

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2019070155

Project Title: Mountain Winery Annexation Project

Lead Agency: City of Saratoga

Contact Name: Debbie Pedro

Email: dpedro@saratoga.ca.us Phone Number: (408) 868-1231

Project Location: Saratoga Santa Clara County
City *County*

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The Mountain Winery Annexation Project (Project) entails the annexation of the existing Mountain Winery facility into the City of Saratoga. The Project site is located at 14831 Pierce Road on three contiguous parcels: APN 503-46-005, 503-46-006, and 503-46-007. Parcel 503-46-005 is located inside the City of Saratoga (City) city limits, and inside the City's Urban Service Area (USA) and City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) boundaries. Parcels 503-46-006 and 503-46-007 are located within unincorporated Santa Clara County (County). Parcel 503-46-006 is located outside of the City USA and a majority of the 503-46-006 parcel is within the City SOI. The 503-46-007 parcel is located outside of both the City USA and the City SOI. The three parcels total approximately 430 acres.

As part of the Project, a General Plan amendment would be required to establish a new land use designation that would apply to the 503-46-006 parcel and to make various conforming amendments. The new land use designation for the 503-46-006 parcel would be Regional Commercial (RC). This land use designation would allow a broad range of visitor serving commercial uses with a regional orientation. The RC designation would allow indoor and outdoor recreation, dining, entertainment, meetings and special events, retreats, lodging, wineries, spas, agriculture, and other similar commercial activities and compatible uses subject to standards specified in the Mountain Winery Precise Plan. The Precise Plan sets forth specific development standards and design review findings related to current and future development within the approximately 73-acre Precise Plan area, located on 503-46-006. The Project would also entail City adoption of the Mountain Winery Precise Plan and a development agreement.

The new General Plan land use designation (RC) would allow uses permitted under the Mountain Winery's existing County Use Permit (approved in 2000, modified in 2018) to continue, while also allowing for new uses (subject to a maximum permissible density and intensity of use established by the Precise Plan). New uses allowed under the RC designation include lodging (up to 300 rooms and ancillary uses) and an additional on-site water storage tank. Any development on lands designated as RC within the Project site would be limited to the Precise Plan area. The 503-46-007 parcel would be designated as Hillside Open Space (OS-H), an existing City General Plan land use designation. The 503-46-005 parcel would retain the existing City General Plan land use designation of Residential Hillside Conservation.

The Project would also require an amendment to the City's Zoning Ordinance to establish a new zoning district of Regional Commercial (RC) and to pre-zone the 503-46-006 parcel as RC, consistent with the General Plan amendment described above. The 503-46-007 parcel would be pre-zoned as the City's existing Residential Open Space (R-OS) zoning district. The 503-46-005 parcel would retain the existing City zoning district of Hillside Residential (HR), which allows for utility lines to be constructed.

The City would apply to the Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County (LAFCo) to initiate the expansion of the City USA to include parcels 503-46-006 and 503-46-007, in anticipation of annexation of the Project site into the City of Saratoga. The City would also apply to LAFCo to initiate the expansion of the City SOI to include parcel 503-46-007 and the remainder of parcel 503-46-006 that is not currently within the City SOI. Following LAFCo approval of the USA and SOI amendments, the City would annex the Project site within the municipal boundaries of the City of Saratoga. Prior to development of lodging uses on the site, the Cupertino Sanitary District is expected to apply to LAFCo to annex parcels 503-46-005 and 503-46-006 to allow for potential future sanitary sewer service to be provided to the Mountain Winery.

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

The Project's potentially significant effects and proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid those effects are summarized in the attached table.

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

This Draft EIR addresses environmental impacts associated with the Project that are known to the City, raised during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) scoping process, or were raised during preparation of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR addresses potentially significant impacts associated with air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, greenhouse gases, hydrology, noise, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire. During the NOP process, seven comment letters were received from interested agencies and individuals. The comments are summarized in Section 2, Introduction, of the Draft EIR and are also provided in Appendix F. Generally, commenters noted concerns about or commented on the Project's potential to impact traffic, noise, public services, aesthetics, cultural resources, growth inducement, hydrology, plan consistency, transportation, and a floating trail easement.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

Lead Agency: City of Saratoga

Responsible Agency: Santa Clara LAFCo

Trustee Agency: California Department of Fish and Game

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
Impact AES-1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	The Santa Clara County General Plan does not identify any scenic vistas near the project site. Visibility around the project site is limited due to topography and dense vegetation, so future development would not obstruct views from any scenic vistas. Furthermore, the Precise Plan includes limitations on building height and design to ensure future buildings blend with existing buildings and would not result in visual impacts to any scenic vista. Therefore, Project impacts on scenic vistas would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact AES-2: Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	Due to existing topography and vegetative cover, only a small portion of one of the five future buildings will be visible from surrounding vantage points. Future development could expand the physical footprint of the project site and visual impacts, but Precise Plan design guidelines and standards include standards to ensure protection of the historic character of the project site and would not conflict with surrounding scenic highways or resources. The existing historic building onsite will not be altered by the Project. As such, the impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Impact AES-3: Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</p>	<p>Topographical differences and densely vegetated hillsides mean that public views of the project are limited. The City is preparing a Precise Plan which will establish design standards for the Project. Future development would conform to the standards set forth in the Precise Plan to ensure the development blends with the natural beauty and hillsides. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No Mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required</p>
<p>Impact AES-4: Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p>	<p>Topographical differences and densely vegetated hillsides minimize impacts from lighting on public views. Future development lighting would be designed in compliance with City Municipal Code, Precise Plan, and CALGreen regulations and standards which minimize impacts from lighting on surrounding public views. The impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No Mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required</p>

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<i>Agricultural and Forest Resources</i>			
Impact AG-1: Would the project 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?	The project site does not include any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. No impacts are anticipated.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact AG-2: Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	None of the parcels within the project site are under a Williamson Act contract. Project implementation would not result in conflict with an existing agricultural use or Williamson Act contract.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact AG-3: Would the project 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))?	The existing County zoning for the parcels within the project site is Hillside-d1 District (HS-D1) and Hillside-d1-Scenic Roads (HS-d1-SR). No parcels within or adjacent to the Project are zoned forest land or timberland. Proposed rezoning would be restricted to the Precise Plan area and would not result in conflict with forest land or timberland. As such no conflict would occur with any forest land or timberland and no impacts are anticipated.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact AG-4: Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	See Impact AG-3.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact AG-5: Would the project 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?	See Impacts AG-1 to AG-3.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Air Quality			
Impact AQ-1: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	The Project is consistent with the 2017 Clean Air Plan policies relevant to the Project. The Project would not be considered by the BAAQMD to be a substantial emitter of criteria air pollutants, and would not contribute to any non-attainment areas in the SFBAAB. Therefore, the Project would be in compliance with the 2017 Clean Air Plan and impacts would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact AQ-2: Would the Project 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?	All criteria pollutant emissions from the Project would remain below their respective thresholds. However, BAAQMD considers fugitive dust emissions to be potentially significant without implementation of fugitive dust controls. Accordingly, MM AQ-1 is required to reduce fugitive dust emissions and MM AQ – 2 would reduce diesel construction emissions. The impact would be reduced to less than significant.	MM AQ – 1, 2	With implementation of MM AQ – 1 and 2, impacts to air quality would be less than significant.
Impact AQ-3: Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	No stationary sources were identified within 1,000 feet of the project site. Diesel particulate matter during construction activities would be temporary and would at multiple locations throughout the project site rather than at a single point. Construction activities would be subject to California regulations limiting idling time to further reduce emissions which would result in the impact being less than significant. The Project would have a nominal effect on existing vehicle distribution and travel speeds. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required
Impact AQ-4: Would the Project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	None of the Project uses are anticipated to generate odors, and land uses typically associated with objectionable odors are not located near the site. Impacts would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Biological Resources			
<p>Impact BIO-1: 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<p>No critical habitat for federally listed species occurs in the study area. Although not identified, it is possible that one federally threatened animal species may occur in the study area. Six special status plant species may occur in the study area and could directly or indirectly be impacted by construction activities. Four animal species may occur within the project site. If any of the above species were found to occur on the project site, MM BIO – 1 through 7 would reduce potential impacts on these species to less than significant.</p>	<p>MM BIO – 1 through 7.</p>	<p>With implementation of MM BIO – 1 through 7, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Impact BIO-2: 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<p>The study area contains several invasive species that have the potential to spread during construction activities. Coast live oak woodland, northern coastal scrub, and chamise chaparral habitats exist on the site and could potentially be significantly impacted by a spread of invasive species. It is unlikely that construction activities would cause the spread of invasive species due to the project site already being disturbed. To further prevent the spread of non-native species MM BIO – 8 would be implemented, which would mitigate the risk to sensitive habitats or communities to less than significant.</p>	<p>MM BIO - 8</p>	<p>With implementation of MM BIO – 8, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.</p>

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Impact BIO-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p>	<p>There is the potential for portions of a roadside ditch at the base of the abandoned quarry to be considered wetlands. Due to the scarcity of wetlands in the Bay Area this impact is potentially significant. MM BIO – 9 has been established to avoid or minimize removal of wetlands, restore after any disturbed, and provide mitigation habitat if any permanent reduction of wetlands occurs. These mitigations would reduce the impact to less than significant. Compliance with standard state and local regulations would reduce potential impacts on water quality from drainage and runoff to less than significant.</p>	<p>MM BIO – 9</p>	<p>With implementation of MM BIO – 9, impacts to wetland resources would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Impact BIO-4: 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?</p>	<p>Full buildout of the Project would affect a relatively small area of the study area and would result in negligible loss of habitat. Construction activities may reduce the ability for species to move through the study area, but the vicinity of the project site would remain available for species to use for moving through the region. No substantial loss of bird nesting habitat is expected as a result of the Project. Additionally, MM BIO – 10 through 12 would protect native birds from direct take and reduce potential impacts to less than significant.</p>	<p>MM BIO – 10 through 12</p>	<p>With implementation of MM BIO – 10 through 12, impacts to any migratory wildlife corridors would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Impact BIO-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p>	<p>The Project would comply with existing City ordinances and policies to preserve biological resources. In addition, MM BIO – 5 would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.</p>	<p>MM BIO – 4 through 7</p>	<p>With implementation of MM BIO – 4 through 7, impacts to would be less than significant.</p>

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact BIO-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	The study area is not located within an area covered by an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required
Cultural Resources			
Impact CR-1: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	The project site includes a winery complex identified as a historic resource. Construction activities such as grading, excavating, and trenching could potentially affect this resource. However, no alterations to the historic resource are proposed as a part of the Project. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required
Impact CR-2: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	No recorded archaeological resources were identified within the project site. The project site has a low to moderate potential to contain archaeological resources. MM CR-1a, 1b, and 1c would require cultural resource training for all construction workers, an archaeological monitor of grading activities, and halt of construction in the event that an archaeological resource is discovered, which would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.	MM CR-1a, 1b, and 1c	With implementation of MM CR-1a, 1b, and 1c, impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact CR-3: Would the project disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Due to the existing use and records search, it is unlikely that human remains are located on the project site. MM CR-2 would require the Applicant to protocols related to discovery of human remains are in place and followed during construction. Impacts would be less than significant.	MM CR-2	With implementation of MM CR-2, impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.
Energy Conservation			
Impact ER-1: Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	None of the project energy uses exceed one percent of Santa Clara County use. Therefore, Project operations would not substantially affect existing energy or fuel supplies or resources. The Project would comply with applicable energy standards and new capacity would not be required. Impacts would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact ER-2: Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	The Project would comply with City General Plan policies and goals to reduce GHG emissions. Impacts would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<i>Geology, Soils, & Mineral Resources</i>			
Impact GEO-1(i): Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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?	The Project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and there are no active faults within the project site. However, the Project is in a seismically active area. The Project would comply with all relevant state and local regulations for building construction in seismically active zones. Furthermore, MM GEO – 1 would ensure that a geotechnical investigation is performed prior to any future development to evaluate and address any potential geological concerns. The City shall review all Project plans to ensure compliance with the geotechnical investigation and other applicable Code requirements. This would reduce the impact to less than significant.	MM GEO – 1	With implementation MM GEO-1, impacts related to geology, soils, and minerals would be less than significant.
Impact GEO-1(ii): Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?	See Impact GEO-1(i).	MM GEO – 1	With implementation MM GEO-1, impacts related to geology, soils, and minerals would be less than significant.
Impact GEO-1(iii): Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	See Impact GEO-1(i).	MM GEO – 1	With implementation MM GEO-1, impacts related to geology, soils, and minerals would be less than significant.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact GEO-1(iv): Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including landslides?	See Impact GEO-1(i).	MM GEO – 1	With implementation MM GEO-1, impacts related to geology, soils, and minerals would be less than significant.
Impact GEO-2: Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Future development would include grading and the removal of vegetation and topsoil as well as additional impervious surfaces. This may make the project site susceptible to runoff and erosion. The Project would develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (see MM HYD – 1) and comply with erosion control ordinances, reducing the impact to less than significant.	MM HYD – 1	With implementation MM HYD-1, impacts related to geology, soils, and minerals would be less than significant.
Impact GEO-3: Would the project 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?	Future development would comply with City General Plan policies to minimize the risk of injury, loss of life, and property damage from geologic disturbances. Additionally, MM GEO – 1 would require a geotechnical evaluation of future developments which would identify measures to reduce impacts to less than significant.	MM GEO-1	With implementation MM GEO-1, impacts related to geology, soils, and minerals would be less than significant.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact GEO-4: Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	Four soil types underlay the study area. Erosion hazard with these soils is very high.	MM GEO – 1	With implementation MM GEO-1, impacts related to geology, soils, and minerals would be less than significant.
Impact GEO-5: Would the project 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?	The Project includes future connection to the Cupertino Sanitary District, eliminating the need for future septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems, therefore no impact would occur.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required
Impact GEO-6: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	The project area has a moderate potential of identifying Native American archaeological resources and a high potential of identifying historic-period archaeological resources. MM CR-1c reduces impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant. Therefore, the impact is less than significant with mitigation.	MM CR – 1c	With implementation MM CR-1c, impacts related to geology, soils, and minerals would be less than significant.
Impact GEO-7: Would the project 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?	Any potential mineral deposits would be underneath developed land and would be incompatible for extraction. Mineral loss would not occur as a result of the Project. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact GEO-8: Would the project 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?	The Project site is not within an active mineral resource operation according to the Santa Clara County General Plan Resource Conservation Element, nor is it identified as containing locally-important mineral resources in the City of Saratoga General Plan. Construction and operation of the Project would not impact extraction operations. No impact would occur.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required
Greenhouse Gases			
Impact GHG-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Construction emissions from the Project emissions is estimated to be 1,323 MTCO ₂ e. Annual, unmitigated operational emissions are estimated to be 2,390 MTCO ₂ e, which would exceed the threshold of 1,100 MTCO ₂ e. 94% of Project emissions would occur from mobile and energy sources. These emissions would decline over Project operation with implementation of various statewide measures. As the project's unmitigated emissions would exceed thresholds, implementation of MM GHG-1 is required. MM GHG-1 requires the Project Applicant to prepare a GHG Reduction Plan to implement all feasible GHG reduction measures. With implementation of MM GHG-1, the annual Project operations emissions would be 1,031 MTCO ₂ e. reducing the impact to less than significant. If Project emissions can be shown to be below BAAQMD GHG threshold of 1,100 MTCO ₂ e per year, then mitigation would not be required.	MM GHG-1	With implementation of MM GHG – 1, impacts would be less than significant.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact GHG-2: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	The Project would be consistent with City goals and policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Project is consistent with all applicable CARB Scoping Plan Measures. As such, the impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required
Hazards & Hazardous Materials			
Impact HAZ-1: Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Existing uses do not generate any hazardous materials. Future uses and facilities would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state and regional regulations which are intended to avoid impacts to the public or environment. The impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact HAZ-2: Would the Project 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?	The existing project site includes an underground storage tank (UST), a aboveground storage tank (AST), and asbestos containing materials. The existing conditions were found to not be a significant hazard. Future development would comply with City and County regulations regarding hazardous materials. Potential impacts associated with an accidental release of hazardous materials to the environment would be less than significant levels.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact HAZ-3: Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	The closest existing school site to the project site is Saratoga Elementary School, which is located approximately 1.5 miles to the east of the project site. Therefore, the Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school and no impact would occur.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact HAZ-4: Would the Project 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, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	The project site does not include any sites identified on the Cortese List. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and no impact would occur.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact HAZ-5: 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport is located approximately 10.5 miles northeast of the project site. Since the project site is not located within two miles of a private or public airport, no impacts would occur.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact HAZ-6: Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	The City of Saratoga Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) is the applicable emergency response plan. No revisions to the EOP would be required as a result of the Project and all major roads would be maintained during full build out construction. The Project would comply with the EOP and the Mountain Winery Emergency Action Guide. As such, the impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact HAZ-7: Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	See Impacts WIL-1, 2, 3, and 4.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Hydrology & Water Quality			
Impact HYD-1: Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Construction activities would be completed in compliance with the NPDES program's Construction General 2 if disturbance is equal to or greater than one acre. Disturbance of 1.0 acre or more would require MM HYD – 1. The Project would not induce permanent population growth but would increase water demand through the construction of lodging uses by up to 84 AFY. This represents 0.02% of the Santa Clara Subbasin's total 2012 groundwater supply. The City would also comply with state regulations to reduce water usage by 20 percent by 2020. Future development of the Project could increase the impervious surface area within the project site, but the Precise Plan would restrict impervious surfaces to 14 acres maximum, and surfaces would be designed to drain to lower elevations to allow recharge. The Project would comply with all state and local policies and regulations for water usage. As a result, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation.	MM HYD – 1	With implementation of MM HYD – 1, impacts would be less than significant.
Impact HYD-2: Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	See Impact HYD-1	MM HYD – 1	With implementation of MM HYD – 1, impacts would be less than significant.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact HYD-3: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	See Impact HYD-1	MM HYD – 1	With implementation of MM HYD – 1, impacts would be less than significant.
Impact HYD-4: Would the project, in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	The project site is approximately 19.6 miles east of the Pacific Ocean and the nearest body of water is the Saratoga Creek, located approximately 0.60 miles south of the project site. Tsunamis and seiches do not pose hazards due to the Project site's inland location and lack of nearby bodies of standing water. The Project is not within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone and would not risk the release of pollutants due to project inundation and this impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Impact HYD-5: Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area by altering the course of a stream or incrementally increasing surface runoff from impervious surfaces in such a manner that would result in increased erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site, substantially increase runoff, create or contribute runoff, or impede or redirect flood flows?</p>	<p>The five new buildings would be required to include an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan which would ensure the project site would be developed with appropriate erosion and sediment controls before full buildout. The future development of the project site would be constructed in compliance with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that would be prepared for the Project, which would ensure that the Project would not result in an increase in flood risks or water runoff that would exceed existing capacity. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.</p>	<p>MM HYD – 2</p>	<p>With implementation of MM HYD – 2, impacts would be less than significant.</p>
Land Use & Planning			
<p>Impact LU-1: Would the project physically divide an established community?</p>	<p>No features such as roads or highways are proposed that might divide an established community. The Project is within Mountain Winery which is an existing land use, and all future land uses would occur within the Precise Plan boundaries; thus, no impact will occur.</p>	<p>No Mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.</p>

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact LU-2: Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	The Project requires an amendment to the City General Plan to re-designate parcels 503-46-006 and 503-46-007, currently located in unincorporated Santa Clara County, from the County land use designation Hillside (HS) to Regional Commercial (RC). Any potential conflicts from future development with the Precise Plan development standards—such as maximum height, setback, or other requirements—would be resolved through the City’s general development plan approval process. As a result, the impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact LU-3: Would the project induce substantial unplanned 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)?	The Project would include lodging with up to 300 lodging units. Job creation from the lodging use is estimated at 75 new jobs, which is within growth predictions for the City. Population growth is consistent with job growth predictions and the City General Plan, so impacts would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact LU-4: Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	The Project would not require off-site construction or acquisitions nor would it require demolition of existing structures. The Project would allow low-density residential uses on the portion of APN 503-46-007 that would be outside of the Precise Plan boundary. No displacement or replacement housing is anticipated from the Project. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Noise and Vibration			
Impact NOI-1: Would the Project generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Noise from construction activities is anticipated to reach a maximum of 76.0 dBA during grading at the nearest sensitive receptor. Construction-related traffic noise would not be noticeable and would result in a less than significant impact. The highest traffic noise from the operation of the Project is anticipated to be a maximum of 49.6 dBA between the Project driveway and Highway 9, which is under the City's normally acceptable 60dBA threshold and would result in a less than significant impact. Noise levels along Pierce Road would increase by 3.4 dBA with the Project which would be acceptable under City noise thresholds. Overall, implementation of MM NOI-1 and adherence to Municipal Code requirements, noise impacts associated with traffic, mechanical equipment, deliveries, loading/unloading activities, and parking lot noise would be reduced to a less than significant level.	MM NOI - 1	With implementation of MM NOI – 1, impacts would be less than significant.
Impact NOI – 2: Would the Project generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Pile driving is not proposed or anticipated as part of the Project. The Project would not generate groundborne vibration that could be felt at surrounding uses. Project operations would not involve railroads or substantial heavy truck operations. As a result, impacts from vibration associated with project operation would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Impact – NOI 3: For a Project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?</p>	<p>The nearest airports to the Project site are the Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport located approximately 10 miles northeast of the Project and Palo Alto Airport located approximately 13 miles north of the site. The Project is not within 2.0 miles of a public airport or within an airport influence zone. No impacts would occur.</p>	<p>No Mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.</p>
Public Services and Utilities			
<p>Impact PSU-1: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or 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 time, or other performance objectives for any other the following public services?</p>	<p>The project site is served by Saratoga Fire Protection District and Santa Clara County Sheriff's Office. The County Sheriff's Office and Saratoga Fire Protection District have confirmed that existing staff and facilities are sufficient to accommodate future development on the site. Additionally, the Project would be required to comply with MM WIL-1, which would require Saratoga Fire Protection District review and approval of development site plans associated with full build out of the project to ensure adequate emergency protection. Therefore, it is not anticipated that new or expanded fire protection facilities would be necessary. As a result, impacts would be less-than-significant and implementation of MM WIL-1 would further reduce impacts.</p>	<p>No Mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.</p>

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Impact PSU-2: Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage facilities or dry utilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>	<p>Future development on the project site would connect to existing utilities. Existing telecommunication and electricity services are sufficient for full buildout of the Project. The Project would include connection to the Cupertino Sanitary District and an additional water tank, but the impacts of the new connection and water tank are included in the analysis throughout this EIR and the Cupertino Sanitary District conditionally approved annexation of the Project site into their service area pending Project approval. Since the Cupertino Sanitary District has capacity to serve the project site and no additional infrastructure would be required, the impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No Mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.</p>
<p>Impact PSU-3: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</p>	<p>The Project receives water from the San Jose Water Company and the current water system meets existing water demand. Full Project buildout would increase the water demand by approximately 84 AFY. The total usage of the Project would be 0.05 percent of the San Jose Water Company's projected water supply in 2035, and no new facilities would be required to meet Project water demand. The impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No Mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.</p>

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact PSU-4: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has a adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments	The Project includes annexation into the Cupertino Sanitary District to connect to the Cupertino Sanitary District system in the future. The Cupertino Sanitary District has confirmed that existing infrastructure and capacity are sufficient to serve the project site. The impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact PSU-5: Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals	The project site is currently served by West Valley Collection for waste collection & Recycling and Guadalupe Rubbish Disposal Company for landfill needs. Providers would not change upon full buildout of the Project. Existing capacity at Guadalupe Rubbish Disposal Company is 11,055,000 cubic yards. The impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact PSU-6: Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Solid waste services would be provided to the Project without significantly impacting existing and planned development within the City and county. As a result, impacts associated with solid waste compliance would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Transportation & Circulation			
Impact TR-1: Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	All study intersections would operate at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) during Background Conditions and Background Plus Project Conditions. The impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact TR-2: Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)	Pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 743, VMT analysis shall be the primary method for determining CEQA impacts after the statewide implementation date of July 1, 2020. Jurisdictions are not required to adopt thresholds of significance for VMT until July 1, 2020. The City of Saratoga has not yet adopted thresholds of significance for VMT. Concerning implementation of VMT, the recently amended State CEQA Guidelines mandate that the new methodology will apply prospectively only and will not affect projects that have already commenced environmental review (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.3(c); 15007). Given that the City has not adopted thresholds of significance for VMT, the Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with any applicable thresholds related to VMT. As such, the Project would not conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) and this impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Impact TR-3: Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No obstacles are expected from full buildout of the Project. The Project does not add or expand roadways and the Precise Plan would not result in any increase in hazards from geometric design features. The impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact TR-4: Result in inadequate emergency access?	Primary access to all major roads would be maintained during construction and operations associated with full buildout of the Project. The Mountain Winery can currently accommodate approximately 2,500 people at one time during a concert. Only the lodging facility visitors would be present overnight. Even while Mountain Winery patrons and hotel guests are on-site at the same time, the existing EOP and Mountain Winery EAG strategies would guide emergency response. However, in order to ensure adequate emergency access and evacuation for the additional visitors to the site, all future development associated with the Project would be required to comply with MM WIL-1.	MM WIL – 1	With implementation of MM WIL-1, impacts would be less than significant.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Recreation			
Impact REC-1: 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?	It is expected that hotel guests would primarily use Mountain Winery activities and facilities. Existing Mountain Winery activities include wine-tasting and concerts, and visitors would use the existing facilities for recreation. The Project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Furthermore, the Project would not cause substantial population growth, nor lead to an increased growth that would accelerate deterioration of existing neighborhood or regional parks, so the impact would be less than significant.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation is required.
Impact REC-2: 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?	See Impact REC-1.	No Mitigation is required.	No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation is required.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i>			
<p>Impact TCR-1: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, that is listed or eligible for listing as a historic resource or is determined by the lead agency to be significant?</p>	<p>No known Native American resources were identified in the Project area. The City contacted representatives from local tribes and, as of publication of this Draft EIR, no tribes have requested AB 52 consultation with the City. The potential to disturb previously unknown tribal cultural resources during ground disturbance activities would result in a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>MMs CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-1c, and CR-2</p>	<p>With implementation of CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-1c, and CR-2, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Wildfire			
Impact WIL-1: Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Primary access to all major roads would be maintained during construction and operations associated with full buildout of the Project. The Mountain Winery can currently accommodate approximately 2,500 people at one time during a concert. Only the lodging facility visitors would be present overnight. Even while Mountain Winery patrons and hotel guests are on-site at the same time, the existing EOP and Mountain Winery EAG strategies would guide emergency response. However, all future development associated with the Project would be required to comply with MM WIL-1, which would ensure the Mountain Winery EAG appropriately addresses the additional visitors to the Project site.	MM WIL- 1	With implementation of WIL-1, impacts would be less than significant.

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Impact WIL-2: Would the project due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</p>	<p>The Project site is a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone according to CalFire, and the City General Plan identifies the area as subject to extreme fire hazards. The City has adopted mitigation measures included a Weed Abatement Program and Brush Abatement Program and conducts annual inspections to ensure compliance with these programs. Existing Mountain Winery buildings have been constructed based upon review and conditions from the Fire Marshal's Office. Future buildings would be subject to review and approval from the Fire Marshal's Office. Since the Project site is already developed and future development would only occur on the flat, developed Precise Plan area, the impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No Mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation is required.</p>
<p>Impact WIL-3: Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</p>	<p>The future development of the Project site would comply with the most current edition of the California Fire Code, International Fire Code, and other applicable local, state, and federal regulations for fire safety. Compliance with the relevant regulations would ensure that new uses on the Project site would not require additional installation or maintenance of additional infrastructure such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities that might increase fire risk or have temporary or ongoing impacts on the environment. The impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No Mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation is required.</p>

Environmental Issue	Impact Analysis Summary	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
<p>Impact WIL-4: Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</p>	<p>The development would occur on mostly flat terrain with the Precise Plan area and any future development would go through review and approval from the City. The site is not located within the 100-year floodplain and the potential for flooding is considered low. The project site's existing drainage system has been designed to mitigate landslide impacts and the developed/proposed condition is not expected to substantially alter the drainage pattern from the current conditions. The impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No Mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No significant impacts will occur. No mitigation is required.</p>

