Print Form

Form F

Sample Summary for Electronic Document Submittal

15 copies of this document may be included when a Lead Agency is submitting electronic copies of environmental impact reports, negative declarations, mitigated negative declarations, or notices of preparation to the SCH. The SCH will still accept other summaries, such as an EIR summary prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, attached to the electronic copies of the document.

SCH # 2018102020

Lead Agency: City of San Jose

Project Title: Amendment to Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport Master Plan

Project Location: City of San Jose (*City*) County of Santa Clara (*County*)

Please provide a Project Decription (Proposed Actions, location, and/or consequences).

The proposed Project consists of a major amendment to the approved Airport Master Plan. The proposed amendment would modify the Airport Master Plan in the following primary categories:

- Modify certain components of the airfield to reduce the potential for runway incursions

- Update the aviation demand forecasts and shift the horizon year from 2027 to 2037

- Modify future facilities requirements at the Airport to reflect updated demand forecasts

A detailed description of the proposed project can be found in Section 3.0 of the Draft EIR.

Please identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

See attached list of impacts and mitigation measures.

If applicable, please describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

The City held a public scoping meeting on January 14, 2019 to discuss the Project and solicit public input as to the scope and contents of this EIR. At that meeting, as well as in several written comments received by the City in response to the EIR Notice of Preparation, noise-related concerns were raised by the City of Palo Alto, as well as a number of residents that live in northwest Santa Clara County within the cities of Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Mountain View, and Palo Alto. The specific concern was whether the proposed Project would result in significant noise impacts to those communities in light of recent flight track modifications associated with the FAA's NextGen program and in light of aircraft overflights associated with other Bay Area airports. airports. As discussed in Section 4.13 Noise of the Draft EIR, the Project would not result in a significant noise impact in those communities.

Please provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table S-1 presents the impact conclusions for each of the subject areas evaluated in this EIR. Table S-2 includes a summary of the significant impacts discussed within the body of this EIR and identifies mitigation measures to avoid or reduce those impacts. For a complete description of impacts and mitigation measures, refer to the text in Section 4 of the EIR.

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project

Impact Category	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Significant Unavoidable Impact
Aesthetics		◙		
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	◙			
Air Quality				◙
Biological Resources			◙	
Cultural Resources			◙	
Energy		◙		
Geology and Soils		◙		
Greenhouse Gas Emissions				◙
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			◙	
Hydrology and Water Quality		◙		
Land Use and Planning		◙		
Mineral Resources	◙			
Noise		◙		
Population and Housing		◙		
Public Services		◙		
Recreation	◙			
Transportation		◙		
Tribal Cultural Resources		◙		
Utilities and Service Systems		◙		
Wildfire	◙			
Growth Inducement		◙		

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures	
Significant Impact	**Mitigation and Avoidance Measures**
AIR QUALITY	
Impact AIR-1: Due to significant emissions of NO_x and PM_{10}, the Project would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan.	Although the Project includes mitigation measures (refer to MM AIR-2.1 through MM AIR-2.5) and other emissions reduction measures (refer to Table 4.3-5) to reduce emissions to the extent feasible, the Project would result in significant emissions of NO_x and PM_{10}. The Project, therefore, would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan. **CONCLUSION: SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACT**
Impact AIR-2: The project would result in significant NO_x emissions related to construction and significant NO_x and PM_{10} emissions related to operation.	**Construction Mitigation Measures:** **MM AIR-2.1:** All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower used in construction projects at the Airport shall have engines that meet Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards. The City's Director of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement (or his/her designee) may waive this requirement if presented with documentation that demonstrates that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an engine meeting Tier 4 Final emission standards is not regionally available. **MM AIR-2.2:** Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The contractor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese, in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the 2-minute idling limit. **MM AIR-2.3:** The contractor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications. **MM AIR-2.4:** Before starting onsite ground disturbance, demolition, or construction activities, the contractor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to the City's Director of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement (or his/her designee) for review and approval. The plan shall demonstrate how the contractor will meet the requirements of MM AIR-2.1. The plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required. The description may include, but is not limited to, equipment type, equipment manufacturer, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used. The Airport shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Construction Emissions Minimization Plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The plan shall include a certification statement that the contractor agrees to comply fully with the plan. The contractor shall make the Construction Emissions Minimization Plan available to the public for review onsite during working hours. The contractor shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the plan for the project

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact	Mitigation and Avoidance Measures
	at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the plan. The contractor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way. **Operational Mitigation Measure:** **MM AIR-2.5:** A minimum of 10 percent of the total number of spaces provided in the proposed short- and long-term parking garages (Projects T-4 and T-8, respectively) will be designed and constructed for electric vehicle charging capability. Even with implementation of mitigation measures MM AIR-2.1 through MM AIR-2.5 and other emissions reduction measures (refer to Table 4.3-5) to reduce emissions to the extent feasible, the project would result in significant NO_x emissions during construction and significant NO_x and PM_{10} emissions during operation. **CONCLUSION: SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACT**
Impact AIR-C: The Project would result in cumulatively considerable contributions to significant NO_x impacts during construction and significant NO_x and PM_{10} impacts during operation.	Even with implementation of mitigation measures MM AIR-2.1 through MM AIR-2.5 and other emissions reduction measures (refer to Table 4.3-5) to reduce emissions to the extent feasible, the project would result in cumulatively considerable contributions to significant NO_x impacts during construction and significant NO_x and PM_{10} impacts during operation. **CONCLUSION: SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE CUMULATIVE IMPACT**
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	
Impact BIO-1: If determined to be present, the Project could have a substantial adverse effect on the Congdon's tarplant.	**MM BIO-1.1:** Pre-Activity Surveys. No more than five years prior to initial ground disturbance for any part of the Project that impacts ruderal grassland at the airfield, Fuel Farm, and VOR site, a focused survey for Congdon's tarplant shall be conducted within the project footprint and a 50-foot buffer around the project footprint during the appropriate blooming period (May – November, inclusive). This buffer may be increased by the qualified plant ecologist depending on site-specific conditions and activities planned in the areas but must be at least 50 feet wide. Situations for which a greater buffer may be required include proximity to proposed activities expected to generate large volumes of dust, such as grading; potential for project activities to alter hydrology supporting habitat for the species; or proximity to proposed structures that may shade areas farther than 50 feet away. Surveys are to be conducted in a year with near-average or above-average precipitation, based on National Weather Service data for San Jose. The purpose of the survey would be to assess the presence or absence of Congdon's tarplant. If the target species is not found in the impact area or the identified buffer, then no further mitigation would be warranted. If Congdon's tarplant individuals are found in the impact area or identified, then MM BIO-1.2 and MM BIO-1.3 would be implemented. The survey will be submitted for review and approval by the City's Director of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement or his/her designee. Surveys for Congdon's tarplant may be conducted over large areas simultaneously (rather than having to be conducted prior to each individual project), but surveys for a particular project area must be performed within five years prior to the start of construction for that project to be valid.

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact	Mitigation and Avoidance Measures
	MM BIO-1.2: Avoidance Buffers. To the extent feasible, and in consultation with a qualified plant ecologist, the City would design and construct the Project to completely avoid impacts on all populations of Congdon's tarplant within the project footprints or within the identified buffers of the impact areas. Avoided Congdon's tarplant populations would be protected by establishing and observing the identified buffer between plant populations and the impact area. All such populations located in the impact area or the identified buffer, and their associated designated avoidance areas, would be clearly depicted on any construction plans. In addition, prior to initial ground disturbance or vegetation removal, the limits of the identified buffer around special-status plants to be avoided would be marked in the field (e.g., with flagging, fencing, paint, or other means appropriate for the site in question). This marking would be maintained intact and in good condition throughout project-related construction activities. If complete avoidance is not feasible and more than 10% of a population (by occupied area or individuals) would be impacted as determined by a qualified plant ecologist, MM BIO-1.3 would be implemented. **MM BIO-1.3:** Preserve and Manage Mitigation Populations. If avoidance of Congdon's tarplant is not feasible and more than 10% of the population would be impacted, compensatory mitigation would be provided via the preservation, enhancement, and management of occupied habitat for the species, or the creation and management of a new population. To compensate for impacts on Congdon's tarplant, off-site habitat occupied by the affected species would be preserved and managed in perpetuity at a minimum 1:1 mitigation ratio (at least one plant preserved for each plant affected, and at least one occupied acre preserved for each occupied acre affected), for any impact over the 10% significance threshold. Alternately, seed from the population to be impacted may be harvested and used either to expand an existing population (by a similar number/occupied area to compensate for impacts to Condgon's tarplant beyond the 10% significance threshold) or establish an entirely new population in suitable habitat. The compensation area could be within the Airport grounds, for example within one of the burrowing owl mitigation sites, or off-site. Additional criteria for the identification of suitable mitigation sites, success criteria for the mitigation, and mitigation management criteria are listed in Section 6.1.2 of Appendix E. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**
Impact BIO-2: If determined to be present, the Project could have a substantial adverse effect on nesting birds.	**MM BIO-2.1:** Avoidance and Inhibition of Nesting. Construction and tree removal/pruning activities shall be scheduled to avoid the nesting season. Tree removal and/or pruning shall be completed before the start of the nesting season to help preclude nesting. The nesting season for most birds and raptors in the San Francisco Bay Area extends from February 1 through August 31. **MM BIO-2.2:** Preconstruction Survey(s). If it is not possible to schedule construction activities during the period of September 1 through January 31, then a qualified ornithologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for nesting raptors and other migratory birds within on-site trees as well as all trees within 250 feet of the site to identify active bird nests that may be disturbed during project construction. This survey shall be completed no more than fourteen days

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact	Mitigation and Avoidance Measures
	prior to the initiation of demolition/construction activities (including tree removal and pruning). During this survey, the ornithologist shall inspect all trees and other possible nesting habitats in and immediately adjacent to the construction areas for nests. If the survey does not identify any nesting birds that would be affected by construction activities, no further mitigation is required. If an active nest is found sufficiently close to work areas to be disturbed by these activities, the ornithologist (in consultation with CDFW) shall designate a construction-free buffer zone to be established around the nest to ensure that no nests of species protected by the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code would be disturbed during construction activities. The buffer shall remain in place until a qualified ornithologist has determined that the nest is no longer active. **MM BIO-2.3:** Reporting. A final report on nesting birds and raptors, including survey methodology, survey date(s), map of identified active nests (if any), and protection measures (if required), shall be submitted and approved by the City's Director of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement or his/her designee prior to the start of grading. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**
Impact BIO-3: If determined to be present, the Project could have a substantial adverse effect on roosting bats.	**MM BIO-3.1:** Conduct Pre-Activity Surveys for Roosting Bats. A Pre-activity survey for roosting bats shall be conducted prior to any removal or renovation of hangar buildings with metal siding or buildings with closed areas such as an attic space, particularly those that are unoccupied. No pre-activity survey is required for buildings without attics or metal siding. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified bat biologist. If no active roosts are found, then no further action is warranted. If a roost is present, a qualified bat biologist shall determine the species and number of individuals present. **MM BIO-3.2:** Avoid Disturbance of Active Roosts. If an occupied roost is found in a structure that would be disturbed or removed by proposed activities, the Project may be redesigned to avoid the disturbance of the structure. If the roost is unoccupied at the time of the survey, the Airport may choose to install bat exclusion devices to prevent bats from taking up occupancy of the structure prior to the onset of the proposed activity. If avoidance is not feasible, MM BIO-3.3 and MM BIO-3.4 shall be implemented. **MM BIO-3.3:** Avoid Disturbance of Maternity Roosts. If an active maternity roost is present within the building to be demolished and the Project cannot be redesigned to avoid removal or disturbance of the occupied roost, disturbance shall not take place during the maternity season (as determined by the qualified bat biologist, but roughly Mar 15 to Aug 31), and an appropriate disturbance-free buffer zone (also determined by the qualified bat biologist) shall be observed during this period to avoid disturbing the roosting bats. **MM BIO-3.4:** Exclude Bats Prior to Disturbance. If disturbance of an active non-breeding roost cannot be avoided, the individuals shall be safely evicted outside the maternity season (as determined by the qualified bat biologist) between approximately August 1 and March 15. Bats may be evicted through exclusion after notifying the CDFW. Exclusion methods may include the

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact	Mitigation and Avoidance Measures
	installation of one-way doors and/or use of ultrasonic deterrence devices. One-way doors and/or deterrence devices should be left in place for a minimum of two weeks with a minimum of five fair-weather nights with no rainfall and temperatures no colder than 50°F. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**
Impact BIO-4: The Project would have a substantial adverse effect on the burrowing owl.	**MM BIO-4.1:** Provide Compensatory Mitigation for Permanent Impacts on Burrowing Owl Nesting Habitat. Compensatory mitigation shall be provided for permanent loss of 32.4 acres of occupied burrowing owl nesting habitat, as well as for the degradation of the remaining 83.4 acres of nesting and roosting habitat at the airfield and the expected increase in annual mortality of burrowing owls due to collisions with aircraft following Amendment implementation. Compensatory mitigation shall be provided via the payment of VHP burrowing owl fees for all 32.4 acres of direct, permanent impacts on occupied habitat. Because the Airport is located within the Habitat Plan area, even though airport improvement projects are not considered "covered activities" under the Habitat Plan, the payment of Habitat Plan burrowing owl fees would be appropriate in lieu of providing on-site and/or off-site mitigation. This mitigation approach would be consistent with the Voluntary Fee Payments Policy of the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency, which states that such voluntary burrowing owl fees paid as mitigation "will be applied toward burrowing owl management agreements, burrowing owl habitat management and monitoring, as well as burrowing owl habitat restoration and land acquisition." Payment of the full, per-acre Habitat Plan burrowing owl fee for all 32.4 acres of direct permanent impacts would satisfy MM BIO-4.1. Compensatory mitigation for impacts to burrowing owls (i.e., payment of VHP burrowing owl fees) may be phased in accordance with phasing of impacts, so that the amount of mitigation provided equals or exceeds that required based on the acreage of impacts. However, compensatory mitigation for impacts to a certain acreage of burrowing owl habitat must be implemented prior to those impacts occurring. **MM BIO-4.2:** Update and Implement the BOMP. The existing BOMP was developed based on 1997 site conditions and owl management and monitoring methodologies. To improve management for burrowing owls at the Airport, the Airport will implement the following updates to Section 3.2 of the BOMP: • Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Burrowing Owls. The existing BOMP requires preconstruction surveys for burrowing owls and suitable owl burrows prior to ground-disturbing activities, with one survey occurring during the prior fall/winter season and one survey occurring within 30 days of the start of construction. However, if the preconstruction survey is conducted 30 days in advance of the proposed activity, there is some potential for owls to change locations between the survey and the activity and potentially occur within the ground disturbance area, or close enough to this area to be disturbed by the activity. In order to ensure that take avoidance measures are successful, the BOMP will be updated to require preconstruction surveys to be conducted per Habitat Plan survey requirements for take avoidance, which represent the latest methodology that is accepted by resource agencies.

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact	Mitigation and Avoidance Measures
	Preconstruction surveys for burrowing owls would be conducted prior to the initiation of all Project construction activities within suitable burrowing owl nesting and roosting habitat (i.e., ruderal grassland habitat with burrows of California ground squirrels) at the airfield, or within 250 feet of this habitat. During the initial site visit, a qualified biologist would survey the entire activity area and (to the extent that access allows) areas within 250 feet by walking transects with centerlines no more than 50 feet apart and ensure complete visual coverage and looking for suitable burrows that could be used by burrowing owls for nesting or roosting. If no suitable burrowing owl habitat (i.e., ruderal grasslands with burrows of California ground squirrels) is present, no additional surveys are required. If suitable burrows are determined to be present within 250 feet of the work area, a qualified biologist would conduct a minimum of two additional surveys to determine whether owls are present in areas where they could be affected by proposed activities. The surveys would last a minimum of three hours, beginning one hour before sunrise and continuing until 2 hours after sunrise or beginning 2 hours before sunset and continuing until 1 hour after sunset. Additional time may be required if the work area is very large. The first survey may occur up to 14 days prior to the start of construction activities in any given area, and the final survey would be conducted within two days prior to the start of construction activities. • Implement Buffer Zones for Burrowing Owls. The existing BOMP does not include the option to maintain disturbance-free buffers around active owl burrows (rather, the eviction of owls from burrows within and near work areas is assumed). This measure will minimize project impacts on owls by providing the option to avoid owl burrows, rather than requiring the eviction of any owls that may be present near work areas. If burrowing owls are detected during the pre-activity survey, a 250-foot buffer, within which no newly initiated construction-related activities would be permissible, would be maintained between construction activities and occupied burrows. Owls present between February 1 and August 31 would be assumed to be nesting, and the 250-foot protected area would remain in effect until August 31. • Monitor Owls During Construction. If maintaining a 250-foot buffer around active owl burrows is not feasible, the buffer may be reduced if (1) the nest is not disturbed, and (2) the City develops an avoidance, minimization, and monitoring plan that would be reviewed and approved by CDFW and USFWS prior to project commencement. The plan would include the following measures: o A qualified biologist would monitor the owls for at least three days prior to construction as well as during construction. o If the biologist observes no change in the owls' nesting and foraging behavior, construction activities may proceed. o If changes in the owls' behaviors as a result of work activities are observed, activities would cease within 250 feet of the active burrow location(s). Work activities may resume when the burrows are no longer occupied. If monitoring indicates that the burrow is no longer in use by owls, the disturbance-free buffer may be removed.

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures	
Significant Impact	**Mitigation and Avoidance Measures**
	• Passive Relocation[3]. If construction activities would directly impact occupied burrows, a qualified biologist would passively evict owls from burrows during the non-nesting season (September 1 to January 31). No burrowing owls would be evicted during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) except with CDFW's concurrence that evidence demonstrates that nesting is not actively occurring (e.g., because the owls have not yet begun nesting early in the season, or because the young have already fledged late in the season). Eviction would occur through the use of one-way doors inserted into the occupied burrow and all burrows within impact areas that are within 250 feet of the occupied burrow (to prevent occupation of other burrows that would be impacted). One-way doors would be installed by a qualified biologist and left in place for at least 48 hours before they are removed. The burrows would then be backfilled to prevent re- occupation. Although relocation of owls may be necessary to avoid the direct injury or mortality of owls during construction, relocated owls may suffer predation, competition with other owls, or reduced health or reproductive success as a result of being relegated to more marginal habitat. However, the benefits of such relocation, in terms of avoiding direct injury or mortality, would outweigh any adverse effects. • Compensatory Mitigation. Because the number of burrows that are present on the airfield does not appear to limit the existing population of owls at the airfield, compensatory mitigation for the eviction of owls for would be provided as described in MM BIO-4.1 above rather than on a case-by-case basis each time an owl is evicted from a burrow. This mitigation would maintain sufficient numbers of burrows in the mitigation areas over the long term to provide habitat for any owls that may be evicted from the airfield as a result of the Project. The City would continue to implement the BOMP with the updates described above. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**
Impact BIO-5: The Project would have a substantial adverse effect on habitat utilized by the Bay checkerspot butterfly.	**MM BIO-5.1:** Although the Airport is owned and operated by the City of San José, a Local Partner in the Habitat Plan, and the Airport is located within the boundaries of Habitat Plan area, improvement projects at the Airport are excluded as covered activities under the Habitat Plan. Irrespective of this fact, the City as CEQA Lead Agency acknowledges the nitrogen deposition impacts of the Project and is committing to pay the nitrogen deposition fee that applies to covered activities, based on new daily vehicle trips. [Note: Per Table 6 in the traffic analysis prepared as part of this EIR, the Project will generate 29,332 new daily vehicle trips.] According to the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency, the fees collected from covered activities do not fully cover the costs related to mitigating nitrogen deposition impacts due to new development. Therefore, the Habitat Agency accepts fees from non-covered activities and states that "nitrogen deposition voluntary fee payments will be applied toward land

[3] The passive relocation of burrowing owls is not currently permitted under the VHP because a positive growth trend in the owls' regional population has not yet been achieved. However, passive relocation is included here as a mitigation measure here because (1) Airport projects are not covered under the VHP, and (2) the proposed Amendment improvements are necessary to address aviation safety concerns at the Airport.

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact	Mitigation and Avoidance Measures
	acquisition, management, and monitoring for Bay checkerspot butterfly and serpentine covered plant species." **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**
Impact BIO-13: The Project would conflict with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources, specifically in relation to riparian buffer encroachment and bird collisions with buildings.	**MM BIO-13.1:** Detailed plans for the structures that may be constructed in or near the 100-foot riparian buffers along the Guadalupe River have not yet been prepared. However, the City will strive to design the parking garage and fuel farm tanks in such a way that encroachment into the riparian buffer can be avoided altogether. If the Airport needs to encroach into the riparian buffer, then the extent to which encroachment occurs (as determined both by the distance between the proposed development and the riparian baseline and by the acreage of encroachment into the buffer) should be minimized. If encroachment is avoided, so that no new, more intensive types of development occur within 100 feet of the buffer baseline, or any closer to the buffer baseline than existing development already occurs (e.g., buildings constructed within the 100-foot setback where only paved areas are currently present), no further mitigation for riparian buffer encroachment impacts would be necessary. If any encroachment is proposed, MM BIO-13.2 would be implemented to reduce the residual impact to less than significant levels. **MM BIO-13.2:** If encroachment into the riparian buffer cannot be avoided, compensatory mitigation shall be provided to offset the impacts on the ecological functions and values of the riparian corridor. Such compensatory mitigation would be provided in one of two ways: 1. At a minimum ratio of 1:1 (compensation:impact), on an acreage basis, existing development (e.g., buildings or hardscape) along the Guadalupe River, either on-site or off-site, would be removed, and the developed area restored to native habitats and dedicated to natural habitat (rather than active human uses such as urban park). For example, if a portion of the study area were subject to riparian buffer encroachment, but a commensurate acreage of existing developed areas adjoining the Guadalupe River levee in other parts of the study area were restored to native habitat, that would compensate for the riparian buffer encroachment impact. 2. At a minimum ratio of 2.5:1 (compensation:impact) on an acreage basis, riparian woodland habitat would be restored or created as described below to provide ecological functions and values that offset those lost due to riparian buffer encroachment. To compensate for encroachment into the riparian buffer, riparian woodland habitat would be restored or created at a minimum ratio of 2.5:1 (compensation:impact) on an acreage basis, based on canopy area. This ratio is not higher due to the moderately high quality of the riparian woodland adjacent to the study area relative to more extensive, less fragmented riparian woodland elsewhere in the region, but is not lower due to the temporal loss of riparian functions and values that would result from the lag between impacts to the woodland adjacent to the study area and maturation of the mitigation habitat. Compensation would be provided by planting riparian habitat so as to achieve the 2.5:1 ratio somewhere in the Santa Clara Valley, preferably along the Guadalupe River but along another stream if appropriate. Mitigation habitat

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact	Mitigation and Avoidance Measures
	may be hydrologically isolated from the stream in question as long as it is located within 300 feet of the stream, is not separated from the stream by development other than a trail or levee, and is dominated by native riparian trees. **MM BIO-13.3:** Implement Bird-Safe Building Design. Due to the potential for buildings within the study area to result in high numbers of bird collisions, the Project would implement the following bird-safe building design features for all buildings constructed or modified within 300 feet of the Guadalupe River: • The use of glass on the façades of new buildings and additions shall be minimized to the extent feasible. • No more than 10% of the surface area of the façades of buildings that face the Guadalupe River shall have untreated glazing between the ground and 60 feet above ground. Bird-safe glazing treatments may include fritting, netting, permanent stencils, frosted glass, exterior screens, and/or physical grids placed on the exterior of glazing or ultraviolet patterns visible to birds. Vertical elements of the window patterns would be at least ¼-inch wide at a maximum spacing of 4 inches, or have horizontal elements at least 1/8-inch wide at a maximum spacing of 2 inches. • No more than 10% of the surface area of façades facing the Guadalupe River and/or façade areas within 12 vertical feet above and/or below landscaped terraces shall have untreated glazing. • All glazing panels at corners of façades that face the Guadalupe River between the ground and 60 feet above ground and/or within 12 vertical feet above and/or below landscaped terraces (regardless of their height above ground) would be 100% treated. • Exterior lighting on the sides of buildings facing the Guadalupe River would be minimized to the extent feasible, except as needed for safety. All exterior lights shall be directed toward facilities on the project site (e.g., rather than directed upward or outward) and shielded to ensure that light is not directed outward towards the Guadalupe River. • Exterior up-lighting shall not be used. • Occupancy sensors or other switch control devices shall be installed on interior lights, with the exception of emergency lights or lights needed for safety purposes. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**
Impact BIO-14: The Project would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, specifically in relation to	With the implementation of MM BIO 4.1, MM BIO-4.2, and MM BIO 5.1, the Project would be consistent with the goals of the Habitat Plan. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact	Mitigation and Avoidance Measures
burrowing owls and nitrogen deposition.	
Impact BIO-C: The Project could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant biological resources impact.	With implementation of mitigation measures and standard permit conditions, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant biological resources impact. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**
CULTURAL RESOURCES	
Impact CUL-2: Portions of the Airport are considered archaeologically sensitive and therefore the construction of the Project could impact buried archaeological resources.	**MM CUL-2.1:** The archaeological monitoring program that is currently in effect at the Airport will be continued by the City as part of the Project. Under this program, a qualified archaeologist will monitor all subsurface construction activity for the identified projects located within designated archaeological sensitive areas. If prehistoric or historic archaeological resources are uncovered during construction activities, the monitoring archaeologist will require that work be discontinued within a 100-foot radius of the find. A report evaluating the find and identifying mitigation for impacts should be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City's Director of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement and the Director of the Airport. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**
Impact CUL-3: Directly related to impact CUL-2, above, if any buried archaeological resources are impacted by the Project, such resources could contain human remains.	**MM CUL-3.1:** In the event that human remains are discovered during excavation and/or grading of the site, all activity within a 100-foot radius of the find shall be stopped. The Santa Clara County Coroner shall be notified and make a determination as to whether the remains are of Native American origin or whether an investigation into the cause of death is required. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) immediately. Once the NAHC identifies the most likely descendants, the descendants will make recommendations regarding proper burial, which will be implemented in accordance with Section 15064.5(e) of CEQA Guidelines. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	
Impact GHG-1: The Project would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. .	**MM GHG-1.1:** The Airport shall develop and implement a phased carbon management program that is consistent with the standards of ACI "Level 3" Airport Carbon Accreditation Program, including calculation of annual carbon emissions from Airport activity, identifying emissions reduction targets, tracking progress toward achieving effective carbon management procedures, and publishing an annual carbon footprint report as a component of the Airport's broader environmental sustainability program. Even with implementation of MM GHG-1.1 and other emissions reduction programs described above, the Project's incremental increase in GHG emissions is considered significant and unavoidable due to forecasted increases in aircraft activity beyond the City's control in operating the Airport.

Table S-2: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact	Mitigation and Avoidance Measures
	CONCLUSION: SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACT
Impact GHG-2: The Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.	Even with implementation of MM GHG-1.1 and other emissions reduction measures, the Project's incremental increase in GHG emissions from aircraft activity serving the region as a whole would conflict with statewide emission reduction targets, resulting in a significant unavoidable impact. **CONCLUSION: SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACT**
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	
Impact HAZ-1: The proposed expanded fuel storage facility could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	**MM HAZ-1.1:** The Project shall be designed, constructed, and maintained in compliance with all applicable regulatory standards and policies, including provisions for full on-site containment, leak detection systems, and cathodic protection. In addition, a 100-foot setback from the Guadalupe River will be maintained. The Airport and Airport tenants will continue to implement its program to minimize accident risks at the fuel handling and storage facilities. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**
Impact HAZ-2: The Project could create a significant risk if hazardous materials in sufficient concentrations are present in soils and those materials are, in turn, released into the environment during construction.	**MM HAZ-2.1:** Prior to beginning construction, the Airport shall investigate construction work areas to characterize soil and groundwater quality at potentially contaminated sites by completing a limited soil and groundwater investigation. Samples will be collected from each of the proposed work areas that will be disturbed during project construction and to the depth of the planned excavation. Soil samples will be analyzed for any chemical of concern including, but not limited to, petroleum (as gasoline, diesel, and waste oil), Title 22 metals, Organochlorine Pesticides, and Volatile Organic Compounds to evaluate the potential presence of contamination. Groundwater samples will be collected if construction projects are anticipated to require dewatering. The results of these soil and groundwater investigations will be included in the Site Management Plan per MM HAZ-2.2. **MM HAZ-2.2:** The City will require the construction contractor for each project to develop and implement a Site Management Plan (SMP) or similar document to manage the cleanup of contaminated soils. If applicable, a SMP shall be prepared prior to construction to reduce or eliminate exposure risk to human health and the environment, specifically, potential risks associated with the presence of contaminated soils. At a minimum, the SMP shall include the following: 1) results from any limited soil and groundwater sampling conducted per MM HAZ-2.1; 2) stockpile management including dust control, sampling, stormwater pollution prevention and the installation of BMPs; 3) proper disposal procedures of contaminated materials; 4) monitoring, reporting, and regulatory oversight notifications; and 5) a health and safety plan for each contractor and subcontractor working at the site that addresses the safety and health hazards of each phase of site operations with the requirements and procedures for employee protection. The health and safety plan will also outline proper soil and/or groundwater handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to contaminated soil and/or groundwater during construction. **CONCLUSION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION**