Santa Clara County Clerk–Recorder's Office
State of California

County of Santa Clara

Office of the County Clerk-Recorder
Business Division

County Government Center
70 West Hedding Street, E. Wing, 1st Floor
San Jose, California 95110 (408) 299-5688

L 103933

Document No.: 622
Number of Pages: 27
Filed and Posted On: 12/19/2012
Through: 1/18/2013
CRO Order Number:
Fee Total: 0.00

REGINA ALCOMENDRAS, County Clerk–Recorder
by Esther Duarte, Deputy Clerk–Recorder,

CEQA DOCUMENT DECLARATION

ENVIRONMENTAL FILING FEE RECEIPT

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

1. LEAD AGENCY: City of Saratoga
2. PROJECT TITLE: Update to Safety Element of City of Saratoga General Plan
3. APPLICANT NAME: City of Saratoga PHONE: 408-868-1222
4. APPLICANT ADDRESS: 13777 Fruitvale Avenue Saratoga CA 95070
5. PROJECT APPLICANT IS A: ☒ Local Public Agency ☐ School District ☐ Other Special District ☐ State Agency ☐ Private Entity
6. NOTICE TO BE POSTED FOR 30 DAYS.
7. CLASSIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

a. PROJECTS THAT ARE SUBJECT TO DFG FEES

☐ 1. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE §21152)	$ 2,919.00	$ 0.00
☐ 2. NEGATIVE DECLARATION (PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE §21080(C)	$ 2,101.50	$ 0.00
☐ 3. APPLICATION FEE WATER DIVERSION (STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD ONLY)	$ 850.00	$ 0.00
☐ 4. PROJECTS SUBJECT TO CERTIFIED REGULATORY PROGRAMS	$ 992.50	$ 0.00
☐ 5. COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEE (REQUIRED FOR a-1 THROUGH a-4 ABOVE) Fish & Game Code §711.4(e)	$ 50.00	$ 0.00

b. PROJECTS THAT ARE EXEMPT FROM DFG FEES

☐ 1. NOTICE OF EXEMPTION ($50.00 COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEE REQUIRED)	$ 50.00	$ 0.00
☐ 2. A COMPLETED "CEQA FILING FEE NO EFFECT DETERMINATION FORM" FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME, DOCUMENTING THE DFG'S DETERMINATION THAT THE PROJECT WILL HAVE NO EFFECT ON FISH, WILDLIFE AND HABITAT, OR AN OFFICIAL, DATED RECEIPT / PROOF OF PAYMENT SHOWING PREVIOUS PAYMENT OF THE DFG FILING FEE FOR THE *SAME PROJECT IS ATTACHED ($50.00 COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEE REQUIRED)		
DOCUMENT TYPE: ☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION	$ 50.00	$ 0.00

c. NOTICES THAT ARE *NOT* SUBJECT TO DFG FEES *OR* COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE FEES

☐ NOTICE OF PREPARATION ☒ NOTICE OF INTENT	NO FEE	$ NO FEE

8. OTHER: _____ FEE (IF APPLICABLE): $ _____
9. TOTAL RECEIVED..... $ 0.00

*NOTE: "***SAME PROJECT***" MEANS **NO** CHANGES. IF THE DOCUMENT SUBMITTED IS NOT THE SAME (OTHER THAN DATES), A "NO EFFECT DETERMINATION" LETTER FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR THE **SUBSEQUENT** FILING OR THE APPROPRIATE FEES ARE REQUIRED.

THIS FORM MUST BE COMPLETED AND ATTACHED TO THE FRONT OF ALL CEQA DOCUMENTS LISTED ABOVE (*INCLUDING COPIES*) SUBMITTED FOR FILING. WE WILL NEED AN ORIGINAL (WET SIGNATURE) AND THREE COPIES. *(YOUR ORIGINAL WILL BE RETURNED TO YOU AT THE TIME OF FILING.)*

CHECKS FOR ALL FEES SHOULD BE MADE PAYABLE TO: SANTA CLARA COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER

PLEASE NOTE: FEES ARE ANNUALLY ADJUSTED (Fish & Game Code §711.4(b); PLEASE CHECK WITH THIS OFFICE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR THE LATEST FEE INFORMATION.

". . . NO PROJECT SHALL BE OPERATIVE, VESTED, OR FINAL, NOR SHALL LOCAL GOVERNMENT PERMITS FOR THE PROJECT BE VALID, UNTIL THE FILING FEES REQUIRED PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION ARE PAID." Fish & Game Code §711.4(c)(3)

RECORDING REQUESTED BY

NAME: City of Saratoga

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:

NAME: Cynthia McCormick, Planner, AICP

ADDRESS: 13777 Fruitvale Avenue

CITY / STATE / ZIP: Saratoga CA 95070

(DOCUMENT WILL ONLY BE RETURNED TO NAME & ADDRESS IDENTIFIED ABOVE)

(SPACE ABOVE FOR RECORDER'S USE)

Update to Safety Element of City of Saratoga General Plan

(DOCUMENT TITLE)

SEPARATE PAGE, PURSUANT TO CA. GOV'T. CODE 27361.6

File#: 622 12/19/2012

Community Development Department
City of Saratoga
13777 Fruitvale Avenue
Saratoga, CA 95070

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A INITIAL STUDY/ NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR UPDATE TO THE SAFETY ELEMENT OF THE CITY OF SARATOGA GENERAL PLAN

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: The Safety Element is a mandatory element of the General Plan required by SB 351, an act which became law on February 23, 1971. Originally addressed in two separate elements of the General Plan, the Safety Element and Seismic Safety Element were combined into one element, the Safety Element, under California Government Code Article 5-65302 (1986). This update is intended to supersede the existing Safety Element of the Saratoga General Plan adopted on October 7, 1987.

The purpose of the General Plan Safety Element is to identify any natural or human activity-related hazards that exist in Saratoga and define measures to address them. Some naturally occurring hazards may be unavoidable, but the potential impact on Saratoga can be reduced through advance planning and preparation. Thus, the Safety Element addresses geologic, seismic, flood, and fire hazards and hazards created by human activity such as hazardous materials and incidents that call for emergency protection. The Safety Element describes the City's efforts to prepare for and respond to emergencies.

As part of this update, the City has initiated minor revisions to the existing goals and policies from the 1987 General Plan Safety Element. These revisions range from minor grammatical edits, changes reflecting new and/or changes in existing regulatory requirements, or new processes in place since the previous element was prepared and adopted. However, these edits would not materially affect the physical environment, nor result in any new environmental impacts not already contemplated as part of the City's General Plan EIR, as they are designed to reduce or eliminate potential hazards and promote safe construction practices within potentially hazardous areas of the City.

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: The Public Review period for the Negative Declaration ends on January 18, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. Comments should be forwarded to:

City of Saratoga - Community Development Department
Attn: Cynthia McCormick, Planner
13777 Fruitvale Avenue, Saratoga, CA 95070

DATE/TIME PLACE OF PUBLIC HEARING:
The Planning Commission will review the update to the Safety Element during a public hearing tentatively scheduled for January 23, 2013.

Ale #-622 12-19-2012

COPIES AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW:

The Initial Study and proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, as well as the draft Safety Element, are available for public review at the Community Development Department at the City of Saratoga City Hall located at 13777 Fruitvale Avenue, Saratoga, CA, 95070 during normal business hours.

Pkt #622 12-19-12

Environmental Initial Study and Negative Declaration

For:

City of Saratoga General Plan Safety Element Update

Public Review Period:

December 19, 2012 to January 18, 2013

Agenda 622 12-19-2012

This page was intentionally left blank

❖

File #622 12-19-2012

1. Project title: General Plan Safety Element Update

2. Lead agency name and address: City of Saratoga; Planning Division
   13777 Fruitvale Avenue; Saratoga, CA 95070

3. Contact person and phone number: Cynthia McCormick AICP, Planner
   (408) 868-1230

4. Project location: City of Saratoga

5. Project sponsor name and address: City of Saratoga; Planning Division

6. General plan designation: Not applicable.

7. Zoning: Not applicable.

8. Description of Project: The Safety Element is a mandatory element of the General Plan required by SB 351, an act which became law on February 23, 1971. Originally addressed in two separate elements of the General Plan, the Safety Element and Seismic Safety Element were combined into one element, the Safety Element, under California Government Code Article 5-65302 (1986). This update is intended to supersede the existing Safety Element of the Saratoga General Plan adopted on October 7, 1987.

   The purpose of the General Plan Safety Element is to identify any natural or human activity-related hazards that exist in Saratoga and define measures to address them. Some naturally occurring hazards may be unavoidable, but the potential impact on Saratoga can be reduced through advance planning and preparation. Thus, the Safety Element addresses geologic, seismic, flood, and fire hazards and hazards created by human activity such as hazardous materials and incidents that call for emergency protection. The Safety Element describes the City's efforts to prepare for and respond to emergencies.

   As part of this update, the City has initiated minor revisions to the existing goals and policies from the 1987 General Plan Safety Element. These revisions range from minor grammatical edits, changes reflecting new and/or changes in existing regulatory requirements, or new processes in place since the previous element was prepared and adopted. However, these edits would not materially affect the physical environment, nor result in any new environmental impacts not already contemplated as part of the City's General Plan EIR, as they are designed to reduce or eliminate potential hazards and promote safe construction practices within potentially hazardous areas of the City.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:
   The City of Saratoga is located in the westerly portion of Santa Clara County just southwest of the major metropolitan community of San Jose and approximately 35 miles south of San Francisco. Saratoga is found at the southerly end of the San Francisco peninsula.

Pl#622 12-19-2012

The north, south and easterly portions of the community are sited on a historic alluvial plain shared with the adjacent communities of Cupertino, San Jose, Los Gatos and Monte Sereno. The westerly portion occupies low-lying foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountains and is adjacent to unincorporated areas within Santa Clara County.

Major regional access to the community is provided by State Route 85 (SR-85), a six-lane freeway linking to US 280 in Cupertino and US 101 to the north in Mountain View, US 101 south in San Jose, and to SR 17 to north San Jose and southwest to Santa Cruz County. Local roadways linking Saratoga to surrounding communities include Saratoga-Los Gatos Road, Saratoga Avenue, Highway 9 and Saratoga- Sunnyvale Road.

10. Other public agencies whose review is required
    a. California Geological Survey
    b. Santa Clara County Geologist

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the checklist beginning on page 7 for additional information.

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

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

X	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.
☐	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 "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
☐	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required

Signature: Cynthia McCormick	**Date:** 12-18-12
Printed Name: Cynthia McCormick	**For:**

File# 622-12-19-2012

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: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than 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 XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiring, 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 explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

File #622-12-9-2012

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-d) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or fundamentally change an area within the City. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely.

The 1981 General Plan EIR identified significant impacts to aesthetics that would occur as a result of changes to the viewshed, these impacts were previously analyzed in the EIR. Adoption and implementation of the updated Safety Element goals and policies would not adversely affect scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, or create light/glare because it would not result in development of a specific site or area within the City. In addition, the Open Space and Conservation Element of the Saratoga General Plan provides an inventory of the scenic resources and identifies goals and policies for the protection and preservation of these resources, which does not conflict with the proposed update. No new impacts not already considered in the 1981 EIR would be generated as a result of this update to the Safety Element.

Based on the above discussion, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Aesthetics.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan, existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan and the 1981 General Plan EIR).

File # 622-12-12

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-e) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or change areas of the City designated for agriculture or forestry uses. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely.

According to the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan, Saratoga contains a number of agricultural sites of varying sizes, including agricultural lands that are currently under Williamson Act contracts. The Open Space and Conservation Element identifies and analyzes these resources and provides goals and policies for their protection and preservation. In addition, the General Plan Land Use Element identifies hillside and open space related land uses, which are intended to preserve the steeper areas of the City adjacent to forested areas within unincorporated Santa Clara County. Adoption of the General Plan Safety Element goals and policies would not result in changes to areas designated for agriculture or forestry uses and are consistent with the Open Space and Conservation Element.

Based on the above discussion, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Agricultural and Forest Resources.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

Pile #622-12-EI-2012

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	X
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
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-e) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or have any effect on the implementation of air quality plans. Significant air quality impacts resulting from construction activities, construction vehicles, and an increase in the amount of traffic were analyzed in the 1981 General Plan EIR. This analysis would not be altered by this update to the Safety Element and no new air quality impacts would be generated. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would not adversely affect air quality because it would not result in development of a specific site or area within the City.

Based on the above discussion, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Air Quality.

(Sources: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan, the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan, 1981 General Plan EIR, and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines)

Agenda 622 12-19-2012

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	X
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
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-f) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or have any effect on areas designated for the protection of biological or natural resources. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would not adversely affect listed species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, or protected wetlands because development of a specific site or area within the City would not occur. In addition, the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Saratoga General Plan includes a discussion of wildlife and plant species within Saratoga and its Sphere of Influence and provides goals and policies for the protection and preservation of these resources. Adoption of the goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element would be consistent with the Open Space and Conservation Element.

No mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Biological Resources.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

File #622 12-19-2012

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-d) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or have any effect on areas designated for the protection of cultural, architectural, historical, paleontological, or archeological resources. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would not result in the disturbance of known significant historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources; and would not result in the disturbance of known sites with human remains.

No mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Cultural Resources.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

Aleth622 12-19-2012

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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
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 18-1-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

DISCUSSION:

a-e) The General Plan Safety Element provides an inventory and generalized mapping of natural and man-made hazards (landslides, unstable soils, faults, etc...) within the City. The mapping indicates that areas of the City and Sphere of Influence may be subject to geologic and seismic hazards. The 1981 General Plan EIR identified significant geological impacts could result from groundshaking and poorly consolidated soils. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely.

Adoption and implementation of the General Plan Safety Element would reduce the exposure of people and/ or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving geologic instability and seismic-related activity. Implementation of the goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element, along with adherence to existing rules and regulations (California Building Code, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems, etc...) would continue to minimize impacts associated with soil erosion or loss of topsoil, and prevent the placement of structures on unstable soils. The analysis provided in the 1981 General Plan EIR remains consistent with this update and no additional geological impacts would be generated. As a result impacts associated with geology and soils are anticipated to be further reduced with adoption and implementation of these goals and policies.

No mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Geology and Soils.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

Filed 622 12-19-2012

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
An assessment of the greenhouse gas emissions and climate change is included in the body of environmental document. While Caltrans has included this good faith effort in order to provide the public and decision-makers as much information as possible about the project, it is Caltrans determination that in the absence of further regulatory or scientific information related to GHG emissions and CEQA significance, it is too speculative to make a significance determination regarding the project's direct and indirect impact with respect to climate change. Caltrans does remain firmly committed to implementing measures to help reduce the potential effects of the project. These measures are outlined in the body of the environmental document.				
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-b) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site, nor does it propose any actions that would conflict or have any other affect on the implementation of existing plans or policies intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies will not generate greenhouse gas emissions within the City.

Therefore, based on the discussion above, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

Filed 1022 12-19-2012

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	X
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
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
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-h) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or have any effect on areas of the City. The General Plan Safety Element provides generalized mapping and information pertaining to hazardous materials, wildland fire threats, and emergency evacuation. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies is anticipated to reduce potential exposure of people and/ or structures to substantial adverse effects involving hazardous materials, wildland fires, and/ or emergency situations.

Therefore, based on the discussion above, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

Pleth 622 12-4-2012

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

DISCUSSION:

a-j) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or fundamentally change an area within the City. The General Plan Safety Element provides generalized mapping and information regarding flooding impact potential and impacts associated with dam failure. The policies and actions in the General Plan Safety Element are designed to protect people and structures in the City of Saratoga from flooding hazards, control erosion and sedimentation, and protect water quality. The 1981 General Plan EIR determined that stormwater runoff would result in a significant impact due to an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces within the City. These findings would not be affected by this update to the Safety Element and no new impacts would be generated. Adoption and implementation of the Safety Element goals and policies would reduce exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from flood hazards, would not violate adopted water quality or wastewater standards, would not alter existing drainage patterns, or exceed planned flows of stormwater runoff for drainage systems.

Based on the above discussion, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Hydrology and Water Quality Resources.

(Sources: Review of the project, FEMA Flood Hazard Mapping) (Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

File #622 12-19-2012

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	X
b)Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-c) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site, fundamentally change an area within the City, or require any revisions to zoned density or land use designation for any parcel. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would not physically divide an established community and would not conflict with any established land use plan, policy, or regulation which was adopted for the purpose of mitigation or avoiding an environmental impact.

Therefore, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Land Use and Planning.

(Sources: Review of the project, Saratoga Municipal Code, Saratoga General) (Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

File# 622-12-EI-2012

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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
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

DISCUSSION:

a-b) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site and does not propose any actions that would result in a loss of availability of a known or locally-important mineral resource. Currently there are no known mines or quarries operating in Saratoga or its Sphere of Influence. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. The adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would not impact a known or locally-important mineral resource.

In addition, the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Saratoga General Plan includes a discussion of the mineral resources within the Saratoga vicinity (primarily sandstone and shale). Adoption and implementation of the General Plan Safety Element goals and policies would be consistent with the Open Space and Conservation Element.

Therefore, based on the discussion above, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Mineral Resources.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

Pleth622 12-11-2012

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-d) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site and does not propose any actions that would increase current noise levels. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would not result in activities that would generate noise levels in excess of established standards in the General Plan.

The 1981 General Plan EIR found that significant noise impacts would result from an increase in the amount of traffic. The analysis conducted in the General Plan EIR remains consistent with this update to the Safety Element and no additional noise impacts would be generated. In addition, the Saratoga General Plan Noise Element provides an inventory and map of existing noise sources and noise sensitive locations, which is consistent with the proposed General Plan Safety Element update.

Therefore, based on the discussion above, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to Noise impacts.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan, existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan, and 1981 General Plan EIR).

Packet 22 12-19-2012

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-c) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or fundamentally change an area within the City and therefore would not result in City population growth. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would not induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly, and would not displace existing housing or substantial numbers of people.

Therefore, based on the discussion above, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Population and Housing.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

File #622 12-19-2012

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	X
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	X
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	X
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	X
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any projects or actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or fundamentally change an area of the City, therefore public facilities related to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public services would not be required to expand. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. The Safety Element goals and policies require the installation of early warning fire alarm systems within single family residences, multi-family residences, and commercial structures, and the continued enforcement of existing regulations for wildland-urban interface areas would improve the Fire Department's ability to respond to fire situations and reduce potential fire hazards in areas of the City most susceptible to fire.

The 1981 General Plan EIR identified significant impacts to public services would be generated due to an increase in number of residential units. These impacts were analyzed in the General Plan EIR and would not change as a result of this update to the Safety Element. Adoption and implementation of the Safety Element goals and policies is intended to assist public services, such as fire and police during emergency events due to the improved information and goals and policies established to protect residents and businesses within Saratoga. No new impacts would be generated as a result of the update to the Safety Element that were not previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

Therefore, based on the discussion above, no mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Public Services.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan, existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan and the 1981 General Plan EIR).

File#622 12-19-2012

XV. RECREATION:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-b) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or fundamentally change an area within the City and would not have a negative impact on the availability of recreation facilities or parks. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would not result in greater demand for recreational facilities and parks. In addition, these goals and policies do not conflict with the Saratoga Open Space and Conservation Element, which includes a list of parks and recreation areas and provides goals and policies to ensure that parks and trails are developed, protected, and preserved.

No mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Recreation.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).

File #622 12-19-2012

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	X
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
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-f) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or fundamentally change an area within the City and would not have a negative impact on traffic. The Circulation and Scenic Highway Element of the City of Saratoga General Plan addresses all modes of travel and provides goals and policies to guide the development and maintenance of the transportation system. The 1981 General Plan EIR identified significant impacts would result from an increase in traffic. These impacts were analyzed in the General Plan EIR and would not be affected by this update to the Safety Element.

The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. An important aspect of the element is community evacuation in response to an emergency/ disaster event. The General Plan Safety Element provides recommended evacuation routes, which indicate the preferred routes of movement that should be followed in order to accommodate safe and efficient evacuation of residents and businesses. These routes are designed to relocate people within the City from hazardous areas to safer locations during an emergency event. Through the use and promotion of these evacuation routes, City residents and businesses are better informed and prepared to evacuate using these specified routes, which will relocate them away from hazardous areas. If a larger proportion of residents and businesses within the City understand and use these routes, then first responder agencies (Police and Fire) will spend less time assisting in evacuation efforts and be able to dedicate more resources to emergency response efforts associated with the disaster situation. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would have a positive impact on traffic and circulation during an emergency event.

No mitigation is necessary or required in relation to Transportation and Traffic.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan, and the 1981 General Plan EIR).

File #622 12-19-2012

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	X
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
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-g) This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site, fundamentally change an area within the City, and would not have a negative impact on utilities or service systems. The 1981 General Plan EIR identified significant impacts to public services and utilities would result due to an increase in number of residential units. These impacts were analyzed in the General Plan EIR and remain consistent with this update to the Safety Element. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would result in fewer physical impacts to existing utilities and/or service systems, since additional requirements in high hazard areas would be required. Through compliance of these additional requirements, (pipes with flexible joints, hazard setbacks, etc...) utilities within certain areas of Saratoga would be more resilient to disaster and hazard events. No impacts would be generated by this update to the Safety Element that were not already considered in the 1981 General Plan EIR.

No mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts on Utilities and Service Systems.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan, existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan and the 1981 General Plan EIR).

Pleff 622 12/9/2012

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, substantially 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
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a-c) The proposed project, the update to the Saratoga General Plan Safety Element will not have significant new impacts on the environment or cumulative impacts on the environment. The goals and policies within the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction within potentially hazardous areas of the City is implemented safely. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies will not require any changes to existing zoning or general plan designations for parcels within the City limits or Sphere of Influence. No Impacts are anticipated.

No mitigation is necessary or required in relation to impacts associated with Mandatory Findings of Significance.

(Source: review of the proposed Safety Element Update of the Saratoga General Plan and the existing elements of the Saratoga General Plan).