

Former City Hall Project Environmental Impact Report

County of Santa Clara

September 25, 2020

DRAFT

This page intentionally left blank.

Prepared for:

County of Santa Clara
Facilities and Fleets Department
2310 N. First Street, Suite 200
San José, CA 95131

Prepared by:

AECOM
4 North Second Street
Suite 675
San José, CA, 95113
USA
aecom.com

This page intentionally left blank.

Executive Summary

This Environmental Impact Report is an informational document prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21000 et seq., that is intended to disclose to the public and decision-makers the environmental consequences of the proposed Former San José City Hall Project (Project), proposed by the County of Santa Clara (County).

This executive summary highlights the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the Project, as required by Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines). This executive summary includes (1) a summary description of the proposed project, (2) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures (Table ES-1), a summary description of cumulative impacts (Table ES-1), (3) identification of the alternatives evaluated, and (4) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the project.

Summary of the Proposed Project

Project Location and Setting

The former San José City Hall is at 801 North First Street, approximately 1.5 miles north of downtown San José, on the northwest corner of North First and West Mission Streets. The former City Hall building is in the southeastern portion of an approximately 9.8-acre parcel, just south of the existing County Government Center, and within “Site D” of the County’s Civic Center Master Plan. The Project site is limited to that portion of the parcel that would be required to enable demolition of the former City Hall building, including the curved driveway and associated surface parking area to the south of the building and the surface parking area formerly occupied by the City Hall Annex building (demolished in 2019) to the north of the building.

Project Description

The Project involves the demolition of the former San José City Hall, a five-story, 113,430-square-foot office building. The building is currently vacant and is not in a usable condition, with ongoing maintenance and security costs borne by the County.

Demolition activities would include the following:

- Abatement of hazardous building materials;
- Site control and preparation for demolition;
- Demolition of the building and disposal of demolition debris; and
- Regrading and hydroseeding the site.

No future use has been identified for the site following demolition of the building. The former building footprint would be a flat, vegetated area surrounded by the same trees and landscaping that are currently present at the site (with the exception of those trees to be removed as part of the Project). The curved driveway and associated surface parking areas would not be removed and any damage to these surfaces during construction would be repaired and resealed as needed.

Project Objectives

The objectives of the Project are to:

- 1) Reduce the County's costs related to the former San José City Hall facility (e.g., maintenance, security, utilities).
- 2) Conduct demolition in a safe, cost-effective, environmentally responsible manner.
- 3) Leave the site in a clean and safe condition.

Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table ES-1 summarizes all of the impacts of the proposed Project, identifies the significance determination of each impact, and presents the full text of the recommended mitigation measures for each impact. A complete discussion of impacts and associated mitigation measures is presented in Section 3, "Environmental Setting and Impact Assessment," of this EIR.

Potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed Project have been identified in relation to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and tribal cultural resources, as discussed further below. No impacts related to aesthetics, agricultural and forestry resources, land use and planning, mineral resources, public services, and wildfire would occur as a result of the Project. All other impacts related to the physical environment (e.g., energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, population and housing, recreation, transportation, and utilities and service systems) would be less than significant and would not require implementation of mitigation measures.

Potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project are summarized below and fall within two categories: significant impacts that would remain significant even with mitigation (significant and unavoidable), and potentially significant impacts that could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. See Table ES-1 for a summary of all Project and cumulative impacts, and recommended mitigation measures.

- Significant and Unavoidable Impacts:
 - Project impacts that would cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (Former City Hall) pursuant to Section 15064.5 would be significant and unavoidable;
 - Cumulative impacts to historical resources would be significant and unavoidable.

Although mitigation measures have been proposed that would minimize or lessen these impacts, the impacts would not be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

- Potentially significant impacts that would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation:
 - Project impacts related to net increase of any criteria pollutant would be mitigated to less than significant;
 - Cumulative air quality impacts would be mitigated to less than significant;
 - Project impacts related to nesting birds would be mitigated to less than significant;
 - Project impacts related to as yet unrecorded subsurface prehistoric and historic-era archaeological resources would be mitigated to less than significant;
 - Cumulative impacts to archaeological resources would be mitigated to less than significant;
 - Project impacts related to increases in ambient noise levels during construction would be mitigated to less than significant;
 - Project impacts related as-yet unidentified buried archaeological resources, which may also be potentially eligible as tribal cultural resources under CEQA, would be mitigated to less than significant;
 - Cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant.

Summary of Project Alternatives

The alternatives discussion of this EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15126(d) of the CEQA Guidelines and focuses on alternatives that are capable of eliminating or reducing significant adverse effects associated with the Project while feasibly attaining most of the basic objectives. The following discussion summarizes the alternatives evaluated in this EIR. See Chapter 4, "Alternatives," for additional detail.

- **No Project Alternative:** CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that an EIR analyze a "No Project" alternative. The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project. The No Project Alternative reflects the conditions that would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)). Under the No Project Alternative, the demolition of the former San José City Hall would not occur and no grading or hydroseeding would be completed on the Project site. This alternative assumes that the former San José City Hall would undergo one-time stabilization activities ("mothballing treatment") in order to protect the building from further damage and deterioration. The former San José City Hall would remain unoccupied and the site would remain vacant and unused, as per existing conditions.
- **Alternative 1 – Office Re-Use:** Under this alternative, the former San José City Hall would remain in its current location. The County would reuse and rehabilitate the existing structure to accommodate approximately 113,430 square feet of Class B office space. The existing 97 parking spaces on the Project site would be retained. Landscaping and hardscaping around the building would also be retained, with minimal repair or replacement to meet ADA requirements. All upgrades would be undertaken in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's (SOI) Standards for Rehabilitation (36 CFR Part 67) and would be overseen by an SOI-qualified Architectural Historian/Historic Architect.
- **Alternative 2 – Residential Re-Use:** Under this alternative, the former San José City Hall would remain in its current location. It is assumed that the County would lease the site to a developer who would rehabilitate and reuse the existing structure to accommodate affordable and/or supportive housing and related services. All repairs, rehabilitation, and upgrades would be undertaken in accordance with the SOI Standards for Rehabilitation, under the oversight of an SOI-qualified Architectural Historian/Historic Architect. Conceptual designs for this alternative indicate that the Former City Hall building could be adapted to provide approximately 57 larger dwelling units (one- to three-bedroom units) or up to 108 smaller dwelling units (studio and one-bedroom units), along with approximately 23,000 square feet of associated supportive services. The existing 97 parking spaces on the Project site would be retained.
- **Alternative 3 – Office Re-Use with New Residential Structure on Project Site:** Under this alternative, the former City Hall would remain in its original location. Similar to Alternative 1, the County would rehabilitate and reuse the existing structure, in accordance with the SOI Standards for Rehabilitation and under the oversight of an SOI-qualified Architectural Historian/Historic Architect, to accommodate Class B office space. Alternative 3 would also include construction of a new building to accommodate up to 100 affordable or supportive housing units with on-site parking. The new residential structure would be constructed in the area between the former City Hall building and Mission Street, within the semi-circular landscaped area and portions of the existing driveway. The new structure would have a footprint of approximately 34,000 square feet and would be up to five stories in height.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires that, among the alternatives, an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected and that the reasons for such selection be disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would generate the fewest or least severe adverse impacts. For the purposes of this EIR,

the No Project Alternative is environmentally superior, because it would have reduced impacts compared to the Project with regard to the greatest number of environmental impact areas and would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources.

When the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires that an additional alternative be identified. In this case, the next environmentally superior alternative would be Alternative 1 – Office Reuse. Although all three alternatives would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources, Alternative 1 would retain more character-defining features of the former City Hall. Alternative 1 would also have fewer potentially significant impacts that can be mitigated to a less than significant level than the Project (see Table 4.4-1 in Section 4).

Areas of Controversy

Section 15213 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the lead agency identify areas of controversy and issues to be resolved, including issues raised by other agencies and the public. The Notice of Preparation and comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation are included in Appendix A and are discussed in Section 1.2.1, "Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting" of this Draft EIR.

The following issues were raised through scoping and comments on the Notice of Preparation that could be considered controversial:

- A request to include mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to nesting birds in the vicinity of the Project site.
- Concern that the proposed demolition would constitute an irreversible, substantial adverse change to the historical resource.
- Concern regarding cumulative effects related to the previous loss of, and current/future threats to, mid-century buildings in San José, many of which have not been inventoried or protected.
- Concern for the lost embodied energy and the adverse impact to the waste stream that demolition would cause.
- Request for consultation under AB52 and SB18 with California Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the Project.
- Recommendations on the content and method of cultural resource assessments to adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources.
- Concern regarding the scope of the alternatives analysis; in particular, consideration of an alternative that would retain the former City Hall and incorporate new development on the project site was requested.
- Request to consider other alternative re-uses of the former City Hall aside from office, such as a hotel or community/arts center.

Issues to be Resolved

The State CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR present issues to be resolved by the lead agency. These issues include the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate potentially significant impacts. The major issues to be resolved by the County regarding the Project are whether:

- recommended mitigation measures should be adopted or modified;
- additional mitigation measures need to be applied to the proposed Project; and
- the proposed Project should or should not be approved or an alternative approved.

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (AIR)			
<p>Impact AIR-1: Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plan The Project would implement BAAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures as identified in Mitigation Measure MM-AIR-2. If any hazardous materials are found, construction worker health and safety regulations and hazardous materials removal and disposal protocols would be implemented in accordance with BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2. Project demolition activities would be consistent with 2017 Clean Air Plan Measure WA4, Recycling and Waste Reduction. This construction-related impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact AIR-2: Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants The BAAQMD does not have quantitative mass emissions thresholds for fugitive PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} dust. Instead, the BAAQMD recommends that all projects, regardless of the level of average daily emissions, implement applicable best management practices, including those listed as Basic Construction Measures in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. Fugitive dust emissions are considered to be significant unless the project implements the BAAQMD's BMPs for fugitive dust control during construction. Construction-related impacts from the Project would therefore be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>MM-AIR-2: Fugitive Dust Reduction Measures The construction contractor shall comply with the following BAAQMD BMPs for reducing construction emissions of uncontrolled fugitive dust (PM10 and PM2.5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, stockpiles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered twice daily, or as often as needed, treated with non-toxic soil stabilizers, or covered to control dust emissions. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from the leaving the site. b) All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off site shall be covered. c) All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads and paved access roads shall be removed using wet power (with reclaimed water, if possible) vacuum street sweepers at least once per day, or as often as needed. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. d) All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour. e) All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. f) Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or by reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. g) All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. h) A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. BAAQMD's phone number also shall be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. <p>The County of Santa Clara project manager or his/her designee shall verify compliance that these measures have been implemented during normal construction site inspections.</p>	LTS
<p>Impact AIR-3: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Pollutants Considering the intermittent nature of the emissions, the short duration of the exposure period, and the distance of sensitive receptors from the demolition footprint and staging areas, the Project is not anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations of toxic air contaminants. Thus, the construction-related impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact AIR-4: Other Emissions Including Those Leading to Odors During Project-related construction activities, construction equipment exhaust and hazardous materials abatement activities may temporarily generate odors. Odors would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the construction equipment. Furthermore, nuisance odors are regulated under the BAAQMD's Regulation 7, Odorous Substances, which places general limitations on odorous substances and specific emission limitations on certain odorous compounds and requires abatement of any nuisance generating an odor complaint. Therefore, the Project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people and impacts during construction would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact C-AIR-1: Conflict with Air Quality Plan or Net Increases in Criteria Pollutants The SFBAAB is in nonattainment of ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} with respect to the CAAQS. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development in the SFBAAB, and this regional impact is cumulative rather than attributable to any one source and is potentially significant. Construction-related emissions of criteria pollutants from the Project would not exceed the thresholds</p>	PS	Implement MM-AIR-2	LTS

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>of significance recommended by the BAAQMD. The BAAQMD does not have quantitative mass emissions thresholds for fugitive PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} dust. Instead, the BAAQMD recommends that all projects, regardless of the level of average daily emissions, implement applicable best management practices, including those listed as Basic Construction Measures in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. Fugitive dust emissions are considered to be significant unless the project implements the BAAQMD's BMPs for fugitive dust control during construction. Cumulative impacts from the Project would therefore be potentially significant.</p>			
<p>Impact C-AIR-2: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Pollutants or Other Emissions None of the cumulative projects would involve construction within one-half mile of the Project site during the Project's 10- to 12-month construction period; therefore, there is no potential for criteria pollutant, toxic air contaminants, or odorous emissions from the Project to combine with other nearby construction emissions to adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, the potential for the cumulative projects, including the proposed Project, to result in a cumulative impact with regard to C-AIR-2 would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Biological Resources (BIO)			
<p>Impact BIO-1: Impacts to Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species The project site is developed, and the entirety of the site is either paved or landscaped. There is no potential for special-status plant species to occur in the sod present on site. The Project site does not provide suitable habitat for any of the special-status animal species. Because there is no suitable habitat for special-status species, the Project would have no impact on special status wildlife species.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact BIO-2: Impacts to Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Communities No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities are located on the project site. No impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities would occur.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact BIO-3: Impacts to State or Federally Protected Wetlands No state or federally protected wetlands are located on the project site. The Project would therefore have no impact on state or federally protected wetlands.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact BIO-4: Impacts to Fish or Wildlife Movement, Migration or Nursery Sites The various ornamental shrubs, ornamental trees, sycamore trees, coast redwood trees, and pine trees on the project site may provide suitable habitat for common nesting birds, such as house finch, mourning dove, common raven, and other birds that typically occupy urban environments. These birds, their nests, and eggs are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Noise and vibration from proposed demolition activities associated with the Project could disturb birds that are nesting on and near the Project site. The impact to nesting birds would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>MM-BIO-4: Nesting Bird Avoidance Measures To the extent practicable, demolition activities and any tree trimming/removal shall be performed from September 16 through January 14 to avoid the general nesting period for birds. If demolition or construction cannot be performed during this period, nesting bird surveys and active nest buffers (as necessary) will be implemented as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nesting Bird Surveys: If Project-related work is scheduled during the nesting season (typically February 15 to August 30 for small bird species such as passerines; January 15 to September 15 for owls; and February 15 to September 15 for other raptors), a qualified biologist will conduct two surveys for active nests of such birds within 14 days prior to the beginning of project construction, with the final survey conducted within 48 hours prior to construction. Appropriate minimum survey radii surrounding the work area are typically the following: i) 50 feet for passerines; ii) 300 feet for raptors. Surveys should be conducted at the appropriate times of day and during appropriate nesting times. • Active Nest Buffers: If the qualified biologist documents active nests within the project area or in nearby surrounding areas, an appropriate buffer between the nest and active construction should be established. The buffer should be clearly marked and maintained until the young have fledged and are foraging independently. Prior to construction, the qualified biologist should conduct baseline monitoring of the nest to characterize "normal" bird behavior and establish a buffer distance which allows the birds to exhibit normal behavior. The qualified biologist should monitor the nesting birds daily during construction activities and increase the buffer if the birds show signs of unusual or distressed behavior (e.g. defensive flights and vocalizations, standing up from a brooding position, and/or flying away from the nest). If buffer establishment is not possible, the qualified biologist or construction foreman should have the authority to cease all construction work in the area until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active. 	LTS
<p>Impact BIO-5: Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources Existing trees would be protected from damage during demolition, except for 10 ornamental trees immediately adjacent to the westernmost portion of the building, which would be removed to allow access for demolition equipment. None of the trees planned for</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
removal are oak trees or would be defined as heritage trees. None of these trees are within County easements or road rights-of-way, but are on property owned by the County. Therefore, the County's Tree Ordinance would require issuance of an administrative permit prior to removing any tree that measures over 37.7 inches in circumference (12 inches or more in diameter), measured 4.5 feet above the ground, or that exceeds 20 feet in height. The administrative permit application would include a replanting plan for all trees to be removed, which must include a detailed description of replacement trees. Because the Project would not conflict with any applicable local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, there would be no impact.			
<p>Impact BIO-6: Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans</p> <p>The Project site is within the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan permit area. However, because the project site is already developed and is within an urban area, the Project would not be a "covered project" under the Habitat Plan. As such, the project is not expected to conflict with the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan. There would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact C-BIO-1: Impacts to Fish or Wildlife Movement, Migration or Nursery Sites</p> <p>The cumulative projects that may result in potential impacts to common resident and nesting birds would be subject to applicable federal, state, regional, and local regulations and would also be required to implement typical nesting bird avoidance measures, similar to those described for the project in MM-BIO-4. Because these standard avoidance measures would reduce the impacts of all cumulative projects, the overall cumulative impact to common resident and nesting birds in the City of San José would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Cultural Resources (CUL)			
<p>Impact CUL-1: Adverse Change to Historical Resources</p> <p>One historical resource, former City Hall, is located in the CEQA Study Area. The Project would demolish the entire building, and therefore would destroy those physical characteristics of former City Hall that convey its historical significance and justify its eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR. Therefore, the Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>MM-CUL-1a: Historical Resource Mitigation Plan</p> <p>Prior to issuance of any grading, demolition, or building permits or any other approval that would allow disturbance of the Project site, an SOI-qualified Architectural Historian/Historic Architect shall prepare a Historical Resource Mitigation Schedule (Mitigation Schedule) demonstrating that the requirements listed in mitigation measures MM-CUL-1b, MM-CUL-1c, MM-CUL-1d, and MM-CUL-1e have been satisfied in accordance with the Mitigation Schedule. The Mitigation Schedule shall include a plan and schedule for the implementation of mitigation measures and describe the roles and responsibilities of the County, qualified consultants, and third parties. The Mitigation Schedule shall be supplemented with an addendum that documents the implementation of the following mitigation measures, once completed.</p> <p>MM-CUL-1b: Archival Documentation (HABS)</p> <p>Former City Hall and its associated features on the Project site shall be documented in accordance with the guidelines established for a Level III Historic American Building Survey (HABS) consistent with the SOI Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation and shall consist of the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawings – Sketch floor plans. • Photographs – Digital photographs of the interior, exterior, and setting of the building in compliance with the National Register Photo Policy Fact Sheet (National Park Service 2013). • Written Data – HABS written documentation. <p>An SOI-qualified Architectural Historian/Historic Architect shall oversee the preparation of the sketch plans, photographs, research and written data. The Level III HABS-equivalent documentation shall cover the former City Hall building along with associated features, spaces, and landscaping.</p> <p>The draft documentation shall be submitted to the County Department of Planning and Development for review and approval. After approval, full archival-quality copies of the final Level III HABS-equivalent documentation shall be filed with the County and the San José Library's California Room. Additional print copies shall be made available to other local research institutions including History San José, the Preservation Action Council of San José, and the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University. Documentation of the implementation of MM-CUL-1b shall be included in the addendum to the Mitigation Schedule.</p> <p>MM-CUL-1c: Offer for Third Party Relocation</p> <p>Prior to issuance of any demolition permits, the County shall advertise the availability of the building for relocation by an interested third party for a period of no less than 60 days. The advertisements must include notification in a newspaper of general circulation, on a website, and notice placed on the Project</p>	SU

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>site. The County shall provide evidence (i.e., receipts, date and time stamped photographs, etc.) that this condition has been met prior to the issuance of demolition permits. If a third party agrees to relocate the building, the following measures must be followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County must determine that the receiver site is feasible for the building. • Prior to relocation, the third party shall hire a historic preservation architect and a structural engineer to undertake an existing condition study that establishes the baseline condition of the building prior to relocation. The documentation shall take the form of written descriptions and visual illustrations, including those character-defining physical features of the resource that convey its historic significance and must be protected and preserved. The documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the County prior to the structure being moved. • To protect the building during relocation, the third party shall engage a building mover who has experience moving similar historic structures. A structural engineer shall also be engaged to determine how the building needs to be reinforced/stabilized before the move. • Once moved, the building shall be repaired and rehabilitated, as needed, by the third party in conformance with the SOI Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. In particular, the character-defining features shall be retained in a manner that preserves the integrity of the building for the long-term preservation and reuse. <p>Upon completion of the repairs, an SOI-qualified Architectural Historian/Historic Architect shall document and confirm that work to the structure(s) was completed in conformance with the SOI Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and that character-defining features were preserved. Documentation of the implementation of MM-CUL-1c shall be included in the addendum to the Mitigation Schedule.</p> <p>MM-CUL-1d: Architectural Salvage If no third party agrees to relocate the building in compliance with MM-CUL-1c, the building shall be made available for salvage to salvage companies facilitating the reuse of historic building materials. The time frame available for salvage shall be established by the County in accordance with the Mitigation Schedule. The County shall verify that this condition has been met prior to demolition. Documentation of the implementation of MM-CUL-1d, if necessary, shall be included in the addendum to the Mitigation Schedule.</p> <p>MM-CUL-1e: Commemoration and Interpretive Program Former City Hall and its associated features on the Project site shall be commemorated and curated in an interpretive program that may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical remnants from the site • Oral histories • Additional research • Historic photographs • Historic maps • Historical displays • Historical marker <p>Details of the commemoration and interpretive program shall be determined in consultation with the County Historical Heritage Commission. Documentation of the implementation of MM-CUL-1e shall be included in the addendum to the Mitigation Schedule.</p>	
<p>Impact CUL-2: Adverse Change to Archaeological Resources Although the Project site is largely disturbed and ground-disturbing activities would be limited to removing the existing building foundations and associated utility connections, implementation of the Project could uncover as yet unrecorded subsurface prehistoric and historic-era archaeological resources on the Project site. Such impacts could be potentially significant.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM-CUL-2: Inadvertent Discoveries In the event that prehistoric or historic resources are encountered during demolition, excavation and/or grading of the site, all activity within a 50-foot radius of the find shall be stopped, the County Project Manager or designee shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist shall examine the find. The archaeologist shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) evaluate the find(s) to determine if they meet the definition of a historical or archaeological resource; and 2) make appropriate recommendations regarding the disposition of such finds prior to issuance of building permits. 	<p>LTS</p>

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		If the finds do not meet the definition of a historical or archaeological resource, no further study or protection is necessary prior to resuming project implementation. If the find(s) does meet the definition of a historical or archaeological resource, then it should be avoided by project activities. If avoidance is not feasible, adverse effects to such resources should be mitigated in accordance with the recommendations of the archaeologist. Recommendations could include collection, recordation, and analysis of any significant cultural materials. A report of findings documenting any data recovery would be submitted to the Director of Planning. If the find(s) are human remains or grave goods, the procedures outlined in County Ordinance Code B6-18 through BC-20 shall be followed. Project personnel should not collect or move any cultural material. Fill soils that may be used for construction purposes should not contain archaeological materials.	
Impact CUL-3: Disturbance of Human Remains The Project site has a moderate to high sensitivity for buried Native American archaeological deposits and cultural materials, which could include human remains, based on its proximity to the Guadalupe River and documented archaeological sites. If human remains were uncovered during demolition activities, the procedures in County Ordinance Code Sections B6-18 through B6-20 would be followed, which would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Impact C-CUL-1: Impacts to Historical Resources In the case of the former City Hall, demolition would be a total loss of the historical resource, which is listed in the County Heritage Resource Inventory and is individually eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR, and as a City and County Landmark. It is not located in a contiguous or discontinuous historic district, which could be cumulatively impacted if contributors were removed or materially altered incrementally. However, because the demolition would result in the irreversible loss of an important example of the International Style and the Modern movement in San José, the Project would have a cumulatively significant contribution to cumulative impact C-CUL-1.	S	Implement MM-CUL-1a to MM-CUL-1e	CC
Impact C-CUL-2: Impacts to Archaeological Resources or Human Remains Past, present, and future developments within the City could impact known or unknown archaeological resources and/or human remains, depending on the proximity to known resources, sensitivity of the project area, and the extent of the proposed ground-disturbing activities. Such impacts would be potentially significant; however, each of the cumulative projects would be subject to its own environmental review under CEQA, either at a project-level or as part of a programmatic CEQA analysis, and therefore appropriate mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts would be required, similar to the Project. Furthermore, existing laws relating to the treatment of human remains would apply to all projects. With implementation of such mitigation measures, the cumulative effects on archaeological resources or human remains would be less than significant. Therefore, the overall cumulative impact due to the Project and probable future development would be less than significant with mitigation.	PS	Implement MM-CUL-2: Inadvertent Discoveries	LTS
Energy (ENE)			
Impact ENE-1: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources Based on the anticipated phasing of the Project demolition activities, the anticipated equipment and construction work staff, the temporary nature of construction, and the project type, the Project would not include unusual characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that is less energy-efficient than the equipment used at comparable construction sites. In addition, construction contractors are required, in accordance with MM-AIR-2 and the CARB Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling. Because the Project would only involve the demolition of the former City Hall building, there would be no ongoing energy use at the site. In addition, one of the objectives of the Project is to reduce the County's costs related to the former City Hall facility which currently includes costs for maintenance, security, and utilities. With implementation of the Project and demolition of the Former City Hall building, the associated energy consumption related to maintenance and security activities, and energy usage associated with utilities, would no longer occur. Therefore, the Project would have a net operational benefit with respect to energy use. Thus, the impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Impact ENE-2: Conflict with or Obstruct a Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency Plan Since the Project involves demolition of a building that was constructed in 1956 through 1958, the Project would also reduce the County's energy consumption for maintenance, security, and utilities associated with the Former City Hall building. Therefore, construction of the Project would not obstruct any state or local plans for renewable energy and or energy efficiency. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Impact C-ENE-1: Wasteful, Inefficient or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy or Conflict with Energy Plan Past, present and probable future projects throughout the state would result in the irreversible use of diesel and gasoline resources during construction, as well as from operational traffic associated with those projects. However, the use of such resources would be subject to the same regulatory framework relating to energy and fuel efficiency as the Project and would be anticipated to become more energy efficient over time as regulatory requirements change and technological advancements are made. Therefore, the overall	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
cumulative impact relating to the use of gasoline and diesel energy resources and consistency with energy plans would be less than significant.			
Geology and Soils (GEO)			
<p>Impact GEO-1: Substantial Adverse Effects from Seismic Hazards</p> <p>The Project site is in a seismically active area. However, because the project would only involve the demolition of the former City Hall building and basement, removal of associated underground utilities, and subsequent site grading (to ensure a uniformly flat surface) and landscaping, there would be no impact related to seismic ground shaking or liquefaction. In addition, the Project site is located on a flat alluvial plain with nearly level topography, and there are no off-site areas with steep slopes adjacent to the Project site that could result in on-site landslide hazards. Thus, there would be no impact related to landslides.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact GEO-2: Substantial Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil</p> <p>Because the County would prepare and implement a SWPPP and implement BMPs designed to control construction-related stormwater runoff and reduce erosion, this construction impact on soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact GEO-3: Unstable or Expansive Soils</p> <p>Soils at the Project site are likely the same as those encountered in soil borings obtained by Cornerstone for other parcels in the Santa Clara Civic Center Master Plan area. Cornerstone determined that the sandy soil layers are subject to liquefaction, and the clay soil layers are subject to expansion. However, since the Project only involves the demolition of the former City Hall building, removal of associated underground utilities, and subsequent site grading and landscaping, there would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact GEO-4: Soil Suitability for Septic Systems</p> <p>The Project involves only the demolition of the former City Hall Building, and no septic system or other type of alternative wastewater system would be required. Portable restrooms would be provided for construction workers. Thus, there would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact GEO-5: Damage or Destruction of Unique Paleontological Resources</p> <p>The Project site is located within Holocene-age rock formations. Holocene deposits contain only the remains of extant, modern taxa (if any resources are present), which are not considered "unique" paleontological resources. There are no other unique geologic features within or adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact C-GEO-2: Substantial Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil</p> <p>All of the cumulative projects that disturb 1 acre or more are required by law to prepare a SWPPP and implement site-specific BMPs that are specifically designed to prevent construction-related erosion. Cumulative projects would also be required to obtain a County or City (as applicable) grading permit, which requires submittal of an erosion control plan for County or City review and approval. Permit conditions would be imposed to reduce potential erosion impacts. Therefore, the overall cumulative impact related to substantial construction-related soil erosion would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG)			
<p>Impact GHG-1: Generation of GHG Emissions</p> <p>Construction of the Project would not exceed the annual SMAQMD threshold of 1,100 MT CO_{2e} adopted for the construction phase of projects. Therefore, Project construction impacts related to the generation of GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment would be less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	LTCC	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact GHG-2: Conflict with an Applicable GHG Plan, Policy, or Regulation</p> <p>The Project would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. Thus, the Project would not conflict with the AB 32 and SB 32 Scoping Plans or any other relevant plans, policies, or regulations for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. As a result, the Project's GHG impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	LTCC	No mitigation required.	LTCC
<p>Impact C-GHG-1: Generation of GHG Emissions or Conflicts with GHG Plan, Policy, or Regulation</p> <p>The GHG emissions impact analysis above constitutes a cumulative analysis, in that it considers global, statewide, and regional projections of GHG emissions, as well as the contribution of the Project, to GHG emission impacts. Therefore, the significance conclusions reached above for project-level impacts GHG-1 and GHG-2 also constitute this EIR's significance conclusions with respect to cumulative GHG emissions impacts and the Project's incremental contribution to GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	LTCC	No mitigation required.	LTCC

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (HAZ)			
<p>Impact HAZ-1: Hazards from Routine Use, Transport, Disposal, or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials Implementation of the SWPPP and associated BMPs; adherence to regulations related to the handling and disposal of hazardous building materials, including BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2; and adherence to the Airborne Toxics Control Measure and worker safety regulations, all of which were enacted to protect humans and the environment from accidental release or other hazards associated with the use, transportation and disposal of hazardous materials, would limit potential impacts from Project construction to less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact HAZ-2: Result in Hazardous Emissions within One-Quarter Mile of a School The Muwekma Ohlone Middle School is approximately 500 feet east of the Project site. Adherence to applicable regulations and implementation of measures to protect construction workers and the general public from hazardous emissions during project construction, including BMPs for spill and leak prevention and dust control, would also serve to protect sensitive receptors at the nearby school. Therefore, the impact of hazardous material emissions or handling of hazardous materials or wastes on schools within 0.25 mile would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact HAZ-3: Result in Hazards from Construction in a Cortese-Listed Site Based on a review of hazardous materials site databases maintained by SWRCB, DTSC, and USEPA, the Project site is not located on a known hazardous materials site that is on the Cortese List. Thus, there would be no potential for significant hazards to the public or the environment from disturbance of soils or groundwater at the site, and there would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact HAZ-4: Airport-related Safety or Noise Hazards The Project site is located approximately 0.5 mile southeast of the San José International Airport, and is within the airport influence area, but is not within the identified aircraft noise contours or safety zones of the airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Furthermore, demolition activities would not occur at night and therefore nighttime construction lighting that could be mistaken for airport lighting would not be used, and tall cranes (i.e., over 100 feet) would not be used during the demolition process. Thus, the Project would not result in any airport-related hazards, and there would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact HAZ-5: Interfere with an Emergency Response or Evacuation Plan Adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan do not identify specific evacuation routes, but rather define responsibilities among the multitude of interested and affected agencies and organizations and identify general response strategies. All demolition activities and construction staging would occur on the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not impede access for emergency vehicles and personnel, and would not impede emergency evacuation routes or emergency plans created by local or regional agencies. Thus, Project construction would have no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact HAZ-6: Exposure to Wildland Fires The Project site is not within or near a CAL FIRE State Responsibility Area. The Santa Clara Valley, including the Project site, is designated as a Local Responsibility Area, and not in or near high or very high fire severity zones (CAL FIRE 2020). The Project site is in a developed, urban area in the City of San José. Thus, the Project would not expose people or structures to hazards from wildland fires, and there would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact C-HAZ-1: Hazards from Routine Use, Transport, Disposal, or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials All cumulative projects, including the Former City Hall Project, are required to comply with local, state, and federal regulations for transport, use, disposal, and accidental release of hazardous materials, which would address impacts associated with both construction- and operation-related handling of hazardous materials. Therefore, these projects would not result in hazardous emissions that would affect residents near the Project site, and the overall cumulative impact from routine use of hazardous materials and accidental releases would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Hydrology and Water Quality (HYD)			
<p>Impact HYD-1: Violate Water Quality Standards Project construction activities would require vegetation removal, excavation, grading, material stockpiling, and staging within the project footprint that temporarily would disturb surface soils. These activities would expose soil to the erosive forces of wind and water. The soil ultimately could be transported via the storm drainage system or overland sheet flow to the Guadalupe River and the San Francisco Bay, increasing turbidity and degrading water quality. Because the County would comply with the provisions of the NPDES Construction General Permit to prepare and implement a SWPPP with associated BMPs, as well as comply with the San Francisco Basin Plan, the project's construction impact on surface water and groundwater quality would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact HYD-2: Substantially Decrease Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>Construction dewatering activities, in the event that groundwater is encountered, would be handled through WDRs issued through the SCVURPPP NPDES permit by the San Francisco Bay RWQCB, and would be minor in volume and of short duration. The building footprint would be revegetated, with the majority of adjacent landscaping and surface hardscaping left in place. The project would improve groundwater recharge at the site because the increased pervious surface area would allow a greater amount of rainfall and landscape irrigation water to percolate through to the groundwater aquifer. Thus, the Project's effect on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge and on implementation of the Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>Impact HYD-3: Substantially Alter Drainage Patterns Resulting in Erosion and Sedimentation, Flooding, Pollution, or Impedance of Flood Flows The County would continue to implement the requirements of the MS4 Permit issued by the San Francisco Bay RWQCB, which requires the SCVURPPP and its member agencies (including Santa Clara County and the City of San José) to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable and to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges. The minor alterations to drainage patterns at the project site would also not redirect or impede flood flows due to the flat topography of the site. Therefore, the project's operational impact on the drainage patter and runoff would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact HYD-4: Release of Pollutants in Flood, Tsunami, or Seiche Hazard Zones The Project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard zone, but is within Zone X (shaded), which could be subject to moderate flood hazards, such as a 0.2% annual exceedance probability flood hazard or a 1% annual exceedance probability flood with average depths of less than 1 foot. Thus, inundation of the Project site is possible, but is unlikely to occur often or to substantial depths. Furthermore, standard measures taken by contractors to reduce the release of pollutants to stormwater during construction (e.g., proper storage of hazardous chemicals) would also serve to reduce the likelihood of release of pollutants in the unlikely event of flooding at the site during construction. For these reasons, construction-related impacts on water quality from transport of pollutants during inundation of the site would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact HYD-5: Obstruct Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Francisco Bay Basin Plan or the Santa Clara Valley Water District's Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan (Santa Clara Valley Water District 2016). Thus, the impacts of the Project on these plans would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact C-HYD-1: Impacts to Water Quality and Hydrology Because the cumulative projects are required by law to implement a SWPPP and BMPs (or a stormwater drainage plan with BMPs that meets County or City requirements), and to comply with the SCVURPPP's MS4 Permit, the overall cumulative impact on water quality would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Noise (NOI)			
<p>Impact NOI-1: Increase In Ambient Noise Levels Construction noise received at the nearest receptors would vary considerably throughout the construction period, as well as throughout each work day, depending on the types of equipment being operated at any one time, and the actual distance between the equipment and the receptor. Although construction-generated noise would be temporary and short-term, it could exceed applicable thresholds established in the County Noise Ordinance, the impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>MM-NOI-1: Minimize Construction Noise The County shall include the following measures in contractor specifications for the Project, and such measures shall be implemented during all construction phases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with Chapter 20.100.450 of the City of San José Municipal Code, the hours of construction, including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements, shall be limited to 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday. No constructions activities shall be permitted on weekends or holidays. • Locate staging areas and stationary noise-generating equipment, such as compressors, as far away from noise-sensitive uses as feasible, and/or provide temporary noise barriers if necessary. • Minimize idling times of equipment by either shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes. • Select "quiet" models of construction equipment, particularly air compressors, generators, pumps and other stationary noise sources, whenever possible; fit motorized equipment with proper mufflers in good working order. • Maintain and operate construction equipment in a manner to reduce or avoid high levels of noise emissions (e.g., to the extent practical, lower—rather than drop—loads into trucks or onto platforms to reduce noise-generating impacts of contacting surfaces). • Designate a disturbance coordinator and conspicuously post this person's number around the project site and in construction notifications. The disturbance coordinator shall receive complaints about 	LTS

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		construction disturbances and, in coordination with the County, shall determine the cause of the complaint and implementation of feasible measures to alleviate the problem.	
<p>Impact NOI-2: Exposure of People to Groundborne Noise and Vibration Levels Vibration generated by heavy-duty construction equipment at the Project site or along haul routes would not exceed the FTA standard for potential human annoyance or damage to buildings at the nearest sensitive receptors. It is not expected that sleep disturbance would occur because no nighttime construction or heavy truck hauling activities would occur. Although there would be individuals who may notice the construction vibration, the vibration levels are such that they would not result in a high percentage of complaints. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact NOI-3: Exposure of People within the Project Area to Excessive Noise Levels in the Vicinity of an Airport The Project site is outside the identified 65 dBA aircraft noise contour, and therefore would not expose workers or residences to excessive noise levels from the airport and Project construction. In addition, construction workers would be required to take adequate precautions to protect their hearing from construction-generated noise at the Project site, in accordance with occupational safety and health regulations, which would also serve to reduce their exposure to other existing noise sources. Therefore, the Project would have no impact on people living or working near the airport.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact C-NOI-1: Generation of Noise and Vibration None of the cumulative projects would involve construction within half a mile of the Project site and overlap with the Project's 10- to 12-month construction period. Therefore, there is no potential for noise or vibration emissions from the Project to combine with other nearby construction emissions to cause a significant cumulative impact on nearby sensitive receptors. The overall cumulative impact for noise and vibration would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Population and Housing (POP)			
<p>Impact POP-1: Inducement of Unplanned Population Growth Project construction activities would generate temporary and short-term employment. Due to its proximity to large urban centers, the Project would be expected to draw from the existing local workforce. In addition, if some nonlocal construction workers were employed for the Project, because of the temporary and short-term nature of the work, these workers would not reasonably be expected to relocate to the City while working at the Project site. Furthermore, because the Project would only involve the demolition of the former City Hall building, there would be no substantial direct or indirect population growth in the City of San José. No impact would occur.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact POP-2: Displacement of People or Housing The Project site is occupied by the former City Hall building, which has been vacant since the City of San José moved its City Hall operations from the site in 2005. The County intends to create a Temporary Housing Shelter within the driveway of the Project site prior to commencement of the Former City Hall Project. Due to the proximity of the proposed temporary shelters to the Former City Hall building, the County would cease operations of the shelter during demolition activities and the temporary residents of the shelter would be temporarily relocated. The relocation of these temporary residents to different temporary or permanent abodes, would not represent a permanent displacement of people or housing that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, as the Temporary Housing Shelter project was never intended to provide permanent housing for residents. Therefore, there the impact of the Project would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact C-POP-3: Inducement of Unplanned Population Growth The less-than-significant effects on population and housing described for the Project would not combine with the impacts of other past, present, or foreseeable future projects to directly or indirectly induce growth, remove any existing constraints to future unplanned growth or displace people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Recreation (REC)			
<p>Impact REC-1: Increased Use of Recreational Facilities Because the Project would not result in any increased use of existing recreational facilities, there would be no impact to recreational resources.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact REC-2: Construction or Expansion of New Recreational Facilities Because the Project would not include new recreational facilities or require construction or expansion of existing facilities, there would be no impact to recreational resources.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact C-REC-1: Increased Use or the Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>If the site was ultimately redeveloped in the future, such a proposal would be evaluated as a separate project under CEQA at that time. If the future use would generate an increase in the demand for recreational facilities that would cause or accelerate physical deterioration of the facilities, appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures would be required by the project proponent, such as provision of recreational space or payment of applicable park impact fees. Because past, present, and future projects would also be required to meet the City's parkland standards through provision of recreational space or payment of fees in lieu thereof, the overall cumulative impact to recreational resources would be less than significant.</p>			
Transportation (TRA)			
<p>Impact TRA-1: Conflict with Transportation Plan, Program, Ordinance or Policy Because the Project would not generate construction-related traffic in excess of industry-standard screening thresholds for construction traffic and would implement a traffic control plan to limit potential conflicts with roadway, pedestrians, bicyclist, and transit traffic during construction, there would be no conflict with applicable transportation-related programs, plans, ordinances, or policies and the impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact TRA-2: Consistency with CEQA Guidelines relating to Vehicle Miles Traveled Because the Project would only involve the demolition of the former City Hall building, there would be no operational traffic generated from the site once demolition activities are complete. The few existing traffic trips associated with the Former City Hall building, such as security or maintenance trips, would cease once the building is demolished. As such, there would be a small net decrease in VMT over existing conditions and the Project would have a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact TRA-3: Potential for Creation of Substantial Traffic-Related Hazards The Project would involve demolition of the Former City Hall building, and all demolition and staging activities would be contained within the Project site, with no encroachment onto or alteration of public rights-of way. As such, the Project would not create any hazardous geometric design features or incompatible uses that would substantially increase traffic-related hazards. There would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact TRA-4: Project-Related Interference with Emergency Access All demolition activities and construction staging would occur on the Project site, and construction activities would not fundamentally alter emergency access to the Project site or other properties in the vicinity. the Project would not impede access for emergency vehicles and personnel, and would not impede emergency evacuation routes or emergency plans created by local or regional agencies. Thus, Project construction would have no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact C-TRA-1: Conflict with Transportation Plan, Program, Ordinance or Policy None of the cumulative projects would involve construction within half a mile of the Project site and overlap with the Project's 10- to 12-month construction period. Therefore, there is no potential for construction-related traffic from the Project site to combine with traffic from nearby construction sites to cause a significant cumulative impact on local roadways in the Project vicinity. Therefore, the overall cumulative impact for transportation would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR)			
<p>Impact TCR-1: Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources Although no tribal cultural resources were identified as part of the background research for this Project, records maintained by the Northwest Information Center and the NAHC are not exhaustive and negative results do not preclude the presence of tribal cultural resources at the project site. Given that the Project consists of the demolition of an existing building in a highly developed urban setting, it is highly unlikely that as-yet unidentified tribal cultural resources could be impacted by the Project. However, there is the potential for the project to impact as-yet unidentified buried archaeological resources, which may also be potentially eligible as tribal cultural resources under CEQA. Disturbance of such resources, if present, during Project demolition and regrading activities would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>MM TCR-1: Inadvertent Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources In the event that potential tribal cultural resources are identified during the implementation of the requirements under Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-2, the qualified expert performing the cultural resources study, along with the County, will contact California Native American tribe(s) that have expressed interest and begin or continue consultation procedures with that tribe(s). If, as a result of the consultation, the County determines that the resource is a tribal cultural resource and the Project will have a potentially significant impact, additional mitigation measures as discussed with the tribe to avoid or reduce impacts to the resource shall be required and implemented. If the find(s) are human remains or grave goods, the procedures outlined in County Ordinance Code B6-18 through BC-20 shall be followed.</p>	LTS
<p>Impact C-TCR-1: Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources Past, present, and future development, in conjunction with the Project, would have the potential to cumulatively impact tribal cultural resources. Such impacts would be potentially significant; however, each of the cumulative projects would be subject to its own environmental review under CEQA, either at a project-level or as part of a programmatic CEQA analysis, and therefore appropriate mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts to tribal cultural resources such as MM-TCR-1 would be required, similar to the Project. With implementation of such mitigation measures, the cumulative effects on tribal cultural resources would be less than significant. Therefore, the overall cumulative impact due to the Project and probable future development would be less than significant with mitigation.</p>	PS	<p>Implement MM-TCR-1: Inadvertent Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources</p>	LTS

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Utilities and Service Systems (UTI)			
<p>Impact UTI-1: New or Expanded Utility Services The Project would involve demolition of the Former City Hall building. As such, the Project would not require connecting to, or the construction of, new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm drainage, electric, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. During construction, power would be provided by portable generators, and existing utility services to the building would be safely disconnected prior to demolition. There would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact UTI-2: Water Supply Availability During demolition of the Former City Hall, minimal water would be needed for activities such as soil compaction and dust control. This water would be obtained from the City's existing water supply and the quantity would be negligible compared with the available water quantities. After demolition and site restoration is completed, there would be a small amount of water used to establish and maintain the new landscaping within the demolition footprint. However, this additional water use would not substantially increase the existing irrigation volumes for the Project site, and would be negligible compared to available water quantities. There would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact UTI-3: Wastewater Treatment Capacity During construction, portable restrooms would be provided for construction workers over the 10- to 12-month construction period. Wastewater from portable restrooms would be disposed of at an appropriately licensed local facility with adequate capacity to accommodate project needs. No wastewater would be generated after the Project is completed. Thus, there would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact UTI-4: Solid Waste Capacity The Project would generate approximately 37,500 cubic yards of demolition debris. The total approximate remaining capacity of the landfills in San José is approximately 49,446,600 cubic yards; therefore, the Project would be unlikely to generate solid waste that would exceed the capacity of any receiving landfill or in excess of State or local standards. As a result, the impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact UTI-5: Solid Waste Statues and Regulations The Project would comply with all statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code and the City's Construction & Demolition Diversion Program. In addition, prior to commencement of demolition activities, the Project contractor would submit a Demolition Plan, a Debris Recovery Plan, a Waste Management and Recycling Plan, and a Debris Recovery Report that comply with all local, state and federal laws, regulations, and ordinances related to solid waste. No solid waste would be generated after Project completion. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact C-UTI-1: Impacts to Solid Waste Capacity All of the cumulative projects would be evaluated at a project-level to determine increase in demand for solid waste services and to ensure compliance with relevant solid waste statutes and regulations. Such regulations and statutes have been adopted in order to protect the environment, and projects that would exceed available landfill capacity would not be approved without appropriate mitigation or plans to address disposal of solid waste. Therefore, the overall cumulative impact related to solid waste would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Mandatory Findings of Significance (MFS)			
<p>Impact MFS-1: Effects to Wildlife or Plant Species or Important Examples of California History or Prehistory Construction of the Project could disturb common birds that are nesting on or near the project site (see Impact BIO-1), and this impact would be potentially significant. All other construction-related biological resources impacts would be less than significant. The Project would have potentially significant impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (see Impact CUL-1) or unrecorded subsurface prehistoric and historic-era archeological resources (see Impact CUL-2). The Project site has a moderate to high sensitivity for buried Native American archaeological deposits and cultural materials based on its proximity to the Guadalupe River and documented nearby archaeological sites, as well as historic-era archaeological resources associated with the original Pueblo de San José del Guadalupe. This impact is potentially significant.</p>	PS (Biological Resources) PS (Historical Resource) PS (Cultural Resources)	<p>Implement MM-BIO-1</p> <p>Implement MM-CUL-1a to MM-CUL-1e</p> <p>Implement MM-CUL-2 Implement MM-TCR-1</p>	LTS (Biological Resources) SU (Historical Resource) LTS (Cultural and Tribal Resources)
<p>Impact MFS-2: Individually Limited Cumulative Considerable Impacts The Project in combination with other past, current, and probable future projects would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts, except for the loss of historical resources. The cumulative impact for built historical resources (Impact C-CUL-1) would be significant and unavoidable, and the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable.</p>	SU (historical resources) NI or LTS (All other resource topics)	<p>Implement MM-CUL-1a to MM-CUL-1e (historical resources)</p> <p>No mitigation required. (All other resource topics)</p>	CC (Historical resources) LTS (All other resource topics)

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact MFS-3: Direct or Indirect Adverse Effects on Human Beings All construction-related environmental impacts that might cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, such as dust, hazardous materials, noise, water quality, or disturbance to local circulation would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS

Acronyms:

- NI = No Impact
- LTS = Less Than Significant
- LTSM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- PS = Potentially Significant
- SU = Significant and Unavoidable
- CC = Cumulatively Considerable
- LTCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable