2004. Accessed February 18, 2010. Available at: http://geochange.er.usgs.gov/sw.changes/anthropogenic/subside

Poland, J.F. *Land Subsidence in the Santa Clara Valley, Alameda, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties, California*. U.S. Geological Survey Technical Report 2. 1971.

Santa Clara Valley Water District. "Subsidence." Accessed February 18, 2010. Available at: <http://www.valleywater.org/Services/LandSubsidence.aspx>

Santa Clara County. *Surface Mine and Reclamation Act (SMARA) Program Update*. February 10, 2010. Accessed February 19, 2010. Available at: <http://www.sccgov.org/keyboard/attachments/Committee%20Agenda/2010/February%2018,%202010/202880022/KeyboardTransmittalWeb202966566.PDF>

Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC). *Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Landslide Hazards in California*. March 2002.

---. *Recommended Procedures for Implementation of DMG*. Special Publication 117. 2002.

---. *Recommended Procedures for Implementation of DMG*. Special Publication 117. March 1999.

State of California, Seismic Safety Commission. *Annual Report for 2005*. Accessed February 19, 2010. Available at: <http://www.seismic.ca.gov/pub/2005%20Annual%20Report.pdf>

---. *Status of the Unreinforced Masonry Building Law*. 2006 Progress Report to the Legislature. Accessed February 19, 2010. Available at: <http://www.seismic.ca.gov/pub/CSSC%202006%20URM%20Report%20Final.pdf>

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.* May 2011. Available at: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_May%202011_5_3_11.ashx>

---. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines.* Available at: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_June%202010.ashx>

---. "Greenhouse Gases". Available at: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/Emission-Inventory-and-Air-Quality-Related/Emission-Inventory/Greenhouse-Gases.aspx>

California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA). *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures A Resource for Local Government to Assess Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*. August 2010.

California Air Resources Board. *California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2008.* May 12, 2010. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm>

---. "Clean Car Standards - Pavley, Assembly Bill 1493." Accessed September 15, 2010. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/ccms/ccms.htm>

---. "Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reporting, 2008 Reported Emissions." Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/reporting/ghg-rep/ghg-reports.htm>

---. *Staff Report Proposed Regional Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets For Automobiles and Light Trucks Pursuant To Senate Bill 375*. August 9, 2010. Available at: <http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/staffreport_sb375080910.pdf>

---. *Trends in California Greenhouse Gas Emissions for 2000 to 2008 – by Category as Defined in the Scoping Plan.* May 28, 2010. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/tables/ghg_inventory_trends_00-08_2010-05-12.pdf>

Communities for a Better Environment v. South Coast Air Quality Management District, 48 Cal.4th 310 (2010)

Santa Clara Valley HCP/NCCP. *2nd Administrative Draft Valley HCP -Appendix F (Nitrogen Deposition Contribution)*. Accessed July 14, 2010. <http://www.scv-habitatplan.org/www/site/alias__default/documents_draft_hcp_chapters/292/draft_hcp_chapters.aspx>

State of California, Department of Finance. *E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2010, with 2000 Benchmark*. Sacramento, California. May 2010 (for 2008 population) and City of San José.

U.S. EPA. *High Global Warming Potential Gases*. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/highgwp/scientific.html>

---. *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 – 2008*. Available at: < http://epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/downloads10/US-GHG-Inventory-2010_Report.pdf>

U.S. Supreme Court. *Massachusetts et al. v. Environmental Protection Agency et al.* 549 U.S. 497 (2007).

Hazardous Materials and Hazards

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. "Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps." Accessed April 30, 2010. Available at: <http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland_zones.php>

---. "Wildland Hazard/Building Codes." Accessed April 30, 2010. Available at: <http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland.php>

---. *Wildland Fire Protection*. Available at: <http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland.php>

California Public Utilities Commission. "Natural Gas Safety Program." Accessed September 14, 2010. Available at: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/aboutus/Divisions/Consumer+Protection/Utilities+Safety+Branch/Natural+Gas+Safety/index.htm>

City of San José. *Emergency Operations Plan*. 2004, as amended. Accessed May 3, 2010. Available at: <http://www.sanJoséca.gov/emergencyServices/pdf/BASIC%20PLAN.pdf>.

Mineta San José International Airport. "About SJS." Accessed April 29, 2010. Available at <http://www.sjc.org/about.php?page=index>

Office of the State Fire Marshal. "Pipeline Safety Division." Accessed September 14, 2010. <http://www.osfm.fire.ca.gov/pipeline/pipeline.php>

Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission. *Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Santa Clara County Airports.* 2008. Accessed April 30, 2010. Available at: <http://www.sccgov.org/portal/site/planning/planningchp?path=%2Fv7%2FPlanning%2C%20Office%20of%20%28DEP%29%2FPlans%20%26%20Programs%2FAirport%20Land-Use%20Commission>

---. *Comprehensive Land Use Plan Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport.* Adopted October 24, 2010. Accessed December 9, 2010. Available at: http://www.sccvote.org/SCC/docs/Planning,%20Office%20of%20(DEP)/attachments/ALUC/CLUP/SJC%20CLUP%20Adopted%2010-27-10.pdf

---. *Comprehensive Land Use Plan Santa Clara County Reid-Hillview Airport.* Adopted October 24, 2007. Accessed April 30, 2010. Available at: <http://www.sccvote.org/SCC/docs/Planning,%20Office%20of%20(DEP)/attachments/ALUC/RHV_10-24-07_ADOPTED_CLUP.pdf>

State of California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics. *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook.* January 2002. Accessed May 3, 2010. Available at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/documents/ALUPHComplete-7-02rev.pdf>

---. *California Public Utilities Code Section 21001 et seq. relating to the State Aeronautics Act.* Available at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/documents2/puc051107.pdf>

U.S. Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. "State Programs". Accessed September 14, 2010. Available at: <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/pipeline/state-programs>

Hydrology and Water Quality

Association of Bay Area Governments. *Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning*. July 2009. Available at: <http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/tsunami/tsunami.html>

California Department of Water Resources. *California's Groundwater Bulletin 118, Update 2003.* Available at: <http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118/bulletin118update2003.cfm>

California Natural Resources Agency. *2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy*. Available at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2009publications/CNRA-1000-2009-027/CNRA-1000-2009-027-F.PDF>

California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region. *Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit Order R2-2009-0074 NPDES Permit No. CAS612008*. October 14, 2009. Available at: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/board_decisions/adopted_orders/2009/R2-2009-0074.pdf>

California State Water Resources Board. "Low Impact Development – Sustainable Storm Water Management". Accessed November 3, 2010. Available at: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/low_impact_development/>

Ocean Protection Council. State of California Sea-Level Rise Interim Guidance Document, October 2010. Available at: <http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/project_pages/Climate/SLR_Guidance_Document.pdf >

Santa Clara Valley Water District. "Groundwater Supply." Accessed August 30, 2010. <http://www.valleywater.org/Services/GroundwaterSupply.aspx>

Schaaf & Wheeler. *Climate Change Impacts for San José, California*. September 3, 2010.

Land Use

California Department of Conservation. *2008 Important Farmland Map for Santa Clara County*. . Map. July 2009.

California Department of Conservation. "Williamson Act". 2010. Accessed September 9, 2010. <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx>

City of San José. *Airport West Stadium and Great Oaks Place Project Final Environmental Impact Report*. 2009.

---. *Coyote Valley Research Park Final Environmental Impact Report*. SCH No. 990923031. 2000.

---. *Moitozo Ranch Residential Project Final Environmental Impact Report*. 1998.

---. *Residential Design Guidelines: Toward Community.* As amended through 2010.

---. *San José 2020 General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. 1995.

---. Zoning Maps. Available at: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/zonemap/default.asp>

H.T. Harvey & Associates. *Envision San José 2040 General Plan Update Biological Resources Report*. August 18, 2010.

Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission. *Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Santa Clara County Airports.* 2008. Accessed April 30, 2010. Available at: <http://www.sccgov.org/portal/site/planning/planningchp?path=%2Fv7%2FPlanning%2C%20Office%20of%20%28DEP%29%2FPlans%20%26%20Programs%2FAirport%20Land-Use%20Commission>

---. *Comprehensive Land Use Plan Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport.* Adopted October 24, 2010. Accessed December 9, 2010. Available at: http://www.sccvote.org/SCC/docs/Planning,%20Office%20of%20(DEP)/attachments/ALUC/CLUP/SJC%20CLUP%20Adopted%2010-27-10.pdf

---. *Comprehensive Land Use Plan Santa Clara County Reid-Hillview Airport.* Adopted October 24, 2007. Accessed April 30, 2010. Available at: <http://www.sccvote.org/SCC/docs/Planning,%20Office%20of%20(DEP)/attachments/ALUC/RHV_10-24-07_ADOPTED_CLUP.pdf>

Noise

AirNav, LLC. "FAA Information for Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport." Accessed March 12, 2009. <http://www.airnav.com/airport/KSJC>

---. "FAA Information for Reid-Hillview Airport." Accessed January 15, 2009. <www.airnav.com/airport/KRHV>

Caltrans. *Technical Noise Supplement (TeNS)*. November 2009.

---. "Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations." *Technical Advisory, TAV-02-01-R9601.* February 2002.

City of San José. *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan*. Figure 16. December 21, 2009.

Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. *Environmental Noise Assessment for the Envision San José 2040 General Plan Update.* December 7, 2010.

Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. *Rancho del Pueblo and iStar Sites – Noise Analysis Memo.* May 18, 2011.

Mineta San José International Airport (SJC). "Airport Facts and Figures". 2010. Accessed September 22, 2010. Available at: <www.sjc.org/about/newsroom/AirportStats.pdf>

---. "SJC Curfew Information". Accessed December 2, 2010. Available at: <http://www.sjc.org/community/curfew.html.

Santa Clara County Airports. "Reid-Hillview Airport: Noise Standards". Accessed September 22, 2010. Available at: <http://www.reidhillviewairport.com/new_website/rhv-noise.html>

US Environmental Protection Agency. *Legal Compilation on Noise*. Vol. 1, p. 2-104. 1973.

Population and Housing

Association of Bay Area Governments. *Projections 2007: Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area to the Year 2035*.

---. *Projections and Priorities 2009*.

Beacon Economics. *The Future of Housing Demand in San José: 2008-2040*. December 2, 2008.

Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy (CCSCE). *Projections of Jobs, Population and Households for the City of San José.* 2008.

City of San José. Maps/Data Community Profile. Accessed August 4, 2010. <http://www.sanjoséca.gov/planning/data/fact_sheet/FactSheet.pdf>.

City of San José, Department of Housing. *City Policies.* Available at: <www.sjhousing.org/policy/citypo.html>

State of California, Department of Finance. *E-1 population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State with Annual Percent Change — January 1, 2008 and 2009*. Sacramento, California. May 2009.

---. *E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State with Annual Percent Change-January 1, 2009 and 2010.* Sacramento, California. May 2010.

---. *E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2010, with 2000 Benchmark*. Sacramento, California. May 2010.

---. *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2010, with 2000 Benchmark*. Sacramento, California. May 2010.

Urban Habitat Program v. City of Pleasanton. No RG06-293831 (Cal. Super. Mar. 12, 2010). Accessed April 2010. Available at: <http://www.publicadvocates.org/ourwork/housing/index.html#urban>

U.S. Census. "American Community Survey." 2008.

---. 2000 and US Census 1990 information. Available at: <http://www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/cities/SanJose.htm>

Public Facilities and Services

City of San José, Department of Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services. *Residents' Proximity to Off-Street Trails*. Map. May 2010. http://www.sjparks.org/Trails/Reports/3-mile%20buffer%2011x17.jpg

City of San José. *Draft Envision San José 2040 General Plan Update Analysis of San José's Fiscal Conditions and Projections of Future Scenarios*. February 12, 2010.

---. *Evergreen/East Hills Vision Strategy Environmental Impact Report.* 2006.

---. *Greenprint 2009 Update for Parks, Recreation Facilities and Trails*. December 2009.

City of San José, Environmental Services Department. "Urban Environmental Accords." February 26, 2009. Accessed May 3, 2010. <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/esd/urban-accords.asp>

City of San José Fire Department, Bureau of Support Services. *Standards for Travel Times and Total Reflex Times for Fires in Buildings of Less Than 4 Stories*. Table. November 17, 2003.

City of San José Fire Department. "Fast Facts." Accessed August 3, 2010. <http://www.sjfd.com/FastFacts/fastfacts.asp>

---. "SJFD Response by Company: Fiscal Year 2007-2008." Accessed May 3, 2010. <http://www.sjfd.org/Stats/0708Company.asp>

City of San José, Parks and Recreation Department. <http://www.sjparks.org>

City of San José Police Department. "Inside SJPD – Department Information." July 28, 2010. Accessed August 2, 2010. <http://www.sjpd.org/InsideSJPD/>

---. "Official Crime Statistics." March 5, 2010. Accessed May 3, 2010. <http://www.sjpd.org/CrimeStats/crimestats.html>

City of San José Redevelopment Agency. *North San José Vision Education Needs 2040: A Report on the Planning for New Schools.* March 6, 2008.

East Side Union High School District. "Measure E Bond." Accessed August 30, 2010. <http://www.esuhsd.org/Operations/Measure-E-Bond/index.html#Frequently_Asked_Questions>

Evergreen School District. "Measure I." Accessed August 30, 2010. <http://evergreen.ccsct.com/page.cfm?p=2463>

Fremont Union High School District. "History of FUHSD Bonds." Accessed August 30, 2010. <http://www.fuhsd.org/historyofbonds>

Los Gatos Union School District. *Los Gatos Union School District Measure B, Bond Oversight Committee June 2010 Annual Report*. June 2010. Accessed August 30, 2010. <http://www.lgusd.k12.ca.us/facilities/bond.htm>

San José Public Library. "Fact and History – Quick Statistics (FY2009/2010)." Accessed May 18, 2011. <http://www.sjpl.org/facts>

Transportation

Caltrans. *Highway Design Manual.* Available at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/hdm/hdmtoc.htm>

City of San José. *Emergency Operations Plan*. 2004, as amended. Accessed May 3, 2010. Available at: <http://www.sanJoséca.gov/emergencyServices/pdf/BASIC%20PLAN.pdf>.

---. *Focus on the Future San José 2020 General Plan*. 1994, as amended.

---. *Greenprint 2009 Update for Parks, Recreation Facilities and Trails*. December 2009.

---. *San José Bike Plan 2020.* 2009. Accessed December 20, 2010. Available at: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/transportation/bikeped/bikeped_update.asp>

City of San José, Department of Transportation. *Envision San José 2040 General Plan Project Scenario 7 and Land Use Options Scenario 7A*. March 2011.

County of Santa Clara. *Countywide Trails Master Plan*. 1995.

Fehr & Peers, Inc. *Envision San José 2040 General Plan: Transportation Impact Analysis for the Draft Environmental Impact Report.* December 2010.

U.S. Census. "Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF-3)." 2007.

U.S. Census. "American Community Survey." 2008.

Utilities and Service Systems

Bay Delta Conservation Plan. "Plan Development Schedule." 2010. Accessed November 15, 2010. <http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Schedule/PlanDevelopmentSchedule.aspx>

California Department of Water Resources, Bay-Delta Office. *Draft State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report*. 2009. Pages 50-51. Available at http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/swpreliability/.

California State Water Resources Board. "Low Impact Development – Sustainable Storm Water Management". Accessed November 3, 2010. Available at: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/low_impact_development/>

CalRecycle. *Estimates of Solid Waste Generation*. December 30, 2009. Accessed November 9, 2010. <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteChar/WasteGenRates/default.htm>

---. *Mandatory Commercial Recycling*. October 13, 2010. Accessed November 12, 2010. <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/climate/Recycling/default.htm>

City of San José, Environmental Services Department. *Assessment of Infrastructure for the Integrated Waste Management Zero Waste Strategic Plan Development*. November 3, 2008.

---. "San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant." May 4, 2010. Accessed October 12, 2010. <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/esd/wastewater/water-pollution-control-plant.asp>

---. *San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plan Master Plan Task No. 3 Project Memorandum No. 5 Capacity Rating of Existing Facilities Final Draft.* November 2009.

---. "Waste Prevention." January 7, 2009. Accessed May 4, 2010. <http://www.sjrecycles.org/waste_prevention.asp>

Great Oaks Water Company. *2005 Urban Water Management Plan.* April 2005. Available at: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/coyotevalley/publications_DEIR.htm>

San José Municipal Water Service. *Water Supply Assessment for Envision San José 2040 General Plan Update*. September 2010.

San José Water Company. *City of San José General Plan Water Supply Assessment*. June 2010.

Santa Clara County. *Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report*. August 22, 2007. Accessed May 4, 2010. <http://www.sccgov.org/SCC/docs%2FIntegrated%20Waste%20Management%20%28DIV%29%2FSCC%202nd%205yr%20rpt%202006%20rev4.pdf>

Santa Clara Valley Water District. *Groundwater Conditions 2002/2003*. January 2005.

---. *Integrated Water Resources Planning Study 2003*. December 2005. Available at: <http://www.scvwd.dst.ca.us/Services/WaterSupplyPlanning.aspx>

---. *Urban Water Management Plan 2005*. December 20, 2005.

---. *Urban Water Management Plan 2010*. 2010. Accessed November 14, 2010. <http://www.scvwd.dst.ca.us/Services/UWMP2010.aspx>

---. "Water Tracker." October 2010. Accessed November 15, 2010. <http://www.valleywater.org/Services/WaterTracker.aspx>

Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, et al. v. City of Rancho Cordova (February 1, 2007). 53 Cal.Rptr.3d 821. Available at: <http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/cases/2007/>

Cumulative Impacts

California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. "Santa Clara County 2006-2008 Land Use Conversion". <http://redirect.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/county_info_results.asp>.

City of Gilroy. *Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Gilroy Revised Draft General Plan*. 2001. <http://www.ci.gilroy.ca.us/cityofgilroy_files/city_hall/community_development/planning/general_plan/Draft_EIR_COG_Revised_Draft_General_Plan-Sept_2001.pdf>

Maas Companies. *Evergreen Valley College Educational and Facilities Master Plan Update - 2025.* 2010. <http://www.maasco.com/clients/EVC%20Educational%20Master%20Plan%20Final%206-15-10.pdf>

---. *San José City College Educational and Facilities Master Plan Update - 2025.* 2010. Available at: <http://maasco.com/clients/SJCC%20Educational%20Master%20Plan%20Final%206-15-10.pdf>

San José State University. *Master Plan 2001.* 2001. Available at: <http://www.sjsu.edu/fdo/docs/sjsu_complete_master_plan_hi-res.pdf>

Persons and Organization Consulted

Krupp, Matt. City of San José Environmental Services Department.
Godley, Laurel. City of San José Environmental Services Department.
Lee, Ivan, Fire Marshal. San José Fire Department.

SECTION 10.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

Lead Agency: **City of San José**
Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

Joseph Horwedel, Director
Laurel Prevetti, Assistant Director
Darryl Boyd, Principal Planner
Susan Walton, Principal Planner
John Davidson, Senior Planner
Andrew Crabtree, Senior Planner
John Baty, Planner I/II
Michael Brilliot, Senior Planner
Lee Butler, Planner I/II
Dipa Chundur, Planner I/II
Perihan Ozdemir, Geographic System Specialist

Office of the City Attorney
Renee Gurza, Senior Deputy City Attorney

Department of Transportation
Manuel Pineda, Acting Deputy Director
Paul Ma, Transportation Systems Planning Manager
Casey Hirasaki, Transportation, Engineering Technician

Department of Environmental Services
Napp Fukuda, Division Manager
Karen McDonough, Environmental Services Specialist
Alice Ringer, Environmental Services Specialist
Jennifer Seguin, Associate ESD Specialist
David Tucker, Program Manager
Junko Vroman, Environmental Services Specialist

Department of Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services
Dave Mitchell, Parks Planning Manager

Consultants: **David J. Powers & Associates**
Planning and Environmental Consultants

Michelle Yesney, Principal
Nora Monette, Principal Project Manager
Will Burns, Project Manager
Tanya Cottle, Assistant Project Manager
Meryka Blumer, Assistant Project Manager
Stephanie Francis, Graphic Artist

Basin Research Associates
Archaeological and Cultural Resources Consultants

Colin I. Busby, Ph.D., Project Principal Investigator
Donna Garaventa, Senior Research Scientist

Melody Tannam, Historic Preservation Planning/GIS/Graphics
Ward Hill, Architectural Historian

C. Bruce Hanson
Paleontologic Resource Specialist

Cornerstone Earth Group
Geotechnical and Environmental Consultants

Scott E. Fitinghoff, P.E., G.E., Principal Geotechnical Engineer
Ron Helm, C.E.G., R.E.A. II, Principal Engineering Geologist
Laura C. Knutson, P.E., G.E., Principal Geotechnical Engineer
Stason I. Foster, P.E., Senior Project Engineer

H.T. Harvey & Associates, Inc.
Ecological Consultants

Stephen C. Rottenborn, Ph.D., Principal-in-charge, Senior Wildlife Ecologist
Patrick Boursier, Ph.D., Senior Plant Ecologist/Wetland Specialist
Julie Klingmann, M.S., Project Manager, Senior Wildlife Ecologist
Kelly Hardwicke, Ph.D., Senior Plant Ecologist/Wetland Specialist
Ron R. Duke, M.S., Senior Wildlife Ecologist
David S. Johnston, Ph.D., Senior Mammalogist
Robin Carle, M.S., Wildlife Biologist

Illingworth and Rodkin, Inc.
Acoustical and Air Quality Consultants

James Reyff, Project Scientist (Air Quality)
Michael S. Thill, Staff Scientist (Noise and Vibration)
Jordan L. Roberts, Staff Consultant
Richard B. Rodkin, PE, Principal

Schaaf & Wheeler
Consulting Civil Engineers

Chuck Anderson, President
Eliza McNulty, Associate Engineer
Charles Hardy, Associate Engineer

Sierra Research
Air Pollution Research and Control

Tom Carlson, Principal Scientist
Eric Walther, Partner/Principal Scientist
Robert Dulla, Senior Partner

SECTION 11.0 ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

µg/m^3:.....Micrograms Per Cubic Meter
AB:.....Assembly Bill
ABAG:.....Association of Bay Area Governments
ACE:.....Altamont Commuter Express
ACS:.....American Community Survey
ADA:.....Americans with Disabilities Act
ADT:.....Average Daily Traffic
ADT:.....Average Daily Trips
ADWEF:.....Average Dry Weather Effluent Flow
ADWF:.....Average Dry Weather Flow
ADWIF:.....Average Dry Weather Influent Flow
AFY:.....Acre-feet Per Year
AIA:.....Airport Influence Area
ALUC:.....Airport Land Use Commission
ALUCP:.....Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
APN:.....Assessor's Parcel Number
AQMP:.....Air Quality Management Plan
AQP:.....Air Quality Plan
AST:.....Aboveground Storage Tank
ATCM:.....Air Toxics Control Measure
ATCM:.....Airborne Toxic Control Measure
BAAQMD:.....Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BACT:.....Best Available Control Technology
BART:.....Bay Area Rapid Transit
BAT:.....Best Available Technology
BAWSCA:.....Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency
BCDC:.....Bay Conservation and Development Commission
BCT:.....Best Control Technology
BDCP:.....Bay Delta Conservation Plan
bgs:.....Below Ground Surface
BMP:.....Best Management Practice
BNR:.....Biological Nutrient Removal
BOD:.....Biological Oxygen Demand
BRT:.....Bus Rapid Transit
BTU:.....British Thermal Unit
C&D:.....Construction and Demolition
CAA:.....Clean Air Act
CAAQS:.....California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAFE:.....Corporate Average Fuel Economy
Cal/EPA:.....California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal/OSHA:.....California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CalARP:.....California Accidental Release Program
CAP:.....Clean Air Plan
CAP:.....Climate Action Plan
CAPCOA:.....California Air Pollution Officers Association
CARB:.....California Air Resources Board
CARE:.....Community Air Risk Evaluation

CAT: .....Climate Action Team
CBC: .....California Building Code
CBS:.....Clean Bay Strategy
CCAA: .....California Clean Air Act
CCAR:.....California Climate Action Registry
CCR: .....California Code of Regulations
CCSCE:.....Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy
CCTV:.....Closed Circuit Television
CDDD: .....Construction & Demolition Diversion Deposit (Program)
CDE: .....California Department of Education
CDFG:.....California Department of Fish and Game
CEC:.....California Energy Commission
CEQA:.....California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA:.....Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CESA: .....California Endangered Species Act
CFC:.....Chlorofluorocarbon
CFG:.....California Fish and Game (Code)
CFR:.....Code of Federal Regulations
CFS: .....Cubic Feet Per Second
CH_4:.....Methane
CHBC:.....California Historical Building Code
CHRIS/NWIC:.....California Historical Resources Information System/
Northwest Information Center
CIP: .....Capital Improvement Program
CIWMB: .....California Integrated Waste Management Board
CLG: .....Certified Local Government
CLUP: .....Comprehensive Land Use Plan
CMA: .....Congestion Management Agency
CMP:.....Congestion Management Plan
CMS:.....Changeable Message Sign
CNDDB: .....California Natural Diversity Data Base
CNEL:.....Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPPA:.....California Native Plant Protection Act
CNPS.....California Native Plant Society
CO:.....Carbon Monoxide
CO_2:.....Carbon Dioxide
CO_2e:.....Carbon Dioxide-Equivalent
CPUC: .....California Public Utilities Commission
CR: .....Light Rail Corridor
CRHR:.....California Register of Historic Places
CRWQCB: .....California Regional Water Quality Control Board
CSSC:.....California Species of Special Concern
CSW:.....Candidate Solid Waste Landfill Site
CTC:.....California Transportation Commission
CUPA:.....Certified Unified Program Agency
CVP:.....Central Valley Project
CVUR: .....Coyote Valley Urban Reserve
DASH:.....Downtown Area Shuttle

dB:.....Decibel
dBA:.....A-weighted Decibel
DDT: .....Dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane
DHS: .....Department of Health Services
DNL: .....Day-Night Level
DO:.....Dissolved Oxygen
DOF: .....California Department of Finance
DOT: .....Department of Transportation
DPH: .....Department of Public Health
DPM:.....Diesel Particulate Matter
DSOD:.....Division of Safety of Dams
DTSC: .....Department of Toxic Substances Control
DU/AC: .....Dwelling Units Per Acre
DWR: .....Department of Water Resources
ECM:.....Energy and Climate Control Measures
EFH:.....Essential Fish Habitat
EIR:.....Environmental Impact Report
EIS: .....Environmental Impact Statement
EMF: .....Electro-Magnetic Fields
EMS: .....Emergency Medical Services
EMV:.....Electric Multiple Units
EP^3: .....Environmentally Preferable Procurement Policy
EPA:.....Environmental Protection Agency
ESA:.....Endangered Species Act
ESD:.....(San José) Environmental Services Department
FAA: .....Federal Aviation Administration
FAR:.....Federal Aviation Regulations
FAR:.....Floor Area Ratio
FEMA: .....Federal Emergency Management Agency
FERC: .....Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FESA:.....Federal Endangered Species Act
FHWA:.....Federal Highway Administration
FIRM:.....Flood Insurance Rate Map
FIS:.....Federal Inspection Services
FMMP:.....Farmland Mapping Program
FMP: .....Field Management Plan
FTA:.....Federal Transit Administration
GCC: .....Global Climate Change
GHG:.....Greenhouse Gas
GIS:.....Geographic Information System
GOWC: .....Great Oaks Water Company
GP: .....General Plan
GPD: .....Gallons Per Day
GW:.....Gigawatt
GWh:.....Gigawatt-hours
GWP:.....Global Warming Potential
HAP: .....Hazardous Air Pollutant
HCD:.....State Department of Housing and Community Development

HCFC: .....Hydro-chlorofluorocarbons
HCM: .....Hydromodification Control Measure
HCP:.....Habitat Conservation Plan
HFC:.....Hydrofluorocarbons
HIT:.....Hazardous Incident Team
HMIS: .....Hazardous Materials Inventory Statement
HMMP: .....Hazardous Materials Management Plan
HMP:.....Hydromodification Management Plan
HMRRP: .....Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory
HMTA:.....Hazardous Materials Transportation Act
HOS: .....Housing Opportunity Study (HOS)
HOV:.....High Occupancy Vehicle
HSR:.....High Speed Rail
HUD:.....Department of Housing and Urban Development
HVAC: .....Heating, Ventilation, and Air-Conditioning
HWG:.....Hazardous Waste Generator
II:.....Internal-Internal
IPCC:.....Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IS:.....California Independent System Operator
IS:.....Identified Site/Structures
ITS: .....Intelligent Transportation Systems
IWMP:.....Integrated Waste Management Plan
IX: .....Internal-External
J/ER:.....Jobs to Employed Resident Ratio
kW:.....Kilowatt
kWh:.....Kilowatt Hour
LCFS:.....Low Carbon Fuel Standard
LEA:.....Local Enforcement Agency
LEED: .....Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
Leq: .....Noise Equivalent Level
LEV:.....Low-Emission Vehicle
LID:.....Low Impact Development
LOS:.....Level of Service
LRA: .....Local Responsibility Area
LRT:.....Light Rail Transit
LUM:.....Land Use and Local Impact Measure
LUST: .....Leaking Underground Storage Tank
LUTE: .....Land Use and Transportation Element
MBTA:.....Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCL:.....Maximum Contaminant Levels
mg/kg: .....Milligrams Per Kilogram
MGD: .....Million Gallons Per Day
MMT:.....Million Metric Tons
MPH:.....Miles Per Hour
MPO:.....Metropolitan Planning Organization
MRF:.....Materials Recovery Facility
MRP:.....Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit
MSAT: .....Mobile Source Air Toxics

MSL: .....Mean Sea Level
MSM: .....Mobile Source Measure
MT: .....Metric Ton
MTBE: .....Methyl Tert-Butyl Ether
MTC:.....Metropolitan Transportation Commission
MW: .....Megawatt
MWMA:.....Medical Waste Management Act
N:.....Nitrogen
N_2O: .....Nitrous Oxide
NAAQS:.....National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC: .....California Native American Heritage Commission
NBD: .....Neighborhood Business District
NCCP: .....Natural Community Conservation Plan
NCCPA: .....Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act
NEPA: .....National Environmental Policy Act
NEPDG: .....National Energy Policy Development Group
NESHAP: .....National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NEV: .....Neighborhood Electric Vehicle
NFIP: .....National Flood Insurance Program
NGPSA: .....Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 (as amended)
NH_3: .....Ammonia
NHPA:.....National Historic Preservation Act
NMFS:.....National Marine Fisheries Service
NO_2: .....Nitrogen Dioxide
NOA:.....Naturally Occurring Asbestos
NOP: .....Notice of Preparation
NO_X:.....Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES:.....National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPL: .....National Priorities List
NRHP:.....National Register of Historic Places
O_3: .....Ozone
OHP: .....Office of Historic Preservation
OHV:.....Off-Highway Vehicle
OPR:.....Office of Planning and Research
OSHA:.....Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OSHPD: .....Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development
PAC-SJ:.....Preservation Action Council of San José
PAH: .....Polyaromatic Hydrocarbons
Pb: .....Lead
PCB: .....Polychlorinated Biphenyls
PCE: .....Perchloroethylene
PCJPB: .....Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
PD: .....Planned Development
PDO: .....Parkland Dedication Ordinance
PEIR:.....Program Environmental Impact Report
PFC: .....Perfluorocarbon
PG&E:.....Pacific Gas and Electric Company
PHEV: .....Plug-in Hybrid Vehicle

PHWWF:.....Peak Hour Wet Weather Flow
PIO:.....Park Impact Ordinance
PM:.....Particulate Matter
PPB: .....Parts Per Billion
PPM: .....Parts Per Million
PPV: .....Peak Particle Velocity
PRC:.....Public Resources Code
PRD:.....Permit Required Document
PWWF: .....Peak Wet Weather Flow
R&D:.....Research & Development
RCRA:.....Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RHNA: .....Regional Housing Needs Allocation
RHNA: .....Regional Housing Needs Assessment
RHV:.....Reid-Hillview Airport
RMS:.....Root Mean Square
ROD:.....Record of Decision
ROG:.....Reactive Organic Gases
ROW: .....Right-of-Way
RPS: .....Renewables Portfolio Standard
RTP: .....Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB:.....Regional Water Quality Control Board
SamTrans: .....San Mateo County Transit District
SARA:.....Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SAVUR:.....South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve
SB:.....Senate Bill
SBSP: .....South Bay Salt Pond
SBWR: .....South Bay Water Recycling
SCCDEH:.....Santa Clara County Department of Environmental Health
SCH:.....State Clearinghouse
SCIA: .....Sewer Capacity Impact Analysis
SCMTD:.....Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
SCP: .....Site Cleanup Program
SCS: .....Sustainable Communities Strategy
SCVMC: .....Santa Clara Valley Medical Center
SCVURPPP: .....Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program
SCVWD .....Santa Clara Valley Water District
SEQ:.....Southeast Quadrant (Morgan Hill)
SF_6:.....Sulfur Hexafluoride
SFM: .....State Fire Marshal
SFPUC: .....San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SHPO: .....State Historic Preservation Officer
SJC:.....Norman Y. Mineta San José International Airport
SJFD:.....San José Fire Department
SJMWS: .....San José Municipal Water System
SJPD:.....San José Police Department
SJRRC:.....San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission
SJSU:.....San José State University
SJWC: .....San José Water Company

SMARA: .....Surface Mining and Reclamation Act
SMART:.....Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit
SOI:.....Sphere of Influence
SO_X.....Sulfur Oxides
SP:.....Service Population
SR:.....State Route
SSO:.....Sanitary Sewer Overflows
STC:.....Sound Transmission Class
STIP:.....State Transportation Implementation Program
SVEW:.....Silicon Valley Energy Watch
SVWTP:.....Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant
SWIS:.....Solid Waste Information System
SWMP:.....Stormwater Management Plan
SWP:.....State Water Project
SWPPP:.....Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB:.....State Water Resources Control Board
TAC:.....Toxic Air Contaminants
TAZ:.....Travel Analysis Zone
TCE:.....Trichloroethylene
TCIF:.....Trade Corridors Improvement Fund
TCM:.....Transportation Control Measure
TCM:.....Treatment Control Measure
TDF:.....Travel Demand Forecasting
TDM:.....Transportation Demand Management
TDS:.....Total Dissolved Solids
TeNS:.....Technical Noise Supplement
TMC:.....Transportation Management Center
TMDL:.....Total Maximum Daily Load
TPM:.....Transit Priority Measure
TW:.....Terrawatt
UGB:.....Urban Growth Boundary
UPRR:.....Union Pacific Railroad
URBEMIS:.....Urban Emissions (Software)
URM:.....Unreinforced Masonry Building
USA:.....Urban Service Area
USACE:.....United States Army Corps of Engineers
USAR:.....Urban Search and Rescue
USFWS:.....United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGBC:.....US Green Building Council
USGS:.....United States Geological Survey
USRB:.....Utilities Safety and Reliability Branch
UST:.....Underground Storage Tank
UV:.....Ultraviolet
UWMP:.....Urban Water Management Plan
V/C:.....Volume to Capacity Ratio
VdB:.....Vibration Decibels
VHFHSZ:.....Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones
VHT:.....Vehicle Hours Traveled

VMT:.....Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC:.....Volatile Organic Compounds
VR:.....Light Rail Village
VT: .....BART/CalTrain Village
VT: .....Vehicle Trips
VTA: .....(Santa Clara) Valley Transportation Authority
WDR: .....Waste Discharge Requirements
WPCP:.....Water Pollution Control Plant
XI: .....External-Internal
XX:.....External-External
ZEV:.....Zero Emissions Vehicle