

## 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 House Family Vineyards Project (the Project), proposed by Old Oak Vineyards, dba House Family Vineyards (the applicant). This report is prepared for the Lead Agency under CEQA, the City of Saratoga (City).

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 property is situated on the eastern foothills of Monte Bello Ridge along the Santa Cruz Mountains in the northwest portion of the City of Saratoga. The property is bounded by single-family residences to the north, east, and south and Cooper-Garrod Vineyards to the west. The project site comprises 23 acres of the overall 48-acre property and consists of two adjacent parcels, 13-acre Parcel A (APN 503-15-081) and 10.3-acre Parcel B (APNs 503-15-082 and 503-15-083) at the terminus of Old Oak Way.

#### Project Description

House Family Vineyards (applicant) is requesting a conditional use permit (CUP) to operate a winery at their property located at the end of Old Oak Way. The proposed project also consists of the construction of a new subterranean wine cave and secondary access road, and modifications to an existing dirt road to make it a fire access road and an existing tasting deck (i.e., tasting deck, restrooms and office), as well as an open space easement exchange. The proposed winery operations include public wine tastings (no appointment needed) and private wine tasting and events (by appointment only).

In addition to the conditional use permit for the winery operations, the proposed project would require a tree removal permit, as well as geotechnical clearance and building permits for the subterranean wine cave and building permit for the tasting deck.

## Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed project are to:

1. Obtain permits to modify existing structures and facilities to comply with City zoning regulations and building codes and obtain a CUP for winery operations at the project site and host public and private wine tastings as well as private events.
2. Operate winery operations with public and private tastings, and private special events of various sizes at the project site.
3. Operate the winery with minimal disturbances to neighbors and its natural setting.
4. Provide a place where guests can enjoy the natural setting and views of the City.
5. Construct a subterranean wine cave to store wine at the project site.
6. Exchange 6,050 square feet of open space where the tasting deck and open seating area were constructed within the open space easement, for a new of 15,129 square foot open space easement adjacent to the existing open space easement. In addition, a vineyard of 11,244 square feet that was installed within the existing open space easement would be removed and replaced with native vegetation.
7. Support the City's economic goals and opportunities by expanding visitor destination venues within the City.

## 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 4, "Environmental Setting and Impact Assessment," of this EIR.

## 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 City would require the removal of the tasting deck, adjacent building, vineyard and all other unpermitted structures and require the grade behind the tasting deck to be restored to the original grade.

- Alternative 1 – No Events Alternative: Alternative 1 eliminate all private special events. No events such as birthdays, graduations, anniversaries, weddings, and charity events would occur.
- Alternative 2 – Reduced Events Alternative: Alternative 2 would eliminate all medium and large sized events. Small events would still be permitted.
- Alternative 3 – Shuttle Services with No Guest Vehicles Onsite for Events: Alternative 3 would require all guests to be shuttled to the project site during private events.

## 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 proposed project with regard to the greatest number of environmental impact areas and would avoid the project’s significant and unavoidable Vehicle Miles Traveled impacts. 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, No Events Alternative because it would remove all of the project’s operational impacts related to private special events, and would have the greatest reduction in noise, VMT, and GHG impacts compared to the proposed project.

## 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 (NOP) and comments received in response to the NOP 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 NOP that could be considered controversial:

- Traffic
- Noise
- Emergency evacuation
- Wildfire hazards
- Aesthetics
- Pedestrian and bicycle safety
- Commercializing a hillside community

## **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 potentially significant impacts can be mitigated. The major issues to be resolved by the City regarding the project are:

- whether the recommended mitigation measures should be adopted or modified;
- whether there are any additional mitigation measures that should be applied to the proposed project; and
- whether the proposed project, a project alternative, or no project should be approved.

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Baseline Scenario</b>	<b>Summary of Impacts and Mitigation</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
#1 Conditions at time of NOP (2022) and #2 Conditions prior to Unpermitted Activities (2013)	<b>Impact AES-1: Scenic Vistas</b> The proposed project would have less than significant impacts on a scenic vista under both scenarios. Mitigation: None required	Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<b>Impact AES-2: Scenic Resources</b> The proposed project would have no impact to scenic resources under both scenarios. Mitigation: None required	Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<b>Impact AES-3: Scenic Quality</b> The proposed project would have less than significant impacts on scenic quality and would not conflict with any applicable zoning and other regulations under both scenarios. Mitigation: None required	Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<b>Impact AES-4: Light and Glare</b> The proposed project would have less than significant impacts and would not create a new source of substantial light or glare under both scenarios. Mitigation: None required	Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<b>Impact AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of State-wide Importance (Farmland)</b> The proposed project would have no impact to any Farmlands under both scenarios. Mitigation: None required	Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<b>Impact AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract</b> The proposed project would have less than significant impacts to existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract under both scenarios. Mitigation: None required	Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<b>Impacts AG-3 and AG-4: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland; or result in the loss of forest land</b> The proposed project would have no impacts to existing zoning, nor would it cause rezoning of forest or timberland for both scenarios. Mitigation: None required	Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact AG-5: Other changes that could result in conversion of Farmland or conversion of forest land</b>                      The proposed project would have less than significant impacts as it would require conversion of only a minimal amount of Farmland under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: LTS                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact AIR-1: Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plan</b>                      The proposed project would have a less than significant impact and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: LTS                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact AIR-2: Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants</b>                      The proposed project would be potentially significant as it would result in net increase in criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. However, with the implementation of MM-AIR-1 detailed below, the impact would be reduced to less than significant under both scenarios.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-AIR-1: Implement Fugitive Dust Reduction Measures During Construction</b>  <i>The construction contractor shall comply with the following Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) BMPs for reducing construction emissions of uncontrolled fugitive dust (PM10 and PM2.5):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off site shall be covered.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>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 CCR Section 2485). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>The City of Saratoga project manager or his/her designee shall verify compliance that these measures have been implemented during normal construction site inspections.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS                      After Mitigation: LTSM</p>

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact AIR-3: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors</b>                      The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts with regards to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: LTS                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact AIR-4: Other Emissions Including those leading to Odors</b>                      The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to other emissions (such as those leading to odors) and would not adversely affect a substantial number of people under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: LTS                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022)	<p><b>Impact BIO-1: Impacts to Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species</b>                      The proposed project could have a potentially significant impact to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species under this scenario. With the implementation of mitigation measures MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-8 below, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1: Pre-construction Botanical Survey</b>  <i>A qualified botanist (retained by the project applicant or their contractor) shall conduct a focused preconstruction survey for western leatherwood during the blooming period (January-March) for the species prior to any construction or ground-disturbing activities associated with the project.</i>  <i>If the species is not identified within the limits of construction, the applicant shall submit the botanist’s survey results to the City at least 10 days prior to construction or ground-disturbing activities and no further mitigation is required.</i>  <i>In the event that the species is identified within the limits of construction, the applicant shall submit the botanist’s survey results to the City at least 10 days prior to beginning any construction or ground-disturbing activities and all recommendations in the botanists survey and report shall be implemented. The qualified botanist shall establish and clearly mark a five-foot buffer around each plant(s) using environmentally sensitive area (ESA) fencing prior to the start of construction. Within the buffer(s), no vegetation removal, ground disturbance, or project construction activity (including the use of machinery or vehicles) shall be allowed.</i>  <i>In either event, pre-construction surveys should be undertaken within two years of submittal to the City.</i>  <i>If activities within the buffer(s) or other impacts to the plant(s) cannot be avoided, then the project applicant shall contact CDFW to obtain guidance on a possible relocation of the plant(s) and measures to maintain the plant(s) survival. Potential relocation of the plant(s) to avoid impacts would depend on several factors, including the health, size and root system of the plant(s).</i>  <i>If relocation can be performed in accordance with CDFW guidance, then the qualified botanist shall oversee any such relocation activities and shall submit a memorandum to the City documenting that the relocation followed the CDFW guidance at least 10 days prior to commencement of any construction or ground-disturbing activities within the five-foot buffer.</i>  <i>If relocation cannot be performed in accordance with CDFW guidance, then plants shall be protected in place until alternative avoidance and/or mitigation measures are agreed with CDFW and the City.</i></p> <p><b>MM-BIO-2: Pre-construction/Pre-disturbance Surveys for Nesting Birds</b>  <i>To the extent practicable, construction activities and any tree trimming/removal shall be performed from September 16 through February 15 to avoid the general nesting period for birds. If construction or tree trimming/removal cannot be performed during this period, nesting bird surveys and active nest buffers (as deemed necessary by a qualified biologist) shall be implemented as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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</i></li> </ul>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS                      After Mitigation: LTSM</p>

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
	<p>qualified biologist shall 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 shall be determined by the qualified biologist but should be at least: i) 50 feet for passerines and ii) 300 feet for raptors. Surveys shall be conducted at the appropriate times of day and during appropriate nesting times, as determined by the qualified biologist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Active Nest Buffers:</i> If the qualified biologist documents active nests within the survey area, an appropriate buffer between the nest and active construction shall be established. The buffer shall be clearly marked and maintained until the young have fledged and are foraging independently. Prior to construction, the qualified biologist shall 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 shall monitor the nesting birds daily during construction activities and shall 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 shall have the authority to cease all construction work in the area until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active. Construction shall only be allowed to impact a migratory bird or its nest, including its young, if a permit from USFWS is obtained in accordance with the MTBA and all permit conditions are adhered to.</li> </ul> <p><b>MM BIO-3: Environmental Awareness Training</b></p> <p>Before the start of project ground-disturbing activities, the project applicant or its contractor shall retain a qualified biologist to prepare and implement an Environmental Awareness Training session for people employed on the project (project personnel). All project personnel must attend the training prior to entering the project work area.</p> <p>Training materials shall include the following: discussion of the federal Endangered Species Act (federal ESA), the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and the Clean Water Act (CWA); the consequences and penalties for violation or noncompliance with these laws and regulations and project permits; identification and value of special-status plants, special-status wildlife, and jurisdictional waters and explanations about their value; hazardous substance spill prevention and containment measures; the contact person in the event of the discovery of a dead or injured wildlife species; and review of mitigation measures, permit conditions, and any other required environmental compliance measures. In the training, project timing in relation to species’ habitat and species’ life-stage requirements shall be detailed and discussed, and a site plan shall be created showing areas of the construction site where minimization and avoidance measures must be undertaken.</p> <p>A fact sheet conveying this information will be prepared by the qualified biologist or designee for distribution to project personnel and to others who enter the project area. After completion of the Environmental Awareness Training, project personnel will sign a form stating that they attended the training, understood the information presented, and will comply with the training requirements. This training may be combined with other environmental training for the project, such as cultural resource training, and may be provided virtually or via recording. In the event that non-English-speaking crew members are employed during the Project, an interpreter will be present during the environmental training, or training materials will be supplied in an alternative language.</p> <p><b>MM BIO-4: Season Limitation</b></p> <p>All construction activity consisting of new ground disturbance in potential special status amphibian habitat areas (e.g. coast live oak woodland, chamise-sage chapparal and California annual grassland) shall be timed to occur during the dry season (April 15 to October 15), or aestivation period to minimize take of dispersing frogs and salamanders. Areas subject to this seasonal limitation shall be marked on the site plan created under MM BIO-3.</p>	



Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
	<p><b>MM BIO 5: Pre-Construction Survey</b></p> <p><i>Within 24 hours prior to initial ground-disturbing activities, construction sites with potential habitat for California red-legged frog, Santa Cruz black salamander or western pond turtle (as determined by a qualified biologist) shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist, to identify any of these species moving above-ground, or taking refuge in burrow openings or under materials that could provide cover such as boards, scrap metal, woody debris, or other materials. Within 24 hours of the survey being conducted, and prior to commencement of ground-disturbing activities, survey results shall be communicated by email to the City. If none of the above-listed species are encountered, no further action is required following submission of the survey results. If any of the above-listed species are identified, the measures detailed in MM BIO-7 shall be implemented.</i></p> <p><b>MM BIO-6: Construction Monitoring</b></p> <p><i>A qualified biologist will be present onsite to monitor the removal of vegetation and the top 12 inches of topsoil at all project areas. The qualified biologist will inspect the area of proposed ground disturbance just before it is disturbed working in close coordination with work crews. The qualified biologist shall have the authority to stop any work should a special status species be discovered during work. A qualified biologist shall be on-call and available by phone during all other construction activities that may result in impacts to special status amphibian and reptile species.</i></p> <p><b>MM BIO-7: Encounters</b></p> <p><i>If individual special status animals (i.e. western pond turtles, California red-legged frogs or Santa Cruz black salamanders), or suspected special status animals are observed, work within 100 feet of that location will be temporarily halted and the qualified biologist shall inspect the animal. Based on the professional judgment of the qualified biologist, if project activities can be conducted without harming or injuring the special status animal, the individual(s) shall be left at the location of discovery and monitored by the qualified biologist. All project personnel shall be notified of the finding and at no time shall work occur within a 100-foot radius of the listed species without a biological monitor present. If in the professional judgement of the qualified biologist the animal would need to be relocated, the appropriate relocation action would be taken by the qualified biologist while work is halted. Qualified biologists shall have handling permits, if required, for the species of animal that is being relocated. The animal shall be captured by hand, or dipnet, transported by hand, dipnet or temporary holding container, and released as soon as practicable the same day of capture. Handling of the special status animals shall be minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Holding/transporting containers and dipnets shall be thoroughly cleaned and disinfected prior to transporting to the action area and shall be rinsed with freshwater onsite immediately prior to usage.</i></p> <p><b>MM-BIO-8: San Francisco Dusky Footed Woodrat Surveys</b></p> <p><i>A qualified biologist (retained by the project applicant or their contractor) will conduct surveys for San Francisco dusky footed woodrat nests and signs of current woodrat activity/inactivity (e.g., presence of fresh scat, freshly chewed vegetation, cobwebs covering nest entrances) within 15 days prior to construction. Survey results shall be submitted to the City at least 10 days prior to commencement of construction activities. If no nests are found, no additional mitigation for woodrats is required and construction may commence. If nests are found, the qualified biologist will establish and clearly mark (with ESA fencing) a 10-foot buffer in which no vegetation removal, ground disturbance, or project construction activity shall occur. If such activities cannot feasibly be avoided within the buffer zones of detected dens, work within the buffer may only commence after a qualified biologist has in the case of an inactive den, relocated the den; and in the case of an active den, submitted and received approval from CDFW for a San Francisco dusky footed woodrat den relocation plan that is subsequently implemented.</i></p>	

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
#2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact BIO-1: Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species</b>                      The project’s construction activities could result in a potentially significant impact to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species under this scenario.  <b>Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-8</b> as described for Baseline Scenario 1 in Impact BIO-1. However, past construction activities were undertaken without mitigation measures.</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: S&U
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact BIO-2: Impacts to Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Communities</b>                      The proposed project would have no impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities under both scenarios                      Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact BIO-3: Impacts to State or Federally Protected Wetlands</b>                      The proposed project would have no impact on state or federally protected wetlands under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact BIO-4: Fish or Wildlife Movement, Migration or Nursery Sites</b>                      The proposed project would have no impact to with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022)	<p><b>Impact BIO-5: Local Policy or Ordinance Conflicts</b>                      The proposed project could have a potentially significant impact on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures, the impact would be reduced to less than significant for this scenario.  <b>Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-9: Tree Preservation Plan</b>  <i>The Applicant shall prepare a Tree Preservation Plan in accordance with City Code 15-50.140 and submit it to the City’s Community Development Director for approval prior to building or grading permit issuance. The Plan shall consist of a separate detailed plan drawn to a sufficient scale but no larger than twenty feet to the inch, with any details to be shown at least ten to the inch to clearly indicate all protection and mitigation measures to be taken as required by the Community Development Director and/or the Arborist Report for the project.</i>  <i>The site-specific measures to be included in the plan must be at least as protective (as determined by the City Arborist) as the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Protection Fencing: Before any work commences, the protective fencing must be up and inspected by City Arborist. This fencing shall consist of a 6-foot cyclone fence with 8-foot steel posts driven 2-feet into the ground, spaced no more than 10 feet apart. A tree protection zone warning sign needs to be attached to the fence every 20 feet.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Water Line Boring: Change water line by boring rather than trenching.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Irrigation: Include supplemental irrigation for select trees that will be determined by the arborist.</i></li> <li>4. <i>Foliar Rinse: Dust that accumulates on tree foliage during earthmoving activities must be washed off. The timing for these rinsing procedures are on an as-needed basis and shall be decided by the project arborist.</i></li> <li>5. <i>Pruning and Repair: Any pruning or repair must be supervised by an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA)-certified arborist/Project Arborist. Tree #11 (tree located at edge of road on downhill side) requires pruning in order for the project to commence. The tree crown shall be raised to allow for truck clearances while protecting its aesthetic appeal, as prescribed by the</i></li> </ol>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
	<p><i>project arborist. One co-dominant stem on a lower scaffolding limb could be removed all together. Furthermore, a root collar excavation and a retaining box shall be installed around the trunk on the roadside.</i></p> <p>6. <i>Tree Trunk Protection: Since tree #11 is right at the edge of the access road and very close to the building excavation, it will require trunk protection before construction begins. This shall be achieved by wrapping the trunk with orange snow fencing ten times; placement of a board around the entire circumference of the trunk (stand 8-foot by 4-foot upright); and securing the protective materials initially with duct tape, and then with either steel banding or thick wire.</i></p> <p>7. <i>Utility Trench/Main Access Road: All the utilities for the wine cellar will be located in a single joint trench, traversing the center of the main access road.</i></p> <p>8. <i>Slope Restoration Behind Tasting Room: A Coast Live Oak (#21) is located near proposed work to restore the grade behind the tasting deck. Protection of this tree would require the following:</i></p> <p>a. <i>The tree protection fencing must be in place and approved by the project arborist before any work commences. This fence shall remain in place until the project arborist approves its removal.</i></p> <p>b. <i>The project arborist must be on site during the beginning of this grading operation. The initial work at the toe of the fill, where fill meets natural grade, needs to be keyed in requiring only a 1-foot cut on the slope outside the Timber Preserve Zone (TPZ). Once that has been established and compacted, constant monitoring by the arborist is not needed, but the arborist should remain on call if needed.</i></p> <p>c. <i>Once the slope restoration is completed and inspected by an arborist, the protective fencing shall be removed and re-erected near the main road to ensure the restored slope area remains undisturbed.</i></p>	
#2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact BIO-5: Local Policy or Ordinance Conflicts</b></p> <p>The proposed project would have a potentially significant impact on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources for this scenario due to past unpermitted activities.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-9</b> as described for Baseline Scenario 1 for Impact BIO-5. However, past construction activities were undertaken without mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: S&amp;U</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact BIO-6: Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Conflicts</b></p> <p>The Project would have no impact with the provisions of an approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan for both scenarios.</p> <p>Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact CUL-1: Adverse change to Historical Resources</b></p> <p>The proposed project would have no impact and would not cause adverse changes to a historical resource under both scenarios.</p> <p>Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022)	<p><b>Impact CUL-2: Adverse change to Archaeological Resources</b></p> <p>The proposed project could cause potentially significant impacts to change in the significance of an archaeological resource under this scenario. However, with the implementation of mitigation measure MM-CUL-1 below, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM</p>

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
#2 (2013)	<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1: Inadvertent Discovery Protocols</b></p> <p><i>In the event that precontact or historic-period archaeological resources (or suspected 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 City Planner or designee shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist shall examine the find.</i></p> <p><i>Precontact archaeological materials/Tribal Cultural Resources might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, hand stones, or milling slabs); and/or battered stone tools, such as hammerstones. Historic period materials may include bottles, ceramics, cans, and other refuse; concentrations of bricks; or wells or privies. The qualified archaeologist will determine impacts, significance, and mitigation in consultation with recognized local Native American groups, if appropriate. In addition, prior to the commencement of project site preparation, all construction personnel will be informed of the potential to inadvertently uncover cultural resources and the procedures to follow subsequent to an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources.</i></p> <p><i>If the finds do not meet the definition of a historical or archaeological resource or a Tribal Cultural Resource (PRC 21074), 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 or Tribal Cultural Resource, then it shall be avoided by project activities. If avoidance is not feasible, adverse effects to such resources shall 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 shall be submitted to the City Planner.</i></p> <p><i>Should the discovery include human remains, all parties will comply with state and County regulations and guidelines regarding the treatment of human remains, including the California Health and Safety Code (Sections 7050.5, 7051, and 7054), which has specific provisions for the protection of human burial remains. These regulations are described in the regulatory framework of this section in more detail. Existing regulations address the illegality of interfering with human burial remains, and protects them from disturbance, vandalism, or destruction, and establishes procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered. PRC Section 5097.98 also addresses the disposition of Native American burials, protects such remains, and designates the NAHC to resolve any related disputes.</i></p> <p><i>If human remains are uncovered during construction activities, compliance with California Health and Safety Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097, require that ground-disturbing activities in the area of the remains shall be halted immediately, and the Santa Clara County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined by the coroner to be Native American, the NAHC shall be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. Following the coroner’s findings, the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant (MLD) and the landowner shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments, if present, are not disturbed.</i></p> <p><i>Project personnel should not collect or move any cultural material. Fill soils that may be used for construction purposes should not contain archaeological materials.</i></p> <p><i>The project applicant shall include the above requirements within the construction plans and specifications.</i></p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS</p> <p>After Mitigation: S&amp;U</p>
	<p><b>Impact CUL-2: Adverse change to Archaeological Resources</b></p> <p>The proposed project could cause potentially significant impacts to change in the significance of an archaeological resource under this scenario.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1</b> as described for Baseline Scenario 1 for Impact CUL-2. However, past construction activities were undertaken without mitigation measures.</p>	

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
#1 (2022)	<p><b>Impact CUL-3: Disturbance of Human Remains</b>                      The proposed project could cause potentially significant impacts to disturbance of human remains under this scenario.  <b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1</b> (see Impact CUL-2).</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM
#2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact CUL-3: Disturbance of Human Remains</b>                      The proposed project could cause potentially significant impacts to disturbance of human remains under this scenario.  <b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1</b> (see Impact CUL-2). However, past construction activities were undertaken without mitigation measures.</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: S&U
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact ENE-1: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources</b>                      The proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. The impact would be less than significant under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact ENE-2: Conflict with or Obstruct a Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency Plan</b>                      The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The impact would be less than significant under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact GEO-1: Substantial Adverse Effects from Seismic Hazards</b>                      The proposed project has potentially significant effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides under both scenarios.  <b>Mitigation Measure MM-GEO-1: Additional Geotechnical Investigations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Prior to issuance of geotechnical clearance or building permits for site grading, tasting deck, wine cave, or improvements to the existing dirt road, the project applicant and its Geotechnical Engineer of Record shall submit additional documentation to the City Engineer in the Public Works Department (City Engineer), including:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Confirmation of the appropriate Site Class designation for the proposed project under the applicable version of the California Building Code (CBC) in effect at the time of permitting, with site-specific justification for the recommended Site Class designation in accordance with the requirements of the CBC, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;</li> <li>ii. Calculations and/or other evidence demonstrating to the City’s Public Works Engineer satisfaction that the design of proposed buildings and structures (including the wine cave and proposed retaining walls) meet the required standards for the Site Class designation recommended in subsection A.i. of this measure and that recommendations of the previous site-specific geotechnical reports and peer review memorandums have been updated and incorporated into the project design, as appropriate, to the City Engineer’s satisfaction;</li> <li>iii. Results of a forensic evaluation of the existing tasting deck foundations or other evidence to the City Engineer’s satisfaction, confirming that the foundations meet the required standards for the Site Class designation recommended in subsection A.i. of this measure;</li> <li>iv. Evaluation of the seismic lateral pressures for retaining walls greater than 12 feet, if applicable, and confirmation that the design of all existing and proposed retaining walls meet the required standards for the Site Class designation recommended in subsection A.i. of this measure;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
	<p><i>B. If it cannot be demonstrated to the City Engineer’s satisfaction that the project design meets the requirements of the Site Class designation recommended in subsection A.i.of this measure, the project applicant and the Geotechnical Engineer of Record shall submit revised designs for the proposed buildings or structures (including retaining walls) and/or revised design or upgrades for the existing tasting deck foundations or other existing structures, along with calculations and/or other evidence demonstrating to the City Engineer’s satisfaction that the revised design meet the required standards and that previous geotechnical recommendations have been updated and incorporated into the final project design, as appropriate, to the City Engineer’s satisfaction.</i></p> <p><i>C. Prior to issuance of geotechnical clearance or building permits for site grading, tasting deck, wine cave, or improvements to the existing dirt road, the Geotechnical Engineer of Record shall review and approve all geotechnical aspects of the project building and grading plans (e.g., site preparation and grading including temporary grading designs and shoring for the proposed wine cave, site surface and subsurface drainage improvements including back- and/or sub-drains as applicable, and design parameters for roadways, engineered fill, site and structure retaining walls, and as-built foundations) to ensure that their recommendations (or updated recommendations, if appropriate) have been properly incorporated into the design and to ensure that they are referenced as the Geotechnical Engineer of Record. Evidence of such review and approval shall be documented in a letter submitted to the City Engineer, to their satisfaction. Specific items to be provided and approved include, but are not limited to, the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. The items listed in subsection A. i-iii of this measure, above;</i></li> <li><i>ii. Specific grading and drainage recommendations for the remedial grading work in the vicinity of the tasting deck (i.e., appropriate materials for fill, compaction requirements, keys and benches, appropriate bearing materials, maximum slopes, etc.), and in particular:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>▪ Mapping of existing fill materials in the vicinity of the restoration grading;</i></li> <li><i>▪ Evaluation and analysis of potential side-cast artificial fill and prior natural; slope configurations</i></li> <li><i>▪ Sections including an estimation of the natural slope.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li><i>iii. Review of final design for the wine cave to confirm that previous recommendations regarding excavation, stem walls, foundations, concrete slabs-on-grade, retaining walls, and subsurface drains are adequately incorporated and/or updated as necessary;</i></li> <li><i>iv. Review of final proposed retaining wall heights, slope configurations (both site and those associated with the wine cave) and design;</i></li> <li><i>v. Review of final design for existing dirt road improvements to confirm that previous recommendations regarding vehicle setback, grading and drainage, subgrade and surface materials and compaction, and retaining walls are adequately incorporated and/or updated as necessary;</i></li> </ul> <p><i>D. Prior to issuance of geotechnical clearance or building permits for the proposed secondary access road, the project applicant and its Geotechnical Engineer of Record shall undertake a supplemental subsurface investigation to characterize the active shallow landslide identified in previous geotechnical investigations, in accordance with the recommendations of the Peer Review Memorandum by Cotton Shires and Associates, dated September 19, 2023. A supplemental report documenting the results of the supplemental investigation, including at a minimum:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Additional geotechnical recommendations (or revisions to previous recommendations) to prevent roadway construction or operation from exacerbating the risk of landslide movement.</i></li> </ul>	

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Additional geotechnical recommendations (or revisions to previous recommendations) to allow the design vehicle (a 75,000 pound emergency vehicle) to pass along the roadway with a minimum static safety factor of 1.25 (per Caltrans Geotechnical Design Manual 2014).</li> <li>E. The project applicant and the Geotechnical Engineer of Record shall submit final design plans for the secondary access road, along with calculations and/or other evidence demonstrating to the City Engineer’s satisfaction that the final roadway design incorporates all recommendations from the supplemental report required by subsection A of this measure, above.</li> <li>F. The project applicant and the Geotechnical Engineer of Record shall comply with the conditions of any building permits or geotechnical clearance permits, and any additional recommendations or requirements of the City Engineer, including but not limited to construction inspections and submittal of as-built documentation to confirm that all requirements and recommendations have been adequately implemented to the City Engineer’s satisfaction.</li> <li>G. The project applicant shall undertake annual maintenance and inspections of the existing dirt road and proposed secondary access road during the dry season of each year and shall submit evidence of the required maintenance and inspections to the City Engineer prior to October 1 of each year. If the required maintenance is not undertaken, or if required repairs are not undertaken in a reasonable timeframe (as determined by the City Engineer), project operations shall halt until such time as all outstanding requirements and repairs have been performed to the City Engineer’s satisfaction. Annual maintenance and inspection requirements include, but are not limited to, the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Annual addition of maintenance layers of class II base rock with compaction.</li> <li>ii. Annual cleanout of culverts and catch basins, or more frequently if overflow occurs.</li> <li>iii. Annual inspection of hardscape features such as retaining walls and energy dissipators for signs of movement or damage. If movement or damage is identified during inspections, repairs and/or remedial actions shall be made to the City Engineer’s satisfaction.</li> <li>iv. Annual inspection of drainage crossings and dissipation structures for signs of erosion or slope instability. If signs of erosion or slope instability are identified during inspections, repairs and/or remedial actions shall be made to the City Engineer’s satisfaction.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact GEO-2: Soil Erosion</b>            The proposed project could have potentially significant effects and would cause soil erosion or loss of topsoil under both scenarios.  <b>Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1A</b> (See Impact HYD-1 below).</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact GEO-3: Unstable Soils or Geological Units</b>            The proposed project could have potentially significant impacts as it would possibly be located on unstable soils or geologic units under both scenarios.  <b>Mitigation Measure MM-GEO-1</b> (See Impact GEO-1 above)</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact GEO-4: Soil Suitability for Septic Systems</b>            The proposed project would not have any impact to soils as the project does not include the use of a septic system under both scenarios.            Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
#1 (2022)	<p><b>Impact GEO-5: Damage or Destruction of Unique Paleontological Resources</b></p> <p>The proposed project could have potentially significant impacts and may result in accidental damage to unique paleontological resources under this scenario. Implementation of the mitigation below would reduce the impact to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-GEO-5: Paleontological Resource Avoidance Measures</b></p> <p><i>Before the start of earthmoving activities, the project applicant shall require that all construction personnel involved with earthmoving activities be trained regarding the possibility of encountering fossils, the appearance and types of fossils likely to be seen during construction, and proper notification procedures if such fossils are encountered. This worker training shall be prepared and presented by an experienced field archaeologist and may be presented at the same time as construction worker education on cultural resources, or prepared and presented separately by a qualified paleontologist.</i></p> <p><i>If paleontological resources are discovered during earthmoving activities, all work within 50 feet of the find shall cease immediately, and the construction contractor shall notify the City of Saratoga Planning Division. The project applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist to evaluate the resource and prepare a recovery plan, based on SVP guidelines (SVP 2010). The recovery plan may include a field survey, construction monitoring, sampling and data recovery procedures, museum curation for any specimen recovered, and a report of findings. Recommendations in the recovery plan that are determined by the City (as the CEQA lead agency) to be necessary and feasible shall be implemented before construction activities resume at the site where the paleontological resources were discovered.</i></p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS</p> <p>After Mitigation: LTSM</p>
#2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact GEO-5: Damage or Destruction of Unique Paleontological Resources</b></p> <p>The proposed project could cause potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources under this scenario.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-GEO-5</b> as described for Baseline Scenario 1 for Impact GEO-5. However, past construction activities were undertaken without mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS</p> <p>After Mitigation: S&amp;U</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact GHG-1: GHG Emissions</b></p> <p>The proposed project would contribute potentially cumulatively considerable impacts that would generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. Even with implementation of mitigation measure below, it is conservatively assumed that the impact would be cumulatively considerable and unavoidable under both scenarios.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-1</b> (see Impact TRA-2 below).</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS</p> <p>After Mitigation: S&amp;U</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact GHG-2: GHG Plan, Policy, or Regulation Conflicts</b></p> <p>The proposed project would have a potentially cumulatively considerable impact to applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions under both scenarios. Even with implementation of MM-TRA-2, the impact would be cumulatively considerable and unavoidable.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-1</b> (see Impact TRA-2 below).</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS</p> <p>After Mitigation: S&amp;U</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact HAZ-1: Hazards from Routine Use, Transport, Disposal, or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials</b></p> <p>The proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials under both scenarios. However, with the implementation of MM-HYD-1A the impact would be reduced to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1A</b> (see Impact HYD-1, below).</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS</p> <p>After Mitigation: LTSM</p>



Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact HAZ-2: Hazardous Emissions near Schools</b>                      The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous emissions within a quarter mile of a school under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: NI                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact HAZ-3: Hazards from Cortese-List Sites</b>                      The proposed project would have no impact as it is not located on a Cortese-list site under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: NI                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact HAZ-4: Airport-related Hazards</b>                      The proposed project would not result in airport-related safety or noise hazards under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: NI                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact HYD-1: Water Quality Standard Violations</b>                      The proposed project would have potentially significant impacts and may have the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality under both scenarios. However, with implementation of mitigation measures below, the impact would be less than significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1A: Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan for Construction</b></p> <p>A. <i>The project applicant shall submit an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan for all project components to the City Engineer in the Public Works Department (City Engineer) for review and approval prior to issuance of grading permits. The Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan shall include all necessary measures to be taken to prevent excessive stormwater runoff or carrying by stormwater runoff of solid materials on to lands of adjacent property owners, public streets, or to creeks as a result of conditions created by grading and/or construction operations. The Plan shall include, but not be limited to, such measures as short-term erosion control planting, waterproof slope covering, check dams, interceptor ditches, benches, storm drains, dissipation structures, diversion dikes, retarding berms and barriers, devices to trap, store and filter out sediment, and stormwater retention basins. Off-site work by the project applicant may be necessary. The project applicant shall obtain permission or easements necessary for off-site work. There shall be a clear notation that the plan is subject to changes as changing conditions occur. Calculations of anticipated stormwater runoff and sediment volumes shall be included, if required by the City.</i></p> <p>B. <i>The project applicant shall implement the approved Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan. No grading shall occur during the wet weather season (October 15 through April 15) unless specifically authorized in writing by the City Engineer.</i></p> <p>C. <i>The project applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The project applicant shall submit a Notice of Intent (NOI), Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and other required Permit Registration Documents to SWRCB. The project applicant shall submit evidence of compliance with Permit requirements to the City Engineer.</i></p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS                      After Mitigation: LTSM</p>
	<p><b>MM-HYD-1B: Post-Construction Stormwater Management Plan and Maintenance Agreement</b>                      The project applicant shall comply with the requirements of Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit issued under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and the Santa Clara County Drainage Manual, as applicable. The project applicant shall submit a Post-Construction Stormwater Management Plan to the City for review and approval with the project drawings</p>	

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
	<p>submitted for site improvements, and shall implement the approved Plan. The Post-Construction Stormwater Management Plan shall include and identify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location and size of all new and replaced impervious surfaces associated with the proposed project;</li> <li>• Directional surface flow of stormwater runoff;</li> <li>• Location of proposed on-site storm drain lines;</li> <li>• Site design measures to reduce the amount of impervious surface area;</li> <li>• Details of on-site infiltration measures;</li> <li>• Source control measures to limit stormwater pollution;</li> <li>• Stormwater treatment measures to remove pollutants from stormwater runoff, including the method used to hydraulically size the treatment measures; and</li> </ul> <p>Hydromodification management measures, if required by Provision C.3, so that post-project stormwater runoff flow and duration match pre-project runoff.</p>	
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact HYD-2: Substantially Decrease Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge</b></p> <p>The proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge and would have a less than significant impact under both scenarios.</p> <p>Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact HYD-3: Substantially Alter Drainage Patterns Resulting in Erosion and Sedimentation, Flooding, Pollution, or Impedance of Flood Flows</b></p> <p>The Project could result in a potentially significant impact and may alter drainage patterns resulting in erosion or siltation, flooding, pollution, or redirection of flood flows under both scenarios. However, with implementation of mitigation measures below, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures MM-HYD-1A and MM-HYD-1B</b> (see Impact HYD-1 above).</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact HYD-4: Release of Pollutants in Flood, Tsunami, or Seiche Hazard Zones</b></p> <p>The proposed project would not risk release of pollutants in flood, tsunami, or seiche hazard zones and the impact would be less than significant under both scenarios.</p> <p>Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact HYD-5: Obstruct Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan</b></p> <p>The proposed project could potentially conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan and would result in a potentially significant impact under both scenarios. However, with implementation of mitigation measures below, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures MM-HYD-1A and MM-HYD-1B</b> (see Impact HYD-1 above)</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact LUP-1: Physically Divide an Established Community</b></p> <p>The proposed project would not physically divide an established community under both scenarios.</p> <p>Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A</p>

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance																										
#1 (2022)	<p><b>Impact LUP-2: Conflict with Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation</b>                      The proposed project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect under this scenario.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A																										
#2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact LUP-2: Conflict with Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation</b>                      The proposed project conflicts with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, due to past unpermitted construction activities under this scenario.                      Mitigation: None feasible</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: S&U																										
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact NOI-1: Ambient Noise Levels</b>                      The proposed project would have a less than significant impact and would not cause an increase in ambient noise levels in excess of applicable standards under both scenarios.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Monitor and Adjust Boundary Noise Levels</b></p> <p>A. Prior to use of the tasting deck or adjacent outdoor seating area for public tastings or events, the applicant shall permanently install a sound level meter at the worst-case (i.e., closest without shielding) residential property boundary to the tasting deck. The City Community Development Director or their designee shall be provided real-time access to the monitoring system data. The meter shall be installed at a height of at least 4 feet above ground level. The meter shall be a rated Class I or II based on ANSI S1.4 standards, utilize the "A" weighting scale, and be set to a "slow" response. The monitoring system shall be actively measuring and logging sound pressure level data from at least one hour prior to event start until one hour after the event ends.</p> <p>B. During events or tastings, the applicant shall review the measured sound pressure levels on a 30-minute recurring basis. If the measured sound pressure levels at the meter exceed the applicable limits described in paragraph C below, the applicant shall reduce the volume of the sound system (or other noise-generating sources) until the measured levels are below the paragraph C limits at the property line.</p> <p>C. The applicable limits for the property boundary sound level meter (installed and operated in accordance with paragraphs A and B above) shall be selected from the options in the table below, based on the distance between the meter and the outdoor use area of the nearest off-site residential unit (or other nearest sensitive receptor, as determined by the City) at the time of monitoring:</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: S&U																										
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Distance between meter and outdoor use area of closest residence</th> <th>Daytime (7am - 7pm) noise limit at meter</th> <th>Evening (7pm - 10pm) noise limit at meter</th> <th>Nighttime (10pm - 7am)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0-24 feet</td> <td>50 dBA Leq(h)</td> <td>45 dBA Leq(h)</td> <td rowspan="7">Events and tastings prohibited</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25-49 feet</td> <td>52 dBA Leq(h)</td> <td>47 dBA Leq(h)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50-99 feet</td> <td>54 dBA Leq(h)</td> <td>49 dBA Leq(h)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>100-199 feet</td> <td>57 dBA Leq(h)</td> <td>52 dBA Leq(h)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>200-399 feet</td> <td>61 dBA Leq(h)</td> <td>56 dBA Leq(h)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>400-799 feet</td> <td>66 dBA Leq(h)</td> <td>61 dBA Leq(h)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>800+ feet*</td> <td>71 dBA Leq(h)</td> <td>66 dBA Leq(h)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Distance between meter and outdoor use area of closest residence	Daytime (7am - 7pm) noise limit at meter	Evening (7pm - 10pm) noise limit at meter	Nighttime (10pm - 7am)	0-24 feet	50 dBA Leq(h)	45 dBA Leq(h)	Events and tastings prohibited	25-49 feet	52 dBA Leq(h)	47 dBA Leq(h)	50-99 feet	54 dBA Leq(h)	49 dBA Leq(h)	100-199 feet	57 dBA Leq(h)	52 dBA Leq(h)	200-399 feet	61 dBA Leq(h)	56 dBA Leq(h)	400-799 feet	66 dBA Leq(h)	61 dBA Leq(h)	800+ feet*	71 dBA Leq(h)	66 dBA Leq(h)	
Distance between meter and outdoor use area of closest residence	Daytime (7am - 7pm) noise limit at meter	Evening (7pm - 10pm) noise limit at meter	Nighttime (10pm - 7am)																									
0-24 feet	50 dBA Leq(h)	45 dBA Leq(h)	Events and tastings prohibited																									
25-49 feet	52 dBA Leq(h)	47 dBA Leq(h)																										
50-99 feet	54 dBA Leq(h)	49 dBA Leq(h)																										
100-199 feet	57 dBA Leq(h)	52 dBA Leq(h)																										
200-399 feet	61 dBA Leq(h)	56 dBA Leq(h)																										
400-799 feet	66 dBA Leq(h)	61 dBA Leq(h)																										
800+ feet*	71 dBA Leq(h)	66 dBA Leq(h)																										

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
	<p><i>* The closest residential unit at time of EIR preparation was approximately 1,100 feet from the tasting deck, therefore the row marked with an asterisk contains the current applicable limits, unless a closer sensitive receptor is identified by the City in the future.</i></p>	
	<p>D. <i>The limits specified in paragraph C above may be modified if, based on site-specific noise prediction modeling or calculations performed by a qualified acoustic engineer, it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City’s Community Development Director that the modified limits would not result in outdoor noise levels at outdoor use areas at the nearest residential unit (or other sensitive receptor) exceeding 50 dBA Leq(h) during daytime hours (7am to 7pm) or 45 dBA Leq(h) during evening hours (7pm to 10pm). Alternatively, the limits specified in paragraph C above may be reduced by the City if it becomes apparent that the limits are not adequately protective of nearby sensitive receptors based on actual noise levels received at residential receptors.</i></p>	
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact NOI-2: Exposure of People to Ground-borne Noise and Vibration Levels.</b>                      The proposed project would have a less than significant impact and would not generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels under both scenarios,                      Mitigation: None required.</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: LTS                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact NOI-3: Excessive Airport Noise</b>                      The proposed project would not expose people to excessive noise levels from nearby airports.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: NI                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact POP-1: Inducement of Unplanned Population Growth</b>                      The proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area and would have no impact under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: NI                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact POP-2: Displacement of People or Housing</b>                      The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and would have no impact under both scenarios                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: NI                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact PS-1: Impacts associated with Provision of or need for New or Altered Government Facilities</b>                      The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. The impact would be less than significant for both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: LTS                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact REC-1: Increase Use of Recreational Facilities</b>                      The proposed project would not have increased use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities, and the impact would be less than significant under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: LTS                      After Mitigation: N/A</p>

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact REC-2: Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities</b>                      The proposed project would have no impact under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: NI After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022)	<p><b>Impact TRA-1: Conflict with Transportation Plan, Program, Ordinance or Policy</b>                      The Project would have a potentially significant impact and may conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system. However, with the implementation of MM-TRA-2, the impact would be reduced to less than significant for this scenario.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-2: Temporary Traffic Control Plan</b>  <i>The applicant shall prepare a temporary traffic control plan in conformance with the City's Standard Details and Specifications for Construction. The plan shall be prepared prior to issuance of grading permits and include details on the use and placement of high-level warning devices, channeling cones, flashing arrow boards, and signage. Any temporary road or lane closures or reroutes (if required) shall also be detailed in the plan. The traffic control plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City's Public Works Department and emergency response officials prior to issuance of grading permits. The temporary traffic control plan would also specify what construction traffic must do in an emergency situation requiring evacuation of the neighborhood, so that evacuation routes are kept clear for evacuating vehicles.</i></p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM
#2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact TRA-1: Conflict with Transportation Plan, Program, Ordinance or Policy</b>                      The proposed project would have a significant and unavoidable impact due to past unpermitted construction activities.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-2</b> as described for Baseline Scenario 1 for Impact TRA-1. However, past construction activities were undertaken without mitigation measures.</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: S&U
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact TRA-2: Consistency with CEQA Guidelines related to Vehicle Miles Traveled</b>                      The proposed project would have a significant and unavoidable impact due to vehicle miles traveled, even with implementation of feasible mitigation.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: MM-TRA-1: VMT Reduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Public and private tastings shall be prohibited from occurring on the same day as private events. Advance notification of upcoming events and closure of the winery to tastings shall be provided to wine club members and the general public by direct email, text message, social media, and/or website notification.</i></li> <li>• <i>Parking supply shall be limited to 55 spaces. All parking shall be on the House Family Vineyards site. No parking shall be allowed along public roadways. "No Parking" signage shall be permanently installed on the public portion of Old Oak Way to prevent spillover parking on the public roadways. On days with private events, additional bollards and/or cones shall also be placed to discourage illegal parking.</i></li> <li>• <i>The project applicant shall provide an optional shuttle service for all private events and private tastings with more than 10 guests, that would collect guests from a centralized location such as West Valley College (with appropriate permissions) or at hotels where guests are staying and transport them to the project site. Organizers and attendees of private events or private tastings with more than 10 guests shall be notified of the shuttle service in advance of the event by direct email, text message, social media, and/or website notification. The applicant shall provide verification of outreach to a designated City contact annually, or upon request.</i></li> </ul>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: S&U

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant shall set up a public outreach page on their website that encourages all guests to carpool or vanpool to and from the site. This website shall provide useful information about the environmental benefits of carpooling and provide links to resources where guests can arrange for vanpool services and ride share services such as Uber or Lyft.</li> </ul>	
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact TRA-3: Potential for creation of substantial Traffic-Related Hazards</b></p> <p>The proposed project could substantially increase traffic-related hazards and the impact would be potentially significant under both scenarios. However, with implementation of MM-TRA-1 and MM-TRA-2, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation MM-TRA-1: VMT Reduction</b> (detailed in TRA-2) and <b>MM-TRA-2: Temporary Traffic Plan</b> (detailed in TRA-1)</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact TRA-4: Project-related interference with Emergency Access</b></p> <p>The proposed project would result in inadequate emergency access and the impact would be potentially significant. However, with implementation of MM-TRA-1 and MM-TRA-2, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation MM-TRA-1: VMT Reduction</b> (detailed in Impact TRA-2 above) and <b>MM-TRA-2: Temporary Traffic Plan</b> (detailed in TRA-1 above)</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM</p>
#1 (2022)	<p><b>Impact TCR-1: Substantial Adverse Change to Tribal Cultural Resources</b></p> <p>The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource. Under this scenario, the impact is potentially significant however, with implementation of MM-CUL-1, the impact would be reduced to less than significant</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1</b> (detailed in MM-CUL-2 above).</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM</p>
#2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact TCR-1: Substantial Adverse Change to Tribal Cultural Resources</b></p> <p>The proposed project could cause potentially significant impacts to tribal cultural resources under this scenario due to past unpermitted construction activities.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1</b> (detailed in MM-CUL-2 above). However, past construction activities were undertaken without mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: S&amp;U</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact UTI-1: New or Expanded Utility Services</b></p> <p>The proposed project would have a potentially significant impact under both scenarios. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-UTI-1: Lift Station Installation and Maintenance Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant would be required to demonstrate that the lift station would meet the standards of and receive approval and permits from the City, Santa Clara County Environmental Health Services, and CuSD for the lift station.</li> <li>The applicant would be required to set up a maintenance agreement with the City to properly maintain the lift station so that impacts related to odors and a malfunctioning system do not arise. The maintenance agreement would require annual inspections of the system.</li> </ul>	<p>Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM</p>
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact UTI-2: Sufficient Water Supplies</b></p> <p>The proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available. Impact would be less than significant under both scenarios.</p> <p>Mitigation: None required</p>	<p>Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A</p>

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact UTI-3: Wastewater Treatment Capacity</b>                      The proposed project would have less than significant impacts to wastewater treatment capacity under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact UTI-4: Solid Waste Capacity &amp; Solid Waste statutes and regulations</b>                      The proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of local standards or capacity of local infrastructure. The impact would be less than significant under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact WF-1: Impairment of Emergency Response Plans or Emergency Evacuation Plans</b>                      The proposed project could have a potentially significant impact under both scenarios. However, with implementation of mitigation measures, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.  <b>MM-TRA-1: VMT Reduction</b> (detailed in Impact TRA-2 above) and <b>MM-TRA-2: Temporary Traffic Plan</b> (detailed in TRA-1 above)</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM
#1 (2022)	<p><b>Impact WF-2: Exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire</b>                      The proposed project would have a potentially significant impact under this scenario. However, with implementation of mitigation measures below, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.  <b>Mitigation MM-WF-1A: Construction Fire Prevention Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to commencement of construction activities, including site clearing, grading, or trenching, the applicant shall work with the SCCFD to prepare a Construction Fire Prevention Plan. The plan shall address training of construction personnel and provide details of fire-suppression procedures and equipment to be used during construction. Information shall be provided as part of a tailgate or pre-construction training to contractors and subcontractors prior to any ground disturbance. At a minimum, the plan shall be consistent with the requirements in California Fire Code Chapter 33 and shall include the following:</li> <li>• Procedures for minimizing potential ignition, including, but not limited to, vegetation clearing, parking requirements/restrictions, idling restrictions, smoking restrictions, proper use of gas-powered equipment, use of spark arrestors, and hot work restrictions.</li> <li>• Specifications for adequate water supply to service construction activities.</li> <li>• Construction worker training for fire prevention, initial attack firefighting, and fire reporting.</li> <li>• Coordination with local fire agencies to facilitate access through the project site during construction.</li> <li>• Emergency contact information; and</li> <li>• Demonstrate compliance with applicable plans and policies established by state and local agencies.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation MM-WF-1B: Operational Fire Protection Plan</b>                      Prior to issuance of building permits for the proposed project, the applicant shall prepare an Operational Fire Protection Plan and submit it to the City and/or SCCFD for review and approval. The Operational Fire Protection Plan may be consolidated with the Construction Fire Prevention Plan described under MM-WF-1A. The plan shall be prepared by a registered design professional, qualified landscape architect, qualified fire safety specialist, or similar specialist acceptable to the fire code official. At a minimum, the plan shall be consistent with the requirements set forth in Chapter 49 of the California Fire Code and include the following:</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM

Baseline Scenario	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	Level of Significance
#2 (2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emergency evacuation procedures for the project site, considering all proposed modifications to the site and access routes. A detailed map with clear instructions shall be prepared and made available in a publicly visible location on-site. The updated evacuation map shall be provided to all neighbors through the Firewise Old Oak Way Committee;</li> <li>Specifications for adequate water supply to service operational activities and meet fire suppression needs;</li> <li>Specifications for regular fuel reduction practices throughout the project site (including adjacent to parking areas), including frequency of maintenance and actions to be taken to reduce fuel loading and maintain defensible space requirements;</li> <li>Protocol for continued compliance with the Brush and Weed Abatement Programs;</li> <li>Prohibitions on outdoor fires at the project site during wine tastings and events;</li> <li>Details on 'No Smoking' signs in publicly visible locations where tastings and events would occur and in all parking areas; and</li> <li>Demonstrate compliance with applicable plans and policies established by state and local agencies.</li> </ul> <p><b>Impact WF-2: Exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire</b>                      The proposed project could have exacerbated wildfire hazards due to past unpermitted construction activities.  <b>Mitigation Measure MM-WF-1A</b> as described in Baseline Scenario 1 for Impact WF-2. However, past activities were implemented without mitigation.</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: S&U
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact WF-3: Installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment</b>                      The proposed project would have a less than significant impact under both scenarios.                      Mitigation: None required</p>	Before Mitigation: LTS After Mitigation: N/A
#1 (2022) and #2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact WF-4: Exposure to significant risks as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes</b>                      The proposed project could have a potentially significant impact under both scenarios. However, with implementation of mitigation measures, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.  <b>Mitigation Measure MM-GEO-1</b> (detailed in Impact GEO-1 above) and <b>MM-HYD-1B</b> (detailed in Impact HYD-1 above).</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM
#1 (2022)	<p><b>Impact WF-5: Exposure of people or structures to significant risk from wildland fires</b>                      The proposed project could have a potentially significant impact under this scenario. However, with implementation of mitigation measures, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.  <b>Mitigation Measures MM-WF-1A and MM-WF-1B</b> (detailed in Impact WF-2 above).</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: LTSM
#2 (2013)	<p><b>Impact WF-5: Exposure of people or structures to significant risk from wildland fires</b>                      The proposed project could have exposed people or structures to significant wildfire hazards due to past unpermitted construction activities.  <b>Mitigation Measures MM-WF-1A and MM-WF-1B</b> (detailed in Impact WF-2 above). However, past activities were implemented without mitigation.</p>	Before Mitigation: PS After Mitigation: S&U

Source: Prepared by AECOM in 2024.

Acronyms: LTS = less than significant impact; LTSM = less than significant with mitigation; LTCC = less than cumulatively considerable; NI = no impact; PS = potentially significant; S&U = significant and unavoidable; N/A = not applicable.