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Project Description

The Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department proposes to replace the existing bridge number 37C0095 with a new bridge (to be numbered 37C0601). The project is located in a rural, unincorporated area of Santa Clara County, approximately 4.5 miles west of the City of Morgan Hill.

Determination

This proposed Negative Declaration (ND) is included to give notice to interested agencies and the public that it is the County’s intent to adopt a ND for this project. This does not mean that the County’s decision regarding the project is final. This ND is subject to modification based on comments received by interested agencies and the public.

The County has prepared an Initial Study for this project, and pending public review, expects to determine from this study that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

The proposed project would have no effect on agricultural lands, land use, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation and transportation.

In addition, the proposed project would have no significant effect on air quality, cultural resources, geology, greenhouse gas emissions, hazardous materials, hydrology, noise, utilities and service systems and cumulative impacts. The Project includes the implementation of a number of standard measures that are designed to minimize or avoid environmental impacts. These measures include those that will minimize construction-related emissions, avoid impacts if previously-undiscovered archaeological resources are encountered, minimize the potential for both short- and long-term degradation of water quality, avoid impacts during demolition associated with exposure to lead and/or asbestos-containing materials, and avoid any potentially significant noise impacts during construction.

The proposed project would have no significant adverse effect on biological resources because the Project includes the implementation of a number of standard measures that are in compliance with the measures identified in the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (Habitat Plan), of which the County is a participating entity and the Project is a “covered activity.”

____________________________________________
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SECTION 1.0    PROJECT INFORMATION

1.1  PROJECT TITLE

Uvas Road at Little Uvas Creek Bridge Replacement Project [Bridge Number 37C0095 (Existing)/37C0601 (New)]

1.2  LEAD AGENCY ADDRESS AND LEAD AGENCY CONTACT

Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department
101 Skyport Drive
San José, CA  95110

Solomon Tegegne, Associate Civil Engineer
408-573-2495

1.3  PROJECT LOCATION

The existing Uvas Road Bridge is located on Uvas Road at Little Uvas Creek in a rural, unincorporated area of Santa Clara County, California. The site is located approximately 4.5 miles west of the City of Morgan Hill, approximately 200 feet north of the Uvas Road/Little Uvas Road intersection. The replacement bridge would be constructed approximately 600 feet northwesterly of the existing bridge on a new alignment on Uvas Road.

The project would require some additional right-of-way and/or temporary construction easements (TCEs) from three adjacent parcels, Assessor Parcel Numbers (APN’s) 742-29-058, 742-29-067, and 712-30-001.

1.4  GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION AND ZONING DISTRICT

General Plan Land Use Designation: Hillsides
Zoning District: HS

1.5  PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department, in cooperation with Office of Local Assistance of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), proposes to replace the existing bridge number 37C0095 with a new bridge (to be numbered 37C0601) that can accommodate two lanes of traffic with shoulders, removal of the existing narrow, Functionally Obsolete bridge, realigning/straightening the Uvas Road approaches to the new bridge, and installation of retaining walls and rock slope protection at the new bridge abutments. A full description of the project follows this section (See Section 2.0).

1.6  PROJECT-RELATED APPROVALS AND PERMITS
• Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) – Section 401 Water Quality Certification.
• U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) – Section 404 Nationwide or Regional General Permit
• State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit
• California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) – Streambed Alteration Agreement under Section 1602

1.7 SANTA CLARA VALLEY HABITAT PLAN DESIGNATION

Land Cover Designation: Zone A
Development Zone: HHS
Fee Zone: A
Owl Conservation Zone: N/A

1.8 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation (completed by the Lead Agency):

☑️ 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 revision in the project could have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and/or 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_________________________  ________________________
Signature            Date
___________________________  __________________________
Title      Agency
SECTION 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW AND LOCATION

The Santa Clara County Roads & Airports Department proposes to replace the existing Uvas Road Bridge (Bridge Number 37C0095) over Little Uvas Creek. As shown on Figures 2-1 and 2-2, the existing bridge is located in a rural, unincorporated, area of Santa Clara County (the “County”) west of the City of Morgan Hill, approximately 200 feet north of the Uvas Road/Little Uvas Road intersection.

2.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing bridge was constructed in 1928 and is a narrow structure that is approximately 24 feet in total width and 53 feet in length. The bridge, which has two, narrow (10-foot) traffic lanes, is functionally obsolete and does not meet current design standards. The bridge is also an impediment to flood flows in Little Uvas Creek for both the 50-year and 100-year storms.

In addition, the existing curvature of Uvas Road on the bridge approaches does not comply with current highway design standards for the desired 55 miles-per-hour (mph) design speed. Specifically, the existing horizontal curve north of the bridge has a radius of approximately 575 feet, and the curve south of the bridge has a radius of approximately 420 feet. This tight “S” curve geometry of the existing road creates a reduced line of sight, which has resulted in a history of both severe and fatal traffic accidents. According to the Highway Design Manual, comfortable speeds associated with these radii are approximately 35 mph, and less than 20 mph, respectively.

2.3 PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

The purpose of the project is to correct existing structural and roadway deficiencies at the project site by constructing a replacement bridge and roadway approaches that comply with current seismic safety and highway design standards.

To achieve its purpose, the project would construct a new bridge over Little Uvas Creek and eliminate the non-compliant approach curves on Uvas Road. As shown on Figure 2-3, this would be accomplished by straightening/realigning Uvas Road to the west of its current alignment for a distance of approximately 1,800 feet. The realignment would begin approximately 300 feet south of the Uvas Road/Little Uvas Road intersection and continue to the north. Given the meander of Little Uvas Creek in this area, this realignment would facilitate the construction of a replacement bridge approximately 600 feet northwesterly of the existing bridge.
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FIGURE 2-3
The replacement bridge, which would clear-span Little Uvas Creek, would be approximately 90 feet in length and 43 feet in width. The bridge would accommodate two 12-foot traffic lanes and two 8-foot shoulders. A barrier/railing with a standard height of 54 inches would be installed on each side of the bridge.

The realigned portion of Uvas Road would have a minimum cross-section consisting of two 12-foot traffic lanes and two 4-foot shoulders. At the approaches to the new bridges, grading would consist of approximately 10 feet of cut and up to about 14 feet of fill. Retaining walls up to 8 feet in height would be required south of the bridge, on the east side of the new roadway, for supporting the approach embankment. Two new culverts would be required for the road alignment, one for the north tributary to Little Uvas Creek, and one on the south end of the alignment to facilitate drainage.

The realignment of Uvas Road would necessitate modifications to several existing driveways and Little Uvas Road at the locations where they connect to Uvas Road. In addition, utilities would be relocated as necessary to accommodate the proposed project.

2.3.1 Construction Phase

The new bridge and road would be constructed while the existing road and bridge continues to be used for traffic and, therefore, detours would not be necessary. Demolition of the existing bridge and road would occur after the new bridge and road opens to traffic.

Bridge supports and retaining walls would be constructed using cast-in-drilled-hole concrete piles and spread footings, which would avoid the need for piledriving. The depth of drilling/excavation for the piles would be approximately 20-25 feet.

Temporary access to the low-flow channel may be required for installation of slope protection and tree removal. During the summer months, however, Little Uvas Creek is generally dry. Construction activities will be conditioned such that work within the banks of the creek channel - including demolition of the existing bridge as well as new roadway embankments, bridge abutments, slope protection and retaining walls - will be scheduled during this dry season (i.e., between April 15th and October 15th), with the intent of avoiding diversion of, or bypass pumping of, the creek channel during construction. All proposed project elements, including demolition of the existing bridge and construction of the proposed bridge, would take place during two consecutive construction seasons.

2.3.2 Right-of-Way Requirements

The project would require some additional right-of-way and/or TCEs from three adjacent parcels, APN’s 742-29-058, 742-29-067, and 712-30-001. None of the needed right-of-way and/or TCE’s would affect existing buildings or result in a change in land use on the affected parcels.

The County has been coordinating with the property owners regarding the project and the need for additional right-of-way and the TCE’s.
2.3.3 **Standard Environmental Compliance Measures**

The Project includes the implementation of a number of standard measures that are designed to minimize or avoid environmental impacts. These measures include those that will minimize construction-related emissions, minimize the potential for both short- and long-term degradation of water quality, avoid impacts during demolition associated with exposure to lead and/or asbestos-containing materials, avoid impacts if previously-undiscovered archaeological resources are encountered, and avoid any potentially significant noise impacts during construction. In addition, biological effects will be avoided, minimized, and mitigated through the Project’s compliance with measures identified in the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (Habitat Plan), of which the County is a participating entity and the Project is a “covered activity.” All of these standard measures are described in their respective sub-sections in Section 3 of this Initial Study.
SECTION 3.0 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section describes the existing environmental conditions on and near the project area, as well as environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. The environmental checklist, as recommended in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, identifies environmental impacts that could occur if the proposed project is implemented.

The right-hand column in the checklist lists the source(s) for the answer to each question. The sources cited are identified at the end of this section. Mitigation measures are identified for all significant project impacts. “Mitigation Measures” are measures that will minimize, avoid, or eliminate a significant impact (CEQA Guidelines §15370). Measures that are required by the Lead Agency or other regulatory agency that will reduce or avoid impacts are categorized as “Standard Permit Conditions.”

3.1 AESTHETICS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.1 Setting

The existing land use in the project area is rural residential and rangeland/grazing. The closest structure is approximately 250 feet from the site of the proposed replacement bridge. The proposed Project alignment is not located within a scenic viewshed or along a state scenic highway. Neither Uvas Road nor Little Uvas Creek are designated as Scenic Roads or Wild and Scenic Rivers. The Project alignment is only visible to the immediately surrounding open space land uses. Views of the sites and Project vicinity are shown in Photos 1 and 2.
Photo 1: View of Existing Bridge (37C0095) looking Northeast
3.1.2 Impacts Evaluation

I(a). Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. As described above, the proposed Project is not located within a scenic vista or viewshed. The proposed Project would not add new structures or buildings to the Project site that would block any scenic views. Therefore, impacts related to scenic vistas would not occur.

I(b). Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. The Project site is not visible from a state scenic highway. Therefore, impacts related to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would not occur.

I(c). Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less than Significant Impact. The existing visual character of the proposed Project area is open space and very low density residential. A few scattered residences are found near the new Uvas Road alignment, however, the replacement of the existing bridge with a new bridge and the realignment of the Uvas Road approaches to the new bridge would not change
the existing use. Furthermore, the project is not adding any structures or buildings to obstruct views from these residences. The primary visual change as a result of the project would be at locations where landscaping will be removed, rock slope protection would be installed, and bridge abutments constructed. The removal of a small amount of vegetation would not significantly impact the aesthetic character, given the open space nature of the area. Moreover, the existing Uvas Road and bridge that would be removed by the proposed Project would be restored to grassland. Therefore, impacts related to substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site would be less than significant.

I(d). Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No Impact. The proposed bridge replacement would not require lighting. Construction at the Project site would not require the addition of any temporary light sources, as the construction would be limited to daylight hours. Therefore, no light and glare impacts would occur.
3.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in a loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 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>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Setting

According to the Santa Clara County Important Farmland 2012 Map, the Project site is designated as Grazing Land. There are no Farmlands, forest lands or agricultural uses at, or near the Project site. The Project site is not protected under the Williamson Act.

3.2.2 Impacts Evaluation

II(a.– b). Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use? Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. Since there are no farmlands or agricultural uses at or near the Project site, the proposed replacement of the existing bridge would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural uses or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.
II(c-d). Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? Would the project result in a loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** The Project site is not zoned as forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with existing zoning, rezoning or loss of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production would not occur.

II(e). Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** Refer to Responses (a) through (d). Impacts related to conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use would not occur.
3.3 AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,4</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>
<td>□</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as 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>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 Setting

The Project site is within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the regional air quality agency for monitoring and regulating pollution within the air basin. As required by the Federal Clean Air Act, National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) have been established for six major air pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOx), ozone (O3), particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), sulfur oxides, and lead. Pursuant to the California Clean Air Act, the State has also established the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are generally more stringent than the corresponding federal standards. Santa Clara County and the Bay Area as a whole do not meet the CAAQS or NAAQS for ground-level O3 and PM2.5, or the State standards for PM10. The Santa Clara County is either in attainment or is unclassified for other pollutants.

Sensitive receptors include those segments of the population that are most susceptible to poor air quality, such as children, elderly people, and sick people, as well as sensitive land uses, such as schools, hospitals, parks, and residential communities. There are no sensitive receptors in close proximity to the Project site; the closest structure is approximately 250 feet from the site of the proposed replacement bridge.

3.3.2 Impacts Evaluation

III(a). Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
No Impact. The applicable air quality plan for the Project site is the 2010 Clean Air Plan developed by BAAQMD. The proposed Project would not conflict with the latest Clean Air Plan because the Project would not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance for criteria air pollutants, as detailed in (b) below. The proposed Project would not change the current land use designation and consequently would be consistent with the land use designation specified in the County’s General Plan. In addition, the proposed Project is neither a source of new housing nor a source of new jobs; hence, the proposed Project is not considered growth or population-inducing on a regional scale. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with implementation of an applicable air quality plan would not occur.

III(b). Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Construction Emissions

Less than Significant Impact. Construction activities from the proposed Project that would generate short-term air quality impacts include exhaust emissions from construction equipment, construction worker trips and material delivery vehicles and dust generation activities such as excavation, grading and paving. Due to the short-term duration of these impacts and the fact that there are no sensitive receptors immediately adjacent to the site, all impacts are considered to be less than significant. To reduce the dustfall emissions even further, the Project would comply with the standard permit conditions stated below:

Standard Permit Conditions: The project would implement the following standard BAAQMD dust control measures during all phases of construction on the Project site to reduce dustfall emissions:

- All active construction areas shall be watered twice daily or more often if necessary. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph.
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads and parking and staging areas at construction sites.
- Cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, and any other materials that can be windblown. Trucks transporting these materials shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt tracked onto public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- Subsequent to clearing, grading, or excavating, exposed portions of the site shall be watered, landscaped, treated with soil stabilizers, or covered as soon as possible. Hydroseeding or non-toxic soil stabilizers shall be applied to inactive construction areas and previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more.
- Sandbags or other erosion control measures shall be installed to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- Vegetation in disturbed areas shall be replanted as soon as possible after completion of construction.

---

• Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes. 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 mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
• A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the County regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Therefore, impacts related to construction phase emissions would be less than significant.

**Operational Emissions**

**No Impact.** The proposed Project would have no long-term effect on air quality as it is limited to the replacement of the existing bridge and an adjacent segment of Uvas Road with a new bridge and realigned Uvas Road of similar size and function. There would be no change in the number of vehicle trips in the area after the Project is implemented. Further, for these reasons, the Project received an exemption from the PM$_{2.5}$ project level conformity process from the Air Quality Conformity Task Force. Therefore, impacts related to operational emissions would not occur.

III(c). Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors?

**No Impact.** As discussed in (b) above, neither construction nor operations of the proposed Project would result in air pollution that would exceed BAAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, impacts related to cumulative emissions would not occur.

III(d). Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**No Impact.** The Project site is located in a rural residential area in unincorporated southern Santa Clara County. The surrounding area has been used and continues to be used for ranching. There are no sensitive receptors adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would not occur.

III(e). Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

**No Impact.** As described above, since the Project area is located in a rural setting with scattered housing along Uvas Road, if any odors are created by construction activities, such odors would not impact a substantial number of people. The proposed Project would utilize typical construction techniques, and the odors would be typical of most construction sites. Additionally, the odors would be temporary and localized, and therefore would not impact a substantial number of people. Over the long-term, the Project would not produce objectionable odors.
### 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,5,6</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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,5,6</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.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,2,5</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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,2,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following biological resources discussion is based on Natural Environment Study (NES) and Biological Assessment (BA) prepared by H.T. Harvey and Associates in April 2015 and November 2015 respectively. These reports can be found in Appendices A and B of this Initial Study. The Biological Opinion (BO) on the project was provided by USFWS on December 17, 2015. The approved BO can be found as Appendix C of this report.

Reconnaissance-level surveys were conducted by H.T. Harvey and Associates personnel in 2010, 2011 and 2014. The purpose of these surveys was to: 1) assess existing biotic habitats; 2) assess the
area for its potential to support special-status species and their habitats; 3) identify potential jurisdictional habitats, including Waters of the U.S.; and 4) provide information for the initial proposed project impact assessment.

3.4.1 Setting

The proposed Project site is located within the Mount Madonna USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle in western Santa Clara County. The biological study area (BSA) covers approximately 6.64 acres and includes the existing bridge, the alignment of the proposed replacement bridge, surrounding habitat that could potentially be impacted by proposed Project activities, and upstream and downstream reaches adjacent to the existing and proposed bridges that are not expected to be impacted by proposed Project activities (See Figure 3-1). The proposed Project area is in the public roadway, privately owned land, and the Santa Clara County right-of-way.

Several of the special-status animal species present in the region (i.e., in central/southern Santa Clara County) do not occur in the BSA because the proposed Project site is upstream of a dam, lacks suitable habitat, and/or is outside the range of the species. Special-status animal species that may occur within the BSA include the federally threatened and state endangered California tiger salamander (Ambystoma californiense) and federally threatened California red-legged frog (Rana draytonii). The proposed Project BSA does not contain suitable habitat for either federally-listed or state-listed plant species and they are not expected to be present at the Project site or impacted by the proposed Project.

No fish regulated by any Fishery Management Plan are present in the Project reach of Little Uvas Creek or the north tributary. Construction is anticipated to occur in two construction seasons, during the dry season of each year between April 15 and October 15.

3.4.2 Regulatory Setting

Federal Endangered Species Act

The federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) protects listed wildlife species from harm or “take” which is broadly defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, collect, or attempt to engage in any such conduct. Take can also include habitat modification or degradation that directly results in death or injury to a listed wildlife species. An activity can be defined as “take” even if it is unintentional or accidental. Listed plant species are provided less protection than listed wildlife species. Listed plant species are legally protected from take under FESA if they occur on federal lands or if the project requires a federal action, such as a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 fill permit from the USACE.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service have jurisdiction over federally threatened and endangered species under the FESA. The USFWS also maintains lists of proposed and candidate species. Species on these lists are not legally protected under the FESA, but may become listed in the near future and are often included in their review of an action related to a federal assistance project.

---

**LEGEND**

- Biological Study Area (6.64 ac)
- Permanent Impact Area (3.73 ac)
- Temporary Impact Area (2.91 ac)

**Habitat Types**

- Seasonal Wetlands (0.12 ac)
- Aquatic Riverine (0.22 ac)
- California Annual Grassland (1.54 ac)
- Grain, Row-crop, Hay and Pasture, Disked/Short-term Fallowed (1.16 ac)
- Mixed Riparian Woodland and Forest (1.75 ac)
- Mixed Oak Woodland (0.23 ac)
- Rural-Residential/Roadway/Bare Ground (1.62 ac)

FEDERALLY LISTED CNDDB RECORDS

California Endangered Species Act

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA), California Fish and Game Code, Chapter 1.5, §§ 2050-2116, prohibits the take of any plant or animal listed or proposed for listing as rare (plants only), threatened, or endangered. In accordance with the CESA, the CDFW has jurisdiction over state-listed species (Fish and Game Code 2070). The CDFW regulates activities that may result in “take” of individuals (i.e., “hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill”). Habitat degradation or modification is not expressly included in the definition of “take” under the California Fish and Game Code. The CDFW, however, has interpreted “take” to include the “killing of a member of a species which is the proximate result of habitat modification.”

Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan

The Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan (“Habitat Plan”) provides a framework for promoting the protection and recovery of natural resources, including endangered species, while streamlining the permitting process for planned development, infrastructure, and maintenance activities. The Habitat Plan allows the County of Santa Clara (County), the Santa Clara Valley Water District, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and the cities of Gilroy, Morgan Hill, and San José (collectively, the Local Partners or Permittees) to receive permits for activities and projects under the jurisdiction of each that may affect threatened and endangered species covered by the Habitat Plan. The Habitat Plan is designed to protect, enhance, and restore natural resources in specific areas of Santa Clara County and contribute to the recovery of endangered species. Rather than separately permitting and mitigating individual projects, the Habitat Plan evaluates natural-resource impacts and mitigation requirements comprehensively in a way that is more efficient and effective for at-risk species and their essential habitats.

Development fees established to mitigate impacts of development activities covered in the Habitat Plan are based on the Habitat Plan’s assumptions of the amount of covered activities that will occur during the 50-year permit term, the cost of implementing the Habitat Plan, and amount of conservation actions that are required to mitigate the impacts of covered activities (Willdan 2012). New development will pay a share of the costs of implementing the Habitat Plan.

The proposed Project is a “covered project” under the approved Habitat Plan. As a result, the proposed Project is required by the County of Santa Clara to pay Habitat Plan fees for impacts to certain habitats (i.e., wetland, aquatic, and riparian habitats) in accordance with the types and acreage of habitat impacted, and to implement conservation measures specified by Habitat Plan conditions.

3.4.3 Impacts Evaluation

IV(a). Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Special-status Plant Species

No Impact. As discussed previously in Section 3.4.1, no special-status plant species are expected to occur within the proposed Project’s BSA, or are expected to be disturbed, endangered, or otherwise impacted by the proposed Project (Figure 3-2).
**Special-status Animal Species**

**Less than Significant Impact.** As discussed previously in Section 3.4.1, most of the regional special-status animal species were rejected for potential occurrence in the BSA because of a lack of suitable habitat and/or because the BSA is outside of the range of the species. The remaining special-status animal species which have the potential to breed on the site and/or regularly use it, have the potential to be substantially impacted by the proposed Project (e.g., due to their rarity), were observed nesting in the BSA such as the San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat, and/or are of particular concern to resource agencies were analysed and discussed in detail in NES and BA prepared for this Project (Refer to Appendices A and B). Special-status animal species that may occur within the BSA and could be impacted by the proposed Project are discussed below:

**California Red-Legged Frog** – The proposed Project would result in impacts to as much as 5.02 acre of potential red-legged frog habitat in the BSA (2.74 acre could be permanent impacts and 2.28 acre could be temporary impacts), including aquatic riverine and seasonal wetland habitat that may serve as foraging habitat, riparian habitat that may serve as cover, and upland grassland and agricultural habitat that may serve as dispersal habitat for red-legged frogs.

The County intends to implement the best management practices (BMPs) described below to reduce potential impacts on aquatic species from degradation of water quality.

- No equipment will be operated in the live stream channel;
- Standard erosion control and slope stabilization measures will be required for work performed in any area where erosion could lead to sedimentation of a waterbody;
- Silt fencing will be installed between any activities conducted within, or just above the edge of, the top-of-bank and the edge of the creek to prevent dirt or other materials from entering the channel;
- No debris, soil, silt, sand, bark, slash, sawdust, cement, concrete, washings, petroleum products or other organic or earthen material will be allowed to enter into or be placed where it may be washed by rainfall or runoff into waters of the U.S./State or aquatic habitat; and,
- Machinery will be refueled at least 60 feet from any aquatic habitat, and a spill prevention and response plan will be implemented.

The Project is a covered activity under Habitat Plan as discussed in Section 3.4.2. Therefore, in addition to the BMPs described above, the proposed Project complies with the following applicable Habitat Plan impact avoidance conditions and design criteria:

- Maintenance of natural stream characteristics and a natural channel bed,
- Incorporation of a free-span bridge design, with bridge piers and abutments placed outside the low-flow channel,
- Temporary disturbance of aquatic habitat will not exceed the minimum area necessary to perform the work,
- Sediments and cut soils will be stored and transported in a manner that minimize water quality impacts, such that no stockpiled soil is allowed to enter the channel through runoff,
• Channel bed temporarily disturbed during construction activities will be returned to pre-project or ecologically improved conditions at the end of construction,
• To minimize the spread of pathogens, all staff working in aquatic systems will adhere to the most current guidelines for equipment decontamination provided by the Wildlife Agencies, including but not limited to: cleaning boots and tire treads or other equipment that come in contact with water be cleaned of all organic matter and scrubbed with an appropriate cleansing solution, with no disinfectant allowed to enter the watercourse,
• Removal of riparian vegetation and trees will be limited to the minimum extent required to construct the project,
• The project will comply with all conditions required by the Project-specific Streambed Alteration Agreement to be issued by CDFW, and
• Seed mixtures used for revegetation of the impacted riparian habitat will not contain invasive non-native species but will be composed of native or sterile nonnative species.

The Project will incorporate preconstruction, construction site, and post-construction BMPs and applicable conditions and BMPs required by Chapter 6 of the Habitat Plan, as outlined above, in all wetland and riparian areas to prevent impacts related to the degradation of water quality in downstream habitats. For impacts to wetland, aquatic, and riparian habitats resulting from the Project, these include Condition 3 (Maintain Hydrologic Conditions and Protect Water Quality), Condition 4 (Stream Avoidance and Minimization for Instream Projects), Condition 5 (Avoidance and Minimization Measures for In-Stream Operations and Maintenance), and Condition 6 (Design and Construction Requirements for Covered Transportation Projects). Implementation of avoidance and minimization measures included in these conditions, along with the conservation strategy included in Chapter 5 of the Habitat Plan, will reduce impacts to the California red-legged frog. The conservation strategy exceeds typical project mitigation requirements and includes specific biological goals and objectives for the California red-legged frog and target areas for habitat acquisition, restoration, and enhancement, as described in Section 5.4.3 of the Habitat Plan.

The proposed project will mitigate impacts to California red-legged frogs and their habitat via the payment of impact fees per the Habitat Plan using the Habitat Plan Fee Calculator Worksheet.

**California Tiger Salamander** - The proposed project would result in impacts to as much as 5.02 acre of potential tiger salamander habitat in the BSA (2.74 acre could be permanent impacts and 2.28 acre could be temporary impacts), including aquatic riverine and seasonal wetland habitat that may serve as foraging habitat, riparian habitat that may serve as cover, and upland grassland and agricultural habitat that may serve as dispersal habitat for tiger salamanders.

The Project will incorporate preconstruction, construction site, and post-construction BMPs and applicable conditions and BMPs required by Chapter 6 of the Habitat Plan, as outlined above, in all wetland and riparian areas to prevent impacts related to the degradation of water quality in downstream habitats. For impacts to wetland, aquatic, and riparian habitats resulting from the Project, these include Condition 3 (Maintain Hydrologic Conditions and Protect Water Quality), Condition 4 (Stream Avoidance and Minimization for Instream
Projects), Condition 5 (Avoidance and Minimization Measures for In-Stream Operations and Maintenance), and Condition 6 (Design and Construction Requirements for Covered Transportation Projects). Implementation of avoidance and minimization measures included in these conditions, along with the conservation strategy included in Chapter 5 of the Habitat Plan, will reduce impacts to the California tiger salamander. The proposed project will mitigate impacts to California tiger salamander and their habitat via the payment of impact fees per the Habitat Plan using the Habitat Plan Fee Calculator Worksheet.

Therefore, with the implementation of Habitat Plan conditions and above-listed avoidance and minimization measures, impacts related to substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species would be less than significant.

IV(b). Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would result in permanent impacts to approximately 1.59 acre and 2,573 linear feet of mixed riparian woodland and forest habitat and temporary direct impacts to a maximum of 0.16 acre and 626 linear feet of mixed riparian woodland and forest habitat within the Little Uvas Creek and north tributary riparian corridors. The other sensitive areas found in the BSA are the oak woodland habitat and aquatic riverine habitat. The impacts of the Project on these two sensitive habitats is relatively small and of a largely temporary nature.

The current permanent and temporary impacts represent a conservative estimate of impacts to mixed riparian woodland and forest habitat within the BSA as a final, detailed tree removal plan has not been prepared, and the final number of trees to be removed by the proposed Project has not been determined. It is anticipated that the temporary impacts to trees within mixed riparian woodland and forest would include tree trimming primarily along the east side of Uvas Road.

Permanent and temporary impacts on the riparian and oak woodland habitat within the BSA would be avoided through incorporation of applicable conditions and BMPs required by the Habitat Plan for impacts to riparian habitats resulting from the Project. These include Condition 3, Condition 4, Condition 5, and Condition 6 (as discussed above in a.). In particular, the proposed Project complies with the following applicable impact avoidance conditions and design criteria:

- Removal of riparian vegetation and trees will be limited to the minimum extent required to construct the project,
- The project will comply with all conditions required by the Project’s Streambed Alteration Agreement to be issued by CDFW, and
- Seed mixtures used for revegetation of the impacted riparian habitat will not contain invasive non-native species but will be composed of native or sterile non-native species. If sterile non-native mixtures must be used for temporary erosion control, native seed
mixtures will be used in subsequent treatments to provide long-term erosion control and prevent colonization by invasive non-native species.

- Temporary staging areas will be located in upland habitat outside the riparian corridor that is not sensitive, as it consists primarily of a grain, row-crop, hay and pasture, disked/short-term fallowed habitat.

Implementation of avoidance and minimization measures listed above, along with the conservation strategy included in Chapter 5 of the Habitat Plan and payment of appropriate impact fees per the Habitat Plan, would result in impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities that are less than significant.

IV(c). Would the project 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.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would result in permanent direct impacts to a maximum of 0.02 acre and 69.3 linear feet of seasonal wetland habitat and temporary direct impacts to a maximum of 0.10 acre and 64.0 linear feet of seasonal wetland habitat. The following BMPs would be implemented to reduce potential impacts on wetlands:

- Impacted areas will be limited to the minimum extent necessary to perform the proposed work, and all work within the bed and banks of each of the active channels will be restricted to the dry season (15 April – 15 October), as discussed in Section 3.4.1, or further restricted to the period when the stream channels are dry if this has not occurred by 15 April of the year of construction.
- Falsework may be placed within each of the dry channels during construction of the new bridge over Little Uvas Creek and installation of culverts in the north tributary; however if this or any other construction activities impact wetlands, these stands would be expected to reestablish during the rainy season.
- No permanent bridge support structures such as bents will be placed within the low flow channel of Little Uvas Creek or the north tributary.
- In addition, measures will be taken to prevent any materials from falling into Little Uvas Creek during bridge demolition and construction, including the erection of barriers and netting, as needed.

Under current proposed Project plans, substantial impacts would not occur to seasonal wetland habitat within Little Uvas Creek or the north tributary. These impacts will be relatively small and mostly of a temporary nature. The incorporation of all recommended BMPs, conditions required by the Habitat Plan, and the restriction of all in-channel work to the dry season will further lessen the likelihood of any substantial impacts to the seasonal wetland habitat within the BSA. Because this proposed Project is a covered project under the Habitat Plan, as per Condition 12 (Wetland and Pond Avoidance and Minimization), the proposed project will mitigate impacts to wetlands via the payment of impact fees per the Habitat Plan using the Habitat Plan Fee Calculator Worksheet. Therefore, impacts to wetlands and waterways are expected to be less than significant.
IV(d). Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The BSA is not located within a particularly important corridor for terrestrial wildlife movement, as the Project vicinity contains extensive natural habitat suitable for use by terrestrial species and suitable for movement among areas of core habitat. However, Little Uvas Creek may be an important movement pathway for aquatic species, such as foothill yellow-legged frogs, western pond turtles, and fish.

Project demolition and construction would occur during the dry season, when use of the proposed Project site as a movement pathway by aquatic species would be at its lowest. Further, the proposed Project would not introduce any new impediments to dispersal by aquatic species, as there would be no new structures within the channel, and the new bridge would completely span the channel. As a result, the proposed Project is not expected to substantially impact wildlife movement, and thus no avoidance or minimization measures are necessary.

IV(e). Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed bridge replacement project would result in permanent impacts to a total of 1.59 acres of mixed riparian woodland and forest habitat and some of this habitat includes ordinance-sized trees covered under the Santa Clara County Tree Ordinance. A final, detailed tree removal plan has not been prepared, and the final number of trees to be removed by the proposed Project has not been determined. It is anticipated that the temporary impacts to trees within mixed riparian woodland and forest would include tree trimming primarily along the east side of Uvas Road.

Santa Clara County requires that a replanting or revegetation plan be submitted for all trees to be removed (County Code §C16.7 (e). If the trees to be removed are native species, then replacement by the same species is requested if feasible. For non-native species, the County Planning Department may determine the species for planting. All replacement tree plantings must use at least five gallon stock. If tree removal is needed, it would be limited to the minimum extent necessary and all applicable requirements and procedures will be followed, including the County’s Tree Ordinance.

Compliance with local laws, policies or guidelines, as proposed by the project, will reduce impacts to the urban forest to a less than significant level.

IV(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?

**No Impact.** As discussed in Section 3.4.2, the Project area is covered by the Habitat Plan and would be constructed to be consistent with the plan. Project design features and construction methods will follow provisions within the Habitat Plan as listed above and throughout other sections of this Initial Study. Fee payment will occur for construction within designated fee
zones as per the Habitat Plan. The Project would thus not conflict with the adopted Habitat Plan and there would be no impact.
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15063.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15063.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussion in this section is primarily based upon an Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) and Historical Property Survey Report (HPSR) prepared by Holman and Associates, Inc. in December 2014. The HPSR is attached as Appendix D of this Initial Study. Copies of the Reports are on-file with the County of Santa Clara.

3.5.1 Setting

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the proposed Project encompasses all areas where work associated with the Project would occur (See Figure 3-3). The research, literature review and field inventory conducted for the Project suggests that there is a low likelihood of historic-era archaeological resources within the Project footprint.

A records search at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information system and an archaeological field survey were completed with neither identifying any known cultural or archaeological resources within the Project APE or any potential resources on historic-era maps. No resources were listed in any federal, state, or local inventories other than the bridge being listed within Caltrans's Local Bridge Inventory. Caltrans’s Local Bridge Inventory rates the current bridge (37C0095) as a Category 5, not eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (Caltrans 2014).

Review of the Sacred Land Files maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) did not identify any Native American cultural resources in the immediate vicinity of the Project area. None of the Native American individuals/organizations contacted identified any known Native American resources within or near the Project APE.

The field survey identified good soil visibility throughout the Project APE. No indications of cultural features on the surface or of buried cultural materials or paleosols were observed.
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3.5.2 Impacts Evaluation

V(a). Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15063.5?

No Impact. The existing bridge was constructed in 1928 and is considered Category 5 under the Caltran’s Local Bridge Inventory, meaning that it is ineligible for National Register listing. In addition, The California Office of Historic Preservation’s Historic Property Data File and the California Inventory of Historic Resources list no resource within or directly adjacent to the project APE. Therefore, impacts related to causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources would not occur.

V(b,d.) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15063.5? Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less than Significant Impact. The record search for the Project found no known cultural and prehistoric or historic archaeological sites located in or adjacent to the APE. A field survey found no surface indicators of cultural materials on the site.

While it is not likely that there are archaeological deposits on the Project site, there is always the possibility that construction and excavation may uncover buried cultural materials or human remains. The Project, therefore, includes the following standard measures to avoid potential impacts to unknown subsurface archaeological or prehistoric resources:

- Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, all work in that area must halt and the Santa Clara County Medical Examiner must be contacted, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99. The Santa Clara County Medical Examiner shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Medical Examiner determines that the remains are not subject to their authority, he/she shall notify the NAHC who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the County shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

- It is the County’s policy to avoid cultural resources whenever possible. If buried cultural materials are encountered during construction, it is the agency’s policy to stop work in that area until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the find.

Therefore, with the implementation of the above standard measures, impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource and disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, would be less than significant.
V(c). Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?

**Less than Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section 3.5.1, the field survey for the Project identified good soil visibility throughout the Project APE. No indications of cultural features on the surface or of buried cultural materials or paleosols were observed. The measures included as part of the Project and described in response (b) above, would ensure that impacts to unique paleontological resources by the proposed Project are less than significant.
## GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described 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>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that will become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,8</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 wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following discussion is based on Preliminary Foundation Report for the Project prepared by Parikh Consultants, Inc. in April 2014. A complete version of the report can be found in Appendix E.

### 3.6.1 Setting

The Project area is situated within unsectioned Las Uvas Rancho that is located within Township 7 South/Range 2 East as depicted on the Mount Madonna 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle. The Project site is flat and is located in a seismically active part of northern California. The site is located outside the designated State of California “Earthquake Fault Zones (2010)” for active faulting and no
mapped evidence of active or potentially active faulting was found for the site. The potential for fault rupture at the site appears to be low.

The subsurface profile at the bridge site predominately consists of medium dense to very dense granular soils and medium stiff to hard clayey materials underlain by meta bedrocks (mélange). The Project area falls under the Liquefaction Hazard Zone but is not designated as Compressible Soil Hazard Zone or area subject to landslides.

3.6.2 Impacts Evaluation

VI(a). Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

(i). Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist 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.

No Impact. As described above, the Project site is not located in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no mapped evidence of active or potentially active faulting was found for the site. The nearest fault to the Project site is the Sargent Fault, approximately three miles from the Project site. The Project site does not sit on a fault, so it is unlikely that the Project site would experience rupture. Therefore, impacts related to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone would not occur.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than Significant Impact. As described above, the Project site is located in a seismically active part of northern California. Many faults in the San Francisco Bay Area are capable of producing earthquakes, which may cause strong ground shaking at the site. The existing bridge was built in 1928 and does not meet current seismic safety design criteria. The replacement bridge and the Uvas Road approaches to the bridge will comply with current design and seismic safety criteria. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant. In fact, this impact would be beneficial, as compared to not constructing the Project and leaving the existing bridge and roadway in place.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?

Less than Significant Impact. As stated above, the Project area falls under the Liquefaction Hazard Zone designated by the County. The Project site is primarily underlain by meta-sandstone and meta-graywacke bedrocks, and no saturated loose sand was encountered during drilling, therefore the liquefaction potential at the bridge site is considered low. Furthermore, the proposed bridge would be designed and constructed in accordance with a
design-level geotechnical investigation report prepared for the site and the Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria to ensure that the Project is designed to account for any potentially liquefiable soils that might be found on-site. With implementation of recommendations in the design level geotechnical report, the Project would not expose people or property to significant impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure.

iv) Landslides?

**No Impact.** The Project site is zoned as Hillsides but is not designated by the County as an area subject to landslides.\(^5\) The Project site is generally flat. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of people or structures to landslides would not occur.

VI(b). Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed bridge replacement would require demolition of the existing bridge and grading to prepare the site for the proposed replacement bridge and future realigned Uvas Road. During implementation of the Project, BMPs would be implemented to reduce soil erosion and water quality impacts, as discussed in Section 3.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality* of this Initial Study. Following construction, no erosion or loss of topsoil would be anticipated. Temporary impacts that would be avoided through implementation of runoff prevention measures would be less than significant.

VI(c). Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that will become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

**Less than Significant.** As described above, the Project site is not designated by the County as Compressible Soil Hazard Zone or area subject to landslides. The Project area falls under the Liquefaction Hazard Zone designated by the County but since the Project site does not have significant deposits of loose sandy soils and no saturated soft clay and loose sand was encountered during drilling therefore, liquefaction potential at the bridge site and seismic induced ground subsidence is not considered a geologic hazard on the site. Furthermore, the proposed bridge would be designed and constructed in accordance with a design-level geotechnical investigation report prepared for the site and the Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria to ensure that the Project is designed to account for any potential soil-related hazards that might be found on-site. Therefore, impacts resulting from being located in unstable soil would be less than significant.

VI(d). Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?

**Less than Significant.** As discussed in response (c) above, the soils at the Project site have a high potential for expansion. However, with implementation of the design measures specified in the geotechnical investigation report and Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria, the

\(^5\) County of Santa Clara Department of Planning and Development. Geological Maps and Data. Published on 9/10/2015. Available at [https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/PlansOrdinances/GeoHazards/Pages/GeoMaps.aspx](https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/PlansOrdinances/GeoHazards/Pages/GeoMaps.aspx)
impacts related to loss of life or property associated with expansive soils would be less than significant.

VI(e). Would the project 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 wastewater?

**No Impact.** The proposed Project would not include septic tanks or alternative disposal systems. Therefore, impacts related to septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not occur.
### 3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.7.1 Setting

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) has always been present in the Earth’s atmosphere, helping to maintain a temperate climate, but in the last century, production has accelerated due to human activity. The most common GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) gases, which come from the burning of fossil fuels for energy and transportation, waste management, agriculture, buildings, and industry. These gases are normalized based on the impact they have on global warming into the standard unit, GHG.

The buildup of GHGs in the atmosphere from human activity has amplified the greenhouse effect. As a result, more solar radiation is trapped in the atmosphere, rather than reflected out, and causes warming. This warming to the atmosphere and oceans is disrupting global weather patterns, and these trends are expected to intensify as more GHG emissions are released (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] 2016).

#### 3.7.2 Impacts Evaluation

VII(a). Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** During construction, the equipment used for the demolition of the existing bridge and the construction of the new bridge and realigned Uvas Road would release GHGs, as would production of materials including bridge supports, asphalt and coatings, and steel rebar. However, GHG emissions during construction would be temporary and negligible compared to the scale and volume of global GHG emissions. Furthermore, there would be no new GHG emissions after construction of the proposed Project because the operations do not include new vehicle trips or other generators of GHG emissions. Consequently, the proposed Project is not considered a substantial source of GHGs. Therefore, impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

VII(b). Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?
No Impact. As discussed in Response to VII(a), GHG emissions associated with the proposed Project would not be considered a substantial emitter of GHGs. Therefore, impacts related to conflict with an application plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions would not occur.
3.8  HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td>1</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>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</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, will it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, will 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>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, will 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>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. 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>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. 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>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.1  Setting

Hazardous materials encompass a wide range of substances, some of which are naturally-occurring and some of which are man-made. Examples of hazardous materials include pesticides, herbicides,
petroleum products, metals (e.g., lead, mercury, arsenic), asbestos and chemical compounds used in manufacturing. Determining if such substances are present on or near project sites is important because exposure to hazardous materials above certain thresholds can result in adverse health effects on humans, as well as harm to plants and wildlife.

The Project site is located in High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The Project site is located in an undeveloped, open space area. Surrounding land uses include public open space and privately owned lands. There are no sensitive receptors (residences, schools, etc.) adjacent to the site. No public or private airports are located within the Project area. The closest public airport is San Martin Airport and is located approximately 10 miles to the southeast.

Structures constructed prior to 1980 are likely to include asbestos-containing materials (ACMs); buildings constructed prior to 1978 are likely to contain lead-based paint (LBP). The existing bridge was built in 1928.

3.8.2 Impacts Evaluation

VIII(a). Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed Project would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, paints, cleaners and solvents. However, all hazardous materials would be transported, contained, stored, used, and disposed of in accordance with manufacturers instructions and would be handled in compliance with all applicable standards and regulations. Construction-related hazardous materials would be used only temporarily (during construction), which does not constitute routine transport, use, or disposal.

The proposed bridge replacement Project would not change the existing use of the Project site and would not add to the number of vehicles using Uvas Road. Consequently, the types and quantities of typical hazardous materials under the proposed Project would be similar as under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts related to the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

VIII(b). Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above in Section 3.8.1, structures constructed prior to 1980 are likely to include ACMs and buildings constructed prior to 1978 are likely to contain LBP. Therefore, the potential for LBP and ACMs to be found at the site is likely as the existing bridge at the Project site was constructed in 1928. The Department of Toxic

---

Substances Control (DTSC) does not generally consider intact painted structural materials to be hazardous waste.

Under existing conditions, if ACMs and LBP remain in good condition and are not disturbed, exposure to asbestos and lead is expected to be negligible. However, the proposed Project would include ACM and LBP abatement, as it is anticipated that the demolition of the existing bridge and Uvas Road realignment would disturb and damage ACMs and LBP. Consequently, there exists the potential for asbestos and lead to be accidentally released into the environment during construction. However, the handling and disposal of ACMs and LBP is a highly-regulated procedure. The proposed Project would be required to comply with all laws and regulations regarding LBP and ACMs.

Compliance with the strict regulations and requirements for ACMs and LBP set in place by Federal, State, and local laws would minimize the potential for accidental release of asbestos and lead into the air. All identified ACMs and LBP would be removed during construction using procedures designed to protect construction workers and the environment. Therefore, impacts related to the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of asbestos and lead dust into the environment would be less than significant.

All other known hazardous materials that would be utilized during construction or operations are typical of such activities for a bridge replacement project as discussed in VIII (a) above. The quantities of these materials are not substantial and they would be stored, used, and disposed of in accordance with manufacturers regulations. In addition, the proposed Project would be required to create and implement a Health and Safety Plan (HASP) for construction of the proposed Project. The HASP would include necessary measures to ensure the safety of construction workers and the public, including measures regarding the proper handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts related to the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials typical of bridge and roadway construction and operations into the environment would be less than significant.

VIII(c). Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

**No Impact.** There is no school within a quarter mile of the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts related to emitting or handling hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a existing school would not occur.

VIII(d). Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
No Impact. The Project site is not listed in a DTSC database nor is it identified on the Cortese List (Government Code Section 65962.5). Therefore, impacts related to creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to location on a hazardous materials site list would not occur.

VIII(e). For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The Project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest public airport to the Project site is San Martin Airport, approximately 10 miles to the southeast. The Project site does not lie within an airport land use plan for San Martin Airport. Therefore, impacts related to public airport safety hazards for people residing or working in the Project area would not occur.

VIII(e). For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project site. Therefore, impacts related to private airstrip safety hazards for people residing or working in the Project area would not occur.

VIII(g). Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. During construction of the replacement bridge, Uvas Road and the existing bridge over Little Uvas Creek would remain in service for both motorized and non-motorized users. Road closures and detours would not be required. Over the long-term, the segment of Uvas Road within the Project limits would have an improved design that would facilitate travel under both normal and emergency conditions. Therefore, impacts related to impairment of implementation of or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would not occur.

VIII(h). 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?

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above on Section 3.8.1, the Project site is located in High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. However, the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires to any greater degree than under existing conditions. Construction equipment would be maintained and operated in accordance with applicable federal, state and local laws. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires would be less than significant.

---

### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there will 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 will drop to a level which will not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,2</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 which will result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage 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 will result in flooding on-or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water which will exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which will impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,5,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following discussion is based on a Location Hydraulic Study Report and Bridge Hydraulic Study Report, prepared by Schaff and Wheeler on June 12, 2015. A complete version of the reports can be found in Appendix F.

3.9.1 Setting

Little Uvas Creek is located within the Pajaro River drainage basin, on the western side of Morgan Hill. Little Uvas Creek flows in a southeasterly direction and discharges to the Uvas Creek, a major tributary of the Pajaro River. The existing Uvas Road bridge, crosses Little Uvas Creek approximately 0.8 miles upstream of the confluence with Uvas Creek and 3.5 miles upstream of Uvas Reservoir. The contributing drainage area at the bridge is approximately 4.5 square miles.

3.9.2 Regulatory Setting

The primary federal law regulating water quality is the CWA administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In California, EPA delegates its regulatory authority to the SWRCB and RWQCBs. RWQCB Region 3, Central Coast Region, is responsible for administering state and federal water quality protection laws and regulations in the vicinity of the Project site. Each RWQCB prepares and adopts a master policy document for managing surface and groundwater quality within its region called the Water Quality Control Plan or Basin Plan. Among other things the Basin Plan identifies water quality problems and establishes beneficial uses for each waterway within its jurisdiction. The SWRCB and RWQCB issue permits to implement the Basin Plan as well as other requirements of the CWA and State Water Code.

- Section 401 of the CWA requires a water quality certification from the State Board or Regional Board when a project: 1) requires a federal license or permit under CWA Section 404, and 2) will result in a discharge to waters of the United States.
- Project construction activities are subject to a statewide Construction General Permit (Order No. 98-08-DWQ, CAS000002) issued by the SWRCB. The key requirement is preparation of a project specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which specifies pollution control measures to be employed during construction. The SWPPP is typically prepared and implemented by the contractor doing the work. The County approves the plan and assures that it is carried out through its construction contract monitoring process.

3.9.3 Impacts Evaluation

IX(a). Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project includes a bridge replacement on Uvas Road over Little Uvas Creek. The proposed single-span bridge does include vertical abutments within the stream channel, which would be subject to abutment scour. Scour is the removal of earth supporting the bridge foundation caused by water turbulence. Rock slope protection (1/4 ton) would, however, be provided at each abutment to protect against scour holes.
Construction of the proposed Project, including equipment usage, excavation, grading, and paving activities, may result in temporary impacts to surface water quality. Usage of construction equipment, as well as trucks and other vehicles, would place fuel, oil, and other chemicals on-site. In addition, construction materials such as asphalt and concrete would be used and stored on-site. The proposed Project would implement the following standard BMPs during construction to ensure that contaminants from such materials are not discharged, thereby preventing water quality standards or waste discharge requirements from being violated:

- Prior to commencement of any clearing, grading or excavation, the Project shall comply with the SWRCB NPDES General Construction Activities Permit regarding urban runoff and water quality. A SWPPP shall be prepared, outlining BMPs that reduce stormwater pollution through source control measures and stormwater treatment measures.
- Excavated or disturbed soil will be kept within a controlled area surrounded by a perimeter barrier that may entail silt fence, hay bales, straw wattles, or a similarly effective erosion control technique that prevents debris/pollutants from entering Little Uvas Creek.
- No debris, soil, silt, sand, bark, slash, sawdust, cement, concrete, washings, petroleum products, or other organic or earthen material shall be allowed to enter into or be placed where it may be washed by rainfall or runoff into Little Uvas Creek.
- Silt fencing will be installed between any activities conducted within, or just above the edge of, the top-of-bank and the edge of the creek to prevent dirt or other materials from entering the channel.
- Active paved construction areas will be swept and washed as needed.

In addition to the above measures, work within and adjacent to the creek will be restricted to the dry season (i.e., April 15 – October 15). This restriction will avoid erosion, sedimentation, and other problems related to water quality that can occur during rain storms at construction sites. The proposed Project is also covered under Condition 3 of the Habitat Plan, which identifies a set of programmatic BMPs, performance standards, and control measures to minimize increases of peak discharge of stormwater and to reduce runoff of pollutants to protect water quality, included during Project construction. These requirements include preconstruction, construction and post-construction actions.

During its long-term operational phase, the proposed Project would not change the existing use and capacity of Uvas Road and discharges would remain essentially the same during operations as under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts related to violation of water quality standards and waste discharge requirements would be less than significant.

IX(b). Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge?

**No Impact.** The project is located in the Llagas Groundwater Sub-basin in Santa Clara County and groundwater is expected to be present at depths around 10 feet below ground surface in the site area. The proposed Project involves paving, grading and demolition of the existing bridge and road and replacing it with a new bridge and realigned road, the net effect of which would be little or no change in the permeability of the area. Therefore, impacts
related to substantial depletion of groundwater supplies and substantial interference with groundwater recharge would not occur.

IX(c). Would the project 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 which will result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would not alter the course of a stream or a river. Construction activities within and adjacent to the creek would be restricted to the dry season, and are not likely to affect water quality in the creek. In addition, implementation of BMPs will minimize erosion as stated in IX (a). Moreover, the proposed Project would improve the hydraulic conditions at the bridge as the replacement bridge would have a longer span and larger bridge opening at the channel, which will reduce the existing water surface elevations and existing channel overflows upstream of the bridge site. Therefore, impacts related to substantial erosion or siltation on alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the Project site would be less than significant.

IX(d). Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage 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 will result in flooding on-or off-site?

**No Impact.** Refer to Response to IX(c). The existing bridge is an impediment to flood flows in Little Uvas Creek for both the 50-year and 100-year storms. Removal of the existing bridge would reduce the existing head losses at the bridge and lower the existing 100-year base flood elevations at the existing bridge site. The replacement bridge would be longer than the existing bridge structure and include a larger opening for the flow through the bridge, therefore would reduce the existing water surface elevations and existing channel overflows upstream of the bridge site. Therefore, impacts related to flooding on-or off-site due to substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern or substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface run-off would not occur.

IX(e). Would the project create or contribute runoff water which will exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The installation of additional paving for the replacement bridge and the realigned Uvas Road would result in a small increase in urban stormwater runoff, which may contain contaminants such as metals, fuel, oil and other chemicals on-site. However, this increase would essentially be offset by the removal of the existing bridge and section of Uvas Road. During construction, typical construction-related BMPs [Refer to IX(a).] would be implemented to capture discharge and prevent the Project site from creating a substantial additional source of polluted runoff. During the long-term, vehicular use of Uvas Road would be unaffected by the Project, thus, the runoff would be the same as under “no project” conditions. Two new culverts would be required for the road alignment, one for the north tributary to Little Uvas Creek, and one on the south end of the alignment to facilitate drainage. Therefore, impacts related to exceeding the capacity of existing or
planned stormwater drainage systems or providing substantial additional sources of polluted runoff would be less than significant.

IX(f). Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

**Less than Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses to IX(a) through IX(e). Impacts related to substantial degradation of water quality would be less than significant.

IX(g). Would the project 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?

**No Impact.** The proposed Project is a bridge replacement project and would not construct any housing. Therefore, impacts related to placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area would not occur.

IX(h). Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which will impede or redirect flood flows?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The existing bridge is located in Zone A flood zone in Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Flood Insurance Rate Map for Santa Clara County. The proposed Project would relocate the existing roadway from the east side to the west side of the existing channel. The realigned roadway is outside the 100-year floodplain area. Removal of the existing bridge would reduce the existing head losses at the bridge and lower the existing 100-year base flood elevations at the existing bridge site. The proposed bridge would be longer than the existing bridge structure and include a larger opening for the flow through the bridge. Therefore, it would reduce the existing encroachment within the creek channel. The existing bridge is a span of 35 feet and the proposed structure is a span of 90 feet. Due to the skew of the new bridge alignment, the bridge has an effective span length of 83 feet abutment to abutment. Because the bridge opening will be larger than the existing channel section, the Project will lower the 100-year base flood elevation upstream of the bridge. Therefore, impacts related to placement of structures in a 100-year flood hazard area would be less than significant.

IX(i). Would the project 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?

**No Impact.** According to the NES (See Appendix A), Uvas Reservoir Dam is located approximately 5 miles downstream of the proposed Project site and Chesbro Reservoir Dam is located approximately 4 miles east of the Project site. The proposed Project location is not located in the dam failure inundation area of Uvas and Chesbro Reservoir Dams. Moreover, as discussed in IX (d) and IX (h), the proposed Uvas Road Bridge would increase the hydraulic capacity of the stream channel at the bridge site, thereby reducing the potential for flooding. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of the failure of a dam or levee would not occur.

---

IX(j). Would the project expose the project to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. The Project site does not lie within a tsunami inundation hazard area. If seiches were to occur in the reservoirs, from seismic shaking, the possible flood waters would be expected to follow a flow pattern similar to the dam inundation areas and would not affect the Project. A mudflow is the rapid movement of a large mass of mud formed from loose soil and water. The Project site is relatively flat and is not susceptible to mudflows. Therefore, impacts related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would not occur.

3.10  LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.  Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.  Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10.1  Setting

The Project is located is a remote, rural, area of unincorporated southern Santa Clara County. The existing land use in the Project area is rural residential and rangeland/grazing. The closest structure is approximately 250 feet from the site of the proposed replacement bridge. The Project would require some additional right-of-way and/or TCEs from three adjacent parcels, APN’s 742-29-058, 742-29-067, and 742-30-001. None of the needed right-of-way and/or TCE’s would affect existing buildings or result in a change in land use on the affected parcels.

3.10.2  Impacts Evaluation

X(a).  Would the project physically divide an established community?

**No Impact.** The Project is located is a remote, rural, area of unincorporated southern Santa Clara County. The replacement bridge would be constructed approximately 600 feet northwesterly of the existing bridge on a new alignment on Uvas Road. During construction of the replacement bridge, Uvas Road and the existing bridge over Llagas Creek would remain in service for both motorized and non-motorized users. Road closures and detours would not be required. Further, the realigned portion of Uvas Road would not divide any neighborhoods or established community. Therefore, impacts related to physical division of an established community would not occur.

X(b).  Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

**No Impact.** The Project is consistent with the County of Santa Clara General Plan, which states that it is the policy of the County to maintain a safe and efficient roadway system that
serves the land uses in Santa Clara County. The proposed project is replacing an existing bridge that is functionally obsolete and does not meet current safety standards with a new bridge and Uvas Road approaches to the bridge that would meet the current design and seismic safety criteria. This would be consistent with the County’s General Plan policies. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project site would not occur.

X(c). Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. As discussed in Section 3.4, Biological Resources, the Project site is located within the boundaries of the Habitat Plan. The proposed Project is therefore a covered activity under the Habitat Plan and would be required to pay the appropriate development fees and adhere to applicable conditions. The proposed Project would not conflict with the Habitat Plan. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with applicable conservation plans would not occur.
3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that will be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.11.1 Setting

The Project site does not contain any known or designated mineral resources.\(^\text{10}\)

3.11.2 Impacts Evaluation

XI(a,b). Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that will be of value to the region and the residents of the state or in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. There are no known mineral resources on or adjacent to the Project site, and no mineral recovery sites are present in the Project area. For these reasons, the proposed development of the Project site would not result in impacts to known mineral resources.

### 3.12 NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 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>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 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>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.12.1 Setting

The Project site is located in an unincorporated rural area of Santa Clara County. The existing sources of noise at the bridge site include vehicles that use the Uvas Road and occasional noises from nearby ranches that are privately owned. No public or private airports are located within the Project area.

#### 3.12.2 Impacts Evaluation

XII(a). Would the project 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?
Less than Significant Impact. The County of Santa Clara Noise Compatibility Standards for Land Use state that the satisfactory noise level for commercial and residential uses is up to 55 Ldn dBA.

Short-Term Increases in Noise

Construction work would consist of the demolition of the existing bridge and a segment of Uvas Road, grading and paving for the roadway realignment, construction of the replacement bridge, and installation of rock slope protection. Construction equipment would likely include air compressors, paving machines, forklift trucks, loaders, pavement grinders, dump trucks, trenching machines, compactors, and backhoes. The construction of the proposed Project would generate short-term noise at properties surrounding the Project sites, however, the adjacent lands are undeveloped with scattered housing nearby. There are three houses within 500 feet of the Project site. A significant noise impact would occur if construction of the proposed project results in a prolonged interference with normal activities at noise-sensitive receptors. This would occur if the construction period lasted more than one year and construction noise levels regularly exceed 60 dBA Leq and increased ambient noise levels by five (5) dBA or more. However, in this case, since construction-related noise impacts would be temporary in nature and standard construction noise avoidance measures (discussed in XII(d) below) would be implemented, significant impacts related to construction noise would not occur.

Long-Term Increases in Noise

The Project is limited to the replacement of a functionally-obsolete bridge and the realignment of a segment of Uvas Road adjacent to the bridge. The volume of traffic using Uvas Road and the bridge would be unaffected by the Project because 1) the capacity of these facilities would not change and 2) the Project would not change or increase development. Further, the realigned roadway would not be materially closer to any residences than the existing roadway. For these reasons, the Project would not increase noise levels over the long-term.

XII(b). Would the project result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

No Impact. Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would not utilize heavy machinery or piledrivers that could potentially generate significant groundborne vibration in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. Although smaller equipments have the potential to generate vibrations, ground-borne vibrations decrease rapidly with distance. Typical vibration levels (measured by peak particle velocity at 25 feet) produced by this smaller construction equipment is approximately 0.035 inches per second.\(^\text{11}\) However, the closest structure is 250 feet from the Project site and any groundborne vibrations during construction would be diminished over this distance. Moreover, the Project is located in a sparsely populated area; therefore the exposure of people to excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels would not occur.

XII(c). Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Impact. The proposed Project would only lead to temporary increase in noise levels during the construction phase of the Project. As discussed is response XII(a), since the operational phase would not add any vehicular traffic to the new bridge and realigned Uvas Road, the proposed Project would not lead to permanent increase in noise levels above the existing condition.

XII(d). Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in responses XII (a) through XII (c), the proposed Project would lead to temporary increase in ambient noise levels during the construction phase. The noise generated by construction equipment, delivery vehicles and construction crews during this short-term phase would lead to increase in noise levels above levels existing without the Project. However, with the implementation of the following standard measures, the proposed Project would be able to reduce the construction noise levels consistent with the County of Santa Clara Noise Ordinance:

- Construction will be limited to weekdays hours of 7 am to 6 pm. Construction will not occur on weekends and holidays.
- Contractors will use “new technology” power construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices.
- Utilize "quiet" air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- Locate all stationary noise-generating equipment, such as air compressors and portable power generators, as far away as possible from adjacent land uses.
- Locate staging areas and construction material areas as far away as possible from adjacent land uses.
- Designate a "noise disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and would require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.

Traffic volumes on the bridge and the realigned Uvas Road would not increase as a result of the Project and therefore, noise levels would not increase during the operational phase. Therefore, impacts related to substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed Project would be less than significant.
XII(e). Would the project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located within 2 miles of a public use airport. The nearest public airport from the Project site is San Martin airport which is approximately 10 miles to the southeast from the Project site. The Project site does not lie within an airport land use plan for San Martin Airport. Therefore, impacts related to public airport noise exposure for people residing or working in the Project area would not occur.

XII(f). For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**No Impact.** There are no airports, public or private, within the vicinity of the Project site. Therefore, impacts related to private airstrip safety noise exposure for people residing or working in the Project area would not occur.
### 3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.13.1 Setting

The Project is located in a remote, rural, area of unincorporated southern Santa Clara County with a few scattered residences found near the new Uvas Road alignment.

#### 3.13.1 Impacts Evaluation

XIII(a). Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

**No Impact.** The proposed Project is limited to the replacement of a functionally obsolete bridge and an adjacent segment of Uvas Road, which do not meet current safety and design standards. The Project would not induce growth in the area as it is not changing the existing use of the bridge or the roadway. Therefore, impacts related to substantial population growth, directly or indirectly, would not occur.

XIII(b,c). Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**No Impact.** The proposed Project is limited to the replacement of a bridge and realignment of a segment of Uvas Road in a rural area of Santa Clara County. The Project would not affect or displace any residences. Therefore, impacts related to displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, would not occur.
3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fire Protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Police Protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other Public Facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.14.1 Setting

The proposed project is located within a rural, unincorporated area of Santa Clara County. Fire services to this area are provided by Uvas Volunteer Fire Department, located at 5770 Croy Rd, in Morgan Hill, approximately 1.5 miles south of the project area.\(^{12}\) The project area is served by the Morgan Hill Police Department located at 16200 Vineyard Blvd, in Morgan Hill, approximately seven miles east of the Project site. The Uvas Canyon County Park is located approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the Project area, but no schools or public parks are located in the immediate vicinity of the Project area.

3.14.2 Impacts Evaluation

XIV(a). Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public services?

**No Impact.** The Project is limited to the replacement of an existing bridge and realignment of an adjacent segment of Uvas Road. The capacity of the new facilities would be the same as the existing facilities. As discussed in Section 3.13 Population and Housing, the proposed Project would not result in any residential or employment change or growth which could

place a permanent increased demand on any of the public services. The Project would incrementally improve traffic operations in the area, which would improve accessibility for emergency vehicles, and would be considered a beneficial impact. Therefore, impacts related to significant impact on public facilities would not occur.
3.15 RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.15.1 Setting

The proposed Project is located within a rural, unincorporated area of Santa Clara County. The Uvas Canyon County Park is located approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the Project area, but no schools or public parks are located in the immediate vicinity of the Project area.

3.15.2 Impacts Evaluation

XV(a). Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated?

**No Impact.** The nearest recreational facility located near the Project site is Uvas Canyon County Park, located approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the Project area. As discussed in Section 3.13 Population and Housing, the proposed Project would not result in any residential or employment change or growth which could lead to increased use of existing recreational facilities in the area. Therefore, impacts related to substantial physical deterioration of these facilities would not occur.

XV(b). Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**No Impact.** Refer to Response XV(a). The proposed Project is replacement of an existing bridge and realignment of an adjacent segment of Uvas Road and does not require construction of recreational facilities. Impacts related to increased demand on recreational facilities would not occur.
TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.16.1 Setting

The existing bridge, which has two, narrow (10-foot) traffic lanes, is functionally obsolete and does not meet current design standards. The existing curvature of Uvas Road on the bridge approaches does not comply with current highway design standards for the desired 55 mph design speed. Specifically, the existing horizontal curve north of the bridge has a radius of approximately 575 feet, and the curve south of the bridge has a radius of approximately 420 feet. This tight “S” curve geometry of the existing road creates a reduced line of sight, which has resulted in a history of both severe and fatal traffic accidents.
The proposed Project would replace a functionally obsolete bridge and the Uvas Road approaches to the bridge which do not meet current safety and design standards. The replacement bridge and the Uvas Road approaches to the bridge would comply with current design and seismic safety criteria.

3.16.2 Impacts Evaluation

XVI(a). Would the project 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?

No Impact. The construction phase of the proposed Project would result in a temporary increase in vehicular traffic relative to the volume of existing traffic. The increased number of construction related traffic would be spread over the two construction seasons. This increase in volume would be temporary and short-term in nature.

The proposed Project would replace the existing substandard two-lane bridge with a bridge that has two 12-foot standard travel lanes. In contrast to the existing bridge with no shoulders, the new bridge would include two eight-foot shoulders. The proposed Project would not affect or increase the usage of other modes of transportation, such as bicycles, mass transit, and pedestrians. In addition it would make it more safe for the motorized and non-motorized users. Therefore, impacts related to 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 would not occur.

XVI(b). Would the project 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?

No Impact. The proposed Project would improve operations of Uvad Road by replacing the existing bridge with a wider bridge that would accommodate two 12-foot lanes of traffic and two eight-foot shoulders, in accordance with current design and safety standards. The straightening/realigning of Uvas Road approaches to the bridge would eliminate the hazards associated with the existing curvature of Uvas Road which does not comply with current highway design standards for the desired 55 mph design speed. Therefore, the improvement would not be capacity increasing but would improve access and reduce hazards. Therefore, impacts related to conflicting with a Congestion Management Program would not occur.

XVI(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?

No Impact. Refer to Responses VIII (e) and VIII (f). The Project would have no impact on air traffic patterns.

XVI(d). Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
No Impact. The existing bridge and tight “S” curve geometry of the existing road creates a reduced line of sight, which has resulted in a history of both severe and fatal traffic accidents. The proposed Project would replace the bridge with a wider, two lane bridge with shoulders and straighten/realign the Uvas Road in accordance with current design and safety standards. Therefore, the proposed Project would reduce design-related hazards.

XVI(e). Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. During construction of the replacement bridge, Uvas Road and the existing bridge over Uvas Creek would remain in service for both motorized and non-motorized users. Road closures and detours would not be required. Therefore, there would be no impacts related to emergency access during construction period. Over the long term, the proposed Project would improve regional emergency access by widening the bridge and providing two eight-foot shoulders as well as realigned Uvas Road approaches to the bridge consistent with the current design and safety standards. Therefore, impacts related to inadequate emergency access would not occur.

XVI(f). Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

No Impact. The proposed Project would improve the Uvas Creek Bridge’s ability to support bicycles and pedestrians by increasing bridge width, constructing shoulders, straightening/realigning Uvas Road and erecting new, improved, concrete barriers/railings on each side of the bridge. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation would not occur.
### UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Checklist Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❏</td>
<td>1</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>
<td>❏</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❏</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❏</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❏</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 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>
<td>❏</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❏</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.17.1 Setting

Electric and gas utilities are provided to the area by the Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and communication is provided by Verizon. The County has sent letters to PG&E and Verizon to notify them about the Project and the need to relocate their overhead cables to accommodate its construction. The County has also held field meetings with PG&E and Verizon to discuss the relocations. The County has a Franchise Agreement with PG&E and Verizon, which allows the County to request relocation of their utilities within its rights-of-way. The County will continue its coordination and negotiations with PG&E and Verizon during the right-of-way phase that commences after the environmental clearance phase is completed.
3.17.2 **Impacts Evaluation**

XVII(a). Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

**No Impact.** Unlike a typical development project (e.g., residences, commercial, industrial) that will generate wastewater, the proposed Project would not generate wastewater since it is limited to the replacement of an existing bridge and realignment of a segment of roadway. Therefore, impacts related to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements would not occur.

XVII(b). Would the project 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?

**Construction**

**No Impact.** Use of water during construction would be temporary and short-term. There would not be a significant generation of wastewater during construction as construction sites would include portable toilets that are not connected to the sewer system. Therefore, construction impacts related to requiring construction or expansion of water or wastewater facilities would not occur.

**Operation**

**No Impact.** The amount of water consumption and wastewater generation during operations is not anticipated to increase or decrease compared to existing operations because no new permanent employees would be added and its current use would remain the same. Therefore, operational impacts related to requiring construction or expansion of water or wastewater facilities would not occur.

XVII(c). Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**No Impact.** The installation of additional paving along the new realigned Uvas Road and replacement bridge would result in a small increase in stormwater runoff. However, this would essentially be offset by the demolition of the existing bridge and removal of pavement from the curved segment of Uvas Road that would no longer be used. Two new culverts would be required for the road alignment, one for the north tributary to Little Uvas Creek, and one on the south end of the alignment to facilitate drainage. During construction, typical construction-related BMPs (Refer to IXa.) would be implemented to capture discharge and prevent the Project site from creating a substantial additional source of stormwater runoff. During operations, the volume of traffic on Uvas Road would not change when compared to “no project” conditions. Therefore, impacts related to requiring or resulting in construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not occur.

XVII(d). Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
No Impact. Construction would use a negligible amount of water and would be temporary and short-term. The proposed Project would not add permanent population or change the existing use/capacity of the bridge in such a way that would expand existing demand or create new demand for water. Therefore, impacts related to sufficient water supplies and the need for new or expanded entitlements would not occur.

XVII(e). Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

No Impact. Refer to Response to XVII(b). Impacts related to a determination by a wastewater treatment provider that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider existing commitments would not occur.

XVII(f). Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Construction

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is expected to produce solid waste typical of standard construction. Solid waste generated by the demolition of the existing bridge and curved segment of Uvas Road would be removed and any hazardous waste would be handled in compliance with all existing DTSC requirements for contaminated waste. Hazardous waste would include ACMs and LBP removed during existing bridge and road demolitions. Hazardous wastes would be taken to a permitted facility meeting all legal requirements for the handling of ACMs and LBP. Non-hazardous waste would be taken to a designated landfill with materials recycled to the extent feasible. Therefore, construction impacts related to service by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the proposed Project needs would be less than significant.

Operations

No Impact. During operations, the overall generation of solid waste in the area would be similar to existing conditions as the use and capacity of the replacement bridge and realigned roadway would remain the same as under existing conditions. Therefore, operation impacts related to service by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the proposed Project needs would not occur.

XVII(g). Would the project comply with federal, state and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. Refer to Response to XVII(f). During construction and operation, the proposed Project would comply with all County of Santa Clara Recycling and Waste Reduction Division mandates, including meeting the requirements of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989. Therefore, impacts related to compliance with Federal, State, or local statutes and regulations would not occur.
### 3.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>1</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 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.** Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a 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)?

**c.** Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

### 3.18.1 Impacts Evaluation

XVIII(a). Does the proposed 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 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?

**Less than Significant Impact.** With the implementation of the BMPs and avoidance measures included in the Project and described in the specific sections of this report (refer to Section 3.4 and 3.5), the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts to any endangered plant, fish or wildlife species or any major periods of California history or prehistory.
XVIII(b). Does the proposed Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

**Less than Significant Impact.** The environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project on biological resources, air quality, cultural resources, hazardous materials, water quality and noise are less than significant with implementation of BMPs and avoidance measures as discussed in Chapter three (3) of this initial study. The proposed Project would have a beneficial impact on the traffic safety and hydraulic conditions of the existing bridge by replacing an existing functionally obsolete bridge with a new bridge that can accommodate two lanes of traffic with shoulders, realigning/straightening the Uvas Road approaches to the new bridge, and installation of retaining walls and rock slope protection at the new bridge abutments. Therefore, none of the environmental impacts evaluated in this document would be cumulatively considerable.

XVIII(c). Does the proposed Project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

**No Impact.** Based on the analysis contained in this Initial Study, the proposed project does not have the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

**Checklist Sources**

1. CEQA Guidelines - Environmental Thresholds (Professional judgment and expertise and review of project plans).
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