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INITIAL STUDY
Environmental Checklist and Evaluation for Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Jail Replacement Project</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>May 5, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>County Capital Project</td>
<td>Project Location:</td>
<td>150 W. Hedding St., San Jose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Summary**

The proposed project consists of replacement of an outdated jail facility at Santa Clara County’s Main Jail Complex with a new jail building at either of two locations shown on Figure 1. The conceptual plan for the replacement jail is a single building up to 325,000 square feet in size with a maximum height of 150 feet (six stories). The existing three-story, 133,000 square-foot Main Jail South building would be demolished following completion of the new building. The new building would have the capacity to house up to an estimated 815 inmates compared to an estimated capacity of 674 inmates in Main Jail South. The proposed new building would address the increased inmate population as a result of the State of California’s AB109 Realignment program and the need for inmate programs (education, substance abuse, job placement, life skills, etc) within the incarceration system.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**Project Objectives**

The new facility is intended to fulfill a need for additional Medium / High Medium Security and Special Management housing beds within the County’s Department of Correction. The current facilities (Main Jail North and Main Jail South) do not currently have sufficient bed space or the correct security levels of existing beds to address current inmate populations, or to address increased inmate population as a result of the State of California’s AB109 Realignment program. The new facility would be designed to address the need for Inmate programs (education, substance abuse, job placement, life skills, etc) within the incarceration system. Additionally, the facility would be designed to address an increased need for Mental Health / Special Management housing beds, and associated programs and treatment space, including Mental Health / Special Management Re-entry programs.

**Project Location and Setting**

The project site is the County of Santa Clara’s Main Jail Complex at 150 W. Hedding St., San Jose, as well as County-owned parking areas east of North San Pedro Street. Figure 1 (see below) shows the location of the project site. The site encompasses:

- the Main Jail South building;
- the Main Jail North building and a parking / driveway area between Main Jail North and W. San Pedro Street; and
- the parking lots between W. San Pedro Street and the County Government Center as well as the driveway between the County Government Center and Mission Street.

The project site is surrounded by other government facilities, including the Santa Clara County Hall of Justice (west of Main Jail North), the San Jose Office of Emergency Services (south of Main Jail South), the County Government Center and Old San Jose City Hall (east of W. San Pedro Street), and the County Re-Entry Resource Center northeast of the intersection of W. San Pedro Street.
Pedro Street and Mission Street). North of Hedding Street are a County employee parking lot, a County Sheriff’s Department training facility (formerly Richey U.S. Army Reserve Center), and a public parking garage.

**Proposed Development**

The County of Santa Clara proposes to design and construct a new Main Jail building for the Santa Clara Department of Correction aimed at replacing outdated bed space and adding special management beds and program and treatment space not currently available in the Main Jail Complex. The proposed new building would be adjacent to the Main Jail Complex and would replace inmate cells located in the Main Jail South building, which would be demolished sometime after the new building has been completed and available for occupancy. The new facility is estimated to cost approximately $145 million. The County of Santa Clara is seeking partial project funding via the State of California lease-revenue bond funds under the Senate Bill (SB) 863 Bond funding measure. Additional project funds would come from County sources. Construction is anticipated to occur in the 2017-2018 time frame.

**New Jail Facility**

The Main Jail South building is 133,200 square feet in size and three stories tall. The conceptual plan for the replacement jail is a single building up to 325,000 square feet in size with a maximum height of 150 feet (six stories). The ultimate square footage and height of the proposed new building would be determined during the design phase of the project. The new building would have the capacity to house up to an estimated 815 inmates compared to an estimated capacity of 674 inmates in Main Jail South—an addition of 141 beds to the Main Jail Complex. It is estimated that the new building could require up to an additional 50 staff to operate compared to the current number of staff at Main Jail South.

**Demolition of Main Jail South**

The Main Jail South building would be demolished sometime after the new building has been completed and available for occupancy. Construction materials would be hauled off site for reuse or disposal at a landfill. The site would be re-graded and likely paved over for as parking as a temporary use. The County has not yet developed plans for reuse of the site following demolition. Possible future uses would be for an administration building or another correctional facility.

**Location Options**

The County has selected two potential locations within the project site to construct the new jail building (see Figure 1), which are described below. With either Site Option #1 or #2, the new facility is planned to be a “rear-chase” design, which would place the maintenance access areas towards the exterior of the building, with the inmate cells being placed on the interior. The inmate cells would receive natural light through windows on the building’s exterior. This design would allow the building exterior to appear more like a commercial building (such as an office) rather than a jail. With either site option, the construction staging area would be located across N. San Pedro Street from the existing Main Jail North and would temporarily displace 105 parking spaces (see Figure 1).
Site Option #1. This option would place the new facility immediately to the east of the existing Main Jail North building directly above an existing intake ramp into the Main Jail North building. Figure 2 shows the approximate location and footprint (20,250 square-foot footprint). Figure 3 shows a 3D depiction of a conceptual jail building adjacent to Main Jail North. Temporary closure of the ramp during construction is expected. A 30-foot setback would be maintained between the two buildings. This siting option would include physical connections to the existing Main Jail North via an above grade, covered canopy (for staff and public access). A below grade tunnel connection to Main Jail North to the new facility is also anticipated, which
would cause moderate / temporary disturbance to operations at the Main Jail Complex. It is anticipated that impacts to existing building utilities (sewer, gas and electrical) will be addressed early on in the construction activities in order to minimize impacts to the existing Main Jail Complex. It is anticipated that temporary disturbances / closures of a portion of N. San Pedro (from West Hedding St. to West Mission Street) would occur throughout the duration of construction. Replacement parking for the spaces that would be lost are available at the public parking garage on the opposite side of Hedding Street.

Figure 2 – Option 1 Jail Site Location

Figure 3 - 3D Depiction of Jail Building Concept at Site Option #1
Site Option #2. This option would locate the new building across N. San Pedro Street east of Main Jail South and the San Jose Office of Emergency Services and north of the Santa Clara County Re-Entry Resource Center. Figure 4 shows the approximate location and building area (34,560 square-foot footprint). Figure 5 shows a 3D depiction of a conceptual jail building across N. San Pedro Street from the Main Jail Complex. The building would be a standalone facility with no physical connections to the Main Jail Complex. Utility connections for this site would likely occur along N. San Pedro Street. This site option would displace 220 existing parking spaces in order to accommodate the new facility. Parking for correctional officers would likely be located in the public parking lot north of Site Option #2 (adjacent to the West Wing of the County Government Center. Replacement parking would be located at other County lots in the vicinity. An inmate transfer area / bus loading zone would located on the ground level of the new jail with access to N. San Pedro Street. From there, the inmates would be bused to the existing Main Jail North ramp, where inmates are currently transferred for court appearances.

Figure 4 – Option 2 Jail Site Location

Figure 5 - 3D Depiction of Jail Building Concept at Site Option #2
I. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

☒ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture / Forest Resources ☒ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources ☒ Cultural Resources ☒ Geology / Soils
☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☒ Hazards & Hazardous Materials ☒ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use ☒ Noise ☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services ☐ Resources / Recreation ☒ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance ☐ None

II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS WITH NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Some proposed applications that are not exempt from CEQA review may have little or no potential for adverse environmental impact related to most of the topics in the Environmental Checklist; and/or potential impacts may involve only a few limited subject areas. These types of projects are generally minor in scope, located in a non-sensitive environment, and are easily identifiable and without public controversy. For the environmental issue areas where there is no potential for significant environmental impact (and not checked above), the following finding can be made using the project description, environmental setting, or other information as supporting evidence.

☐ Check here if this finding is not applicable

FINDING: For the following topics, there is no potential for significant environmental impact to occur either from construction, operation or maintenance of the proposed project, and no further discussion in the Environmental Checklist is necessary.

EVIDENCE: Agricultural and Forest Resources: The County-owned property is currently developed with existing jail facilities and is surrounded by other government facilities. Project construction would not affect farmland or forest resources, and the property is not under a Williamson Act Contract. (Reference #3, 4)

EVIDENCE: Biological Resources: The project site is currently developed with existing buildings and parking lots and is surrounded by other government facilities. No biological resources exist at the project site. The project would comply with the Santa Clara County Habitat Plan Area. (Reference #3, 4)

EVIDENCE: Hydrology and Water Quality: The proposed project would not employ groundwater wells for water supply or affect groundwater recharge. The site is already developed with buildings and parking lots; therefore, further development would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns or change the volume of stormwater runoff discharged...
to the stormwater drain. The Guadalupe River is located approximately 900 feet west of the project site, which is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Best management practices used during construction would prevent substantial soil erosion and stormwater runoff. (Project Description; Reference # 4, 6, 35a, 35b)

**EVIDENCE:** **Land Use:** The proposed project is replacement of an existing jail facility and therefore would not divide an established community. The site is designated Public/Quasi-Public under San Jose’s Envision 2040 General Plan, and zoned R1-8. As a public agency, the County is not subject to the land use designations of other jurisdictions for development of facilities related to government operations. (Project Description; Reference # 3, 4, 5)

**EVIDENCE:** **Population and Housing:** The proposed project would replace an existing jail facility. The new facility would not significantly change bed capacity compared with the existing Main Jail South; therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth. Bed capacity displaced by demolition of Main Jail South would be shift to the proposed new jail facility. (Project Description; Reference # 1, 3, 4, 30)

**EVIDENCE:** **Public Services:** The proposed project is replacement of an existing jail facility. Law enforcement services are already provided by the Santa Clara County Sheriff’s Office. The proposed project is intended to replace an existing facility, it would not significantly increase the need for additional fire response services. Other public services, such as schools or parks, would not be required. (Project Description; Reference # 3, 4, 5, 6)

**EVIDENCE:** **Resources/Recreation:** The proposed project site is not located in an area where mineral resources of value to the region or state have been identified. The site is also not located on locally important mineral resource recovery sites. The proposed project is replacement of an existing jail facility. It would not involve either the use of or construction of public recreational facilities. (Project Description; Reference # 3, 5, 6)

**EVIDENCE:** **Utilities/Service Systems:** Sewer, gas, and electrical services for the proposed jail building would be provided through existing City / County mains and would be independent of the existing jail facilities. The proposed project would not require the construction of new stormwater, water, or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. (Project Description; Reference # 3)
III. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature: David M. Rader
Date: 5/5/15

Printed Name: David M. Rader
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

A. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  
   | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |
   2,3,4,6,8,12

b) Substantially damage scenic resources along a designated scenic highway?  
   | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |
   3,6,7,30

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  
   | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |
   2,3,38,40

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?  
   | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |
   3,4,5

SETTING

The project site is the County of Santa Clara’s Main Jail Complex, located at 150 W. Hedding St., San Jose, as well as two County-owned parking areas located east of North San Pedro Street. Figure 1 shows the location of the project site. The site is located in an urban setting and is surrounded by other government facilities.

DISCUSSION:

b)

No Impact. The project site is not located in the vicinity of a designated scenic highway.

a,c,d)

Less Than Significant. The maximum height of the proposed jail facility would be 150 feet (six stories). Site Option #1 is located immediately east of Main Jail North, which is approximately 160 in height. Site Option #2 is in the vicinity of the West Wing and East Wing of the County Government Center, which are approximately 90 feet and 175 feet in height, respectively, and the Old San Jose City Hall which ranges from 115 feet and 140 feet in height. Figures 3 and 5 show 3D depictions of the proposed new building at the two site options. Given the proposed new building would be of similar height to these adjacent buildings, it would tend to blend into existing urban setting and would not change views from the surrounding area and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Exterior lighting would be similar to the lighting at Main Jail North—basic architectural / façade lighting and security lighting of public and egress routes (per code) and parking areas, as well as security lighting of the outdoor inmate recreation areas. Given the limited amount of light required and the location of the project amid other mid-rise buildings, the new building would
not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

MITIGATION:

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert 10 or more acres of farmland classified as prime in the report <em>Soils of Santa Clara County (Class I, II)</em> to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with an existing Williamson Act Contract or the County’s Williamson Act Ordinance (Section C13 of County Ordinance Code)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Conflict with existing zone for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Agriculture and Forest Resources

MITIGATION:

None required.
C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SETTING:

The proposed project is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), which regulates air pollutants, including those that may be generated by construction and operation of development projects. These so-called criteria pollutants include reactive organic gases, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter (PM). BAAQMD also regulates toxic air contaminants (TACs), which are fine particulate matter, long-term exposure to which is linked with respiratory conditions and increased risk of cancer. Major sources of toxic air contaminants in the Bay Area include major automobile and truck transportation corridors (e.g., freeways and expressways) and stationary sources (e.g., factories, refineries, power plants).

DISCUSSION:

a-d)

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.** The proposed project would replace the existing Main Jail South building with a new building, increasing bed capacity from approximately 674 to 815 (141 additional beds). BAAQMD has published screening criteria for operational criteria pollutants for different land use types.¹ The BAAQMD list of land use types does not include correctional facilities. Because County jail facilities house inmates who do not leave during their confinement period, as well as have staff who operate these facilities, the land

¹Although the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines that contain these screening level sizes have been overturned in court, the County has determined that these thresholds are based on substantial evidence, as identified in Appendix D of the Guidelines, and has therefore incorporated them into this Initial Study.
use type that most closely matches the new jail building is *congregate care facility*. The BAAQMD operational screening threshold for this land use is 657 dwelling units. In comparing the congregate care facility to the proposed jail, dwelling units would be the equivalent of beds. Because the project would increase bed capacity in the Main Jail Complex by 141 beds, the proposed project would be well below this threshold. Therefore, operation of the facility would not violate air quality standards, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Construction of the new building and demolition of Main Jail South would involve excavation, grading, and concrete crushing. These construction activities could generate fugitive dust emissions. Implementation of BAAQMD’s basic construction mitigation measures for dust control mitigation would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.

BAAQMD has identified freeways and roadways as potential sources of TACs. TACs are a defined set of airborne pollutants that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. Although the project site is located approximately 1,000 feet east of Highway 87, this area falls below BAAQMD’s thresholds for PM$_{2.5}$ and cancer risks from exposure to TACs.

**MITIGATION:**

**Mitigation Measure #1 – Dust Control**

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- 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.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
## D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or tributary to an already impaired water body, as defined by section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have a substantial adverse effect on oak woodland habitat as defined by Oak Woodlands Conservation Law (conversion/loss of oak woodlands) – Public Resource Code 21083.4?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Interferes substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Tree Preservation Ordinance [Section C16]?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Wetland Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 25-30]?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Riparian Habitat [GP Policy, R-RC 31-41]?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Biological Resources

## MITIGATION:

None required.
### Setting:

The project site is located in the City of San Jose at the intersection of Hedding and San Pedro Streets, an area that has been developed with government facilities since the 1950s. Project development would involve construction of a new jail building, followed by demolition of Main Jail South.

### Discussion:

a,d)

**Less Than Significant.** Garavaglia Architecture, Inc. prepared a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) (Appendix A) to evaluate the historic significance of Main Jail South, which is proposed to be demolished following completion of the new jail facility. The jail was built in 1958 and is more than 50 years old. Pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, the HRE evaluated whether Main Jail South is eligible for listing as a historic resource on the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places; it also applied the provisions of the County Santa Clara Historic Preservation Ordinance. The HRE concluded that Main Jail South does not have a level of historical significance or integrity that would qualify it for listing as a historic resource on the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places or as a local landmark under the County’s Historic Preservation Ordinance. Therefore, the property does not qualify as a historic resource under CEQA.

b,c)
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation. A records search and archaeological field reconnaissance was conducted by Archaeological Resource Management for the Santa Clara County Crime Laboratory site and vicinity in 2003. The region along the Guadalupe River has revealed both prehistoric and historic material found buried beneath alluvial soils. Most of these sites have been found during archaeological testing, archaeological monitoring, and construction excavation. Archaeological Resource Management did not find cultural materials on the crime lab site; however, most of the site was obscured by asphalt. The two site options for the proposed jail building have similar conditions. The possible presence of unknown cultural resources is a significant impact. The County would be required to comply with County Ordinance B6-18, which would ensure that if significant buried cultural resources are encountered during construction activities that standard County procedures are followed. In addition, implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this potentially significant environmental impact to a less-than-significant level.

MITIGATION:

Mitigation Measure #2

The County shall have a qualified archaeological monitor spot-check grading and excavation of undisturbed soils during construction activities for both development of the new jail building and demolition of Main Jail South to determine if any prehistoric or historic artifacts are present at the construction sites. This requirement shall be included in any construction contracts for the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the report, <em>Soils of Santa Clara County</em>, creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>14,32,52,53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>3,6,32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Cause substantial compaction or over-covering of soil either on-site or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>3,6,32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Cause substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>2,3,6,32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SETTING:**

The project site is located on flat topography east of the Guadalupe River. Geotechnical studies of the two site options would be performed during the design phase of the project. A geotechnical investigation was performed for the location of the Santa Clara County New Crime Laboratory on 250 W. Hedding Street, which is located approximately 1,000 feet west of Site Option #1.3

**DISCUSSION:**

a-c) **Less Than Significant.** The proposed site is not located in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no known active fault is known to cross through or near either of the site location options. The project site is not located in a landslide hazard zone. The site is located in County and State Liquefaction Zones. The geotechnical investigation of the crime lab site found some isolated sand and silt layers that could be subject to liquefaction. The County would be determine through geotechnical site investigations for the two location options whether remediation of site soils is necessary and what type of structural engineering would be required to meet the requirements of the California Building Code.

The geotechnical investigation of the crime lab site cited USDA description of Campbell silty clay loam (Ca) and Cropley clay loam (CsA), which have a low erosion hazard. The jail replacement project are also contains these soil types. Best management practices used during construction would prevent substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

d-g) **No Impact.** The two site options for the proposed new building are not located on expansive soil. The new building would be connected to the sewer system and would not require an on-site septic system. Construction of the new building and demolition of Mail Jail South would not involve substantial compaction or over-covering of soil or a substantial change in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill.

---

MITIGATION:

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT</td>
<td>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</td>
<td>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SETTING:

Given the overwhelming scope of global climate change, it is not anticipated that a single development project would have an individually discernible effect on global climate change. It is more appropriate to conclude that the greenhouse gas emissions generated by a proposed project would combine with emissions across the state, nation, and globe to cumulatively contribute to global climate change. The primary GHG associated with the proposed Jail replacement project is carbon dioxide, which is directly generated by fuel combustion (vehicle trips, use of natural gas for buildings) and indirectly generated by use of electricity.

DISCUSSION:

a-b)

Less Than Significant. The proposed project would replace the existing Main Jail South building with a new building, increasing inmate bed capacity from approximately 674 to 815. BAAQMD has published screening criteria for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for different land use types.4 The BAAQMD list of land use types does not include correctional facilities. Because County jail facilities house beds for inmates who do not leave during their confinement period, as well as have support staff who operate these facilities, the land use type that most closely matches the new jail building is congregate care facility. The BAAQMD operational screening threshold for this land use is 143 dwelling units. In comparing a congregate care facility with a jail facility, dwelling units are equivalent to beds. Because it is estimated that the project would increase bed capacity of the Main Jail Complex by approximately from 674 to 815

4Although the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines that contain these screening level sizes have been overturned in court, the County has determined that these thresholds are based on substantial evidence, as identified in Appendix D of the Guidelines, and has therefore incorporated them into this Initial Study.
(141 additional beds), the proposed project would be below this threshold. Therefore, operation of the facility would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in GHG emissions.

**MITIGATION:**

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

a) **Less Than Significant.** The proposed project includes the demolition of Main Jail South following completion of the proposed new jail facility. In March 2015, ProTech Consulting &
Engineering, Inc. performed a building survey to identify asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and presence of Lead-based paint (Pb) at the subject project. The survey was conducted in an effort to comply with pre-demolition/renovation regulatory requirements. The survey report (Appendix B) provided recommendations for removal of these materials prior to demolition and in compliance with regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

b-f,g-i)

**No Impact.** The proposed project is replacement of a jail facility. It would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project site is located within ¼ mile of Burnett Middle School. However, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area for San Jose International Airport; however the land use is consistent with the safety and noise policies within the airport’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan and would be under the maximum 212-foot building elevation allowed under Federal Aviation Regulations CFR Part 77 covering obstructions to air navigation. N. Pedro Street would be closed for short periods during construction, but emergency access to all buildings would be maintained, and the project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is located in an urban area and is not subject to a risk of wildland fires.

**MITIGATION:**

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOULD THE PROJECT:</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Note policy regarding flood retention in watercourse and restoration of riparian vegetation for West Branch of the Llagas.)

e) Create or contribute increased impervious surfaces and associated runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

j) Be located in an area of special water quality concern (e.g., Los Gatos or Guadalupe Watershed)?

k) Be located in an area known to have high levels of nitrates in well water?

l) Result in a septic field being constructed on soil where a high water table extends close to the natural land surface?

m) Result in a septic field being located within 50 feet of a drainage swale; 100 feet of any well, water course or water body or 200 feet of a reservoir at capacity?

n) Conflict with Water Collaborative Guidelines and Standards for Land Uses Near Streams?

DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Hydrology

MITIGATION:

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. LAND USE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</th>
<th>c) Conflict with special policies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

See Section II; Land Use

**MITIGATION:**

None required.

### J. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACTS</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,8,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,6,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,5,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 3,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or private airstrip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,5,19,22,40,51a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

SETTING:

The project site is located in the City of San Jose at the intersection of Hedding and San Pedro Streets. Figure 1 shows the proposed location options for construction of the replacement jail building and the location of Main Jail South, which would be demolished sometime after the new facility is in operation. Land uses within the surrounding area (1,000 feet or less from construction / demolition sites) are generally institutional or commercial, such as government facilities, offices, and retail. No residential dwellings are located within this radius, with the exception of four single family homes located on the east side of North San Pedro Avenue, just north of Taylor Street. These homes are between 800 and 1,000 feet from the nearest location where construction could occur.

DISCUSSION:

(a-c,e)

**Less Than Significant.** The proposed project would add a maximum of 50 more staff at the Main Jail Complex, which would result in up to 100 daily vehicle trips. Given existing background noise levels, this increase in traffic levels would not be sufficient to increase in the overall noise environment. Because the project is replacement of an existing jail facility, it would not generate a permanent increase in noise levels that exceed existing ambient noise levels or standards of the Santa Clara County Noise Ordinance. The subject property is located within an airport land use plan area for the Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport. However, the project site is outside the 65 dB CNEL aircraft noise contour and therefore would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

(d)

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Construction on the project site would generate noise and would temporarily increase noise levels at adjacent land uses. Noise impacts resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise-generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise sensitive receptors. Construction noise impacts primarily occur when construction activities take place during noise-sensitive times of the day (early morning, evening, or nighttime hours), the construction occurs in areas immediately adjoining noise sensitive land uses, or when construction durations last over extended periods of time.

The County Noise Ordinance (Section B11-152) prohibits construction activities between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays and Saturdays, or at any time on Sundays or holidays. Construction and demolition is exempted from the exterior noise standards identified in Section B11-152 (County, 2012). According to the County Code, the mobile construction equipment threshold is 85 dBA and the Santa Clara County stationary construction equipment threshold is 70 dBA daily during allowable construction periods in commercial areas (County, 2012).

It is anticipated that construction would not occur weekdays and Saturday between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., or at any time on Sundays or holidays. Construction would be
temporary in nature. Use of mobile construction equipment, such as excavators, backhoes, pile drivers, front-end loaders, and dump trucks, would generally not exceed the 85 dBA threshold for nearby land uses, such as offices. However, to ensure that the proposed project would comply with the County Code in regards to special provisions for construction noise, the following mitigation would be incorporated into the project to ensure temporary noise emissions from construction would be less than significant.

MITIGATION:

Mitigation Measure #3 - Construction Noise
- Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7 AM to 8 PM Monday through Friday and 9 AM to 6 PM on Saturdays. This includes all construction activities associated with the project, including grading, excavation, stripping, pavement, foundation, and installing new structures and improvements etc., on-site.
- Contractors shall use "new technology" power equipment with state of the art noise shielding and muffling devices. All internal combustion engine driven equipment shall be equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers which are in good working condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Stationary noise generating equipment shall be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors, such as single family residences.
- Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be prohibited.

K. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Population and Housing

MITIGATION:

None required.
### L. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

See Section II; Public Services

**MITIGATION:**

None required.

### M. RESOURCES AND RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOULD THE PROJECT:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

See Section II; Public Services

**MITIGATION:**

None required.
important mineral resource recovery site as delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?
c) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
d) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
e) Be on, within or near a public or private park, wildlife reserve, or trail or affect existing or future recreational opportunities?
f) Result in loss of open space rated as high priority for acquisition?

DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Resources and Recreation

MITIGAITON:

None required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Not provide safe access, obstruct access to nearby uses or fail to provide for future street right of way?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SETTING:**

The proposed project is located at the Santa Clara County Main Jail Complex at the intersection of N. San Pedro Street and W. Hedding Street in San Jose (see Figure 1). The project site is also bounded by Mission Street to the south. The Valley Transportation Agency (VTA) is the designated congestion management agency for Santa Clara County, including the City of San Jose.

**DISCUSSION:**

a,b,e)

**Less Than Significant.** VTA’s Transportation Impact Guidelines require that a complete Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for Congestion Management Plan Purposes be performed for any project in Santa Clara County expected to generate 100 or more net new weekday (AM or PM peak hour) or weekend peak hour trips, including both inbound and outbound trips. The proposed project would add approximately 50 staff to the Main Jail Complex, with a portion of these employees working during off-peak shifts. Therefore, the project would not generate enough peak-hour trips to require preparation of a TIA. Because the estimated inmate population of the Main Jail Complex would only increase by up to 36, it is not anticipated that there would be a significant increase in daily visits by the public to see inmates. On that basis, operation of the proposed new jail facility would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system or conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures.

During construction, N. San Pedro Street may be closed for short periods of time to accommodate the movement of construction equipment, such as cranes and supply trucks. However, adequate emergency vehicle access to the Main Jail Complex and the County Government Center would continue to be provided by Hedding, Mission, and North First Streets as well as Guadalupe Parkway.

c,d,f,g)

**No Impact.** The proposed project is replacement of a jail facility and would not affect air traffic or involve permanent changes to roadways or pedestrian facilities. During construction, N. San Pedro Street may be closed for short periods of time to accommodate the movement of construction equipment, such as cranes and supply trucks.
MITIGATION:

None required.

### 0. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Require new or expanded entitlements in order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Not be able to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Be in non-compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

See Section II; Utilities and Service Systems

MITIGATION:

None required.
**P. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number of or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | 1 to 52 |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | 1 to 52 |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | 1 to 52 |

**DISCUSSION:**

a) **No Impact.** The proposed project would be developed site located in an urban area would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of any fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) **No Impact.** No past, current, or probable future projects were identified in the project vicinity that, when added to project-related impacts, would result in cumulatively considerable impacts. No cumulatively considerable impacts would occur with development of the proposed project. As discussed in the analyses provided in this Initial Study, project impacts were found to be less than significant. The incremental effects of the proposed project are not cumulatively
significant when viewed in context of the past, current, and/or probable future projects. No cumulative impacts would occur.

c) **No Impact.** The proposed project is construction and operation of a new jail facility to replace the outdated Main Jail South building at Santa Clara County’s Main Jail Complex. As described in the environmental topic sections of this Initial Study, the proposed building and use would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
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