PLANNING DIVISIO'
CITY OF SUNNYVALL
P.O. BOX 3707
SUNNYVALE, CALIFORNIA 94088-3707

File Number: 2004-0139
No. 04-22

E11918

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This form is provided as a notification of an intent to adopt a Negative Declaration which has been prepared in compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended, and Resolution #118-04.

PROJECT TITLE:

Application for **Special Development Permit** and **Tentative Map** filed by Miro Design Group

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION (APN):

2004-0139 – Application for related proposals on a 9,562 square-foot site located at **560 South Mathilda Avenue** in a DSP-20 (Downtown Specific Plan/Block 20) Zoning District. (APN: 209-29-058)

- **Special Development Permit** to allow demolition of an existing single family home and to construct an 8,200 square-foot three story mixed use office and residential building, and
- **Tentative Map** to subdivide one lot into six condominium spaces and one common lot.

WHERE TO VIEW THIS DOCUMENT:

The **Mitigated Negative Declaration**, its supporting documentation and details relating to the project are on file and available for review and comment in the Office of the Secretary of the Planning Commission, City Hall, 456 West Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale.

This **Mitigated Negative Declaration** may be protested in writing by any person prior to **5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 21, 2004**. Such protest shall be filed in the Department of Community Development, 456 W. Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale and shall include a written statement specifying anticipated environmental effects which may be significant. A protest of a **Mitigated Negative Declaration** will be considered by the adopting authority, whose action on the protest may be appealed.

HEARING INFORMATION:

A public hearing on the project is scheduled for:

Monday, September 27, 2004 at 8:00 p.m. by the Planning Commission in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 456 West Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale.

TOXIC SITE INFORMATION:

(No) listed toxic sites are present at the project location.

Circulated On September 1, 2004

Signed: Fred Bell, Principal Planner

PLANNING DIVISION
CITY OF SUNNYVALE
P.O. BOX 3707
SUNNYVALE, CALIFORNIA 94088-3707

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has been prepared in compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended, and Resolution #118-04.

PROJECT TITLE:

Application for **Special Development Permit** and **Tentative Map** filed by Miro Design Group

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION (APN):

2004-0139 – Application for related proposals on a 9,562 square-foot site located at **560 South Mathilda Avenue** in a DSP-20 (Downtown Specific Plan/Block 20) Zoning District. (APN: 209-29-058)

- **Special Development Permit** to allow demolition of an existing single family home and to construct an 8,200 square-foot three story mixed use office and residential building, and
- **Tentative Map** to subdivide one lot into six condominium spaces and one common lot.

FINDINGS:

The Director of Community Development of the City of Sunnyvale, California, hereby determines that an environmental impact report is not required. There are sufficient environmental controls incorporated into the Zoning and Subdivision regulations to ensure no significant detrimental effect by any proposed use, in the case of a PD overlay or any application for a Special Development Permit.

The above determination is based upon the initial study conducted in this matter, information provided by the applicant in an "Application for Environmental Clearance" and is based on the fact that use is in keeping with and not in conflict with the adopted General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance. Site and architectural control will be exercised over the proposed development by the Planning Commission. No endangered species are known to depend on this site for habitat.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

AESTHETICS (d) The existing use on the property is a single-family home and the new use is a 3 story mixed-use building; therefore; new sources of light will be cast onto adjoining properties. The light will come primarily from the higher story windows on the second and third story levels. With the standard conditions of approval (lighting plan approval prior to building permit issuance) and proposed project mitigation, the project will not create any new significant glare or adversely affect the nighttime views.

The following mitigation measures are proposed:

WHAT: 1) All walkway lighting and security lighting will be down lit and will be kept to less than 6 feet above the ground.

2) No flood lighting or pole mounted lights shall be allowed

3) No lighting from the building will cast across any property lines.

WHEN: These mitigation measures will be converted into conditions of approval for this Special Development Permit prior to its final approval by the City's Planning Commission. The conditions will become valid when the SDP is approved and prior to building permit issuance.

WHO: The property owner will be solely responsible for implementation and maintenance of these mitigation measures.

HOW: The conditions of approval will require these mitigation measures to be incorporated into the construction plans.

IV CULTURAL RESOURCES (a) See Note for IV (b).

IV CULTURAL RESOURCES (b) Staff has no evidence of archaeological resources being located on-site or being found in the immediate vicinity. However, the project scope does include excavation of the site for construction of the proposed building and there may be the potential that the project may uncover yet undiscovered archaeological resources.

The following mitigation measures are proposed:

WHAT: 1)The applicant is responsible for onsite monitoring of project-related construction. In the event that subsurface cultural resources are encountered during approved ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the finds. The discovery or disturbance of any cultural resources shall also be reported to the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) and, if Native American artifacts are found, to the Native American Heritage Commission. Identified cultural resources should be recorded on form DPR 523 (historic properties). Mitigation measures prescribed by these groups and required by the City of Sunnyvale should be undertaken prior to resumption of construction activities.

2) If human remains are found during project grading, work shall halt and the County Coroner shall be informed immediately. If the Coroner determines that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission should be contacted and further actions should be taken in consultation with them.

3) If disturbance of a project area cultural resource cannot be avoided, a mitigation program, including measures set forth in Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, shall be implemented.

WHEN: These mitigation measures will be converted into conditions of approval for this Special Development Permit prior to its final approval by the City's Planning Commission. The conditions will become valid when the SDP is approved and prior to building permit issuance.

WHO: The property owner will be solely responsible for implementation and maintenance of these mitigation measures.

HOW: The conditions of approval will require these mitigation measures to be incorporated into the construction plans.

VII NOISE (a) The project may introduce short-term and temporary additional sources of noise to the project area during construction. Through the City's implementation of the Citywide Design Guidelines and Municipal Code noise regulations, this impact will be lessened to a less than significant level during construction.

The applicant submitted a noise study prepared by Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., (study is on file in the Community Development Department) analyzing the existing exterior noise levels at the site. The study measured the noise levels at the property lines along the South Mathilda Avenue side as well as along the eastern (interior) property line adjacent to the existing multi-family residential developments. The measurement occurred over two, 24-hour period and the results are presented as an average for the day.

According to the noise study, noise levels along Mathilda were the most significant and reached 71bBA over the 24-hour period. To account for a future traffic increase, 1 dBA was added for a total noise level of 72dBA. The noise level along the eastern property line measured 54dBA averaged over the 24-hour period.

When determining if noise generated from adjacent streets are at acceptable levels for a project, the Noise Sub-Element of the General Plan is typically applied to projects. The Sub-Element requires that interior noise levels cannot exceed a maximum 24-hour day/night average sound level of 45dBA when there is an exterior noise level of 60dBA or greater. In this case, the noise level generated from Mathilda reached 71dBA, therefore, the traffic noise needs to be attenuated through standard construction techniques, so that the interior noise level is 45dBA or less. This will be accomplished through standard conditions of approval and project mitigation.

The following mitigation measures are proposed:

WHAT: 1) The residential unit facing S. Mathilda Ave. shall have all windows and doors sound rated to a range of STC 30-33 or greater.

2) All other residential units shall have all windows and doors sound rated to a range of STC 28 or greater.

3) Since all windows and doors are required to be shut to achieve a dBA or 45 or less, ventilation or air conditioning systems must be incorporated to provide a habitable environment for all habitable space.

4) An acoustical consultant shall review the final construction techniques to confirm the mitigation will be sufficient to reduce noise to 45dBA criterion.

WHEN: These mitigation measures will be converted into conditions of approval for this Special Development Permit prior to its final approval by the City's Planning Commission. The conditions will become valid when the SDP is approved and prior to building permit issuance.

WHO: The property owner will be solely responsible for implementation and maintenance of these mitigation measures.

HOW: The conditions of approval will require these mitigation measures to be incorporated into the construction plans.

Circulated On September 1, 2004

Signed: Fred Bell, Principal Planner

Adopted On _____

Verified: _____
Fred Bell, Principal Planner

E11918

File Number: 2004-0139
No. 04-22

Attachment C
Page 5 of 26

California Department of Fish and Game

CERTIFICATE OF FEE EXEMPTION

De Minimis Impact Finding

PROJECT TITLE/LOCATION (INCLUDE COUNTY):

The **Special Development Permit** and **Tentative Map** are located on **560 South Mathilda Avenue**, City of Sunnyvale, County of Santa Clara in a DSP-20 (Downtown Specific Plan/Block 20) Zoning District. APN: 209-29-058

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

2004-0139 – Application for related proposals on a 9,562 square-foot site located at **560 South Mathilda Avenue** in a DSP-20 (Downtown Specific Plan/Block 20) Zoning District. (APN: 209-29-058)

- **Special Development Permit** to allow demolition of an existing single family home and to construct an 8,200 square-foot three story mixed use office and residential building, and
- **Tentative Map** to subdivide one lot into six condominium spaces and one common lot.

FINDINGS OF EXEMPTION:

1. This project is in an urban setting.
2. There is no alteration of land or effect on fish or wildlife.

CERTIFICATION:

I hereby certify that the public agency has made the above finding and that the project will not individually or cumulatively have an adverse effect on wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of the Fish and Game Code.

Fred Bell

Title: Principal Planner, Community Development
Lead Agency: City of Sunnyvale
Date: September 1, 2004

INITIAL STUDY
City of Sunnyvale
Department of Community Development
Planning Division
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707

Project #: **2004-0139 SDP/TM**
Project Address: **560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale**
Applicant: **Miro Design Group**

1. Project Title: Application for a Special Development Permit and Tentative Map on a 9,562 square foot site to demolish an existing single-family home and to construct a 3-story, 1,780 square foot, mixed-use, office and residential building.

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Sunnyvale, Community Development Department, Planning Division

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Steve Lynch 408-730-2723

4. Project Location: 560 South Mathilda Ave.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Miro Design Group, 1895 Dobbin Dr., #102
San Jose, 95133
Contact: Anthony Ho, 408-259-1166

6. General Plan Designation: Downtown Specific Plan

7. Zoning: Existing DSP-20 - Downtown Specific Plan

   : Proposed (same) DSP-20 - Downtown Specific Plan

8. The project consists of a Special Development Permit and Tentative Map applications to allow the construction of an 8,196 square foot mixed-use building. The building will consist of 1 professional office and 5 residential condominium units. The units will be 1, 1-bedroom unit, and 4, 2-bedroom units. Parking for the office and residential units will all be on the ground floor, underneath the two living area floors. The existing single-family home is proposed to be demolished and does not have any historical or architectural significance. The existing parcel will be divided into 6 air-space parcels and one common lot (ground floor parking and landscaping area).

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)
   North: Single-Family Residential
   South: Single-Family Residential
   East: High Density Residential Apartments
   West: Sunnyvale City Offices

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
Page 2

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐	Aesthetics	☐	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐	Public Services
☐	Agricultural Resources	☐	Hydrology/Water Quality	☐	Recreation
☐	Air Quality	☐	Land Use/Planning	☐	Transportation/Traffic
☐	Biological Resources	☐	Mineral Resources	☐	Utilities/Service Systems
☐	Cultural Resources	☐	Noise	☐	Mandatory Findings of Significance
☐	Geology/Soils	☐	Population/Housing		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. **X**

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. ☐

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potential significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required. ☐

Signature 8-30-04 Date

Steve Lynch, Associate Planner City of Sunnyvale *(Lead Agency)*

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
Page 4

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 94
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 94
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	X	☐	2, 94, 101
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	X	☐	☐	2, 94
II. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	3, 97, 100, 111,
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	☐	☐	☐	X	3, 97, 100, 111,
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	X	3, 96, 97, 100, 111,
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	X	62, 63, 111, 112
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	X	111, 112

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
III. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 94, 111, 112, 109
b. Have a substantially adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 94, 111, 112, 109
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 94, 111, 112, 109
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 94, 111, 112, 109
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	X	41, 94, 111, 112
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 41, 94, 111, 112
IV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	☐	X	☐	☐	10, 42, 60, 61, 94, 111
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☐	X	☐	☐	10, 42, 94
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	X	10, 42, 94, 111
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 111, 112

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
V. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:					
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 11, 12, 21, 28
b. Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	X	31, 28, 111
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 41, 94, 111
VI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 94,
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 94
VII. NOISE. Would the project result in:					
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	X	☐	☐	2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	X	☐	2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112
d. A substantially temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	X	☐	2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
VIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:					
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	X	☐	2, 11, 111, 112
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 11, 111, 112,
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 11, 111, 112

IX. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Parks?	☐	☐	X	☐	2, 18, 111, 112
b) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	X	UFC/UBC/SVMC
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 111, 112
d) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	X	1, 2, 111, 112
e) Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	X	26, 65, 66, 103, 104

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
X. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.					
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 10, 26, 42, 59, 60, 61, 111, 112
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	X	☐	1, 2, 111, 112
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	X	111, 112

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
XI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:					
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	X	UBC, UPC, UMC, NEC
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	X	☐	"
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	X	☐	"
(iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	X	"
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	X	"
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	X	☐	"
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-a-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	X	"
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	X	"

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 20, 24, , 87, 88, 89, 90, 111, 112
b) Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 20, 24, 25 , 87, 88, 89, 111, 112
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 20, 24, 25, 87, 88, 89, 111, 112
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 20, 24, 25, 87, 88, 89, 111, 112
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 20, 24, 25, 87, 88, 89, 90, 111, 112
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 22, 90, 111, 112
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 22, 90, 111, 112

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
XIII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:					
a) Cause an increase in the traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	X	☐	2, 12, 71, 75, 76, 77, 111, 112
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	X	☐	2, 71, 75, 76, 77, 80, 84, 111, 112,
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 111, 112, 113
d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 12, 71, 75, 76, 77, 80, 84, 111, 112,
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 111, 112
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 37, 111, 112
g) Conflict with adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 12, 81, 111, 112

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
XIV. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	X	Discussion at end of check-list
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X	UFC/UBC/SVMC
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an exiting or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	X	UFC/UBC/SVMC
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X	UFC/UBC/SVMC
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	X	UFC/UBC/SVMC
f) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	UFC/UBC/SVMC
g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	X	UFC/UBC/SVMC

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
XV. RECREATION. Would the project:					
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	X	☐	2, 18, 111, 112
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	X	☐	2, 18, 111, 112

XVI. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	X	94
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	X	94
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	X	94

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
XVII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112
b) Substantially degrade groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112
e) Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 12, 19, 24, 111, 112
g) Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 19, 24, 111, 112
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 19, 24, 25, 111, 112
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 19, 24, 25, 111, 112
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	X	2, 19, 24, 25, 111, 112

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS THAT ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

I AESTHETICS (c) The City's implementation of the Citywide Design Guidelines and staff's review of final development plans, which will be submitted for final Building Permit review, will ensure that the final design of the project is consistent with the plans reviewed by the Planning Commission. The project will not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. As a result, this impact will be less than significant.

VII NOISE (c) The project will introduce additional sources of noise to the project area both during construction and as an operational aspect of the office and 4 additional housing units. The new use of the property is anticipated to be more intensive at certain times (weekday evenings and weekends) than the existing single-family home, but less intensive at other times (weekday day times). Through the City's implementation of the Citywide Design Guidelines and Municipal Code noise regulations, this impact will be lessened to a less than significant level both during construction and post-construction operation.

VII NOISE (d) The project may introduce short-term and temporary additional sources of noise to the project area during construction. Through the City's implementation of the Citywide Design Guidelines and Municipal Code noise regulations, this impact will be lessened to a less than significant level during construction.

VIII POPULATION AND HOUSING (a) The project will add 4 new residential units to the project site. The project's impact will be a slight incremental beneficial impact to the City's Jobs/Housing balance. As a result, this positive aspect of the project is a less than significant impact.

IX PUBLIC SERVICES (a) The project will generate a very slight increase in the use of existing park facilities, but this impact is less than significant because the project will comply with the City's Park Dedication Fee requirement, which includes a fee of $5,390.55 per unit. The project will generate $21,562.20 for the Citywide acquisition and improvement of park facilities to offset this potential increased use.

X MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE (b) The project will provide additional housing units for the City's housing stock and has cumulative incremental effects, but these effects are not significant based on applicable environmental thresholds, existing facility and system capacities, and/or adopted service levels.

XI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS (a)(ii) The project site is not located in an area with any active faults, but may experience strong seismic ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. Through the City's implementation of the Uniform Building Code requirements for area's with potential for seismic activity this aspect of the project will be reduced to a less than significant level.

XI GEOLOGY AND SOILS (a)(iii) See Note for XI(ii).

XI GEOLOGY AND SOILS (c) See Note for XI(ii).

XIII TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC (a) The Traffic Division of the Public Works Department has determined that the project does not warrant the preparation of a Traffic Study and that the proposed project will not have a significant impact on transportation or traffic because the project will not generate additional peak hour traffic trips.

XIII TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC (b) The Traffic Division of the Public Works Department has determined that the project does not warrant the preparation of a Traffic Study and that the proposed project will not have a significant impact on transportation or traffic because the project density is below the adopted maximum density for the project site that is noted in the General Plan.

XV RECREATION (a) The project will generate a very slight increase in the use of existing park facilities, but this impact is less than significant because the project will comply with the City's Park Dedication Fee requirement, which includes a fee of $5,390.55 per each additional unit. The project will generate $21,562.20 for the Citywide acquisition and improvement of park facilities to offset this potential increased use.

XV RECREATION (b) See Note for XV(a).

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS THAT ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

I AESTHETICS (d) The existing use on the property is a single-family home and the new use is a 3 story mixed-use building; therefore; new sources of light will be cast onto adjoining properties. The light will come primarily from the higher story windows on the second and third story levels. With the standard conditions of approval (lighting plan approval prior to building permit issuance) and proposed project mitigation, the project will not create any new significant glare or adversely affect the nighttime views.

The following mitigation measures are proposed:

WHAT: 1) All walkway lighting and security lighting will be down lit and will be kept to less than 6 feet above the ground.

2) No flood lighting or pole mounted lights shall be allowed

3) No lighting from the building will cast across any property lines.

WHEN: These mitigation measures will be converted into conditions of approval for this Special Development Permit prior to its final approval by the City's Planning Commission. The conditions will become valid when the SDP is approved and prior to building permit issuance.

WHO: The property owner will be solely responsible for implementation and maintenance of these mitigation measures.

HOW: The conditions of approval will require these mitigation measures to be incorporated into the construction plans.

IV CULTURAL RESOURCES (a) See Note for IV (b).

IV CULTURAL RESOURCES (b) Staff has no evidence of archaeological resources being located on-site or being found in the immediate vicinity. However, the project scope does include excavation of the site for construction of the proposed building and there may be the potential that the project may uncover yet undiscovered archaeological resources.

The following mitigation measures are proposed:

WHAT: 1) The applicant is responsible for onsite monitoring of project-related construction. In the event that subsurface cultural resources are encountered during approved ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the finds. The discovery or disturbance of any cultural resources shall also be reported to the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) and, if Native American artifacts are found, to the Native American Heritage Commission. Identified cultural resources should be recorded on form DPR 523 (historic properties). Mitigation measures prescribed by these groups and required by the City of Sunnyvale should be undertaken prior to resumption of construction activities.

2) If human remains are found during project grading, work shall halt and the County Coroner shall be informed immediately. If the Coroner determines that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission should be contacted and further actions should be taken in consultation with them.

3) If disturbance of a project area cultural resource cannot be avoided, a mitigation program, including measures set forth in Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, shall be implemented.

WHEN: These mitigation measures will be converted into conditions of approval for this Special Development Permit prior to its final approval by the City's Planning Commission. The

conditions will become valid when the SDP is approved and prior to building permit issuance.

WHO: The property owner will be solely responsible for implementation and maintenance of these mitigation measures.

HOW: The conditions of approval will require these mitigation measures to be incorporated into the construction plans.

VII NOISE (a) The project may introduce short-term and temporary additional sources of noise to the project area during construction. Through the City's implementation of the Citywide Design Guidelines and Municipal Code noise regulations, this impact will be lessened to a less than significant level during construction.

The applicant submitted a noise study prepared by Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., (study is on file in the Community Development Department) analyzing the existing exterior noise levels at the site. The study measured the noise levels at the property lines along the South Mathilda Avenue side as well as along the eastern (interior) property line adjacent to the existing multi-family residential developments. The measurement occurred over two, 24-hour period and the results are presented as an average for the day. According to the noise study, noise levels along Mathilda were the most significant and reached 71bBA over the 24-hour period. To account for a future traffic increase, 1 dBA was added for a total noise level of 72dBA. The noise level along the eastern property line measured 54dBA averaged over the 24-hour period.

When determining if noise generated from adjacent streets are at acceptable levels for a project, the Noise Sub-Element of the General Plan is typically applied to projects. The Sub-Element requires that interior noise levels cannot exceed a maximum 24-hour day/night average sound level of 45dBA when there is an exterior noise level of 60dBA or greater. In this case, the noise level generated from Mathilda reached 71dBA, therefore, the traffic noise needs to be attenuated through standard construction techniques, so that the interior noise level is 45dBA or less. This will be accomplished through standard conditions of approval and project mitigation.

The following mitigation measures are proposed:

WHAT: 1) The residential unit facing S. Mathilda Ave. shall have all windows and doors sound rated to a range of STC 30-33 or greater.

2) All other residential units shall have all windows and doors sound rated to a range of STC 28 or greater.

3) Since all windows and doors are required to be shut to achieve a dBA or 45 or less, ventilation or air conditioning systems must be incorporated to provide a habitable environment for all habitable space.

Project #: 2004-0139 SDP/TM
Address: 560 S. Mathilda Ave., Sunnyvale
Applicant: Miro Design Group

4) An acoustical consultant shall review the final construction techniques to confirm the mitigation will be sufficient to reduce noise to 45dBA criterion.

WHEN: These mitigation measures will be converted into conditions of approval for this Special Development Permit prior to its final approval by the City's Planning Commission. The conditions will become valid when the SDP is approved and prior to building permit issuance.

WHO: The property owner will be solely responsible for implementation and maintenance of these mitigation measures.

HOW: The conditions of approval will require these mitigation measures to be incorporated into the construction plans.

Completed By: Steve Lynch, Associate Planner **Date: August 17, 2004**

E11918

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST REFERENCE LIST

Note: All references are the most recent version as of the date the initial Study was prepared:

1. **City of Sunnyvale General Plan:**
2. Map
3. Air Quality Sub-Element
4. Community Design Sub-Element
5. Community Participation Sub-Element
6. Cultural Arts Sub-Element
7. Executive Summary
8. Fire Services Sub-Element
9. Fiscal Sub-Element
10. Heritage Preservation Sub-Element
11. Housing & Community Revitalization Sub-Element
12. Land Use & Transportation Sub-Element
13. Law Enforcement Sub-Element
14. Legislative Management Sub-Element
15. Library Sub-Element
16. Noise Sub-Element
17. Open Space Sub-Element.
18. Recreation Sub-Element
19. Safety & Seismic Safety Sub-Element
20. Sanitary Sewer System Sub-Element
21. Socio-Economic Sub-Element
22. Solid Waste Management Sub-Element
23. Support Services Sub-Element
24. Surface Run-off Sub-Element
25. Water Resources Sub-Element

26. **City of Sunnyvale Municipal Code:**
27. Chapter 10
28. Zoning Map
29. Chapter 19.42. Operating Standards
30. Chapter 19.28. Downtown Specific Plan District
31. Chapter 19.18. Residential Zoning Districts
32. Chapter 19.20. Commercial Zoning Districts
33. Chapter 19.22. Industrial Zoning Districts
34. Chapter 19.24. Office Zoning Districts
35. Chapter 19.26. Combining Zoning Districts
36. Chapter 19.28. Downtown Specific Plan
37. Chapter 19.46. Off-Street Parking & Loading
38. Chapter 19.56. Solar Access
39. Chapter 19.66. Affordable Housing
40. Chapter 19.72. Conversion of Mobile Home Parks to Other Uses
41. Chapter 19.94. Tree Preservation
42. Chapter 19.96. Heritage Preservation

Specific Plans

43. El Camino Real Precise Plan
44. Lockheed Site Master Use Permit
45. Moffett Field Comprehensive Use Plan
46. 101 & Lawrence Site Specific Plan
47. Southern Pacific Corridor Plan

Environmental Impact Reports

48. Futures Study Environmental Impact Report
49. Lockheed Site Master Use Permit Environmental Impact Report
50. Tasman Corridor LRT Environmental Impact Study (supplemental)
51. Kaiser Permanente Medical Center Replacement Center Environmental Impact Report (City of Santa Clara)
52. Downtown Development Program Environmental Impact Report
53. Caribbean-Moffett Park Environmental Impact Report
54. Southern Pacific Corridor Plan Environmental Impact Report

Maps

55. City of Sunnyvale Aerial Maps
56. Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FEMA)
57. Santa Clara County Assessors Parcel
58. Utility Maps (50 scale)

Lists/Inventories

59. Sunnyvale Cultural Resources Inventory List
60. Heritage Landmark Designation List
61. Santa Clara County Heritage Resource Inventory
62. Hazardous Waste & Substances Sites List (State of California)
63. List of Known Contaminants in Sunnyvale

Legislation/Acts/Bills/Codes

64. Subdivision Map Act
65. Uniform Fire Code, including amendments

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST REFERENCE LIST

EH918

Note: All references are the most recent version as of the date the initial Study was prepared:

per SMC adoption
66. National Fire Code (National Fire Protection Association)
67. Title 19 California Administrative Code
68. California Assembly Bill 2185/2187 (Waters Bill)
69. California Assembly Bill 3777 (La Follette Bill)
70. Superfund Amendments & Reauthorization Act (SARA) Title III

Transportation
71. California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual
72. California Department of Transportation Traffic Manual
73. California Department of Transportation Standard Plan
74. California Department of Transportation Standard Specification
75. Institute of Transportation Engineers - Trip Generation
76. Institute of Transportation Engineers Transportation and Traffic Engineering Handbook
77. U.S. Dept. of Transportation Federal Highway Admin. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Street and Highways
78. California Vehicle Code
79. Traffic Engineering Theory & Practice by L. J. Pegnataro
80. Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program and Technical Guidelines
81. Santa Clara County Transportation Agency Short Range Transit Plan
82. Santa Clara County Transportation Plan
83. Traffic Volume Studies, City of Sunnyvale Public works Department of Traffic Engineering Division
84. Santa Clara County Sub-Regional Deficiency Plan
85. Bicycle Plan

Public Works
86. Standard Specifications and Details of the Department of Public Works
87. Storm Drain Master Plan
88. Sanitary Sewer Master Plan
89. Water Master Plan
90. Solid Waste Management Plan of Santa Clara County
91. Geotechnical Investigation Reports
92. Engineering Division Project Files
93. Subdivision and Parcel Map Files

Miscellaneous
94. Field Inspection
95. Environmental Information Form
96. Annual Summary of Containment Excesses (BAAQMD)
97. Current Air Quality Data
98. Chemical Emergency Preparedness Program (EPA) Interim Document in 1985?)
99. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Population Projections
100. Bay Area Clean Air Plan
101. City-wide Design Guidelines
102. Industrial Design Guidelines

Building Safety
103. Uniform Building Code, Volume 1, (Including the California Building Code, Volume 1)
104. Uniform Building Code, Volume 2, (Including the California Building Code, Volume 2)
105. Uniform Plumbing Code, (Including the California Plumbing Code)
106. Uniform Mechanical Code, (Including the California Mechanical Code)
107. National Electrical Code (Including California Electrical Code)
108. Title 16 of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code

Additional References
109. USFWS/CA Dept. F&G Special Status Lists
110. Project Traffic Impact Analysis
111. Project Description
112. Project Development Plans
113. Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Plan
114. Federal Aviation Administration