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PROJECT DESCRIPTION
San Joaquin County (County), in coordination with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), proposes to replace the Pezzi Road Bridge (Number 29C0199) and improve the approach roadway to the bridge. The bridge is located within an agricultural area in San Joaquin County, approximately 3 miles east of State Route (SR) 99 and north of the town of Waterloo.

The existing Pezzi Road Bridge is on a two-lane rural road across the Calaveras River. It was originally constructed in 1926 and consists of a three-span reinforced concrete T-Beam approximately 63.5 feet long. The deck clear width is approximately 18 feet and is striped for two 9-foot lanes. The bridge is supported by two column piers and diaphragm abutment walls, all of which are founded on shallow spread footings. The Caltrans Structure Inventory and Appraisal Report classifies the bridge as Functionally Obsolete. The most recent County traffic count in March 2018 determined the average daily traffic (ADT) at approximately 420.

Typical equipment for roadway construction would include heavy construction earthmoving equipment, dump trucks and pavers. Typical bridge construction equipment would include cranes, pile drivers, excavators, and concrete pumps. Overhead power lines are located on the east side of the road near the bridge and on the south side of the road east of the bridge. These overhead lines may need to be relocated. Construction staging can occur on County property east of the bridge between the river and existing road.

Construction is expected to begin in 2023 and would require approximately 8 months.

DETERMINATION
This proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is included to give notice to interested agencies and the public that it is the County’s intent to adopt an MND for this Project. This does not mean that the County’s decision regarding the Project is final. This proposed MND 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, has determined from this study that the Project would not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

The Project would have no impact on energy; mineral resources; population and housing; public services; and recreation.

The Project would have a less than significant impact on agriculture and forest resources; land use; and wildfire.

The Project would have less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated on aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; geology and soils; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; noise; transportation/traffic; tribal cultural resources; and utilities and services systems.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

San Joaquin County (County), in coordination with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), proposes to replace the Pezzi Road Bridge (Number 29C0199) and improve the approach roadway to the bridge. The bridge is located within an agricultural area in San Joaquin County, approximately 3 miles east of State Route (SR) 99 and north of the town of Waterloo.

The existing Pezzi Road Bridge is on a two-lane rural road across the Calaveras River. It was originally constructed in 1926 and consists of a three-span reinforced concrete T-Beam approximately 63.5 feet long. The deck clear width is approximately 18 feet and is striped for two 9-foot lanes. The bridge is supported by two column piers and diaphragm abutment walls, all of which are founded on shallow spread footings. The Caltrans Structure Inventory and Appraisal Report classifies the bridge as Functionally Obsolete. The most recent County traffic count in March 2018 determined the average daily traffic (ADT) at approximately 420.

Table i below provides a summary of potential impacts to environmental resources from the Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project (Project).

This environmental document is prepared in conformance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Public Resources Code (PRC) 21000-21178. The County is the Lead Agency for CEQA implementation.

Table i: Summary of Potential Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Project Impacts</th>
<th>Summary of Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Hydroseed and erosion control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Forest Resources</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Dust and erosion control during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area fencing, pre-construction nesting bird surveys, Swainson’s hawk protocol surveys, and measures to reduce impacts to fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Compliance with regulations relating to discovered human and/or Native American remains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Standard BMPs and Storm Water Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Comply with all local Air Quality Management District rules, ordinances, and regulations for air quality restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Proper handling of potential hazardous materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Standard BMPs and Storm Water Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Planning</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Project Impacts</td>
<td>Summary of Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Minimize construction-generated noise and comply with County noise ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/ Traffic</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Prepare and implement a Traffic Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Compliance with regulations relating to discovered human and/or Native American remains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Service Systems</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Standard BMPs and Storm Water Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>With mitigation measures in place, all impacts will be reduced to less than significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The detailed CEQA checklist summarizing specific Project impacts is included within each of the following sections.
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### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>°F</td>
<td>Degrees Fahrenheit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>American Association of State Highways and Transportation Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Assembly Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADL</td>
<td>Aerially deposited lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>Average Daily Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Area of Potential Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASR</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AULs</td>
<td>Activity and Use Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>Biological Study Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS</td>
<td>California Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCIC</td>
<td>Central California Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFW</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESA</td>
<td>California Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFG</td>
<td>California Fish and Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>Methane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDDDB</td>
<td>California Natural Diversity Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEL</td>
<td>Community Noise Equivalent Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNPS</td>
<td>California Native Plant Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>Carbon Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>San Joaquin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVFPB</td>
<td>Central Valley Flood Protection Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dBA</td>
<td>Decibel A-weighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>Environmental Data Resources Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESA</td>
<td>Federal Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM</td>
<td>Flood Insurance Rate Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTIP</td>
<td>Federal Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFCs</td>
<td>Hydrofluorocarbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPSR</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPCC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Initial Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>Initial Site Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP</td>
<td>Incidental Take Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L_{dn}</td>
<td>Day-night Average Sound Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L_{eq}</td>
<td>Equivalent Continuous Sound Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L_{max}</td>
<td>Maximum Sound Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MND</td>
<td>Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mph</td>
<td>miles per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2O</td>
<td>Nitrous Oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Protection Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES</td>
<td>Natural Environment Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMFS</td>
<td>National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO2</td>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOX</td>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>Naturally Occurring Asbestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAAC</td>
<td>Natural Resource Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Natural Resource Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHWM</td>
<td>Ordinary High Water Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHP</td>
<td>Office of Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB</td>
<td>Polychlorinated Biphenyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFCs</td>
<td>Perfluorocarbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Particulate Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>Particulate Matter 10 Microns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>Particulate Matter 2.5 Microns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>Public Resources Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Recognized Environmental Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>Standard Special Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWD</td>
<td>Stockton East Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF₆</td>
<td>Sulfur Hexafluoride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>State Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG</td>
<td>San Joaquin Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJVAPCD</td>
<td>San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>State Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>Source Receptor Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACs</td>
<td>Toxic Air Contaminants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCR</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAIC</td>
<td>United Auburn Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VELB</td>
<td>Valley elderberry longhorn beetle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCs</td>
<td>Volatile organic compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCP</td>
<td>Water Pollution Control Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 PROJECT

1.1 INTRODUCTION
San Joaquin County, in coordination with Caltrans, proposes to replace the Pezzi Road Bridge (Number 29C0199) and improve the approach roadway to the bridge. The bridge is located within an agricultural area in the County, approximately 3 miles east of SR 99 and north of the town of Waterloo (Figures 1 and 2).

The existing Pezzi Road Bridge is on a two-lane rural road across the Calaveras River. It was originally constructed in 1926 and consists of a three-span reinforced concrete T-Beam approximately 63.5 feet long. The deck clear width is approximately 18 feet and is striped for two 9-foot lanes. The bridge is supported by two column piers and diaphragm abutment walls, all of which are founded on shallow spread footings. The Caltrans Structure Inventory and Appraisal Report classifies the bridge as Functionally Obsolete. The most recent County traffic count in March 2018 determined the ADT at approximately 420.

1.2 PURPOSE
The purpose of the Project is to replace a functionally obsolete bridge in order to:

- Enhance safety on Pezzi Road by eliminating the two ninety-degree curves in the road and providing a consistent 50 miles per hour (mph) roadway facility over the Calaveras River;
- Provide a transportation facility consistent with County and Caltrans Standards, as well as local and regional plans.

1.3 NEED
The existing Pezzi Road Bridge is rated “functionally obsolete” by Caltrans under Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) prescribed inspection criteria. Full replacement of the bridge is needed because the current structure does not meet structural design standards.

1.4 ALTERNATIVES
Two alternatives are being considered for this Project—the Build Alternative (Figure 3) and the No-Build Alternative.

1.4.1 BUILD ALTERNATIVE
The Calaveras River is a natural channel and the primary soil type in and around the canal is sandy-silt/silty sand, which makes the foundation of the existing bridge susceptible to scour. The banks of the river are heavily vegetated with blackberry and other small bushes. On the top of the banks are several trees, including native oaks along the southern bank, just east of the bridge.

Pezzi Road is primarily a north-south route with tight, reversing, horizontal curves at the bridge location. The bridge is located near the center of the western curve, although the bridge itself is on a tangent. There is no posted speed so the speed limit defaults to 55 mph; however, there are 15 mph advisory signs when approaching the reversing curves. The roadway is classified as a local road and primarily serves as a connector from East Eight Mile Road to the north, and Waterloo Road (SR 88) to the south, for local property owners and farming operations.
FIGURE 1
Project Vicinity
Federal Project: BRLO 5929(240)
Pazzi Road Bridge Replacement Project
San Joaquin County, California

Source: ESRI 2016; Dokken Engineering 3/9/2017; Created By: brianm
FIGURE 2
Project Location
Federal Project: BRLO 5929(240)
Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project
San Joaquin County, California
Project Features

- Proposed Edge of Pavement
- Proposed Bridge
- Proposed Cut and Fill
- Parcels

Source: ESRI Maps Online; Dokken Engineering; Created by: hsheldon

Figure 3
Project Features

Federal Project: BRLO 5929(240)
Road 204 Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project
San Joaquin County, California
The proposed Project would replace the substandard bridge with a structure meeting current standards and realign the roadway approaches to replace the sharp curves with a new 50-mph alignment meeting the American Association of State Highways and Transportation Officials (AASHTO Green Book) design specifications. The total improved road length would be approximately 1,570 feet. The new alignment would consist of approximately 1,925-foot radius reversing curves that meet a 50-mph design speed. The new road section would have two 10-foot lanes which widen to 11 feet at bridge and paved shoulders which vary from 1 to 3 feet, for a total width of 22 to 26 feet.

Based on preliminary engineering, the proposed alignment would require right-of-way acquisitions of the orchards to the north and south of the proposed bridge for the roadway footprint, as well as an orchard remnant that would exist between the new and existing roads; however, exact right-of-way needs will be determined during final design, in coordination with the County and through negotiations with local property owners.

The existing bridge would be removed and replaced with an approximately 75-foot long, two-span, cast-in-place reinforced concrete slab bridge on a tangent alignment. The new alignment would move the bridge 250 to 300 feet east of the existing location. Bridge foundations are expected to consist of precast driven piles. Bridge barriers would be concrete Caltrans Type 836.

The existing road and bridge are anticipated to remain open during construction. If a detour was needed, it would be 4.5 miles long with traffic using SR 88 to the east or Alpine Road to the west.

The Stockton East Water District (SEWD) utilizes the river for water deliveries. These cannot be interrupted to maintain normal farming irrigation in the region. The river would be dewatered by methods determined appropriate by the contractor. However, the summer flows are small, and it is anticipated the contractor would use flexible culverts to direct the water away from construction activities.

Typical equipment for roadway construction would include heavy construction earthmoving equipment, dump trucks and pavers. Typical bridge construction equipment would include cranes, pile drivers, excavators, and concrete pumps. Overhead power lines are located on the east side of the road near the bridge and on the south side of the road east of the bridge. These overhead lines may need to be relocated. Construction staging can occur on County property east of the bridge between the river and existing road.

Construction is expected to begin in 2023 and would require approximately 8 months.

1.4.2 NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126[e]) require consideration of a No-Project alternative that represents the existing conditions, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved. Under the No-Build, or “Do Nothing” Alternative, replacement of the Pezzi Road Bridge and improvements to the roadway approach would not be performed. The bridge would continue to deteriorate and no longer meet the sufficiency ratings, thereby placing the public at risk.

1.5 PERMITS AND APPROVALS NEEDED

Environmental findings within the Project include impacts to water quality, waters of the United States (U.S.) and State, special status species, and the floodway. The following consultations and environmental permits will be obtained prior to the start of construction.
### Table 1: Permit and Approvals Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Permit/Approval</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>Section 401 Certification</td>
<td>Will be Obtained Prior to Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement</td>
<td>Will be Obtained Prior to Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Section 7 Biological Opinion</td>
<td>Obtained May 18, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
<td>Section 7 Biological Opinion</td>
<td>Obtained September 3, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Section 404 Nationwide Permit 14</td>
<td>Will be Obtained Prior to Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System 402 General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity</td>
<td>Will be Obtained Prior to Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Flood Protection Board</td>
<td>Encroachment Permit</td>
<td>Will be Obtained Prior to Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 Initial Study

This chapter explains the impacts that the Project would have on the human, physical, and biological environments in the Project area. It describes the existing environment that could be affected by the Project, potential impacts from the alternatives, and avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures. Any indirect impacts are included in the general impacts analysis and discussions that follow.

2.1 AESTHETICS

Would the Project: Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?    

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?    

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?    

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

REGULATORY SETTING

CEQA establishes that it is the policy of the state to take all action necessary to provide the people of the state “with…enjoyment of aesthetic, natural, scenic and historic environmental qualities (California PRC Section 21001[b]).”

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

A Visual Impact Assessment (Minor Level) was prepared for the proposed Project in March 2019. The Project location and setting provides for the context for determining the type of changes to the existing visual environment. The proposed Project is located on Pezzi Road approximately 2,900 feet south of East 8 Mile Road and approximately 1 mile north of Waterloo Road (SR 88) in unincorporated San Joaquin County, California. The Project is located in the San Joaquin Valley region of central California. The landscape is characterized by agricultural lands, and riparian habitat associated with the Calaveras River. The land use within the Project corridor is primarily agricultural. The Project corridor is defined as the area of land that is visible from, adjacent to, and outside the highway right-of-way, and is determined by topography, vegetation, and viewing distance.

The Pezzi Road Bridge (29C0199) over the Calaveras River is classified as a Category 5 - not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) - on the Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory. No designated scenic vistas are at or near the Project site. Pezzi Road is not a designated scenic highway in the National Scenic Byways Program nor is it a State scenic highway (Caltrans 2007). There are no wild and scenic rivers within the proposed Project corridor.

DISCUSSION

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
No Impact. No designated scenic vistas are at or near the Project site. Pezzi Road is not a designated scenic highway in the National Scenic Byways Program nor is it a State scenic highway (Caltrans 2017). There are no wild and scenic rivers within the Project corridor. Therefore, no impacts to a scenic vista would result from the Project.

b) 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 located within a State scenic highway nor is the site visible from a State highway, including any State highways designated as scenic highways. Therefore, no impacts to scenic resources within a State scenic highway would result from the Project.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?

Less than Significant Impact. Visual resources of the Project setting are defined and identified below by assessing visual character and visual quality in the Project corridor. Resource change is assessed by evaluating the visual character and the visual quality of the visual resources that comprise the Project corridor before and after the construction of the proposed Project.

The visual character of the proposed Project will be compatible with the existing visual character of the corridor. Pezzi Road within the proposed Project area runs from East 8 Mile Road to Waterloo Road for a total of approximately 2.10 miles. For the entire length of Pezzi Road, agriculture dominates the visual character of the area including the form, line, color, and texture of the visual environment. The proposed Project would require the removal of a portion of orchard within the proposed Project alignment; however, this minor removal would not drastically alter the form, line, color, or texture of the visual character of the area.

The proposed Project would remove the existing bridge (63.5-foot long by 22-foot wide) and replace it with an approximately 75-foot long by 26-foot wide two-span, cast-in-place reinforced concrete slab bridge. The new bridge would be approximately 550 square feet larger than the existing bridge and the new bridge would include Type 836 “36-inch tall” solid concrete railings. This would differ from the approximately 20-inch tall, substandard existing concrete barrier with arch keyhole type design. The new alignment would move the bridge 250 to 300 feet east of the existing location, removing some natural vegetation within the new bridge and roadway footprint. With the removal of the existing bridge and replacement of the larger bridge and solid concrete railings, a moderate change of the visual resources would occur; however, these changes would not drastically alter the form, line, color, and texture of the visual character of the area.

Pattern elements of form, line, color, and texture would remain intact through the proposed Project corridor. Therefore, visual character of the proposed Project area would be compatible with the existing visual character of the area.

- Form elements (flat agricultural areas) would remain intact;
- Line elements (agricultural rows) would remain similar as a result of the minor impacts to the orchard area;
- Color elements (green composition of trees, riparian areas, and irrigated croplands) would remain intact; and
- Texture elements (agricultural cropland and orchards) would remain similar to the existing setting as a result of the minor impacts to the orchard area.
The visual quality of the existing corridor will not be altered by the proposed Project. The vividness of the Project site is considered moderately low due to the continuous agricultural lands, small riparian area, and adjacent rural residences. The intactness of the site is moderately low due to amount of existing agricultural landscape and the man-made roadway. Unity of the site is low, as there is a minimal amount of natural vegetation (riparian area associated with Calaveras River) and the area is dominated by flat agriculture areas.

Resource change (changes to visual resources as measured by changes in visual character and visual quality) will be low. Visual character and quality of the proposed Project will be similar to the existing visual character and quality of the Project area in its current state as shown in the following representative photographs:

**Photograph 1**: Representative existing Pezzi Road Bridge, Calaveras River and associated riparian habitat. Photo taken east of Pezzi Road Bridge facing west.
Photograph 2: Adjacent rural residence and orchards along Pezzi Road. Photo taken south of Pezzi Road Bridge facing south.

Photograph 3: Adjacent orchards in background along Pezzi Road. Photo taken at Pezzi Road Bridge facing north.
Neighbors (people with views to the road) and highway users (people with views from the road) will be affected by the proposed Project. For the neighbor’s viewer group, the local rural-residential neighbor’s viewer exposure would be considered high and the awareness of residents was rated high as the 3 rural residences are directly adjacent to Pezzi Road. The duration of these viewers is high, due to their long term and constant presence in the area.

Neighbor’s response to visual changes would be considered moderate. A high rating of sensitivity due to the proximity to Pezzi Road and the amount of time spent in the area; however, there would only be a low degree of change to views. The awareness of this group is considered high as the resident’s view of the proposed Project area is within close proximity. The aesthetics of the Project area is unlikely to be highly valued by the residents considering the existing level of urban infrastructure (road and bridge) within the existing rural area.

For highway users, viewer exposure is moderately-high. The location of the motorists is rated high, as the motorists would travel along the newly aligned roadway and bridge replacement. The quantity of motorists that would travel this section of the road would be low as the corridor is anticipated to be used predominately by residents and agricultural equipment. The duration of these viewers would be moderately-low, due to the rate of speed that the road would operate at, and the small length of the Project segment.

The highway users viewer group would have low sensitivity due to the short time span spent along the proposed Project. The highway users’ activity level within the Project area is high as they are traveling on the roadway and not able to be engaged in observing their surroundings. The awareness of motorists is low as it is focused on the roadway and not the surrounding agricultural environment. The aesthetics of the Project area is unlikely to be valued by the motorists considering the existing level of visual character and quality. It is anticipated that the average response of all viewer groups would be moderately-low.
Visual impacts are determined by assessing changes to the visual resources and predicting viewer response to those changes. The Project is expected to have minimal permanent and temporary visual impacts from Project construction. The Project is characterized to have an overall visual impact of low. In consideration of the no-build alternative, not re-aligning Pezzi Road and replacing the Pezzi Road bridge would cause continued safety issues of the roadway’s reversing curves and structurally deficient bridge. The proposed Project would replace the substandard bridge with a structure meeting current standards, and realign the roadway approach to replace the sharp curves with a new 55 mph alignment. Since the Project does not change the existing land uses and adds a minor amount of new paved surfaces, the visual character would not change substantially.

Tree and Vegetation Removal
Within the Central Valley, an area of valley foothill riparian vegetation is found within the proposed Project area. This area is comprised of native and non-native vegetation including valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), boxelder (*Acer negundo*), blue elderberry (*Sambucus nigra ssp. caerulea*), Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), and blessed milk thistle (*Silybum marianum*). While some riparian habitat would be removed, this would not substantially change the visual quality of the site. As a wooded area, numerous trees would remain in view of the replacement bridge, and all trees along the edge of construction would be trimmed rather than removed where possible. All temporary impacts to riparian areas would be re-contoured to pre-construction conditions, and re-vegetated with a native seed mix, and all permanent impacts will be mitigated for at an agency approved mitigation ratio at an on or off-site agency approved location or a combination of both.

With the implementation of measures VIA-1 through VIA-6, impacts would be less than significant.

d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

**No Impact.** The Project would not substantially affect light and glare. No new lighting is proposed. Construction activities would temporarily introduce equipment and vehicles to the Project site; however, work would take place during daylight hours and no construction lighting is anticipated. The Project would not result in substantial additional light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the Project area; therefore, there will be no impact.

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

**VIA-1:** Landscape architecture considerations shall be implemented as directed by the Department’s Highway Design Manual, Chapter 900, and the Department’s Landscape Architecture PS&E Guide. As such, highway planting, lighting plans, and aesthetic treatment would be incorporated into the Project as appropriate. This would also include coordination between the Department’s Landscape Architecture staff for areas within state right-of-way as well as with San Joaquin County.

**VIA-2:** Caltrans Standard Specifications (2018) “Erosion Control” will be followed during construction. At the conclusion of construction, areas of bare soil shall be hydroseeded with native seed mix to prevent or at least minimize erosion. Hydroseeding will follow Standard Special Provision (SSP) 21-2.03D for Erosion Control (Hydroseed).

**VIA-3:** Vegetation clearing would only occur within the delineated Project boundaries in an effort to minimize the impacts. Trees located in areas along the edge of the construction zone would be trimmed whenever possible and only those trees that lie within the active construction areas would be removed.
VIA-4: All disturbed areas including staging of vehicles and equipment will be restored to pre-construction contours and revegetated, either through hydroseeding or other means, with native species.

VIA-5: Permanent impacts to riparian vegetation within construction limits will be mitigated for at an agency approved mitigation ratio at an on or off-site agency approved location or a combination of both.

VIA-6: The contractor will be required to maintain good housekeeping in and around construction sites, staging areas, and equipment storage areas.

**FINDINGS**

The Project would have **Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation** relating to aesthetics.
2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the Project:

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?

Less than Significant Impact

To identify Prime and Unique Farmland within the Project area, an examination of the soils on the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) website was performed. Based on preliminary engineering, the proposed alignment would require right-of-way acquisitions of the orchards to the north and south of the proposed bridge for the roadway footprint, as well as an orchard remnant that would exist between the new and existing roads. Approximately 2.23 acres of Prime Farmland and 0.25 acres of Unique Farmland would be acquired and converted as a result of the roadway improvements associated with the Project. Temporary construction easements would indirectly affect 4.52 acres of Prime Farmland and 1.0 acres of Unique Farmland. A NRCS-CPA-106 form was completed and submitted to the NRCS for review on July 21, 2020. NRCS determined that the Project would have negligible impacts to Prime and Unique Farmland, or any land protected by the Farmland Protection Policy Act, as documented in the attached NRCS correspondence dated July 23, 2020 (Appendix A). Therefore, the Project would have less than significant impacts to farmland soils.

Less than Significant Impact.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. There is Williamson Act contract land directly adjacent to the Project area, east of Pezzi Road; however, permanent acquisition of this property for roadway improvements would not be
required. The Project would only result in temporary impacts due to construction and is consistent with state and local farmland protection programs and policies; therefore, the Project would have less than significant impacts on farmland and Williamson Act contract land.

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))?

No Impact. There are no forests or timberland located within the Project area; therefore, the Project would have no impact with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. There are no forests or forest resources located within the Project area; therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

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

No Impact. The land adjacent to Pezzi Road and Pezzi Road Bridge would continue to be used for agriculture; therefore, the Project would not result in the additional conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Findings

The Project would have Less than Significant impacts relating to agriculture and forest resources.
2.3 AIR QUALITY

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

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REGULATORY SETTING

The Clean Air Act (CAA) as amended in 1990 is the federal law that governs air quality. Its counterpart in California is the California CAA of 1988. These laws set standards for the quantity of pollutants that can be in the air. At the federal level, these standards are called National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Standards have been established for six criteria pollutants that have been linked to potential health concerns; the criteria pollutants are carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), particulate matter (PM), lead (Pb), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂).

Regional level conformity in California is concerned with how well the region is meeting the standards set for CO, NO₂, O₃, and PM. California is in attainment for the other criteria pollutants. At the regional level, Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) are developed that include all of the transportation projects planned for a region over a period of years, usually at least 20. Based on the projects included in the RTP, an air quality model is run to determine whether or not the implementation of those projects would conform to emission budgets or other tests showing that attainment requirements of the CAA are met. If the conformity analysis is successful, the regional planning organization, such as the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) for San Joaquin County, and the appropriate federal agencies, such as the FHWA, make the determination that the RTP is in conformity with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for achieving the goals of the CAA. Otherwise, the projects in the RTP must be modified until conformity is attained. If the design and scope of the transportation project are the same as described in the RTP, then the project is deemed to meet regional conformity requirements for purposes of project-level analysis.

Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards

California and the federal government have established standards for several different pollutants. For some pollutants, separate standards have been set for different measurement periods. Most standards have been set to protect public health. For some pollutants, standards have been based on other values (such as protection of crops, protection of materials, or avoidance of nuisance conditions). The pollutants of greatest concern in the Project area are O₃, PM 2.5 microns (PM₂.₅) and PM 10 microns (PM₁₀).
State Regulations
Responsibility for achieving California’s air quality standards, which are more stringent than federal standards, is placed on the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and local air districts, and is to be achieved through district-level air quality management plans that will be incorporated into the SIP. In California, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has delegated authority to prepare SIPs to the CARB, which, in turn, has delegated that authority to individual air districts.

The CARB has traditionally established state air quality standards, maintaining oversight authority in air quality planning, developing programs for reducing emissions from motor vehicles, developing air emission inventories, collecting air quality and meteorological data, and approving SIPs.

Responsibilities of air districts include overseeing stationary source emissions, approving permits, maintaining emissions inventories, maintaining air quality stations, overseeing agricultural burning permits, and reviewing air quality–related sections of environmental documents required by CEQA.

The California CAA of 1988 substantially added to the authority and responsibilities of air districts. The California CAA designates air districts as lead air quality planning agencies, requires air districts to prepare air quality plans, and grants air districts authority to implement transportation control measures. The California CAA focuses on attainment of the state ambient air quality standards, which, for certain pollutants and averaging periods, are more stringent than the comparable federal standards.

The California CAA requires designation of attainment and non-attainment areas with respect to state ambient air quality standards. The California CAA also requires that local and regional air districts expeditiously adopt and prepare an air quality attainment plan if the district violates state air quality standards for CO, SO₂, NO₂, or O₃. These Clean Air Plans are specifically designed to attain these standards and must be designed to achieve an annual 5% reduction in district-wide emissions of each non-attainment pollutant or its precursors. Where an air district is unable to achieve a 5% annual reduction, the adoption of “all feasible measures” on an expeditious schedule is acceptable as an alternative strategy (Health and Safety Code Section 40914(b)(2)). No locally prepared attainment plans are required for areas that violate the state PM₁₀ standards.

The California CAA requires that the state air quality standards be met as expeditiously as practicable but, unlike the federal CAA, does not set precise attainment deadlines. Instead, the act established increasingly stringent requirements for areas that will require more time to achieve the standards.

CARB’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (2005) provides CARB recommendations for the siting of new sensitive land uses (including residences) near freeways, distribution centers, ports, refineries, chrome plating facilities, dry cleaners, and gasoline stations. The handbook recommends that new development be placed at distances from such facilities.

Affected Environment
The proposed Project is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin and is under the auspices of the SJVAPCD. No additional capacity is proposed (no new through- or turn-lanes) and the Project would not result in any new trips, vehicle miles traveled, or vehicle hours traveled in the permanent condition. Table 1 of the Caltrans Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol lists specific types of projects that are exempt from all emissions analyses for determining air quality conformity. Included in the list is “Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no
additional travel lanes). Additionally, since the Project is consistent with these requirements, the Project will not be increasing operational traffic and it is assumed to be consistent with SJVAPCD and is exempt from local conformity review.

**DISCUSSION**

*a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

**No Impact.** The Project is consistent with the site land use and zoning, and construction of the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality plan. The Project is included in the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) final conformity analysis for the 2019 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) (SJCOG 2018) as an exempt project under code 4.12 as “Transportation enhancement activities”. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

*b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?*

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The CARB is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, non-attainment, or unclassified for any state standard. An “attainment” designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations do not violate the standard for that pollutant in that area. A “non-attainment” designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the standard at least once within a calendar year. The area air quality attainment status of San Joaquin County is shown in Table 2.

All construction impacts to air quality would be short-term and intermittent; therefore, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant. The emission of pollutants during construction would not contribute significantly to a net increase of any criteria pollutant. No long-term, operational impacts are anticipated.

**Table 2: NAAQS and CAAQS Attainment Status for San Joaquin County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Designation/Classification</th>
<th>Federal Standards</th>
<th>State Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 8-Hour</td>
<td>No Federal Standard</td>
<td>Non-attainment/Severe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 1-Hour</td>
<td>Non-attainment/Extreme</td>
<td>Non-attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Non-attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>Non-attainment</td>
<td>Non-attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>Attainment/Unclassified</td>
<td>Attainment/Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td>Attainment/Unclassified</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>Attainment/Unclassified</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates</td>
<td>No Federal Standard</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>No Designation/Unclassified</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide</td>
<td>No Federal Standard</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility Reducing Particles</td>
<td>No Federal Standard</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Chloride</td>
<td>No Federal Standard</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: CARB 2019

**Operational Emissions**

The proposed Project is not a capacity increasing project and would not cause a change in the traffic patterns. Since there would be no change in operating conditions or lane configuration and traffic would not increase after construction, there would be no additional regional or local air emissions and no impact on air quality. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not exceed the applicable
thresholds of significance for air pollutant emissions during operation. Therefore, operation of the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment.

**Construction Emissions**

Construction activities associated with the replacement of Pezzi Road bridge and realignment of Pezzi Road would result in temporary incremental increases in air pollutants, such as $\text{O}_3$ precursors and PM due to operation of gas-powered equipment and minor land disturbance. However, the proposed construction activities would be temporary in nature and are not anticipated to generate large amounts of dust or particulates. Additionally, the Project will be implementing best available control measures, as required by AQ-1 through AQ-3, to reduce dust and particulate spreading.

The Project’s construction is anticipated to take 8 months. The Project’s construction emissions were estimated using the Roadway Construction Emissions Model by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD 2014), which is the accepted model for all CEQA roadway projects throughout California. The Roadway Construction Emissions Model results are compared with the SJVAPCD Air Quality Significance Thresholds in Table 3. As summarized in Table 3, construction activities from the Project would not exceed emission thresholds established by the SJVAPCD.

### Table 3: SJVAPCD Air Quality Thresholds of Significance – Criteria Pollutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant/ Precursor</th>
<th>Construction Emissions</th>
<th>Operational Emissions</th>
<th>Permitted Equipment and Activities</th>
<th>Non-Permitted Equipment and Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 tons per year (~540 lbs per day)</td>
<td>100 tons per year (~540 lbs per day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>100 tons per year (~540 lbs per day)</td>
<td>100 tons per year (~540 lbs per day)</td>
<td>100 tons per year (~540 lbs per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{NO}_x$</td>
<td>10 tons per year (~54 lbs per day)</td>
<td>10 tons per year (~54 lbs per day)</td>
<td>10 tons per year (~54 lbs per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>10 tons per year (~54 lbs per day)</td>
<td>10 tons per year (~54 lbs per day)</td>
<td>10 tons per year (~54 lbs per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO$_2$</td>
<td>27 tons per year (~145 lbs per day)</td>
<td>27 tons per year (~145 lbs per day)</td>
<td>27 tons per year (~145 lbs per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>15 tons per year (~81 lbs per day)</td>
<td>15 tons per year (~81 lbs per day)</td>
<td>15 tons per year (~81 lbs per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>15 tons per year (~81 lbs per day)</td>
<td>15 tons per year (~81 lbs per day)</td>
<td>15 tons per year (~81 lbs per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SJVAPCD (2015)

All construction activities would follow the SJVAPCD rules and would implement all appropriate air quality Best Management Practices (BMPs), including minimizing equipment idling time and use of water or similar chemical palliative to control fugitive dust. The implementation of AQ-1 through AQ-3 would also be used to minimize effects of impacts on air quality due to construction. These measures provide compliance guidelines for minimizing fugitive dust to protect sensitive receptors in the vicinity. With implementation of AQ-1 through AQ-3 construction emissions would result in a less than significant impact.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Less than Significant Impact.** During construction, short-term degradation of air quality is expected from the release of particulate emissions (airborne dust) generated by excavation, grading, hauling, and other activities related to construction. Emissions from construction equipment powered by gasoline and diesel engines are also anticipated and would include CO, nitrogen oxides ($\text{NO}_x$), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), directly emitted PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$, and
toxic air contaminants (TACs) such as diesel exhaust PM. Construction activities are not expected to result in any changes to traffic congestion as the bridge will remain open during construction.

**Localized Construction Analysis**

The nearest sensitive receptors are within 500 feet from the construction area within the Project boundaries. The SJVAPCD Air Quality Significance thresholds for construction (Table 2) represent the maximum emissions from a project that will not cause or contribute to an air quality exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard at the nearest sensitive receptor, taking into consideration ambient concentrations in each source receptor area (SRA), project size, distance to the sensitive receptor, and other applicable criteria.

Construction emissions were estimated using the latest Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District’s Road Construction Model, Version 9.0.0 (SMAQMD 2019). Construction-related emissions for the proposed Project are presented in Table 4. The emissions presented are based on the best information available at the time of calculations. The emissions represent the peak daily construction emissions that would be generated by construction of the proposed Project.

**Table 4: Construction Emissions from Construction Activity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CO (lbs/day)</th>
<th>NOx (lbs/day)</th>
<th>ROG (lbs/day)</th>
<th>SOx (lbs/day)</th>
<th>PM10 (lbs/day)</th>
<th>PM2.5 (lbs/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grubbing/Land Clearing</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading/Excavation</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage/Utilities/ Sub-Grade</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum daily (lbs/day)</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Total (tons/construction project)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emissions from construction activities associated with the Project would not exceed the SJVAPCD significance thresholds for criteria pollutants.

**Toxic Air Contaminants**

The greatest potential for toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions would be related to diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. In addition, incidental amounts of toxic substances such as oils, solvents, and paints would be used during construction. These substances would comply with all applicable SJVAPCD rules for their manufacture and use. The proposed bridge rehabilitation and maintenance Project would have no permanent impact on sensitive receptors. Therefore, impacts relating to pollutant concentrations during construction are less than significant.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project site is located within an agricultural area and would not produce substantial quantities of other emissions that could lead to odors during construction that would affect the surrounding rural residents; therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact on air quality and other emissions.
AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

The following measures would be implemented as part of the Project to minimize short term construction related air quality emissions.

**AQ-1:** The construction contractor shall comply with Caltrans’ Standard Specifications Section 14-11.04 Dust Control of Caltrans’ Standard Specifications (2018).

**AQ-2:** The construction contractor shall comply with Section 7-1.02C Emissions Reduction and Section 18 Dust Palliative of Caltrans’ Standard Specifications (2018).

**AQ-3:** The Wind Erosion Control BMP (WE-1) from Caltrans’ Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual will be implemented as follows:

- Water shall be applied by means of pressure-type distributors or pipelines equipped with a spray system or hoses and nozzles that will ensure even distribution.
- All distribution equipment shall be equipped with a positive means of shutoff.
- Unless water is applied by means of pipelines, at least one mobile unit shall be available at all times to apply water or dust palliative to the Project.
- If reclaimed water is used, the sources and discharge must meet California Department of Health Services water reclamation criteria and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements. Non-potable water shall not be conveyed in tanks or drainpipes that will be used to convey potable water and there shall be no connection between potable and non-potable supplies. Non-potable tanks, pipes and other conveyances shall be marked “NON-POTABLE WATER – DO NOT DRINK.”
- Materials applied as temporary soil stabilizers and soil binders will also provide wind erosion control benefits.

**FINDINGS**

The Project would have **Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation** relating to air quality.
2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the Project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
--|--|--|--|
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or NOAA Fisheries? ☐ ☒ ☒ ☒
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? ☐ ☒ ☒ ☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ☐ ☒ ☒ ☒
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, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? ☐ ☒ ☒ ☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? ☐ ☒ ☒ ☒
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? ☐ ☒ ☒ ☒

REGULATORY SETTING
This section describes the Federal, State, and local plans, policies, and laws that are relevant to biological resources within the Biological Study Area (BSA). Applicable Federal permits and approvals that will be required before construction of the Project are provided in Section 1.5.

Federal Regulations

National Environmental Policy Act
The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) provides an interdisciplinary framework for environmental planning by Federal agencies and contains action-forcing procedures to ensure that Federal agency decision makers take environmental factors into account. NEPA applies whenever a Federal agency proposes an action, grants a permit, or agrees to fund or otherwise authorize any other entity to undertake an action that could possibly affect environmental resources. Caltrans, under delegation from the FHWA, is the NEPA lead agency for this Project.

Federal Endangered Species Act
The Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) of 1973 (16 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) section 1531 et seq.) provides for the conservation of endangered and threatened species listed pursuant to Section 4 of the Act (16 U.S.C. section 1533) and the ecosystems upon which they depend. These species and resources have been identified by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

Clean Water Act
The Clean Water Act (CWA) was enacted as an amendment to the Federal Water Pollutant Control Act of 1972, which outlined the basic structure for regulating discharges of pollutants to waters of the U.S. The CWA serves as the primary Federal law protecting the quality of the nation’s surface waters, including lakes, rivers, and coastal wetlands. CWA empowers the U.S. EPA to set national water quality standards and effluent limitations, and includes programs
addressing both point-source and non-point-source pollution. Point-source pollution originates or enters surface waters at a single, discrete location, such as an outfall structure or an excavation or construction site. Non-point-source pollution originates over a broader area and includes urban contaminants in storm water runoff and sediment loading from upstream areas. CWA operates on the principle that all discharges into the nation’s waters are unlawful unless they are specifically authorized by a permit; permit review is CWA’s primary regulatory tool. This Project will require a CWA Section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit regulated by the EPA.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the U. S. These waters include wetlands and non-wetland bodies of water that meet specific criteria, including a direct or indirect connection to interstate commerce. USACE regulatory jurisdiction pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA is founded on a connection, or nexus, between the water body in question and interstate commerce. This connection may be direct (through a tributary system linking a stream channel with traditional navigable waters used in interstate or foreign commerce) or may be indirect (through a nexus identified in USACE regulations).

The RWQCB has jurisdiction under Section 401 of the CWA and regulates any activity which may result in a discharge to surface waters. Typically, the areas subject to jurisdiction of the RWQCB coincide with those of USACE (i.e., waters of the U.S. including any wetlands). The RWQCB also asserts authority over “waters of the State” under waste discharge requirements pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

**Executive Order 13112: Prevention and Control of Invasive Species**

Executive Order (EO) 13112 (signed February 3, 1999) directs all Federal agencies to prevent and control introductions of invasive species in a cost-effective and environmentally sound manner. The EO and directives from the FHWA require consideration of invasive species in NEPA analyses, including their identification and distribution, their potential impacts, and measures to prevent or eradicate them.

**Executive Order 13186: Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

EO 13186 (signed January 10, 2001) directs each Federal agency taking actions that could adversely affect migratory bird populations to work with USFWS to develop a Memorandum of Understanding that will promote the conservation of migratory bird populations. Protocols developed under the Memorandum of Understanding will include the following agency responsibilities:

- Avoid and minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, adverse impacts on migratory bird resources when conducting agency actions;
- Restore and enhance habitat of migratory birds, as practicable; and
- Prevent or abate the pollution or detrimental alteration of the environment for the benefit of migratory birds, as practicable.

The EO is designed to assist Federal agencies in their efforts to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (50 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 10 and 21) and does not constitute any legal authorization to take migratory birds. Take is defined under the MBTA as “the action of or attempt to pursue, hunt, shoot, capture, collect, or kill” (50 CFR 10.12) and includes intentional take (i.e., take that is the purpose of the activity in question) and unintentional take (i.e., take that results from, but is not the purpose of, the activity in question).
State Regulations

California Environmental Quality Act
California State law created to inform governmental decision-makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities and to work to reduce these negative environmental impacts. San Joaquin County is the CEQA lead agency for this Project.

California Endangered Species Act
The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (California Fish and Game (CFG) Code Section 2050 et seq.) requires the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to establish a list of endangered and threatened species (Section 2070) and to prohibit the incidental taking of any such listed species except as allowed by the Act (Sections 2080-2089). In addition, CESA prohibits take of candidate species (under consideration for listing).

CESA also requires the CDFW to comply with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) when evaluating Incidental Take Permit (ITP) applications (CFG Code Section 2081(b) and California Code Regulations, Title 14, section 783.0 et seq.), and the potential impacts the Project or activity for which the application was submitted may have on the environment. CDFW's CEQA obligations include consultation with other public agencies which have jurisdiction over the Project or activity [California Code Regulations, Title 14, Section 783.5(d)(3)]. CDFW cannot issue an ITP if issuance would jeopardize the continued existence of the species [CFG Code Section 2081(c); California Code Regulations, Title 14, Section 783.4(b)].

Section 1602: Streambed Alteration Agreement
Under CFG Code 1602, public agencies are required to notify CDFW before undertaking any project that will divert, obstruct, or change the natural flow, bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake. Preliminary notification and project review generally occurs during the environmental process. When an existing fish or wildlife resource may be substantially adversely affected, CDFW is required to propose reasonable project changes to protect the resources. These modifications are formalized in a Streambed Alteration Agreement that becomes part of the plans, specifications, and bid documents for the project.

Section 3503 and 3503.5: Bird and Raptors
CFG Code Section 3503 prohibits the destruction of bird nests and Section 3503.5 prohibits the killing of raptor species and destruction of raptor nests. Trees and shrubs are present in and adjacent to the study area and could contain nesting sites.

Section 3513: Migratory Birds
CFG Code Section 3513 prohibits the take or possession of any migratory non-game bird as designated in the MBTA or any part of such migratory non-game bird except as provided by rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the MBTA.

Affected Environment
Online databases from the USFWS, NMFS, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) were used to generate a list of special status species with potential off occurring in the vicinity of the Project area.

The BSA was used to generate an official species list through the Information for Planning and Consultation online tool operated by USFWS. The NMFS official species list was also obtained through the Information for Planning and Conservation operated by USFWS. The following six United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangles were used to generate the CNDDB and CNPS search results: Waterloo, Stockton East, Lodi South, Linden, Stockton West and Lockeford. On March 28, 2017 and June 27, 2019, general biological surveys, habitat assessments, and a delineation of jurisdictional waters was conducted by Dokken Engineering.
biologist Scott Salembier. General biological surveys included walking meandering transects, observing vegetation communities, compiling notes on observed flora and fauna, and assessing the potential for existing habitat within the BSA to support sensitive plants and wildlife. The BSA was defined by using a 100-foot buffer around all anticipated work areas, staging areas, and access routes for construction. The BSA is approximately 1,850 feet long east-west, approximately 2,669 feet long, and approximately 26 acres in total size (Figure 4).

**Physical Conditions**

**Topography**
The BSA is in the Waterloo USGS 7½ minute quadrangle (T2N & R7E, S3). Since the Project is located in the Central Valley, the topography is relatively flat, with elevation within the BSA approximately 59-65 feet above mean sea level. Topographic features within the area include Mosher Creek approximately 0.9 miles north of the BSA and Mormon Slough approximately 5.8 miles south of the BSA.

**Soils**
Soil units within the BSA include Archerdale clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, Cogna loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, and Stockton fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, overwashed (National Resources Conservation Services [NRCS], 2019). Soils within the BSA are somewhat poorly drained to well drained and have a medium runoff class (NRCS 2019).

**Hydrological Resources**
Based on survey results and the USGS 7½ minute quadrangle topographical map, the Calaveras River occurs within the BSA. The Calaveras River is approximately 51 miles long and lies within the San Joaquin River watershed. The Calaveras River originates in New Hogan Reservoir approximately 23 miles northeast of the Project area. The Calaveras River flows east to west through the Project area and confluences with the San Joaquin River approximately 11 river miles downstream of the BSA.

**Land Cover Types**
Land use within the BSA consists of rural mixed residential and small-scale agriculture. The BSA has been highly disturbed by ongoing agriculture and natural vegetative communities have been invaded by introduced exotic species. The BSA consists of three developed land cover types and two undeveloped land cover types (Figure 4).

*Developed Land Covers*

*Ruderal/Disturbed*
Ruderal/disturbed lands typically occur adjacent to roadways, drainage ditches, and developed areas. These areas are highly disturbed and dominated by annual invasive species. Dominant species in this vegetation community within the BSA includes blessed milk thistle (*Silybum marianum*), and doveweed (*Croton setiger*). This vegetation community constitutes roughly 0.31 acres (1%) of the BSA.
FIGURE 4
Waters and Vegetation Communities Within the BSA
Federal Project: BRLO 5929(240)
Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement over Calaveras River
San Joaquin County, California

Source: ESRI World Street Maps Online; Dokken Engineering 2/13/2020; Created By: Sheldon

- Biological Study Area (26 acres)
- Valley Foothill Riparian (1.57 acres)
- Calaveras River (0.56 acres)
- Orchard (19.83 acres)
- Ruderal (0.31 acres)
- Urban (3.62 acres)
Urban
Urban areas are characterized by structures, landscaping, pavement, dirt roads, and other disturbed areas. Landscaping within the BSA generally consists of lawns, and non-native trees and shrubs. Three residences occur within the BSA and constitute roughly 3.62 acres (14%) of the BSA.

Orchard-Vineyard
Orchards are typically single species tree dominated habitats and vineyards are typically single species planted in rows, often supported with wire or wood trellises. The dominant species in this habitat within the BSA include almonds and cherries. Orchard-Vineyard occupies 19.83 acres (approximately 77%) of the BSA.

Undeveloped Land Covers

Riverine
The Old Calaveras River (Riverine) is the only riverine feature within the BSA and the only surface water feature. The Old Calaveras River (Riverine) carries seasonal flow that is controlled by releases from the New Hogan Dam which are then diverted into either the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) or the Mormon Slough by the Bellota Weir located at the confluence of these two channels. The weir is operated by the SEWD for irrigation purposes. Riverine makes up 0.56 acres (approximately 2%) of the BSA.

Valley Foothill Riparian
Within the Central Valley, valley foothill riparian corridors are typically comprised of cottonwood (Populus sp.), California sycamore (Platanus racemosa), and valley oak (Quercus lobata), with typical understory species including wild grape, wild rose (Rosa californica), California blackberry (Rubus ursinus), blue elderberry (Sambucus nigra ssp. caerulea), poison oak (Toxicodendron diversilobum), buttonbush (Cephalanthus occidentalis), and willows in close proximity to a water source. Transition to adjacent non-riparian vegetation is usually abrupt, especially near agriculture (Cheatham and Haller 1975). The dominant species in this habitat type within the BSA include a valley oak (Quercus lobata), boxelder (Acer negundo), and blue elderberry sub canopy, and an understory of Himalayan blackberry (Rubus armeniacus) and blessed milk thistle (Silybum marianum). Valley foothill riparian makes up 1.57 acres (approximately 6%) of the BSA.

DISCUSSION

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, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or NOAA Fisheries?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The following is a discussion on special status plant and animal species that were determined have potential of occurring with the Project area, potential impacts, and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures that when incorporated will reduce impacts to a less than significant impact.

Special-Status Plants
The Natural Environment Study (NES) (Dokken Engineering 2020a) serves as basis for much of this section. Prior to field surveys, a review of CNDDB, CNPS and online databases found that there was no potential for special status plant species to occur in the Project vicinity. Additionally, surveys conducted June 27, 2019 did not observe any special status plant species within the BSA. No impacts to special status plant species are anticipated; therefore, no compensatory mitigation or minimization measures are will be necessary. All special status plant species are
presumed absent from the BSA. The Project would have no impacts to special status plant species.

**Special-Status Animals**
Prior to field surveys, online database searches returned 18 special-status animal species that have been documented within the vicinity of the BSA (Appendix B). Based on an assessment of available habitats within the BSA, the habitat requirements of each species, and an assessment of each species’ historic and current distribution, it was determined that three special-status animal species have the potential of occurring within the BSA, including Swainson’s hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), Central Valley steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*), and valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*). Each species is discussed individually below.

**Swainson’s Hawk**
The Swainson’s hawk is State-listed as threatened. Swainson’s hawk migrates annually from wintering areas in South America to breeding locations in northwestern Canada, the western U.S., and Mexico. In California, Swainson’s hawk nest throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys in large trees in riparian habitats and in isolated trees in or adjacent to agricultural fields. The breeding season extends from late March through late August, with peak activity from late May through July (England et al. 1997). Swainson’s hawks forage in large, open agricultural habitats, including alfalfa and hay fields. The breeding population in California has declined by an estimated 91% since 1900; this decline is attributed to the loss of riparian nesting habitats and the conversion of native grassland and woodland habitats to agriculture and urban development (CDFW 1994).

**Swainson’s Hawk Survey Results**
Tall oak and cottonwood trees within the BSA provide potentially suitable riparian nesting habitat, however they are surrounded by orchards, which is not suitable foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawks. During the March 2017 biological survey, one individual hawk was identified flying over the BSA. During the June 2019 biological survey, two individual hawks were identified flying southeast of the BSA. The nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 0.8 miles northeast of the BSA, along Brumby Road, recorded in 2000. However, since 2000, the usage of the surrounding agricultural land has changed from primarily open fields (once suitable habitat) to orchards. None of the individual hawks observed in the 2017 and 2019 surveys were seen nesting within or adjacent to the BSA. Due to the lack of suitable foraging habitat, despite identification of Swainson’s hawks during biological surveys, the species is considered to have a low to moderate potential of utilizing the BSA or adjacent riparian habitat for nesting.

**Project Impacts to Swainson’s Hawk**
With the inclusion of avoidance and minimization measures, direct impacts to Swainson’s hawk are not anticipated. Project impacts will be limited to the temporary loss of approximately 3 mature riparian trees that may provide nesting habitat for raptors. In addition, with the inclusion of compensatory mitigation for Project impacts to the Calaveras River riparian corridor, the Project will not result in take of Swainson’s hawk. With the avoidance of take, the Project does not anticipate that a CDFW Section 2081 ITP for Swainson’s hawk will be necessary.

**Swainson’s Hawk Avoidance and Minimization Efforts**
To avoid and minimize potential Project impacts to Swainson’s hawk, measure BIO-11 shall be implemented.
Compensatory Mitigation for Swainson’s Hawk
With the inclusion of avoidance and minimization measures, direct impacts to Swainson’s hawk are not anticipated. Indirect effects from the loss of approximately 3 potential nesting trees within the BSA will be mitigated by purchasing riparian mitigation credits as described in measure BIO-10. Additional compensatory mitigation is not required.

Central Valley Steelhead
Central Valley steelhead is listed as threatened under FESA (63 FR 13347, March 19, 1998) and is under the jurisdiction of NMFS. This distinct population segment consists of steelhead in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins in the Central Valley. Steelhead are anadromous fish that spend part of their life cycle in freshwater and part in salt water. The species was once abundant in California coastal and Central Valley drainages. However, population numbers have declined significantly, especially in the tributaries of the Sacramento River (NMFS 2014). The species spawns in small, freshwater streams where the young remain from one to several years before migrating to the ocean to feed and grow. Adults return to their natal streams to spawn and complete their life cycle. Juvenile steelhead typically migrate to marine waters after spending two years in cool, clear, fast-flowing permanent streams and rivers where they reside for two or three years prior to returning to their natal stream to spawn at four or five years old.

Upon entering freshwater, the species holds until flows are high enough in tributaries to enter for spawning. Unlike Pacific salmon, steelhead are capable of spawning more than once before they die (NMFS 2014). Steelhead may survive a wide temperature gradient, but optimal immigration and holding temperatures are 46 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) to 52°F and optimal growing temperatures for juveniles are 59°F to 64.4°F (NMFS 2014). Furthermore, there are six primary constituent elements of Critical Habitat for steelhead including: freshwater spawning sites, freshwater rearing sites, freshwater migration corridors, estuarine areas, nearshore marine areas, and offshore marine areas. The Project area provides a freshwater migration corridor for adults or juveniles between freshwater spawning and rearing sites higher in the watershed and estuarine and marine habitats in the San Francisco Bay and Pacific Ocean.

Steelhead Survey Results
Within the Calaveras River Watershed, anadromous steelhead are restricted to areas downstream of the New Hogan Dam. The lower Calaveras River Watershed is broken into four main segments including the Calaveras River, the Old Calaveras River (Riverine), the Mormon Slough, and the Stockton Diverting Canal. From the New Hogan Dam, the Calaveras River flows approximately 15 miles before the channel is split between the Mormon Slough and the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) by the Bellota Weir, operated by the SEWD. From the Bellota Weir, the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) flows northwest emptying into the San Joaquin River on the north side of Stockton while the Mormon Slough flows southwest before emptying into the Stockton Diverting Canal which feeds back into the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) approximately 5.6 miles upstream of its confluence with the San Joaquin River.

The Calaveras River between the New Hogan Dam and the Bellota Weir provide potentially suitable spawning habitat for steelhead and this reach does support a small run most years; however, in order to access this reach, a majority of migrating steelhead utilize the Mormon Slough since flows within the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) are typically lower and more obstructed during the fall and winter steelhead runs when the Bellota Weir is open and most of the outflow from the New Hogan Dam is directed into the Mormon Slough (Stillwater Sciences 2004). In addition, the Calaveras River Fish Migration Barriers Assessment Report prepared by the California Department of Water Resources in 2007 found that numerous barriers to anadromous migration exist in the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) (CDWR 2007).
Within the BSA, Old Calaveras River (Riverine) provides marginal migration habitat for the species; however, numerous obstructions and low flows during the species migration season reduce the likelihood that the species will be present within the BSA. Potential presence of the species cannot be completely discounted due to presence of suitable upstream spawning habitat and documented occurrences of the species within the watershed. The species is therefore considered to have a low to moderate potential of occurring within the BSA.

**Critical Habitat**

Within the BSA, the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) is final designated Critical Habitat for steelhead.

**Project Impacts to Steelhead**

Due to construction occurring during the spring and summer months outside of the species' migration season, the Project is extremely unlikely to result in direct impacts to individual steelhead. However, the Project will result in both temporary and permanent impacts to final designated Critical Habitat for the species. Temporary impacts would be limited to temporary ground disturbance within the channel due to construction activities. Permanent impacts would be limited to the placement of a single pier and two abutments within the channel. The Project will have approximately 0.074 acres of temporary impacts and approximately 0.015 acres of permanent impacts to Old Calaveras River (Riverine). Additionally, riparian vegetation is a key component of steelhead habitat, providing bank stabilization and maintaining cooler water temperatures. The Project will result in approximately 0.184 acres of temporary impacts and approximately 0.093 acres of permanent impacts to riparian habitat.

Project activities will be restricted to low flow periods, as listed in BIO-3, when the species is less likely to be present. Additionally, construction equipment will not be operated in flowing water that could potentially result in take of the species. With implementation of the proposed avoidance and minimization measures, direct impacts to the species are not anticipated. A biological assessment (BA) has been prepared, and formal consultation with NMFS was concluded on September 3, 2021, with a "would adversely affect" determination for CCV Steelhead and Critical Habitat. Measures BIO-24 through BIO-30 will be incorporated per the NMFS Biological Opinion, and any additional measures required by USFWS will be incorporated.

**Steelhead Avoidance and Minimization Efforts**

The Project is not anticipated to directly impact individuals of the species. Project activities would occur when the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) is dry or when flow in the channel is low, as specified in measure BIO-3. During this period, it is unlikely that the species will be present in Old Calaveras River (Riverine). When water flow is low, the steelhead habitat present within the Project area becomes less suitable and more difficult for individuals to migrate. The Project has been designed to minimize temporary and permanent impacts to riverine and riparian habitat. In addition to measures BIO-1 through BIO-10 and measures BIO-12 and BIO-13, measures BIO-24 through BIO-30 will be implemented.

**Compensatory Mitigation for Steelhead**

Compensatory mitigation is proposed specifically for CCV Steelhead or Critical Habitat with the implementation of measures BIO-24 through BIO-30; temporary and permanent impacts to riverine and riparian habitat will be mitigated for at appropriate ratios determined by permitting agencies, as listed in BIO-27. In addition, potential effects to steelhead would be further minimized or avoided through the implementation of measures BIO-1 through BIO-10.
Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle
The valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB) is federally listed as threatened. The beetle goes through four life stages (egg, larva, pupa, and adult) (USFWS 2017). The adults are active from March to June. The VELB requires elderberry shrubs within riparian habitat as a host plant. VELB’s usage of elderberry shrubs can be detected by the presence of exit holes created by the beetle’s larval stage in the stem of the shrubs. The VELB is threatened by habitat loss of California’s Central Valley riparian areas, which is occurring due to agriculture and urban development.

Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Survey Results
The Calaveras River riparian corridor provides suitable habitat for VELB. During the March 2017 surveys, 37 elderberry shrubs were identified and mapped along the riparian corridor. Since this survey, vegetation has been removed from the riparian corridor by the respective property owner. During the June 2019 biological surveys, approximately 24 elderberry shrubs were identified and mapped, including one exhibiting potential VELB exit holes. Surveys were only conducted on the south side of Calaveras River due to restricted access on the north side. Binoculars were used to scan vegetation on the north side of the Project area and no elderberry shrubs were observed. The nearest historic occurrence of the beetle was approximately 1.4 miles upstream of the BSA along the Calaveras River. Due to the presence of elderberry shrubs within suitable habitat and range, the identification of exit holes, and the local, historic occurrence of the species on the Calaveras River, the VELB is considered to have a high potential of occurring within the BSA.

Project Impacts to Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle
The Project requires removal of the existing bridge and construction of a new 75-foot bridge approximately 250-300 feet east of the existing bridge. This location of the new bridge is where many of the elderberry shrubs were observed during the June 2019 biological survey. Removal of the existing bridge will require removal and transplantation of one elderberry shrub and the construction of the new bridge will require removal and transplantation of three elderberry shrubs, which are located in the temporary impact area. Elderberry shrubs will be transplanted to a USFWS approved mitigation bank and will occur between December 15th and February 15th, as stated in measure BIO-14. All other elderberry shrubs, approximately 20 shrubs, within the Project limits will be protected in place with the use of Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) fencing and sheeting, as stated in avoidance and minimization measure BIO-16 (Figure 5). Impacts to VELB habitat include approximately 0.184 acres of temporary impacts and approximately 0.093 acres of permanent impacts. The removal of elderberry shrubs will directly impact a population of VELB within the BSA by removing one shrub and permanently or temporarily disturbing potentially suitable habitat; as a result, avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project.

A BA was prepared for the species, initiating formal consultation under a “not likely to adversely affect” determination. A biological opinion was received from USFWS on May 18, 2021. The biological opinion included no additional measures to be incorporated into the Project; the USFWS determined that the measures described in the following sections (BIO-14 through BIO-21) are sufficient to minimize effects to the species.

Compensatory Mitigation for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle
Compensatory mitigation for permanent impacts to VELB habitat is proposed in BIO-21 based on the Framework for Assessing Impacts to the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (USFWS
2017). Direct impacts from the loss of one elderberry shrub and approximately 0.093 acres of riparian habitat will be mitigated through the purchase of 6.7 credits at an approved USFWS mitigation bank (Table 5). In addition, the directly impacted elderberry shrub will be relocated to a USFWS approved location as described in measure BIO-14.
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  - Protect in place (20 shrubs)
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  - Permanent Waters of the US/State (0.015 acres)
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  - Permanent CDFW Riparian Habitat (0.093 acres)
  - Temporary CDFW Riparian Habitat (0.184 acres)
- Habitat Type:
  - Valley Foothill Riparian
  - Calaveras River

Project Area:
- Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement over Calaveras River
- San Joaquin County, California

Impacts to Jurisdictional Waters:
- Permanent Waters of the US/State (0.015 acres)
- Temporary Waters of the US/State (0.074 acres)
- Permanent CDFW Riparian Habitat (0.093 acres)
- Temporary CDFW Riparian Habitat (0.184 acres)
Table 5: Impacts to VELB Habitat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Impact</th>
<th>Amount of Impact</th>
<th>Compensation Ratio</th>
<th>Mitigation Requirement</th>
<th>Credit Purchase(^2)</th>
<th>Total Credit Purchase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Habitat</td>
<td>0.093 acres</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>12,154 ft(^2)</td>
<td>6.7 credits (12,154/1,800)</td>
<td>6.7 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)acre(s) of credits: acre(s) of disturbance
\(^2\)One credit (unit) = 1,800 square feet

Migratory Birds

Birds protected by the MBTA and CFG Code Section 3513 are known to utilize the BSA as nesting habitat. The underside of the existing bridge could support nesting cliff swallows (*Petrochelidon pyrrhonota*), and many individuals were observed in the BSA during the June 2019 biological survey. Measure BIO-11 shall be implemented to identify and protect nesting birds present in areas surrounding the bridge. Avoidance and minimization measure BIO-22 shall be implemented to prevent swallows from establishing a nesting colony on the bridge that will be removed during the Project.

Small Terrestrial Wildlife

Small terrestrial wildlife includes commonly occurring small mammals, amphibians, and reptiles. In order to minimize potential long-term effects on small terrestrial wildlife, measure BIO-23 shall be implemented.

With regards to the Project’s effects on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW, USFWS, or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries, the implementation of measures BIO-1 through BIO-26 will result in the Project having less than significant impacts.

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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The following is a discussion on riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities within Project area, potential impacts, and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures that when incorporated will reduce impacts to a less than significant impact.

San Joaquin River Riparian Corridor

The Calaveras River is located within a valley foothill riparian corridor. Riparian vegetation extends onto both sides and into the channel. Approximately 95% of historic riparian vegetation in the Central Valley has been lost over the last 150 years (CRP 2003), predominantly to agriculture and urban development.

Survey Results

The valley foothill riparian vegetation along both banks of the Calaveras River are comprised of valley oak, boxelder, and elderberry species with dense patches of Himalayan blackberry and blessed milk thistle. These areas are not waters of the U.S. but are within CDFW jurisdiction. A total of 1.57 acres of montane riparian vegetation was mapped within the BSA.

Project Impacts

Construction access and staging is anticipated to temporarily disturb approximately 0.184 acres of the Calaveras River riparian corridor and require the removal of approximately 25 riparian trees (Figure 5). The Project would require the permanent removal of approximately 0.093 acres of
riparian habitat surrounding the river channel, involving the removal of four elderberry shrubs, Himalayan blackberry, and blessed milk thistle.

To offset temporary disturbance of 0.184 acres of riparian vegetation and the removal of 25 riparian trees, measures BIO-7 through BIO-10 shall be implemented. These measures will restore the construction area to pre-construction or better conditions through re-grading, hydroteering and replanting of riparian species. With the implementation of the measures listed above, the Project will have a less than significant impact.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The Calaveras River was the only surface waterbody identified within the BSA. All parts of the main channel below the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) are under the jurisdiction of USACE under §10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and §404 of the CWA and under the jurisdiction of the Central Valley RWQCB under §401 of the CWA. In addition, the main channel and associated floodplain are under the jurisdiction of CDFW under CFG Code §1600.

Discussion of the Calaveras River Channel
The Calaveras River is a relatively small low elevation drainage within the San Joaquin River watershed. Flow within the Calaveras River is regulated by New Hogan Dam approximately 23 miles northeast of the BSA. From the New Hogan Dam, the Calaveras River flows approximately 15 miles before the channel is split between the Mormon Slough and the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) by the Bellota Weir, operated by the SEWD. From the Bellota Weir, the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) flows north west emptying into the San Joaquin River on the north side of Stockton while the Mormon Slough flows southwest before emptying into the Stockton Diverting Canal. The San Joaquin River continues to flow northwest into the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta before outflowing into Suisun Bay and ultimately the Pacific Ocean.

Survey Results
The BSA contains a section of the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) approximately 14 miles downstream of the Bellota Weir. A jurisdictional delineation was conducted on March 28, 2017 and on June 27, 2019 by Dokken Engineering biologist Scott Salembier (Figure 5). Delineation of the channel followed the Field Guide to the Identification of the Ordinary High-Water Mark (OHWM) in the Arid West Region of the Western United States (USACE 2008). Within the BSA, the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) has been channelized and primarily functions as an irrigation and drainage canal for the surrounding orchards. The channel is moderately entrenched with densely vegetated banks. The channel measured approximately 20 feet wide at the OHWM. Flow regime is controlled by SEWD for irrigation supply and the channel is typically dry during the non-irrigation season (October – March) (Figure 4).

Project Impacts
Removal of the existing bridge and construction of the new bridge will result in both temporary and permanent impacts to the Old Calaveras River (Riverine). Removal of the existing bridge including removal of the existing bridge abutments and shallow spread footings within the river will result in temporary disturbance of approximately 0.04 acres of the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) stream channel and will restore approximately 0.01 acres of stream channel.

Construction of the new bridge will result in temporary disturbance of 0.03 acres and permanent impacts to approximately 0.015 acres of the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) Channel (Riverine).
Construction of the Project will involve dewatering around the two bridge locations for construction access in the channel. A water diversion will be placed around the two bridge locations to temporarily redirect water flows during construction. This diversion is anticipated to cause temporary impacts to river habitat. Temporary and permanent impacts to riverine and riparian habitat will be mitigated for at appropriate ratios determined by permitting agencies.

Avoidance and minimization measures BIO-1 through BIO-6 and BIO-10 shall be implemented to reduce long term effects on the river channel and reduce the risk of accidental chemical spills that may affect downstream water quality. In addition to the avoidance and minimization measures stated here, additional protective measures will be included in the regulatory permits from USACE, Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB), Central Valley RWQCB, and CDFW that will be obtained prior to the start of construction. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation.

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, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Calaveras River corridor serves as an east-west movement corridor for terrestrial wildlife through an otherwise developed portion of the San Joaquin Valley. Under existing conditions, Pezzi Road runs north-south over the river corridor bisecting habitat with an elevated 2-lane roadway. The Pezzi Road bridge provides an undercrossing approximately 600 feet wide for terrestrial wildlife.

The Project is not anticipated to have any effects to the habitat connectivity for birds, fish, or small and medium terrestrial wildlife. The Project will not reduce habitat connectivity for large terrestrial wildlife, such as black-tailed deer, moving along the San Joaquin River corridor. No loss of habitat connectivity is anticipated; therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

e) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

**No Impact.** There are no local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources in San Joaquin County; therefore, the Project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances.

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.** There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans within the Project area; therefore, the Project will not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plan.

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

**BIO-1:** All construction personnel shall be provided with environmental awareness training prior to being allowed to work on the job site. The training shall include an overview of sensitive habitats and special-status species that are present within or adjacent to the Project area and Project specific protective measures that must be adhered to. The training will also include a description of the legal penalties for violating protective measures.

**BIO-2:** Contract specifications will include the following BMPs, where applicable, to reduce erosion during construction:
- Implementation of the Project will require approval of a site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) or Water Pollution Control Program (WPCP) that
would implement effective measures to protect water quality, which may include a hazardous spill prevention plan and additional erosion prevention techniques.

- Existing vegetation will be protected in place where feasible to provide an effective form of erosion and sediment control.
- Stabilizing materials will be applied to the soil surface to prevent the movement of dust from exposed soil surfaces on construction sites as a result of wind, traffic, and grading activities.

BIO-3: In channel work shall be limited to periods of low flow. If water is present within the channel during construction, a water diversion will be implemented. The water diversion will be designed and implemented by the contractor selected for this Project.

BIO-4: Refueling or maintenance of equipment shall not be permitted within the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) and must occur at least 25 feet from the top of bank. All onsite refueling and maintenance must occur over plastic sheeting, drip pans, or other secondary containment measures to capture accidental spills before they can contaminate the soil. Secondary containment must have a raised edge (e.g. sheeting wrapped around wattles).

BIO-5: A chemical spill kit must be kept onsite at all times during work and must be easily accessible for use in the event of a spill.

BIO-6: Secondary containment consisting of plastic sheeting or other impermeable sheeting shall be installed underneath all stationary equipment to prevent petroleum products or other chemicals from contaminating the soil or the Old Calaveras River (Riverine). Secondary containment must have a raised edge (e.g. sheeting wrapped around wattles).

BIO-7: The Calaveras River riparian corridor shall be established as an ESA. Prior to ground disturbance, the Project limits adjacent to riparian vegetation shall be marked off with high visibility orange fencing (ESA Fencing) to prevent further encroachment into the ESA. Construction equipment, materials, and personnel shall not be permitted beyond the ESA fencing.

BIO-8: Native tree removal shall be limited to the minimum amount necessary for equipment access through the Project area. Trees shall be preferentially trimmed rather than removed and trimming should not exceed 30% of the total canopy of each tree.

BIO-9: Following construction, the Project area shall be re-graded to pre-construction or better conditions and hydoseeded with a mix of regionally appropriate native species approved by the Project biologist.

BIO-10: The County will purchase mitigation bank credits from a CDFW approved mitigation bank. The County anticipates purchasing credits at a 3:1 ratio for permanent impacts and at a 1:1 ratio for temporary impacts but final mitigation ratios and credits will be determined in coordination with CDFW through the 1602 permitting process, and through the USACE/RWQCB during the 404/401 permitting process.

BIO-11: Prior to vegetation removal or initial ground disturbance during the nesting bird season (February 1st – September 30th) a pre-construction nesting bird survey must be conducted by a Project biologist prior to the start of work. The nesting bird survey must include the Project area plus a 300-foot buffer. Within 2 weeks of the nesting bird survey,
all areas surveyed by the biologist must be cleared by the contractor or a supplemental nesting bird survey is required.

A minimum 300-foot no work buffer will be established around any active nests of a raptor species. A 100-foot no work buffer will be established around any active nests for other migratory birds. If an active nest is discovered during construction, the contractor must immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established. If a Swainson’s hawk nest is observed during the pre-construction survey, a 600-foot buffer will be established and CDFW will be contacted for further guidance. The contractor is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by a Project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged. A reduced buffer can be established if determined appropriate by a Project biologist and approved by CDFW.

**BIO-12:** If water is present at the start of in channel work, prior to installing the water diversion, the Project biologist(s) will remove fish from the work area. This may be accomplished by dip netting or seine netting as determined by the Project biologist(s). Handling of salmonids is not anticipated; however, if this action is necessary, the County will contact Caltrans in coordination with NMFS and consultation may need to be re-initiated.

**BIO-13:** Silt fences and fiber rolls should be utilized to reduce potential sediment discharge that could impact water quality.

**BIO-14:** Prior to initiating construction, elderberry shrubs that cannot be avoided will be removed and transplanted to a USFWS approved mitigation bank. Relocation must be completed between December 15th and February 15th when elderberry shrubs are dormant to minimize transplant stress on the shrubs. Transplanting methods must follow the recommendations included in Section 5.2 of the *Framework for Assessing Impacts to the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle* (USFWS 2017) or more recent published USFWS recommendations. The Project biologist will be present onsite during shrub relocation.

**BIO-15:** Prior to construction, during transplantation of elderberry shrubs, the Project biologist will conduct a survey of the Project area to ensure that no new shrubs, with stems 1 inch or greater, have appeared since the original survey. If new shrubs, with stems 1 inch or greater, are discovered that may be impacted by the Project coordination with USFWS will occur.

**BIO-16:** Elderberry shrubs adjacent to the Project limits will be protected in place. ESA fencing will be placed around the dripline of elderberry shrubs and protective sheeting will be used to block construction dust and debris.

**BIO-17:** A qualified biologist will be present onsite for any elderberry shrub removal and will periodically inspect the construction area and ESA fencing to ensure that no unauthorized take of VELB occurs.

**BIO-18:** Signs will be installed along the edge of the ESA and will read the following: “This area is habitat of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, a threatened species, and must not be disturbed. This species is protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Violators are subject to prosecution, fines, and imprisonment.” The signs should be clearly readable from a distance of 20 feet and must be maintained for the duration of construction.
BIO-19: Herbicides, insecticides, fertilizers, or other chemicals that might harm the VELB or VELB’s host plant will not be used within 100 feet of elderberry shrubs. All chemicals will be applied using a backpack sprayer or a similar direct application method.

BIO-20: To prevent fugitive dust from drifting into adjacent habitat, all clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, demolition activities, or other dust generating activities will be effectively controlled for fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.

BIO-21: Prior to the start of construction, the County will purchase 6.7 mitigation credits for VELB from a USFWS approved mitigation bank.

BIO-22: If demolition of the existing bridge is planned to occur during the swallow nesting season, measures must be taken to avoid impacts to migratory swallows. To protect migratory swallows, unoccupied nests must be removed from the existing bridge and swallow exclusions must be installed prior to the nesting season (February 15th – September 30th). Swallow exclusion design is at the discretion of the contractor but may consist of netting, sheeting, or low friction coatings. If a swallow is allowed to complete a nest on the existing bridge, work may not resume on the bridge without written approval from CDFW or until the Project biologist has determined that the young have fledged, and the nest is empty.

BIO-23: Erosion control materials that incorporate plastic monofilament netting are not permitted within the Project area.

The following measures were recommended by NMFS to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or otherwise offset the impact of the proposed action on critical habitat.

BIO-24: In coordination with NMFS, if a temporary water diversion is determined to be needed, then Caltrans shall develop a plan that describes: (1) how a temporary diversion structure will be installed, and uninstalled, in the action area within the Old Calaveras River channel, including any relevant designs; (2) how dewatering will occur in the work area; (3) protocols for how, and where, fish will be relocated, including conservation measures that would reduce the potential for fish injury and mortality; and (4) communication protocols for how to notify NMFS in the event that a temporary diversion structure needs to be installed, and dewatering and fish relocation activities need to occur. Caltrans shall submit the plan to NMFS for review and approval a minimum of 30 days prior to installation of a temporary diversion structure within the Old Calaveras River channel.

BIO-25: Caltrans shall notify NMFS within 24 hours if CCV steelhead are observed, encountered, or relocated during fish relocation activities.

BIO-26: If a temporary diversion structure is installed and fish relocation activities occur, then within 60 days after completion of fish relocation activities and removal of the temporary diversion structure, Caltrans shall submit a report to NMFS that describes and summarizes fish relocation activities. This report shall include a description of the conservation measures that were implemented to reduce the potential for fish injury and mortality, and summarize all the fish species that were observed, encountered, and relocated.
BIO-27: San Joaquin County will purchase credits from approved banks for impacts to riparian habitat at a 3:1 ratio for permanent impacts, and a 1:1 ratio for temporary impacts. Potential banks include Bullock Bend Mitigation Bank and Fremont Landing Conservation Bank.

BIO-28: Caltrans should protect existing, and wherever practicable, establish new riparian vegetation to enhance shading, cover, terrestrial food supply, and supply of instream woody material.

BIO-29: Caltrans should require contractors to use biodegradable lubricants and hydraulic fluid in construction machinery entering the Old Calaveras River channel. The use of petroleum alternative can greatly reduce the risk of contaminants from entering the aquatic ecosystem.

BIO-30: Bank erosion control should use vegetation methods or “soft” approaches (such as vegetative plantings and placement of woody material) to shoreline modifications whenever feasible. Hard bank protection should be a last resort and the following options should be explored: tree revetments, stream flow deflectors, and vegetative riprap.

Findings

The Project would have **Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation** relating to biological resources.
2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REGULATORY SETTING

CEQA established statutory requirements for establishing the significance of historical resources in PRC Section 21084.1. The CEQA Guidelines (Section 10564.5[c]) also require consideration of potential Project impacts to "unique" archaeological sites that do not qualify as historical resources. The statutory requirements for unique archaeological sites that do not qualify as historical resources are established in PRC Section 21083.2. These two PRC sections operate independently to ensure that significant potential effects on historical and archaeological resources are considered as part of a Project’s environmental analysis. Historical resources, as defined in Section 15064.5 as defined in the CEQA regulations, include 1) cultural resources listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); 2) cultural resources included in a local register of historical resources; 3) any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in one of several historic themes important to California history and development. Under CEQA, a Project may have a significant effect on the environment if the Project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, meaning the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource would be materially impaired. This would include any action that would demolish or adversely alter the physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historic significance and qualify it for inclusion in the California Register or in a local register or survey that meets the requirements of PRC Section 5020.1(l) and 5024.1(g). PRC Section 5024 also requires state agencies to identify and protect state-owned resources that meet National Register of Historic Place (National Register) listing criteria. Sections 5024(f) and 5024.5 require state agencies to provide notice to and consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) before altering, transferring, relocation, or demolishing state-owned historical resources that are listed on or are eligible for inclusion in the National Register or are registered or eligible for registration as California Historical Landmarks. CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines also recommend provisions be made for the accidental discovery of archaeological sites, historical resources, or Native American human remains during construction (PRC Section 21083.2(i) CCR Section 15064.5[d and f]).

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

An Area of Potential Effects (APE) was established as the area of direct and indirect effects which encompasses an approximately 34.1-acre area. This includes all staging areas, street closures, vegetation/tree removal, approach roadway realignment, bridge replacement, ground disturbance, temporary construction easements, and utility relocation. The APE extends along Pezzi Road approximately 1,200 feet to the north and south of the Calaveras River (Figure 6).
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The vertical APE consists of a maximum of 2 feet of depth below existing ground surface to accommodate earthwork for the construction of the roadway and required for all roadway approach realignment, vegetation removal, and fill compaction. Bridge abutments will require an excavation depth of 8 feet below existing ground surface, plus an additional 55 feet (for a total of approximately 70 feet) below existing ground surface to accommodate piles driven into the ground. Underground utilities may require relocation, and all relocation will occur within 5 feet below ground surface.

Efforts to identify potential cultural resources in the APE included background research, a search of previously recorded archaeological site records and cultural resource identification reports on file at the California Historical Resources Information System Central California Information Center (CCIC), consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), and a pedestrian ground surface survey.

Archaeologist Dr. Brian S. Marks conducted an archaeological field survey of the APE on March 28, 2017. The pedestrian survey was conducted at roughly 10-meter transect intervals. All Project area conditions and cultural resources were fully recorded in the field notes. Coverage varied in areas with vegetation coverage.

Exposed subsurface cuts, such as the banks within Calaveras River, roadway cuts, and bank cuts were observed for the presence of archaeological resources, soil color change, and/or staining that could indicate past human activity or buried deposits. The property north of the river and east of Pezzi Road could not be surveyed due to lack of permission to access the property (APN 08902037). An inspection of the property from the road and from the dry riverbed saw that the ground surface was bare ground beneath an orchard of almond trees with the rows of grass. By comparing this property with the surrounding area and examining historic aerial photographs, it is unlikely that a pedestrian inspection of this property would have revealed any cultural resources. Additionally, with the planting and removal of trees, the upper 5 feet of the surface soil would be heavily disturbed and the probability of finding intact buried deposits in this area is low. Therefore, the pedestrian survey conducted on March 28, 2017 did not reveal any archaeological resources.

**DISCUSSION**

a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?*

**No Impact.** Dokken Engineering obtained a record search (File #10217L) for the Project area and a one-mile radius surrounding the Project area from the CCIC, California State University, Stanislaus on March 15, 2017. The record search was conducted by Robin Hards, Assistant Research Technician from the Information Center. The search examined the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Historic Properties Directory, OHP Determinations of Eligibility, California Inventory of Historical Resources, Historical Literature and Maps, Caltrans Bridge Inventory, GLO and/or Rancho Plat Maps, Local Inventories, and Soil Survey Maps. The record search disclosed eleven cultural resources within the one-mile record search boundary, but no resources within the APE. As there are no cultural resources documented or encountered within the Project area, the Project would have no impact on historical resources as defined in §15064.5.

b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** In an effort to identify archaeological resources that might be affected by the undertaking, a pedestrian survey, background research, and consultation with individuals and organizations were conducted. A record search conducted at the CCIC identified
eleven cultural resources within a one-mile radius of the APE and no resources within the APE. The pedestrian survey did not observe any cultural resources within the APE.

On February 22, 2019, Dokken Engineering sent a letter and a map depicting the Project vicinity to the NAHC in West Sacramento, asking the commission to review the sacred land files for any Native American cultural resources that might be affected by the Project. The request to the NAHC seeks to identify any Native American cultural resources within or adjacent to the Project area. On March 22, 2019, Katy Sanchez, Staff Services Analyst, informed Dokken Engineering that a review of the sacred lands was completed and returned negative results.

On December 17, 2019, Section 106 consultation letters were sent by mail to the seven Native American individuals on the list provided by the NAHC. These letters were also sent digitally via email to those with emails provided by the NAHC. The letters provided a summary of the Project and requested information regarding comments or concerns the Native American community might have about the Project. For those individuals that did not reply to the letter, follow-up emails were sent on January 29, 2020 to those individuals with email contact. Follow-up phone calls were placed to all non-responders on January 29, 2020. The following discussion presents a summary of consultation efforts for each individual on the list provided by the NAHC.

**Rhonda Morningstar-Pope, Chairperson, Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians.** A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. On January 15, 2020, an email response from Richard Hawkins of the Buena Vista Rancheria stated that the tribe has no concerns about the Project but would like to be notified if any cultural resources are discovered during construction.

**California Valley Miwok Tribe.** A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019. As there was no email address, a phone call was placed on January 29, 2020. There was no answer and no option to leave a voice mail was available. An email was sent on March 5, 2020 with a digital copy of the notification letter attached. No response has been received to date.

**California Valley Miwok Tribe AKA Sheep Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians of CA.** A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. A follow up email with a digital copy of the letter attached was sent on January 29, 2020 and March 5, 2020. No response has been received to date.

**Sara Dutschke Sethchwaelo, Chairperson, Ione Band of Miwok Indians.** A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. A follow up email with a digital copy of the letter attached was sent on January 29, 2020 and March 5, 2020. No response has been received to date.

**Katherine Erolinda Perez, Chairperson, North Valley Yokuts Tribe.** A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. A follow up email with a digital copy of the letter attached was sent on January 29, 2020. Chairperson Perez responded via email that although the pedestrian survey, record search, and sacred lands file search did not identify any Native American resources within the Project area, there is still potential to encounter such resources. She requested consultation and a site visit. A site visit was set for June 5, 2020. A field meeting was held with Kathy Erolinda Perez, Erolinda Perez, Joan Faustorilla (County Project Engineer), and Amy Dunay (Dokken Engineering archaeologist). Project details and cultural resource identification efforts to date were discussed. Ms. Kathy Perez noted that burials and other Native American cultural resources have been found within several miles of the Project area and that in general, she is concerned about buried resources. She recommended Native American awareness training be provided to construction staff and that
Native American monitoring also occur during construction, including any removal of trees. She provided more comprehensive measures in an email following the meeting. These recommended measures are included in measures CR-1 through CR-2. Worker Environmental Training will be provided during construction and Caltrans standard guidelines and protocols regarding inadvertent discoveries will be followed should any cultural resources be identified during construction.

Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria. A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. An email was received on December 26, 2019 from Anna Starkey, Cultural Regulatory Specialist for the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC), stating that they have no knowledge of resources within the Project area. The UAIC requested copies of the cultural documents, copies of the IS/MND, and that workers be provided with cultural awareness training. A response was sent on December 30, 2019 stating that the UAIC will be sent a copy of the Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR), once available. A second email was received on January 14, 2020 with a letter attached from Chairman Whitehouse requesting consultation under AB52. The letter and email also requested copies of the record search, cultural documents, and a site visit. The record search results were sent to Ms. Starkey on January 27, 2020 and requested available dates for site visit. A follow up email requesting site visit availability was sent on March 5, 2020. The UAIC responded that they prefer to conduct cultural surveys in conjunction with the consulting archaeologist and inquired as to whether other tribes have engaged in consultation and have requested a site visit. A response email was sent the same day to the UAIC providing dates and times in March for a site visit and confirming that there were other tribes consulting with the County and that site visits with these tribes were being scheduled. No tribe names were provided.

A field meeting was later held with Antonio Ruiz (UAIC), Travis Young (UAIC), Joan Faustorilla (County Project Engineer), and Amy Dunay (Dokken Engineering archaeologist) on June 9, 2020. Project details and cultural resource identification efforts to date were discussed. Mr. Ruiz noted that he needed to check the UAIC’s internal database for the presence of Native American cultural resources, but stated that in general, he is concerned about buried resources within the Project area. A site survey within the publicly accessible embankment of the river was conducted, but visibility was zero percent. Mr. Ruiz inquired as to whether other tribes had consulted on the Project. Upon hearing that Katherine Perez was actively consulting, he stated that the UAIC would defer to her, but would still like to review the UAIC internal database and receive copies of the records search, geotechnical report, tree survey/data, and draft cultural report to gain a better understanding of the Project area. A copy of the draft HPSR/Archaeological Survey Report (ASR), which included the records search and all current Native American consultation, was provided via email on July 6, 2020 while the Project area Geographic Information System (GIS) shapefile and draft geotechnical report were provided via email on July 8, 2020. The July 8, 2020 email also provided the tree species within the Project area and relayed that tree data (numbers, species, sizes, etc.) would not be known until the permitting phase, which would occur after the environmental document approval phase. Both July emails requested that the UAIC provide the results of their internal database search. A July 6, 2020 email from the UAIC stated that they anticipated providing the results of their internal database search, as well as recommendations for the Project, “later in the week”. No email or other correspondence transmitting this information was received by the end of that week or as of the date of this document. Raymond Hitchcock, Chairperson, Wilton Rancheria. A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. Mariah Mayberry of the Wilton Rancheria responded via email on January 14, 2020 that the tribe wishes to consult on this Project. They requested copies of the cultural resources record search and wanted to be included in cultural surveys. An email was sent to Ms. Mayberry on January 20, 2020, with copies of the cultural resources record
search results and informed Ms. Mayberry that the pedestrian inspection was completed in 2017. No further response has been received to date.

At this time, no further archaeological study is recommended unless Project plans change to include areas not previously included in the APE or a greater amount of ground disturbance. With the findings of the visual survey and record search, no impacts are anticipated for the Project related to archaeological resources. With any project, there is always the possibility that unknown cultural resources may be encountered during construction. With the implementation of mitigation measure CR-1 potential impacts from the Project would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** With any project, there is always the possibility that unmarked burials may be unearthed during construction. Implementation of measure CR-2 would reduce this to a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

**CR-1:** If previously unidentified cultural materials are unearthed during construction, work shall be halted in that area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and develop a plan for documentation and removal of resources if necessary. Additional archaeological survey will be needed if Project limits are extended beyond the present survey limits.

**CR-2:** Section 5097.94 of the PRC and Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code protect Native American burials, skeletal remains and grave goods, regardless of age and provide method and means for the appropriate handling of such remains. If human remains are encountered, work should halt in that vicinity and the county coroner should be notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist should be contacted to evaluate the situation. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the coroner must notify the NAHC within twenty-four hours of such identification. CEQA details steps to be taken if human burials are of Native American origin.

**FINDINGS**

The Project would have **Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation** relating to cultural resources.
2.6 ENERGY

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

DISCUSSION

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?

No Impact. Long-term operation of the Project would not result in the additional consumption of energy resources other than what currently occurs. During construction, the Project would comply with standard BMPs to ensure that wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources does not occur.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No Impact. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct any state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

No impacts to energy are anticipated; therefore, no avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.

FINDINGS

The Project would have No Impact relating to energy.
2.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REGULATORY SETTING

For geologic and topographic features, the key federal law is the Historic Sites Act of 1935, which establishes a national registry of natural landmarks and protects “outstanding examples of major geological features.” Topographic and geologic features are also protected under the CEQA.

This section also discusses geology, soils, and seismic concerns as they relate to public safety and Project design. Earthquakes are prime considerations in the design and retrofit of structures.

DISCUSSION

a) 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-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?
   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
   iv) Landslides?
No Impact. The Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides. The Project is not located within an Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest seismic source is the Stockton Fault approximately 22 miles south of the Project site.

Landslides usually occur in locations with steep slopes and unstable soils. San Joaquin County has not yet been mapped by the Seismic Hazards Zonation Program to determine landslide potential. The majority of the Project area is situated on flat or very gently sloping topography where the potential for slope failure is minimal to low. Seismic-related failure, including liquefaction, is also a less than significant impact because the potential is believed to be slight at this predominantly flat, low-seismicity site. The Project area is located on a flat area. No impact from landslides would occur with the Project. Design and construction in accordance with Caltrans’ seismic design criteria will ensure that substantial impacts due to seismic forces and displacements are avoided or minimized to the extent feasible. The Project is not on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the Project. On- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse is not anticipated.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The NRCS Web Soil Survey was used to identify soils within the Project area. Soil units within the BSA include Archerdale clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, Cogna loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, and Stockton fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, overwashed (NRCS 2019). Soils within the BSA are somewhat poorly drained to well drained and have a medium runoff class (NRCS 2019). The Project will involve ground disturbance with vegetation removal within the flood plain of the Calaveras River and associated riparian areas, as well as during construction for the new alignment of Pezzi Road. Potential impacts to soils would be minimized through soil stabilization measures covered within the required General Construction MS4 Permit and implementation of the SWPPP as discussed in Section 1.5 and Section 2.10. Erosion control practices outlined in a SWPPP. In addition, measures WQ-1 through WQ-5 in Section 2.10 of this document would further reduce impacts to erosion of soil.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

No Impact. The Project is not located on soil that is known to be unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No Impact. The Project is not located on expansive soils that would create substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, no impact would occur.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No Impact. The Project will not utilize septic tanks or an alternative waste water disposal system on the site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
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No Impact. No findings of unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geological features were identified during the record search and cursory pedestrian survey within the Project area. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Measures WQ-1 through WQ-5 provided in Section 2.10 Hydrology and Water Quality would reduce potential impacts associated with soil erosion to a less than significant level.

Findings

The Project would have Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation relating to geology and soils.
2.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the Project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REGULATORY SETTING

While climate change has been a concern since at least 1988, as evidenced by the establishment of the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the efforts devoted to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction and climate change research and policy have increased dramatically in recent years. These efforts are primarily concerned with the emissions of GHG related to human activity that include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), NOₓ, nitrous oxide (N₂O), tetrafluoromethane, hexafluoroethane, sulfur hexafluoride, HFC-23 (fluoroform), HFC-134a (s, s, s, 2–tetrafluoroethane), and HFC-152a (difluoroethane).

On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed EO S-3-05. The goal of this EO is to reduce California’s GHG emissions to: 1) 2000 levels by 2010, 2) 1990 levels by the 2020 and 3) 80 percent below the 1990 levels by the year 2050. In 2006, this goal was further reinforced with the passage of AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 sets the same overall GHG emissions reduction goals while further mandating that CARB create a plan, which includes market mechanisms, and implement rules to achieve “real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of GHG.” EO S-20-06 further directs state agencies to begin implementing AB 32, including the recommendations made by the state’s Climate Action Team.

With EO S-01-07, Governor Schwarzenegger set forth the low carbon fuel standard for California. Under this EO, the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels is to be reduced by at least 10 percent by 2020.

Climate change and GHG reduction is also a concern at the federal level; however, at this time, no legislation or regulations have been enacted specifically addressing GHG emissions reductions and climate change. California, in conjunction with several environmental organizations and several other states, sued to force the EPA to regulate GHG as a pollutant under the CAA (Massachusetts vs. [EPA] et al., 549 U.S. 497 (2007). The court ruled that GHG does fit within the CAA definition of a pollutant, and that the EPA does have the authority to regulate GHG. Despite the Supreme Court ruling, there are no promulgated federal regulations to date limiting GHG emissions.[1]

On December 7, 2009, the EPA Administrator signed two distinct findings regarding GHG under section 202(a) of the CAA:

- Endangerment Finding: The Administrator finds that the current and projected concentrations of the six key well-mixed GHG--CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆)--in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations.

Cause or Contribute Finding: The Administrator finds that the combined emissions of these well-mixed GHG from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines contribute to the GHG pollution which threatens public health and welfare.

These findings do not themselves impose any requirements on industry or other entities. However, this action is a prerequisite to finalizing the EPA’s GHG emission standards for light-duty vehicles, which were jointly by EPA and the Department of Transportation’s National Highway Safety Administration on September 15, 2009.

**Figure 7: California Greenhouse Gas Inventory**

According to Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals on How to Analyze GHG Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents (March 5, 2007), an individual project does not generate enough GHG emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Rather, global climate change is a cumulative impact. This means that a project may participate in a potential impact through its incremental contribution combined with the contributions of all other sources of GHG. In assessing cumulative impacts, it must be determined if a project’s incremental effect is “cumulatively considerable.” See CEQA Guidelines sections 15064(i)(1) and 15130. To make this determination the incremental impacts of the Project must be compared with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. To gather sufficient information on a global scale of all past, current, and future projects in order to make this determination is a difficult if not impossible task.

As part of its supporting documentation for the Draft Climate Change Scoping Plan, CARB recently released an updated version of the GHG inventory for California (June 26, 2008). Figure 7 is a graph from that update that shows the total GHG emissions for California for 1990, 2002-2004 average, and 2020 projected if no action is taken.

The Project is a bridge replacement and road realignment project and would not be increasing traffic capacity along Pezzi Road. The only additional GHG that would be created as part of this Project would occur during construction.
DISCUSSION

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. GHG emissions can be divided into those produced during construction and those produced during operations. Construction GHG emissions include emissions produced as a result of material processing, emissions produced by on-site construction equipment, and emissions arising from traffic delays due to construction. GHG emissions produced during operations are those that result from potentially increased traffic volumes or changes in automobile speeds. The Project would not result in an increase in the number of automobiles in the traffic system; therefore, operational emissions are not anticipated. The Project would result in a temporary increase of 386 tons of GHG emissions during construction activities (maximum emissions of 5,391 lbs/day during grading/excavation) (Appendix C). However, work would be short-term in duration and is not anticipated to result in significant adverse construction GHG emissions. With implementation of measures GHG-1, the emission of GHGs during construction of the proposed Project would be negligible.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project involves replacing the Pezzi Road bridge and realigning the road. The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emission. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

In addition to the Air Quality measures AQ-1 through AQ-3, the following measures will also be included in the Project to further minimize the GHG emissions and potential climate change impacts from the Project:

GHG-1: According to the Caltrans’ Standard Specification Section 14-9.02, the contractor must comply with air pollution control rules, regulations, ordinances, and statutes that apply to work performed under the Contract, including air pollution control rules, regulations, ordinances, and statutes provided in Govt Code § 11017 (Pub Cont Code § 10231).

FINDINGS

The Project would have Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation relating to GHG emissions.
2.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</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>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</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, would the Project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REGULATORY SETTING

Hazardous materials and hazardous wastes are regulated by many state and federal laws. These include not only specific statutes governing hazardous waste, but also a variety of laws regulating air and water quality, human health, and land use. Hazardous waste in California is regulated primarily under the authority of the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 and the California Health and Safety Code. Other California laws that affect hazardous waste are specific to handling, storage, transportation, disposal, treatment, reduction, cleanup, and emergency planning. Worker health and safety and public safety are key issues when dealing with hazardous materials that may affect human health and the environment. Proper disposal of hazardous material is vital if it is disturbed during Project construction.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This section presents results of an Initial Site Assessment (ISA) for property associated with the Project. The purpose of the ISA is to evaluate the Subject Properties for the presence of Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) and/or Activity and Use Limitations (AULs), which are:

REC: “...the presence or the likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum hydrocarbons on the (Subject Property) that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum hydrocarbons into structures or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the subject property.”
AUL: “...an explicit recognition by a federal, tribal, state, or local agency that residual levels of hazardous substances or petroleum hydrocarbons may be present on the property, and that unrestricted use of the property may not be acceptable.”

The properties assessed for this ISA (Subject Properties) includes existing San Joaquin County right-of-way, and existing adjacent parcels throughout the length of the Project. This ISA was prepared in general accordance with the Caltrans ISA Guidance Document. A summary of the published lists of known hazardous substance sites was provided by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR). EDR reviewed standard federal, state, and local listings of known sites within a one-mile radius. A total of 10 RECs were identified within a one-mile radius of the Project area. The 10 RECs are presented on Table 6 and Figure 8.

### Table 6: REC or AUL Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>See Figure 8 for General Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Listing Acronym</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Release Information/Cleanup</th>
<th>Case Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9760 Pezzi Road Stockton, CA 95212</td>
<td>CHMIRS</td>
<td>Mineral oil spill due to lightning strike.</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Avanti Nut Company 9882 Pezzi Road 9982 Pezzi Road Stockton, CA 95212</td>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>Construction Storm Water</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>FINDS</td>
<td>Oil and fuel storage.</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>EMI</td>
<td>Failure to submit hazardous material information.</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>FINDS</td>
<td>Air quality emissions.</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>FINDS</td>
<td>Air Emissions</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FINDS</td>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>Storage of Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCRA NONGEN/NLR</td>
<td>FINDS</td>
<td>Non Generator of Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CERS HAZ WASTE CERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemical Storage Facilities</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8
Recognized Environmental Condition Locations

Federal Project: BRLO 5929(240)
Road 204 Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project
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Source: ESRI Maps Online; Dokken Engineering 12/27/2019; Created By: astorck
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**DISCUSSION**

a) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** The Project would involve the use of heavy equipment for grading, hauling, and materials handling. Use of this equipment may require the use of fuels and other common materials that have hazardous properties (e.g., fuels are flammable). These materials would be used in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations and, if used properly, would not pose a hazard to people, animals, or plants. All refueling of construction vehicles and equipment would occur within the designated staging area for the Project as defined in Section 2.4 of this document, in biological measures BIO-4 through BIO-6. The use of hazardous materials would be temporary, and the Project would not include a permanent use or source of hazardous materials. By complying with measure HAZ-1, the Project would have a less than significant impact to the disposal and transportation of hazardous materials.

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?**

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** Potential hazardous materials during construction activities can occur during ground disturbance within the Project area. Potentially hazardous materials identified adjacent to the Project area include heavy metals in pavement striping and transformers. Based on site observations and review of the database records search, there are no other REC’s within the Project area, and Project activities should not affect the pavement striping or the transformers; therefore, no additional testing is recommended.

**Naturally Occurring Asbestos**

Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) can occur in serpentine rock. The most common forms of NOA minerals are chrysotile, actinolite, and tremolite. A review of the “General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California – Areas likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos” (DOC Open-file Report 2000-19, 2000) indicated that NOA was not mapped on, or in the near vicinity of the Project area. No impacts from asbestos containing materials are anticipated.

**Aerially Deposited Lead**

Aerially deposited lead (ADL) is known to be present within soils near major roadways in operation prior to 1980, when lead was discontinued as a gasoline additive in the State of California. Pezzi Road has been in place at the current location since the early 1900s. ADL might exist along the shoulder of the road; however, concentrations of ADL in excess of regulatory limits are not likely due to the lower classification of Pezzi Road and evidence of disking, grading, and other soil movement activities associated with farming near the road. No impacts to ADL are anticipated. No further analysis or testing for ADL is recommended.

With any project that involves excavation, there is a possibility of encountering unknown hazardous contamination during construction. With the implementation measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3, Project impacts will be less than significant with mitigation.

c) **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.** No schools are located within one-quarter mile of the Project site; therefore, no impact would occur.
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact. EDR, Envirostor and Geotracker were used to find active hazardous waste sites within the Project vicinity. A review of the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Database indicated that there were no sites on or near the Project area that were not already included in the record search by EDR. Therefore, there would be no impact related to creating a significant hazard to the public.

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area?

No Impact. The Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area as the Project is not within the vicinity of an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, there would be no impact related to the safety of the public in the Project area.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The existing road and bridge are anticipated to remain open during construction. If a detour is determined to be needed during final design, it would be 4.5 miles long with traffic using SR 88 to the east or Alpine Road to the west. The Project would not require any road closures. As discussed further in Section 2.17, measure TRA-1, a Traffic Management Plan will be prepared should the need for partial road closures occur during construction; therefore, there would be a less than significant impact to emergency access.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

No Impact. The Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, and no wildlands are adjacent to or within the Project area; therefore, no impact is anticipated.

Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

In addition to TRA-1 (see Section 2.17), the following measures will be implemented:

HAZ-1: There is a potential that the proposed Project could affect yellow thermoplastic pavement markings and other types or colors of street or municipal markings containing lead-based paint. If such markings are affected as a result of the Project, samples will be collected, tested, and/or disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. Therefore, to avoid impacts from pavement striping during construction, it is recommended that testing and removal requirements for yellow striping and pavement marking materials be performed in accordance with Caltrans SSPs for removing traffic stripes and pavement markings.

HAZ-2: Any leaking transformers observed during the course of the Project should be considered a potential polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hazard. A detailed inspection of individual electrical transformers was not conducted for this ISA. However, should leaks from electrical transformers (that will either remain within the construction limits or will
require removal and/or relocation) be encountered during construction, the transformer fluid should be sampled and analyzed by qualified personnel for detectable levels of PCB’s. Should PCBs be detected, the transformer should be removed and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency. Any stained soil encountered below electrical transformers with detectable levels of PCB’s should also be handled and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency.

HAZ-3: As is the case for any project that proposes excavation, the potential exists for unknown hazardous contamination to be revealed during Project construction. For any previously unknown hazardous waste/material encountered during construction, the procedures outlined in Appendix E (Caltrans Unknown Hazard Procedures) shall be followed.

FINDINGS

The Project would have **Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation** relating to hazards and hazardous materials.
2.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to Project inundation?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REGULATORY SETTING

Section 401 of the CWA requires water quality certification from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) or from a RWQCB when the project requires a CWA Section 404 permit. Section 404 of the CWA requires a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to discharge dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S.

Along with CWA Section 401, CWA Section 402 establishes the NPDES permit for the discharge of any pollutant into waters of the U.S. The federal EPA has delegated administration of the NPDES program to the SWRCB and nine RWQCBs. The SWRCB and RWQCB also regulate other waste discharges to land within California through the issuance of waste discharge requirements under authority of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act.

The SWRCB has developed and issued a statewide NPDES permit to regulate storm water discharges from all Caltrans activities on its highways and facilities. Caltrans construction projects are regulated under the Statewide permit, and projects performed by other entities on Caltrans right-of-way (encroachments) are regulated by the SWRCB's Statewide General Construction Permit. All construction projects over 1 acre require a SWPPP to be prepared and implemented during construction. Caltrans activities less than 1 acre require a WPCP.
San Joaquin County has a Storm Water Management Program (Program), adopted in July of 2010, to meet the terms of the General Permit, regulating storm water discharges from small MS4s. The Program has six control measures, established by the SWRCB, to regulate the discharge of storm water. The control measures include public education and outreach, public involvement, discharge detection and elimination program, construction site storm water runoff control, post-construction storm water management, and pollution prevention/good housekeeping for municipal operations.

**AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

Much of the information below, pertinent to the Project, is from the Water Quality Assessment Memorandum (Dokken Engineering 2020).

**Hydrology**

The proposed Project is within the designated Lower Calaveras Hydrologic Area, which is within the greater North Valley Floor Hydrologic Unit sub watershed of the San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region (Caltrans, 2019). The area is characterized by a Central Valley type climate with hot, dry summers, and cold, rainy winters. Average temperatures for the area range from as low as 37°F to as high as 94°F. Annual precipitation is approximately 17 inches (NOAA, 2019). The Calaveras River is located within the Project area. The Calaveras River originates approximately 23 miles northeast of the Project from the New Hogan Reservoir and outfalls into the San Joaquin River, approximately 11 miles southwest of the Project area.

**Groundwater**

The Project is located within the San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin within the Eastern San Joaquin Sub-basin. The Eastern San Joaquin Sub-basin is bound on the east by the Sierra Nevada and the Coast Ranges on the west. Annual precipitation within the sub-basin ranges from about 11 inches in the southwest to about 25 inches in the northeast (DWR, 2006). The proposed Project does not anticipate impacting or altering any groundwater basins.

**Municipal Supply**

Drinking water within the Project area is supplied by the SEWD derived from the New Hogan Reservoir on the Calaveras River. The Project would not impact any water reservoirs or water recharge facilities.

**Flooding**

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) designates the Project area as Zone X (shaded). Zone X (shaded) indicates areas of moderate flood hazard. The Project is also located in Zone AE, which indicates a 100-year special flood hazard area and that the Calaveras River is a “Regulated Floodway” (Appendix D). Due to the Project being located within Zone AE and a regulated floodway, a CVFPB permit will be obtained.

**DISCUSSION**

a) **Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?**

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** The Project will disturb greater than one acre; therefore, a Construction Storm Water General Permit is required, consistent with Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ, issued by the SWRCB to address storm water runoff. The permit will address clearing, grading, grubbing, and disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation. This permit will also require the County to prepare and implement a
SWPPP with the intent of keeping all products of erosion from moving off site into receiving waters. The SWPPP includes BMPs to prevent construction pollutants from entering storm water runoff. Mitigation Measures WQ-1 through WQ-5 will be implemented to ensure the Project grading will conform to SWRCB standards and in doing so will ensure the Project impacts will be less than significant.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

No Impact. The Project would not directly or indirectly result in the construction of uses that would utilize groundwater supplies. Therefore, there would be no impact related to depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The proposed Project would increase impervious surface area resulting in additional storm water drainage and potential erosion during construction. However, the existing bridge and roadway approach north of the bridge would be removed. The addition of the new roadway and bridge would increase impervious surface area by approximately 28,137 sq. ft (0.65 acre) within the Project area. the Project would be designed consistent with local requirements and the Caltrans Project Planning and Design Guide and Storm Water Management Plan. To potentially reduce runoff, site design BMPs would be incorporated during final design as described in WQ-1. As the bridge replacement would only permanently impact 0.015 acre of the Calaveras River, the change will not impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, with mitigation incorporated.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to Project inundation?

No Impact. The Project would not create a potential situation for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The Project is located in a dominantly flat landscape, is not located in proximity to a large body of water, and is not near the coastal waters; therefore, No Impact would occur.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project may have short-term impacts associated with sediment and runoff during grading and construction. Material imported during this process will be kept in piles of staged soil, and/or re-graded and distributed within the Project site. As noted above, the Project is subject to NPDES regulations since these improvements will exceed one acre. Compliance with existing regulations and implementation of BMPs would reduce potentially significant impacts associated erosion or siltation on- or offsite to levels less than
significant. Implementation of measures WQ-1 through WQ-5 will ensure that Project impacts to water quality will be less than significant.

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

**WQ-1:** BMPs will be incorporated into Project design and Project management to minimize impacts on the environment including the release of pollutants (oils, fuels, etc.):
- The area of construction and disturbance would be limited to as small an area as feasible to reduce erosion and sedimentation.
- Measures would be implemented during land-disturbing activities to reduce erosion and sedimentation. These measures may include mulches, soil binders and erosion control blankets, silt fencing, fiber rolls, temporary berms, sediment desilting basins, sediment traps, and check dams.
- Existing vegetation would be protected where feasible to reduce erosion and sedimentation. Vegetation would be preserved by installing temporary fencing, or other protection devices, around areas to be protected.
- Exposed soils would be covered by loose bulk materials or other materials to reduce erosion and runoff during rainfall events.
- Exposed soils would be stabilized, through watering or other measures, to prevent the movement of dust at the Project site caused by wind and construction activities such as traffic and grading activities.
- All construction roadway areas would be properly protected to prevent excess erosion, sedimentation, and water pollution.
- All vehicle and equipment maintenance procedures would be conducted off-site. In the event of an emergency, maintenance would occur away from the Calaveras River.
- All concrete curing activities would be conducted to minimize spray drift and prevent curing compounds from entering the waterway directly or indirectly.
- All construction materials, vehicles, stockpiles, and staging areas would be situated outside of the stream channel as feasible. All stockpiles would be covered, as feasible.
- Energy dissipaters and erosion control pads would be provided at the bottom of slope drains. Other flow conveyance control mechanisms may include earth dikes, swales, or ditches. Stream bank stabilization measures would also be implemented.
- All erosion control measures and storm water control measures would be properly maintained until the site has returned to a pre-construction state.
- All disturbed areas would be restored to pre-construction contours and revegetated, either through hydoseeding or other means, with native or approved non-invasive exotic species.
- All construction materials would be hauled off-site after completion of construction.

**WQ-2:** Any requirements for additional avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures will be adhered to from all required regulatory agencies.

**WQ-3:** The Project limits in proximity to the Calaveras River will be marked as an ESA or either be staked or fenced with high visibility material to ensure construction activities will not encroach further beyond established limits.

**WQ-4:** The construction contractor will adhere to the SWRCB Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ NPDES Permit pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA. This permit authorizes storm
water and authorized non-storm water discharges from construction activities. As part of this Permit requirement, a SWPPP or Water Pollution Control Plan (if ground disturbance is less than 1 acre) will be prepared prior to construction consistent with the requirements of the RWQCB. This SWPPP/Water Pollution Control Plan will incorporate all applicable BMPs to ensure that adequate measures are taken during construction to minimize impacts to water quality.

WQ-5: Storm water systems will be designed to prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials or other elements that might degrade or harm biological resources.

**Findings**

The Project would have **Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation** relating to hydrology and water quality.
2.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

The Project is located in a rural part of San Joaquin County approximately 7 miles northeast of Stockton, California. According to the San Joaquin County 2035 General Plan, Land Use Element, all parcels within the Project area are listed as General Agriculture and zoned for agriculture (AG-40). The property within the Project area is currently used for orchards and rural residential housing. The Calaveras River is currently used by the SEWD to convey water for agricultural use.

**DISCUSSION**

a) **Physically divide an established community?**

**No Impact.** The Project would not divide an established community. The area is zoned for agriculture, and there are several single residential homes along Pezzi Road and adjacent to the Calaveras River. The Project would realign Pezzi Road approaches to replace the sharp curves with a new 50-mph alignment meeting the AASHTO Green Book design specifications. Based on preliminary engineering, the proposed alignment would require right-of-way acquisitions of the orchards to the north and south of the proposed bridge for the roadway footprint, as well as an orchard remnant that would exist between the new and existing roads (Figure 3). The realignment would not be placed within an established community and land use and the area would continue to be zoned for agriculture; therefore, there would be no division of an established community. **No Impacts** would occur.

b) **Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project does not conflict with any applicable land us plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The Project is a bridge replacement and roadway realignment project and would not change any land use. Parcels adjacent to Pezzi Road would continue to be used for agriculture and rural residential housing. The Project is located within CVFPB, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CDFW, RWQCB, and SEWD jurisdiction and will require permits and/or notifications for work within the river channel. Therefore, there will be **Less than Significant Impacts** to land use plan, policy, or regulations.

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

No impact to land use and planning resources are anticipated; therefore, no avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures will be required.

**FINDINGS**

The Project would have **Less than Significant Impacts** relating to land use and planning.
2.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the Project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✕</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

According to the San Joaquin 2035 General Plan (2016), the primary mineral resources in San Joaquin County are sand and gravel aggregate. Limited extraction of peat, gold, and silver is also known to occur. However, it is believed that all significant gold deposits have been fully extracted, and gold is typically found only as a secondary product of sand and gravel processing. Currently, sand and gravel deposits constitute the only commercially significant extractive mineral resource in the region.

DISCUSSION

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. According to the San Joaquin 2035 General Plan, the Project area does not have known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; therefore, the Project will have no impact to known mineral resources.

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?

No Impact. According to the San Joaquin 2035 General Plan, the Project area does not have any areas that are listed as a locally important mineral resource recovery site; therefore, the Project will have no impact to mineral resources.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures will be required.

FINDINGS

The Project would have No Impact relating to mineral resources.
2.13 NOISE

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

Pursuant to the County’s 2035 General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the San Joaquin County Code establishes noise standards for transportation and stationary noise sources. The overall noise goal for the County is to limit the exposure of the community to excessive noise levels. The code also specifies exemptions and prohibited activities. Proposed noise-sensitive land uses that would be affected by existing or planned transportation noise sources (e.g., vehicular traffic or trains) would be required to mitigate exterior noise exposure to a level not exceeding the County’s standards as shown in Table 7. These transportation noise criteria also apply to private development, including new transportation facilities.

Table 7: Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise-Sensitive Land Use Types</th>
<th>Outdoor Activity Areas (dBA Ldn)</th>
<th>Interior Spaces (dBA Ldn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Office</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Services-Child Care Centers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Assembly</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Library Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services: General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral and Intemnt Services – Undertaking</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging Services</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (excluding Hospitals)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (hospitals only)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation – Indoor Spectator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Assembly</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: These standards apply to new or existing residential areas affected by new or existing non-transportation sources. Where the location of outdoor activity areas is unknown or is not applicable, the noise standard shall be applied at the property line of the receiving land use. When determining the effectiveness of noise mitigation measures, the standards shall be applied on the receiving side of noise barriers or other property line noise mitigation measures.
**Affected Environment**

The Project area is within a rural area of San Joaquin County. The noise environment near the Project is dominated by traffic sources. Background noise levels are influenced by Pezzi Road and the existing surrounding residential and agricultural areas. The existing noise level ranges from 29 to 51 dB. A Noise Study Report was prepared in March 2020 to determine potential noise impacts caused by traffic and construction due to the Project. Noise measurements were conducted at two locations in August 2019 where concurrent traffic volumes were recorded through the use of a video camera. A total of five existing receiver locations were evaluated in the model to determine the predicted noise levels that would occur as a result of the Project. These modeled noise receptor locations are shown on Figure 9.

**Discussion**

a) *Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The San Joaquin County 2035 General Plan EIR establishes noise standards for maximum allowable noise exposure due to transportation sources and performance standards for fixed noise sources. Transportation noise standards (65 decibel A-weighted (dBA) L_{dn}/Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)) are applied at the outdoor activity area of noise sensitive land use (residential) where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 65 dB L_{dn}/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures.

Fixed noise sources are not to exceed 50 dBA L_{eq} and 70 dBA L_{max} during daytime hours (7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.) and 45 dBA L_{eq} and 65 dBA L_{max} during nighttime hours (10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.) as measured at the property line of noise sensitive land uses.

**Temporary Noise Impacts**

During construction of the Project, noise from construction activities may intermittently dominate the noise environment in the immediate area of construction. Construction equipment is expected to generate noise levels ranging from 70 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet, and noise produced by construction equipment would be reduced over distance at a rate of about 6 dB per doubling of distance. The nearest receptor is over 500 feet from the extent of construction. This would drop the noise levels more than 20 dB.

No adverse noise impacts from construction are anticipated because construction would be conducted in accordance with Standard Specification 14-8.02, SSP14-8.02 and applicable local noise standards. Construction noise would be short-term and intermittent. In addition, the local County noise ordinance, San Joaquin County Noise Control Ordinance, would be followed. The County's Municipal Code (Chapter 9-1025) specifically prohibits the operation of any construction equipment at or beyond the property line of any property between the hours of 9:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. as indicated in measure NOI-1.
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A Noise Study Report was prepared in March 2020 to determine potential permanent noise impacts caused by traffic due to the Project. A total of five (5) existing receiver locations were evaluated in the noise model (Figure 9).

Existing average daily traffic data was obtained from the current bridge inspection report and converted into existing peak hour data. Peak hour traffic is assumed to be ten percent of average daily traffic volumes. Existing peak hour traffic was entered into the noise model to estimate existing peak hour traffic noise levels.

The results of the existing traffic noise modeling are shown in Table 8. As shown in Table 8, existing noise levels in the proposed Project area range from 29 to 51 dBA $L_{eq}(h)$. Noise levels do not currently exceed the County's accepted level of noise for residential and/or agricultural land uses at any of the sensitive receiver locations analyzed.

The noise study was conducted to determine the future traffic noise impacts at sensitive receivers along the proposed Pezzi Road bridge replacement and road realignment. Potential long-term noise impacts associated with Project operations arise solely from traffic noise. Traffic noise was evaluated for future scenario Design Year 2040 for the Project as worst-case conditions for five (5) receiver locations. The predicted future worst-case traffic noise levels for the Project were extrapolated from existing traffic data and converted into future peak hour data. The noise model is sensitive to the volume of trucks on the roadway because trucks contribute disproportionately to the traffic noise. Truck percentages on modeled roadways were obtained via email from the Project’s traffic engineer. The modeled future noise levels for the Project were compared to the County’s noise ordinance standards to determine whether a traffic noise impact would occur. When traffic noise impacts occur, noise abatement measures must be considered.

The Design Year 2040 traffic noise modeling results for the Project range from 33 to 56 dBA $L_{eq}(h)$. The realignment of Pezzi Road would allow for increased average traffic speeds on Pezzi Road, causing an overall increase in ambient noise levels. However, permanent Project noise levels would not approach or exceed the County’s standards at any sensitive receptors as a result of the proposed Project. For receivers R-1 through R-3, noise levels ranged from 33 to 43 dBA $L_{eq}(h)$ and would not exceed the County’s standard of 65 dBA for residential land use. Receivers NM-1 and NM-2 would be exposed to noise levels ranging from 46 to 56 dBA. Therefore, the Project would not generate a permanent substantial increase in noise, and no noise abatement
evaluation is required. Measure NOI-1 will be implemented to further reduce potential noise impacts. Therefore, the Project will have less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated.

b) **Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** The Project area is within a rural area of San Joaquin County with a limited number of rural residences within the Project vicinity. The Project will be driving piles for the abutments of the bridge, which may require vibratory pile driving and limited pile driving. These temporary construction activities within the Project vicinity are anticipated to create groundborne vibration, but the nearest receptor to this activity will be more than 500 feet away and groundborne vibration effects of pile driving would be at the threshold of distinctly perceptible and well below the threshold of effects. Additionally, the implementation of measure NOI-1 will further reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level.

c) **For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** The Project is not located within or adjacent to an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

**Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Abatement Measures**

**NOI-1:** To minimize the construction-generated noise, abatement measures from Standard Specification 14-8.02 “Noise Control” and SSP 14-8.02 must be followed:

- Do not exceed 86 dBA at 50 feet from the job site activities from 9 p.m. to 6 a.m.
- Equip an internal combustion engine with the manufacturer recommended muffler.
- Do not operate an internal combustion engine on the job site without the appropriate muffler.

**Findings**

The Project would have **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation** relating to noise.
2.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REGULATORY SETTING

CEQA also requires the analysis of a project’s potential to induce growth. CEQA guidelines, Section 15126.2(d), require that environmental documents “…discuss the ways in which the Project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment…”

DISCUSSION

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)?

No Impact. The Project is located in rural San Joaquin County that supports agricultural land. There is no planned development along Pezzi Road. The adjacent parcels would continue to be used for agriculture and existing rural residential housing. The Project would not induce population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly; therefore, the Project would have no impact related to population growth, and no mitigation is required.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The proposed realignment of Pezzi Road would require right-of-way acquisitions of the orchards to the north and south of the proposed bridge for the roadway footprint, as well as an orchard remnant that would exist between the new and existing roads; however, no acquisition of housing or businesses would occur. The Project would not displace any number of existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing. The Project will have no impact related to displacement of housing or businesses and no mitigation is required.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The Project would not displace any number of people, or necessitate the construction of replacement housing; therefore, the Project would have no impact related to displaced persons, and no mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

The Project will have no impacts relating to population and housing; therefore, no avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures will be required.
FINDINGS
The Project would have **No Impacts** relating to population and housing.
## 2.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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:

- **Fire protection?**
  - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  - [ ] Less Than Significant with Mitigation
  - [x] Less Than Significant Impact
  - [ ] No Impact

- **Police protection?**
  - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  - [ ] Less Than Significant with Mitigation
  - [x] Less Than Significant Impact
  - [ ] No Impact

- **Schools?**
  - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  - [ ] Less Than Significant with Mitigation
  - [x] Less Than Significant Impact
  - [ ] No Impact

- **Parks?**
  - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  - [ ] Less Than Significant with Mitigation
  - [x] Less Than Significant Impact
  - [ ] No Impact

- **Other public facilities?**
  - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  - [ ] Less Than Significant with Mitigation
  - [x] Less Than Significant Impact
  - [ ] No Impact

### AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The nearest fire station, Stockton Firefighters, is located 3.6 miles west of the Project area at 3606 Hendrix Drive within the City of Stockton. The nearest police station is located 4.5 miles south west of the Project area at 2720 Wilcox Road within the City of Stockton. The nearest school, Cesar Chavez High School, is approximately 4.3 miles south west of the Project area on 2929 Windflower Lane in the City of Stockton. The nearest park, Panella Park, is approximately 5 miles south west of the Project area within the City of Stockton.

### DISCUSSION

a) Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and/or other public facilities?

**Less than Significant.** There are no public services located within the Project area. The Project is located in rural San Joaquin County, which consists of agricultural lands and low-density rural residential housing. The Project consists of replacing Pezzi Road bridge and realigning the road for safety purposes and will not restrict access to any park or other public facilities, nor will it construct any facilities that would impact service ratios or response times for emergency services. The Project may require partial lane closure for realignment of the road; however, a Traffic Management Plan would be implemented (see TRA-1 in Section 2.17). Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact to public services.

### AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

The Project will have no impacts relating to public services; therefore, no avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures will be required.
FINDINGS

The Project would have **No Impacts** relating to public services.
2.16 RECREATION

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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 would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

As stated in the previous section, the nearest public park, Panella Park, is approximately 5 miles south west of the Project area within the City of Stockton.

DISCUSSION

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 would occur or be accelerated?

No Impact. The bridge replacement and road realignment would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. The nearest recreational facility is Panella Park, which is approximately 5 miles south west of the Project area within the City of Stockton. No other recreational facilities are located within or near the Project area; therefore, no impact would occur.

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?

The Project does not include other recreational facilities, nor does it require the construction or expansion of other recreational facilities; therefore, no impact would occur.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

No impact to recreation facilities would occur; therefore, no avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures will be required.

FINDINGS

The Project would have No Impact relating to recreation.
2.17 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the Project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

According to the San Joaquin County 2035 General Plan (2016), when measuring levels-of-service (LOS), San Joaquin County uses the criteria established in the Highway Capacity Manual published and updated by the Transportation Research Board. LOS is a qualitative description of traffic flow based on factors such as speed, travel time, delay, freedom to maneuver, volume, density, and capacity. Six levels are defined, from LOS A, as the best operating conditions, to LOS F, or the worst operating conditions. LOS E represents “at-capacity” operations. When volumes exceed capacity, stop-and-go conditions result and operations are designated as LOS F.

For roadways within San Joaquin County, the 2035 General Plan (2016) states that the County shall maintain LOS standards consistent with the SJCOG Congestion Management Program (CMP) for State highways and designated County roadways and intersections of regional significance. Per the CMP, all designated CMP roadways and intersections shall operate at an LOS D or better except for roadways with “grandfathered” LOS. LOS for State highways shall be maintained in cooperation with Caltrans. The County LOS standards for intersections is LOS “D” or better on Minor Arterials and roadways of higher classification and LOS “C” or better on all other non-CMP designated County roadways and intersections.

DISCUSSION

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

No Impact. As the Project is a bridge replacement and road realignment project, there will be no change to the bridge width or carrying capacity. Pezzi Road would be realigned for safety purposes and would not include additional lanes. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, and no impact would occur.

b) Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

No Impact. CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 describes specific considerations for evaluating a project’s transportation impacts. Generally, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is the most appropriate
measure of transportation impacts. For the purposes of this section, VMT refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Subdivision (b) defines the criteria for analyzing transportation impacts. However, as the Project is a bridge replacement and road realignment project, the Project would have no change on VMT. Per section 15064.3 (b)(2), transportation projects that have no impact on VMT are presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact, and as there will be no changes in the roadway, the Project would have no impact to VMT.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project would realign the roadway approaches to replace the sharp curves with a new 50-mph alignment meeting the AASHTO Green Book design specifications. The total improved road length would be approximately 1,570 feet. The new alignment would consist of approximately 1,925-foot radius reversing curves that meet a 50-mph design speed. However, changes in the geometry of the road would occur for safety purposes to remove the existing sharp curves which pose a safety hazard. The Project would provide a transportation facility consistent with County and Caltrans Standards, as well as local and regional plans. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and mitigation is not required.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The existing road and bridge are anticipated to remain open during construction. If a detour is determined to be needed during final design, it would be 4.5 miles long with traffic using SR-88 to the east or Alpine Road to the west. The Project would not require any road closures. Further, a Traffic Management Plan will be prepared should the need for partial road closures occur during construction; therefore, there would be a less than significant impact to emergency access.

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

**TRA-1:** Temporary impacts to traffic flow as a result of construction activities would be minimized through construction phasing and signage and a traffic control plan.

**FINDINGS**

The Project would have **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation** relating to transportation/traffic.
2.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

- b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

REGULATORY SETTING

Effective July 1, 2015, CEQA was revised to include early consultation with California Native American tribes and consideration of tribal cultural resources (TCRs). These changes were enacted through AB 52. By including TCRs early in the CEQA process, AB 52 intends to ensure that local and Tribal governments, public agencies, and project proponents would have information available, early in the project planning process, to identify and address potential adverse impacts to TCRs. CEQA now establishes that a "project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment" (PRC § 21084.2).

To help determine whether a project may have such an adverse effect, the PRC requires a lead agency to consult with any California Native American tribe that requests consultation and is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project. The consultation must take place prior to the determination of whether a negative declaration, MND, or EIR is required for a project (PRC § 21080.3.1). Consultation must consist of the lead agency providing formal notification, in writing, to the tribes that have requested notification or proposed projects within their traditionally and culturally affiliated area. AB 52 stipulates that the NAHC shall assist the lead agency in identifying the California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated within the project area. If the tribe wishes to engage in consultation on the project, the tribe must respond to the lead agency within 30 days of receipt of the formal notification. Once the lead agency receives the tribe’s request to consult, the lead agency must then begin the consultation process within 30 days. If a lead agency determines that a project may cause a substantial adverse change to TCRs, the lead agency must consider measures to mitigate that impact. Consultation concludes when either: 1) the parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a TCR, or 2) a party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached (PRC § 21080.3.2). Under existing law, environmental documents must not include information about the locations of an archaeological site or sacred lands or any other information that is exempt from public disclosure pursuant to the Public Records act. TCRs are also exempt from disclosure. The term “tribal cultural resource” refers to either of the following:
Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:

- Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources
- Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of California PRC Section 5020.1
- A resource determined by a California lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the PRC Section 5024.1.

**Affected Environment**

The APE was established as the area of direct and indirect effects which encompasses an approximately 34.1-acre area. This includes all staging areas, street closures, vegetation/tree removal, approach roadway realignment, bridge replacement, ground disturbance, temporary construction easements, and utility relocation. The APE extends along Pezzi Road approximately 1,200 feet to the north and south of the Calaveras River (Figure 6). The vertical APE consists of a maximum of 2 feet of depth below existing ground surface to accommodate earthwork for the construction of the roadway and required for all roadway approach realignment, vegetation removal, and fill compaction. Bridge abutments will require an excavation depth of 8 feet below existing ground surface, plus an additional 55 feet (for a total of approximately 70 feet) below existing ground surface to accommodate piles driven into the ground. Underground utilities may require relocation, and all relocation will occur within 5 feet below ground surface.

Efforts to identify potential cultural resources in the APE included background research, a search of previously recorded archaeological site records and cultural resource identification reports on file at the California Historical Resources Information System CCIC, consultation with the NAHC, and a pedestrian ground surface survey.

Archaeologist Dr. Brian S. Marks conducted an archaeological field survey of the APE on March 28, 2017. The pedestrian survey was conducted at roughly 10-meter transect intervals. All Project area conditions and cultural resources were fully recorded in the field notes. Coverage varied in areas with vegetation coverage.

Exposed subsurface cuts, such as the banks within Calaveras River, roadway cuts, and bank cuts were observed for the presence of archaeological resources, soil color change, and/or staining that could indicate past human activity or buried deposits. The property north of the river and east of Pezzi Road could not be surveyed due to lack of permission to access the property (APN 08902037). An inspection of the property from the road and from the dry riverbed saw that the ground surface was bare ground beneath an orchard of almond trees with the rows of grass. By comparing this property with the surrounding area and examining historic aerial photographs, it is unlikely that a pedestrian inspection of this property would have revealed any cultural resources. Additionally, with the planting and removal of trees, the upper 5 feet of the surface soil would be heavily disturbed and the probability of finding intact buried deposits in this area is low. Therefore, the pedestrian survey conducted on March 28, 2017 did not reveal any archaeological resources.

**Discussion**

- Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)
Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of resources eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historic resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k). No cultural resources were identified during the visual survey, or the record search. No impacts are anticipated for the Project related to archaeological resource; however, with any Project requiring ground disturbance, there is always the possibility that unmarked cultural resources may be unearthed during construction. This impact would be considered potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 and CR-2 would result in less than significant impacts to historical resources.

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Less than Significant with Mitigation. In an effort to identify potential TCRs that might be affected by the undertaking, a pedestrian survey, background research, and consultation with individuals and organizations were conducted. A record search conducted at the CCIC identified eleven cultural resources within a one-mile radius of the APE and no resources within the APE. The pedestrian survey did not observe any cultural resources within the APE.

On February 22, 2019, Dokken Engineering sent a letter and a map depicting the Project vicinity to the NAHC in West Sacramento, asking the commission to review the sacred land files for any Native American cultural resources that might be affected by the Project. The request to the NAHC seeks to identify any Native American cultural resources within or adjacent to the Project area. On March 22, 2019, Katy Sanchez, Staff Services Analyst, informed Dokken Engineering that a review of the sacred lands was completed and returned negative results.

On December 17, 2019, ABS2 consultation letters were sent by mail to the seven Native American individuals on the list provided by the County and NAHC. These letters were also sent digitally via email to those with emails provided by the County and NAHC. The letters provided a summary of the Project and requested information regarding comments or concerns the Native American community might have about the Project. For those individuals that did not reply to the letter, follow-up emails were sent on January 29, 2020 to those individuals with email contact. Follow-up phone calls were placed to all non-responders on January 29, 2020. The following discussion presents a summary of consultation efforts for each individual on the list provided by the NAHC.

Rhonda Morningstar-Pope, Chairperson, Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians. A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. On January 15, 2020, an email response from Richard Hawkins of the Buena Vista Rancheria stated that the tribe has no concerns about the Project but would like to be notified if any cultural resources are discovered during construction.

California Valley Miwok Tribe. A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019. As there was no email address, a phone call was placed on January 29, 2020. There was no answer and no option to leave a voice mail was available. An email was sent on March 5, 2020 with a digital copy of the notification letter attached. No response has been received to date.

California Valley Miwok Tribe AKA Sheep Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians of CA. A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. A follow up email with a digital copy of the letter attached was sent on January 29, 2020 and March 5, 2020. No response has been received to date.
Sara Dutschke Sethchwaelo, Chairperson, Ione Band of Miwok Indians. A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. A follow up email with a digital copy of the letter attached was sent on January 29, 2020 and March 5, 2020. No response has been received to date.

Katherine Erolinda Perez, Chairperson, North Valley Yokuts Tribe. A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. A follow up email with a digital copy of the letter attached was sent on January 29, 2020. Chairperson Perez responded via email that although the pedestrian survey, record search, and sacred lands file search did not identify any Native American resources within the Project area, there is still potential to encounter such resources. She requested consultation and a site visit. A site visit was set for June 5, 2020. A field meeting was held with Kathy Erolinda Perez, Erolinda Perez, Joan Faustorilla (County Project Engineer), and Amy Dunay (Dokken Engineering archaeologist). Project details and cultural resource identification efforts to date were discussed. Ms. Kathy Perez noted that burials and other Native American cultural resources have been found within several miles of the Project area and that in general, she is concerned about buried resources. She recommended Native American awareness training be provided to construction staff and that Native American monitoring also occur during construction, including any removal of trees. She provided more comprehensive measures in an email following the meeting. These recommended measures are included in measures CR-1 and CR-2. Worker Environmental Training will be provided during construction and Caltrans standard guidelines and protocols regarding inadvertent discoveries will be followed should any cultural resources be identified during construction.

Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria. A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. An email race received on December 26, 2019 from Anna Starkey, Cultural Regulatory Specialist for the UAIC, stating that they have no knowledge of resources within the Project area. The UAIC requested copies of the cultural documents, copies of the IS/MND, and that workers be provided with cultural awareness training. A response was sent on December 30, 2019 stating that the UAIC will be sent a copy of the HPSR, once available. A second email was received on January 14, 2020 with a letter attached from Chairman Whitehouse requesting consultation under AB52. The letter and email also requested copies of the record search, cultural documents, and a site visit. The record search results were sent to Ms. Starkey on January 27, 2020 and requested available dates for site visit. A follow up email requesting site visit availability was sent on March 5, 2020. The UAIC responded that they prefer to conduct cultural surveys in conjunction with the consulting archaeologist and inquired as to whether other tribes have engaged in consultation and have requested a site visit. A response email was sent the same day to the UAIC providing dates and times in March for a site visit and confirming that there were other tribes consulting with the County and that site visits with these tribes were being scheduled. No tribe names were provided.

A field meeting was later held with Antonio Ruiz (UAIC), Travis Young (UAIC), Joan Faustorilla (County Project Engineer), and Amy Dunay (Dokken Engineering archaeologist) on June 9, 2020. Project details and cultural resource identification efforts to date were discussed. Mr. Ruiz noted that he needed to check the UAIC’s internal database for the presence of Native American cultural resources, but stated that in general, he is concerned about buried resources within the Project area. A site survey within the publicly accessible embankment of the river was conducted, but visibility was zero percent. Mr. Ruiz inquired as to whether other tribes had consulted on the Project. Upon hearing that Katherine Perez was actively consulting, he stated that the UAIC would defer to her, but would still like to review the UAIC internal database and receive copies of the
records search, geotechnical report, tree survey/data, and draft cultural report to gain a better understanding of the Project area. A copy of the draft HPSR/ASR, which included the records search and all current Native American consultation, was provided via email on July 6, 2020 while the Project area GIS shapefile and draft geotechnical report were provided via email on July 8, 2020. The July 8, 2020 email also provided the tree species within the Project area and relayed that tree data (numbers, species, sizes, etc.) would not be known until the permitting phase, which would occur after the environmental document approval phase. Both July emails requested that the UAIC provide the results of their internal database search. A July 6, 2020 email from the UAIC stated that they anticipated providing the results of their internal database search, as well as recommendations for the Project, “later in the week”. No email or other correspondence transmitting this information was received by the end of that week or as of the date of this document. Raymond Hitchcock, Chairperson, Wilton Rancheria. A letter was mailed on December 17, 2019, with an email sent the same day with a digital copy of the letter. Mariah Mayberry of the Wilton Rancheria responded via email on January 14, 2020 that the tribe wishes to consult on this Project. They requested copies of the cultural resources record search and wanted to be included in cultural surveys. An email was sent to Ms. Mayberry on January 20, 2020, with copies of the cultural resources record search results and informed Ms. Mayberry that the pedestrian inspection was completed in 2017. No further response has been received to date.

The Project is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse change to a TCR pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Cod Section 5024.1. No cultural resources were identified during the visual survey, record search, or Native American consultation. No impacts are anticipated for the Project related to archaeological resource; however, with any Project requiring ground disturbance, there is always the possibility that unmarked cultural resources may be unearthed during construction. Implementation of measures CR-1 and CR-2 would result in a less than significant impact to TCRs.

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2 within Section 2.5 will be implemented for any impacts relating to Tribal Cultural Resources.

**FINDINGS**

The Project would have Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation relating to Tribal Cultural Resources.
## 2.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION

a) **Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project would not include the construction of any wastewater-generating uses, nor electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities. The Project would not increase population in the Project vicinity, and there would be no additional wastewater flows as a result of Project development. The proposed Project would increase impervious surface area resulting in additional storm water drainage. However, the existing bridge and roadway approach north of the bridge would be removed. The addition of the new roadway and bridge would increase impervious surface area by approximately 28,137 sq. ft (0.65 acre) within the Project area. The Project would be designed consistent with local requirements and the Caltrans Project Planning and Design Guide and Storm Water Management Plan. To potentially reduce runoff, site design BMPs would be incorporated during final design as described in WQ-1 (see Section 2.10). To further prevent items impacts to the Calaveras River and water quality, measures WQ-2 through WQ-5 would be incorporated during final design. Therefore, impacts associated with development of the Project would be considered less than significant.

b) **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

No Impact. The Project would not result in the need for new or expanded water supplies. No impacts would result from development of the Project, and no mitigation is required.

c) **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.** The Project is a bridge replacement and roadway realignment project. The Project would not include the construction of any wastewater-generating uses. The Project would not increase population in the Project vicinity, and there would be no additional wastewater flows as a result of Project development; therefore, the Project would not result in the need for new or expanded wastewater facilities. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

   d)  *Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*

**Less Than Significant.** The Project would not generate substantial solid waste during operation. Solid waste may be generated during construction; however, the amount would not exceed landfill capacities because the amounts would not be substantial and would only occur during construction. Therefore, impacts associated with development of the Project would be considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

   e)  *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

**Less Than Significant.** The Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste; therefore, impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

**Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation measures WQ-1 through WQ-5 in Section 2.10 will be implemented for any impacts relating to Utilities and Service Systems.

**Findings**

The Project would have **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation** relating to utilities and service systems.
2.20 WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose Project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

According to the CAL FIRE Adopted Fire Hazard Severity Zone maps for Local, State, and Federal Responsibility Areas (CAL FIRE 2007), the Project is not located within a designated “very high fire hazard severity” area.

**DISCUSSION**

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**No Impact.** The Project is not located within a very high fire hazard severity area and would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Pezzi Road will remain open during construction. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose Project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

**No Impact.** The Project would not exacerbate wildfire risks as the Project would not change any of the existing slopes associated with the Calaveras River. The Project is a bridge replacement and road realignment project and does not increase the number of occupants within or adjacent to the Project area; therefore, no impact would occur.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

**No Impact.** The Project would require the installation of a new alignment of Pezzi Road; however, neither maintenance or installation of the road are anticipated to exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Utilities would be relocated as a result of the realigned road; however, no additional utilities would be installed other than what currently exist. Therefore, no impact would occur.
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project would not expose people or structures to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as the Project would not change any of the existing slopes or grades adjacent to the Project or associated with the Calaveras River levee system. As the Project is a replacement and realignment project with minimal increase to impervious surfaces, runoff will be similar to the existing. Additionally, as the Project is not located within a designated “very high fire hazard severity” area, it is anticipated there will be a less than significant impact.

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required for wildfires.

**FINDINGS**

The Project would have a **Less than Significant Impact** relating to wildfires.
2.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the Project: |
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |

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, substantially 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?

DISCUSSION

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, substantially 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 with Mitigation. Implementation of the Project would have the potential to degrade the quality of the existing environment. Potential impacts have been identified related to Biological Resources (2.4), Cultural Resources (Section 2.5), and Tribal Cultural Resources (Section 2.18). Mitigation measures have been identified related to individual resource-specific impacts. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation.

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)?

Less than Significant. All potential significant impacts identified for this Project would be addressed with avoidance, minimization, and mitigation. Past projects near the Pezzi Road Bridge have been cleared through the CEQA process and potentially significant impacts from those previous projects would have already been mitigated for. No cumulative effects are anticipated because no resources would be adversely affected by the Project, or the Project effects would be localized and of limited extent. No impact would occur in relation to cumulatively considerable effects.

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

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project would not cause significant adverse effects to human beings, either directly or indirectly with mitigation incorporated. Potential impacts have been identified related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology
and Water Quality, Noise. Mitigation measures have been identified related to individual resource-specific impacts. Mitigation measures would reduce the level of all Project-related impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation.

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

No specific avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures for cumulative impacts are needed for the Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project. The following measures discussed in other sections in this document would ensure that cumulative impacts would be less than significant should they occur.

- Measures VIA-1 through VIA-6
- Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3
- Measures BIO-1 through BIO-26
- Measures CR-1 and CR-2
- Measure GHG-1
- Measures HAZ-1 through Haz-3
- Measure NOI-1
- Measure TRA-1
- Measures WQ-1 through WQ-5
3.0 Comments and Coordination

This chapter summarizes the County’s efforts to identify, address and resolve Project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

3.1 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH PUBLIC AGENCIES

Coordination with the following agencies was initiated for the Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB)
Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)
Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
United States Coast Guard (USCG)
United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The public comment period for the Project will occur from October 28, 2021 to December 1, 2021. All written comments received by the County will be incorporated into the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and added in an appendix. Any additions or corrections to the IS/MND subsequent to public comments will be addressed within the final document.
4.0 List of Preparers

DOKKEN ENGINEERING

Amy Bakker, Associate Environmental Planner
Tim Chamberlain, Senior Environmental Planner
Scott Salembier, Associate Environmental Planner / Biologist
Ken Chen, Environmental Planner / Noise and Air Specialist
Amy Dunay, Senior Environmental Planner / Archaeologist

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

Michael Chung, P.E., Project Manager
Joan Faustorilla, P.E., Project Engineer
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Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/?cid=nrcs142p2_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require
alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.
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How Soil Surveys Are Made

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.

Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.

The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.

Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil
scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the
individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that
they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and
research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the
objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that
have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a
unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable
proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components
of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way
diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such
landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the
development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite
investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map.
The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of
mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape,
and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the
soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at
specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller
number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded.
These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color,
depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for
content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil
typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.

Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of
characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct
measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit
component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other
properties.

While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally
are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists
interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed
characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the
soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through
observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management.
Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new
interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other
sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of
specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management
are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same
kinds of soil.

Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on
such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over
long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example,
soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will
have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict
that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.

After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the
survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and
identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.
Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.
Custom Soil Resource Report

MAP LEGEND

Area of Interest (AOI)

Soils

Soil Map Unit Polygons
Soil Map Unit Lines
Soil Map Unit Points

Special Point Features
Blowout
Borrow Pit
Clay Spot
Closed Depression
Gravel Pit
Gravelly Spot
Landfill
Lava Flow
Marsh or swamp
Mine or Quarry
Miscellaneous Water
Perennial Water
Rock Outcrop
Saline Spot
Sandy Spot
Severely Eroded Spot
Sinkhole
Slide or Slip
Sodic Spot

Spoil Area
Stony Spot
Very Stony Spot
Wet Spot
Other
Special Line Features
Streams and Canals

Transportation
Rails
Interstate Highways
US Routes
Major Roads
Local Roads

Background
Aerial Photography

MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.

Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service
Web Soil Survey URL:
Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: San Joaquin County, California
Survey Area Data: Version 12, Sep 14, 2018

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Feb 14, 2016—Oct 23, 2017

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.
Map Unit Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Symbol</th>
<th>Map Unit Name</th>
<th>Acres in AOI</th>
<th>Percent of AOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Archerdale clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Cogna loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Stockton fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, overwashed</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for Area of Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate
pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or 
landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The 
delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the 
development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however, 
onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous 
areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. 
Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil 
properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a soil series. Except for 
differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major 
horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, 
salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the 
基础 of such differences, a soil series is divided into soil phases. Most of the areas 
shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase 
commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha 
silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. 
These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A complex consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate 
pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. 
The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar 
in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An association is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or 
miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present 
or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered 
practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The 
pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat 
similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An undifferentiated group is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas 
that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar 
interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion 
of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can 
be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made 
up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include miscellaneous areas. Such areas have little or no soil 
material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.
San Joaquin County, California

107—Archerdale clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting
National map unit symbol: hhr6
Elevation: 40 to 130 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 14 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 61 degrees F
Frost-free period: 270 days
Farmland classification: Prime farmland if irrigated

Map Unit Composition
Archerdale and similar soils: 85 percent
Minor components: 15 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Archerdale

Setting
Landform: Fan terraces
Landform position (two-dimensional): Footslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Alluvium from mixed rock sources

Typical profile
A - 0 to 8 inches: clay loam
Bw1 - 8 to 35 inches: clay
Bw2 - 35 to 60 inches: clay

Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 2 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: High
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately low to moderately high (0.06 to 0.20 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: Rare
Frequency of ponding: None
Salinity, maximum in profile: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)
Available water storage in profile: High (about 9.3 inches)

Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): 2s
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4s
Hydrologic Soil Group: C
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components
Cogna
Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Finrod
Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Hollenbeck
Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Vignolo
Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Unnamed, steeper slopes
Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

129—Cogna loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting
National map unit symbol: hhrx
Elevation: 70 to 150 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 15 to 17 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 61 to 63 degrees F
Frost-free period: 230 to 250 days
Farmland classification: Prime farmland if irrigated

Map Unit Composition
Cogna, loam, and similar soils: 85 percent
Minor components: 15 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Cogna, Loam

Setting
Landform: Alluvial fans
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Fine-loamy alluvium derived from igneous, metamorphic and sedimentary rock

Typical profile
A - 0 to 25 inches: loam
Bk - 25 to 38 inches: clay loam
C - 38 to 64 inches: loam

Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 2 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: Low
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.57 to 1.98 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: Rare
Frequency of ponding: None
Calcium carbonate, maximum in profile: 2 percent
Salinity, maximum in profile: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)
Available water storage in profile: High (about 9.3 inches)

Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): 1
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4c
Hydrologic Soil Group: B
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Archerdale
Percent of map unit: 6 percent
Landform: Stream terraces
Landform position (two-dimensional): Footslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Hydric soil rating: No

Nord
Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Landform: Fan skirts
Hydric soil rating: No

Veritas
Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Landform: Fan remnants
Hydric soil rating: No

Columbia
Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Landform: Flood plains
Hydric soil rating: Yes

Honcut
Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Landform: Flood plains
Hydric soil rating: No

248—Stockton fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, overwashed

Map Unit Setting
National map unit symbol: hhwr
Elevation: 20 to 70 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 14 inches  
Mean annual air temperature: 61 degrees F  
Frost-free period: 270 days  
Farmland classification: Prime farmland if irrigated

Map Unit Composition  
Stockton and similar soils: 85 percent  
Minor components: 15 percent  
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Stockton

Setting
Landform: Basin floors  
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope  
Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf  
Down-slope shape: Linear  
Across-slope shape: Linear  
Parent material: Alluvium derived from mixed rock sources

Typical profile
A - 0 to 16 inches: fine sandy loam  
2Ab - 16 to 53 inches: clay  
2Bk - 53 to 58 inches: clay loam  
2Bkqm - 58 to 60 inches: cemented

Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 2 percent  
Depth to restrictive feature: 40 to 60 inches to duripan  
Natural drainage class: Somewhat poorly drained  
Runoff class: High  
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low (0.00 in/hr)  
Depth to water table: About 60 inches  
Frequency of flooding: Rare  
Frequency of ponding: None  
Calcium carbonate, maximum in profile: 5 percent  
Salinity, maximum in profile: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)  
Available water storage in profile: Moderate (about 8.6 inches)

Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): 2s  
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4s  
Hydric Soil Group: C  
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components
Archerdale
Percent of map unit: 5 percent  
Hydric soil rating: No

Hollenbeck
Percent of map unit: 4 percent  
Hydric soil rating: No

Cogna
Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

**Unnamed, fine textured throughout soils**

Percent of map unit: 2 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

---

**W—Water**

**Map Unit Composition**

Water: 100 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the map unit.
References


Appendix B:
CNDDB, USFWS, and CNPS Special Status Species Database Results
### Selected Elements by Common Name

**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**

#### Query Criteria:
Quad IS (Linden (3812111) OR Lockeford (3812122) OR Lodi North (3812123) OR Lodi South (3812113) OR Peters (3712181) OR Stockton East (3712182) OR Waterloo (3812112))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Element Code</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An andrenid bee</td>
<td>IHYM35210</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G1G2</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrena subapasta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burrowing owl</td>
<td>ABNSB10010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athene cunicularia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California linderiella</td>
<td>ICBRA06010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linderiella occidentalis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California tiger salamander - central California DPS</td>
<td>AAAAA01181</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td>WL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambystoma californiense pop. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crotch bumble bee</td>
<td>IIHYM24480</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombus crotchii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta button-celery</td>
<td>PDAP10Z0S0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eryngium racemosum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foothill yellow-legged frog</td>
<td>AAABH01050</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana boylii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giant gartersnake</td>
<td>ARADB36150</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamnophis gigas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene's tectoria</td>
<td>PMPOA6N010</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tectoria greenei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legenere</td>
<td>PDCAM0C010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legenere limosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason's lilaeopsis</td>
<td>PDAP19030</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilaeopsis masonii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midvalley fairy shrimp</td>
<td>ICBRA03150</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branchinecta mesovallensis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool</td>
<td>CTT44110CA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pallid bat</td>
<td>AMACC10010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrozos pallidus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recurved larkspur</td>
<td>PDRAN0B1J0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2?</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphinium recurvatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento splittail</td>
<td>AFCJB34020</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>GNR</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford's arrowhead</td>
<td>PMALI040Q0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagittaria sanfordii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>song sparrow (&quot;Modesto&quot; population)</td>
<td>ABPBXA3010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melospiza melodia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steelhead - Central Valley DPS</td>
<td>AFCHA0209K</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5T2Q</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus pop. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Element Code</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>succulent owl’s-clover</td>
<td>PDSCR0D3Z1</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G4T2T3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Castilleja campestris var. succulenta</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suisun Marsh aster</td>
<td>PDASTE8470</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Symphyotrichum lentum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainson’s hawk</td>
<td>ABNKC19070</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buteo swainsoni</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tricolored blackbird</td>
<td>ABPBXB0020</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>G1G2</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agelaius tricolor</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valley elderberry longhorn beetle</td>
<td>IICOL48011</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3T2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Oak Woodland</td>
<td>CTT71130CA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Valley Oak Woodland</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernal pool fairy shrimp</td>
<td>ICBRA03030</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Branchinecta lynchi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernal pool tadpole shrimp</td>
<td>ICBRA10010</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lepidurus packardi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western pond turtle</td>
<td>ARAAD02030</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emys marmorata</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western spadefoot</td>
<td>AAABF02020</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Spea hammondii</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow warbler</td>
<td>ABPBX03010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Setophaga petechia</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Record Count: 30
In Reply Refer To: Consultation Code: 08ESMF00-2021-SLI-2509
Event Code: 08ESMF00-2021-E-07217
Project Name: Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the Service under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Please follow the link below to see if your proposed project has the potential to affect other species or their habitats under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service:

http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/protected_species/species_list/species_lists.html

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 et seq.), Federal agencies are required to
utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at:
http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm;
http://www.towerkill.com; and

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Sacramento Fish And Wildlife Office
Federal Building
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605
Sacramento, CA 95825-1846
(916) 414-6600
Project Summary
Consultation Code: 08ESMF00-2021-SLI-2509
Event Code: 08ESMF00-2021-E-07217
Project Name: Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project
Project Type: TRANSPORTATION
Project Description: Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project
Project Location:
   Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/@38.04658,-121.20098792050412,14z

Counties: San Joaquin County, California
Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 9 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Mammals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Brush Rabbit <em>Sylvilagus bachmani riparius</em></td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No critical habitat has been designated for this species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6189">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6189</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reptiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giant Garter Snake <em>Thamnophis gigas</em></td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No critical habitat has been designated for this species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4482">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4482</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amphibians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Red-legged Frog <em>Rana draytonii</em></td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is <strong>final</strong> critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2891">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2891</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Tiger Salamander <em>Ambystoma californiense</em></td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: U.S.A. (Central CA DPS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is <strong>final</strong> critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2076">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2076</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fishes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delta Smelt <em>Hypomesus transpacificus</em></td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/321">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/321</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Insects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle <em>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</em></td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7850">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7850</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crustaceans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp <em>Branchinecta lynchi</em></td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/498">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/498</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal Pool Tadpole Shrimp <em>Lepidurus packardi</em></td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2246">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2246</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flowering Plants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fleshy Owl's-clover <em>Castilleja campestris ssp. succulenta</em></td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8095">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8095</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Critical habitats**

There are no critical habitats within your project area under this office's jurisdiction.
### Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California

**Search Results**

17 matches found. Click on scientific name for details

Search Criteria: **Quad** is one of [3812112, 3712182, 3812113, 3812111, 3712183, 3812122]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Lifeform</th>
<th>Blooming Period</th>
<th>Fed List</th>
<th>State List</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>CA Rare Plant Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus tener var. tener</td>
<td>alkali milk-vetch</td>
<td>Fabaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>Mar-Jun</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2T1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atriplex cordulata var. cordulata</td>
<td>heartscale</td>
<td>Chenopodiaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>Apr-Oct</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3T2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blepharizonia plumosa</td>
<td>big tarplant</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>Jul-Oct</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G1G2</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brasenia schreberi</td>
<td>watershield</td>
<td>Cabombaceae</td>
<td>perennial rhizomatous herb (aquatic)</td>
<td>Jun-Sep</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>2B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilleja campestris var. succulenta</td>
<td>succulent owl's-clover</td>
<td>Orobanchaceae</td>
<td>annual herb (hemiparasitic)</td>
<td>(Mar)Apr-May</td>
<td>FT CE</td>
<td>G4? T2T3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centromadia parryi ssp. rudis</td>
<td>Parry's rough tarplant</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>May-Oct</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3T3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloropyron palmatum</td>
<td>palmate-bracted bird’s-beak</td>
<td>Orobanchaceae</td>
<td>annual herb (hemiparasitic)</td>
<td>May-Oct</td>
<td>FE CE</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphinium recurvatum</td>
<td>recurved larkspur</td>
<td>Ranunculaceae</td>
<td>perennial herb</td>
<td>Mar-Jun</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2?</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extriplex joaquinana</td>
<td>San Joaquin spearscale</td>
<td>Chenopodiaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>Apr-Oct</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperevax caulescens</td>
<td>hogwallow starfish</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>Mar-Jun</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, visit [CNPS](https://rareplants.cnps.org/Search/Results).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>LIFEFORM</th>
<th>BLOOMING PERIOD</th>
<th>FED LIST</th>
<th>STATE LIST</th>
<th>GST RANK</th>
<th>STATE RANK</th>
<th>GLOBAL RANK</th>
<th>STATE RANK</th>
<th>CA RARE PLANT RANK</th>
<th>PHOTO AVAILABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hibiscus</strong></td>
<td><strong>woolly rosemallow</strong></td>
<td>Malvaceae</td>
<td>perennial rhizomatous herb (emergent)</td>
<td>Jun-Sep</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>GST3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>G5T3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>No Photo Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lasthenia ferrisiae</strong></td>
<td>Ferris' goldfields</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>Feb-May</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Photo Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lathyrus jepsonii var. jepsonii</strong></td>
<td>Delta tule pea</td>
<td>Fabaceae</td>
<td>perennial herb</td>
<td>May-Jul(Aug-Sep)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>GST2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Photo Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lilaeopsis masonii</strong></td>
<td>Mason's lilaeopsis</td>
<td>Apiaceae</td>
<td>perennial rhizomatous herb</td>
<td>Apr-Nov</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Photo Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sagittaria sanfordii</strong></td>
<td>Sanford's arrowhead</td>
<td>Alismataceae</td>
<td>perennial rhizomatous herb (emergent)</td>
<td>May-Oct(Nov)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Photo Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symphyotrichum lentum</strong></td>
<td>Suisun Marsh aster</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>perennial rhizomatous herb</td>
<td>(Apr)May-Nov</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Photo Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trifolium hydrophilum</strong></td>
<td>saline clover</td>
<td>Fabaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>Apr-Jun</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Photo Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing 1 to 17 of 17 entries
Appendix C:
Construction Air Quality Emissions Model
### Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 9.0.0

#### Daily Emission Estimates for Pezz Road Bridge Replacement Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>ROG (tons/day)</th>
<th>CO (tons/day)</th>
<th>NOx (tons/day)</th>
<th>Total PM10 (tons/day)</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10 (tons/day)</th>
<th>Fugitive Dust PM10 (tons/day)</th>
<th>Total PM2.5 (tons/day)</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5 (tons/day)</th>
<th>Fugitive Dust PM2.5 (tons/day)</th>
<th>SOx (tons/day)</th>
<th>CO2 (tons/day)</th>
<th>CH4 (tons/day)</th>
<th>N2O (tons/day)</th>
<th>CO2e (MT/phase)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grubbing/Land Clearing</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1,572.18</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1,594.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading/Excavitation</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>5,325.92</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>5,391.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4,999.12</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5,045.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2,002.48</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2,052.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum (tons/day)</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>5,325.92</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>5,391.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (tons/construction project)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>381.71</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>386.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Project Start Year: 2023
- Project Length (months): 8
- Total Project Area (acres): 34
- Maximum Area Disturbed/Day (acres): 1
- Water Truck Used?: Yes

#### Total Material Imported/Exported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume (yd³/day)</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Asphalt</th>
<th>Soil Hauling</th>
<th>Asphalt Hauling</th>
<th>Worker Commute</th>
<th>Water Truck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grubbing/Land Clearing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading/Excavation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Daily VMT (miles/day):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Total PM10 (tons/day)</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10 (tons/day)</th>
<th>Fugitive Dust PM10 (tons/day)</th>
<th>Total PM2.5 (tons/day)</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5 (tons/day)</th>
<th>Fugitive Dust PM2.5 (tons/day)</th>
<th>SOx (tons/day)</th>
<th>CO2 (tons/day)</th>
<th>CH4 (tons/day)</th>
<th>N2O (tons/day)</th>
<th>CO2e (MT/phase)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grubbing/Land Clearing</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading/Excavitation</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>187.47</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>153.97</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum (tons/day)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>187.47</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (tons/construction project)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>381.71</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PM10 and PM2.5 emissions estimates assume 50% control of fugitive dust from water truck and associated dust control measures if a minimum number of water trucks are specified. Total PM10 emissions shown in column F are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns G and H. Total PM2.5 emissions shown in Column I are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns J and K. CO2e emissions are estimated by multiplying mass emissions for each GHG by its global warming potential (GWP): 1, 25 and 298 for CO2, CH4 and N2O, respectively. Total CO2e is then estimated by summing CO2e estimates over all GHGs.**
Appendix D: FEMA FIRMette Map
This map complies with FEMA’s standards for the use of digital flood maps if it is not void as described below. The basemap shown complies with FEMA’s basemap accuracy standards. The flood hazard information is derived directly from the authoritative NFHL web services provided by FEMA. This map was exported on 7/3/2019 at 7:03:34 PM and does not reflect changes or amendments subsequent to this date and time. The NFHL and effective information may change or become superseded by new data over time.

This map image is void if the one or more of the following map elements do not appear: basemap imagery, flood zone labels, legend, scale bar, map creation date, community identifiers, FIRM panel number, and FIRM effective date. Map images for unmapped and unmodernized areas cannot be used for regulatory purposes.
Appendix E: Distribution List

A Notice of Availability was distributed to all residences within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project area and to the following agencies and interested parties (unless IS hardcopies specified).

San Joaquin County Department of Public Works  
Attn: Michael Chung, PE  
Project Manager  
San Joaquin County  
1810 East Hazelton Avenue  
Stockton, CA 95205  
(IS hardcopy)

Federal Government

United States Fish and Wildlife Service  
Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office  
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605  
Sacramento, CA 95825

National Marine Fisheries Service  
5-100, 650 Capitol Mall  
Sacramento, CA 95814

US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District  
ATTN: Regulatory Branch  
1325 J Street, Room 1480  
Sacramento, CA 95814-2922

United States Coast Guard  
Eleventh Coast Guard District  
Coast Guard Island, Bldg. 50-2  
Alameda, CA 94501

State Government

California State Clearinghouse  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044  
(IS hardcopy)

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

California Department of Fish and Wildlife Region 4  
1234 E. Shaw Avenue  
Fresno, CA 93710
Local Agencies

San Joaquin County Clerk-Recorder
44 N San Joaquin Street #260
Stockton, CA 95202

Stockton East Water District
6767 E Main Street
Stockton, CA 95215
Appendix F: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>VERIFICATION (DATE AND INITIALS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AESTHETICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project...</td>
<td>VIA-1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>Landscape architecture considerations shall be implemented as directed by the Department’s Highway Design Manual, Chapter 900, and the Department’s Landscape Architecture PS&amp;E Guide. As such, highway planting, lighting plans, and aesthetic treatment would be incorporated into the Project as appropriate. This would also include coordination between the Department’s Landscape Architecture staff for areas within state right-of-way as well as with San Joaquin County.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction activities</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project...</td>
<td>VIA-2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>Caltrans Standard Specifications (2018) “Erosion Control” will be followed during construction. At the conclusion of construction, areas of bare soil shall be hydroseeded with native seed mix to prevent or at least minimize erosion. Hydroseeding will follow Standard Special Provision (SSP) 21-2.03D for Erosion Control (Hydroseed).</td>
<td>During and after construction activities</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project...</td>
<td>VIA-3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>Vegetation clearing would only occur within the delineated Project boundaries in an effort to minimize the impacts. Trees located in areas along the edge of the construction zone would be trimmed whenever possible and only those trees that lie within the active construction areas would be removed.</td>
<td>During construction activities</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project...</td>
<td>VIA-4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>All disturbed areas including staging of vehicles and equipment will be restored to pre-construction contours and revegetated, either through hydroseeding or other means, with native species.</td>
<td>After construction activities</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project...</td>
<td>VIA-5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>Permanent impacts to riparian vegetation within construction limits will be mitigated for at an agency approved mitigation ratio at an on or off-site agency approved location or a combination of both.</td>
<td>Prior to construction activities</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact aesthetic features</td>
<td>VIA-6: The contractor will be required to maintain good housekeeping in and around construction sites, staging areas, and equipment storage areas.</td>
<td>During construction activities</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AIR QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project implementation has the potential to impact air quality.</th>
<th>AQ-1: The construction contractor shall comply with Caltrans’ Standard Specifications Section 14-11.04 Dust Control of Caltrans’ Standard Specifications (2018).</th>
<th>During construction activities</th>
<th>Construction Contractor</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project implementation has the potential to impact air quality.</th>
<th>AQ-2: The construction contractor shall comply with Section 7.1.02C Emissions Reduction and Section 18 Dust Palliative of Caltrans’ Standard Specifications (2018).</th>
<th>During construction activities</th>
<th>Construction Contractor</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project implementation has the potential to impact air quality.</th>
<th>AQ-3: The Wind Erosion Control BMP [WE-1] from Caltrans’ Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual will be implemented as follows:  - Water shall be applied by means of pressure-type distributors or pipelines equipped with a spray system or hoses and nozzles that will ensure even distribution.  - All distribution equipment shall be equipped with a positive means of shutoff.  - Unless water is applied by means of pipelines, at least one mobile unit shall be available at all times to apply water or dust palliative to the Project.  - If reclaimed water is used, the sources and discharge must meet California Department of Health Services water reclamation criteria and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements. Non-potable water shall not be conveyed in tanks or drainpipes that will be used to convey potable water and there shall be no connection between potable and non-potable supplies. Non-potable tanks, pipes and other conveyances shall be marked “NON-POTABLE WATER – DO NOT DRINK.”  - Materials applied as temporary soil stabilizers and soil binders will also provide wind erosion control benefits.</th>
<th>During construction activities</th>
<th>Construction Contractor</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project implementation has the potential to impact special status aquatic/semi-aquatic and terrestrial species.</th>
<th>BIO-1: All construction personnel shall be provided with environmental awareness training prior to being allowed to work on the job site. The training shall include an overview of sensitive habitats and special-status species that are present within or adjacent to the Project area and Project specific protective measures that must be adhered to. The training will also include a description of the legal penalties for violating protective measures.</th>
<th>Prior to and during construction activities</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project implementation has the potential to impact stormwater. | BIO-2: Contract specifications will include the following BMPs, where applicable, to reduce erosion during construction:  
  - Implementation of the Project will require approval of a site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) or Water Pollution Control Program (WPCP) that would implement effective measures to protect water quality, which may include a hazardous spill prevention plan and additional erosion prevention techniques.  
  - Existing vegetation will be protected in place where feasible to provide an effective form of erosion and sediment control.  
  - Stabilizing materials will be applied to the soil surface to prevent the movement of dust from exposed soil surfaces on construction sites as a result of wind, traffic, and grading activities. | Prior to and during construction activities | Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |
<p>| Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources. | BIO-3: In channel work shall be limited to periods of low flow. If water is present within the channel during construction, a water diversion will be implemented. The water diversion will be designed and implemented by the contractor selected for this Project. | Prior to and during construction activities | Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |
| Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources. | BIO-4: Refueling or maintenance of equipment shall not be permitted within the Old Calaveras River (Riverine) and must occur at least 25 feet from the top of bank. All onsite refueling and maintenance must occur over plastic sheeting, drip pans, or other secondary containment measures to capture accidental spills before they During construction activities | Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources.</th>
<th>BIO-5: A chemical spill kit must be kept onsite at all times during work and must be easily accessible for use in the event of a spill.</th>
<th>During construction activities</th>
<th>Construction Contractor</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources.</td>
<td>BIO-6: Secondary containment consisting of plastic sheeting or other impermeable sheeting shall be installed underneath all stationary equipment to prevent petroleum products or other chemicals from contaminating the soil or the Old Calaveras River (Riverine). Secondary containment must have a raised edge (e.g. sheeting wrapped around wattles).</td>
<td>During construction activities</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact riparian habitat and tree preservation policies.</td>
<td>BIO-7: The Calaveras River riparian corridor shall be established as an ESA. Prior to ground disturbance, the Project limits adjacent to riparian vegetation shall be marked off with high visibility orange fencing (ESA Fencing) to prevent further encroachment into the ESA. Construction equipment, materials, and personnel shall not be permitted beyond the ESA fencing.</td>
<td>During construction activities</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact riparian habitat and tree preservation policies.</td>
<td>BIO-8: Native tree removal shall be limited to the minimum amount necessary for equipment access through the Project area. Trees shall be preferentially trimmed rather than removed and trimming should not exceed 30% of the total canopy of each tree.</td>
<td>Prior to construction activities</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact riparian habitat and tree preservation policies.</td>
<td>BIO-9: Following construction, the Project area shall be re-graded to pre-construction or better conditions and hydroseeded with a mix of regionally appropriate native species approved by the Project biologist.</td>
<td>After construction activities</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact special status aquatic/semi-aquatic species.</td>
<td>BIO-10: The County will purchase mitigation bank credits from a CDFW approved mitigation bank. The County anticipates purchasing credits at a 3:1 ratio for permanent impacts and at a 1:1 ratio for temporary impacts but final mitigation ratios and</td>
<td>Prior to construction activities</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
aquatic and terrestrial species. | credits will be determined in coordination with CDFW through the 1602 permitting process, and through the USACE/RWQCB during the 404/401 permitting process. |  |

Project implementation has the potential to impact special status terrestrial species. | **BIO-11:** Prior to vegetation removal or initial ground disturbance during the nesting bird season (February 1st – September 30th) a pre-construction nesting bird survey must be conducted by a Project biologist prior to the start of work. The nesting bird survey must include the Project area plus a 300-foot buffer. Within 2 weeks of the nesting bird survey, all areas surveyed by the biologist must be cleared by the contractor or a supplemental nesting bird survey is required.

A minimum 300-foot no work buffer will be established around any active nests of a raptor species. A 100-foot no work buffer will be established around any active nests for other migratory birds. If an active nest is discovered during construction, the contractor must immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established. If a Swainson’s hawk nest is observed during the pre-construction survey, a 600-foot buffer will be established and CDFW will be contacted for further guidance. The contractor is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by a Project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged. A reduced buffer can be established if determined appropriate by a Project biologist and approved by CDFW. | Prior to and during construction activities | County/Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |

Project implementation has the potential to impact special status aquatic/semi-aquatic species. | **BIO-12:** If water is present at the start of in-channel work, prior to installing the water diversion, the Project biologist(s) will remove fish from the work area. This may be accomplished by dip netting or seine netting as determined by the Project biologist(s). Handling of salmonids is not anticipated; however, if this action is necessary, the County will contact Caltrans in coordination with NMFS and consultation may need to be re-initiated. | Prior to construction activities | County/Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources.</th>
<th><strong>BIO-13</strong>: Silt fences and fiber rolls should be utilized to reduce potential sediment discharge that could impact water quality.</th>
<th>During construction activities</th>
<th>Construction Contractor</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact riparian habitat and tree preservation policies.</td>
<td><strong>BIO-14</strong>: Prior to initiating construction, elderberry shrubs that cannot be avoided will be removed and transplanted to a USFWS approved mitigation bank. Relocation must be completed between December 15th and February 15th when elderberry shrubs are dormant to minimize transplant stress on the shrubs. Transplanting methods must follow the recommendations included in Section 5.2 of the Framework for Assessing Impacts to the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (USFWS 2017) or more recent published USFWS recommendations. The Project biologist will be present onsite during shrub relocation.</td>
<td>Prior to construction activities</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact riparian habitat and tree preservation policies.</td>
<td><strong>BIO-15</strong>: Prior to construction, during transplantation of elderberry shrubs, the Project biologist will conduct a survey of the Project area to ensure that no new shrubs, with stems 1 inch or greater, have appeared since the original survey. If new shrubs, with stems 1 inch or greater, are discovered that may be impacted by the Project coordination with USFWS will occur.</td>
<td>Prior to construction activities</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact riparian habitat and tree preservation policies.</td>
<td><strong>BIO-16</strong>: Elderberry shrubs adjacent to the Project limits will be protected in place. ESA fencing will be placed around the dripline of elderberry shrubs and protective sheeting will be used to block construction dust and debris.</td>
<td>Prior to construction activities</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact riparian habitat, tree preservation policies, and special status terrestrial species.</td>
<td><strong>BIO-17</strong>: A qualified biologist will be present onsite for any elderberry shrub removal and will periodically inspect the construction area and ESA fencing to ensure that no unauthorized take of VELB occurs.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction activities</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Prior to Construction Activities</td>
<td>During Construction Activities</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-18</td>
<td>Signs will be installed along the edge of the ESA and will read the following: “This area is habitat of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, a threatened species, and must not be disturbed. This species is protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Violators are subject to prosecution, fines, and imprisonment.” The signs should be clearly readable from a distance of 20 feet and must be maintained for the duration of construction.</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-19</td>
<td>Herbicides, insecticides, fertilizers, or other chemicals that might harm the VELB or VELB’s host plant will not be used within 100 feet of elderberry shrubs. All chemicals will be applied using a backpack sprayer or a similar direct application method.</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-20</td>
<td>To prevent fugitive dust from drifting into adjacent habitat, all clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, demolition activities, or other dust generating activities will be effectively controlled for fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-21</td>
<td>Prior to the start of construction, the County will purchase 6.7 mitigation credits for VELB from a USFWS approved mitigation bank.</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-22</td>
<td>If demolition of the existing bridge is planned to occur during the swallow nesting season, measures must be taken to avoid impacts to migratory swallows. To protect migratory swallows, unoccupied nests must be removed from the existing bridge and swallow exclusions must be installed prior to the nesting season (February 15th – September 30th). Swallow exclusion design is at the discretion of the contractor but may consist of netting, sheeting, or low friction coatings. If a swallow is allowed to nest in the area, the County will take action to remove the swallow.</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
complete a nest on the existing bridge, work may not resume on the bridge without written approval from CDFW or until the Project biologist has determined that the young have fledged, and the nest is empty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIO-23: Erosion control materials that incorporate plastic monofilament netting are not permitted within the Project area.</th>
<th>During construction activities</th>
<th>Construction Contractor</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NMFS CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

**BIO-24:** In coordination with NMFS, if a temporary water diversion is determined to be needed, then Caltrans shall develop a plan that describes: (1) how a temporary diversion structure will be installed, and uninstalled, in the action area within the Old Calaveras River channel, including any relevant designs; (2) how dewatering will occur in the work area; (3) protocols for how, and where, fish will be relocated, including conservation measures that would reduce the potential for fish injury and mortality; and (4) communication protocols for how to notify NMFS in the event that a temporary diversion structure needs to be installed, and dewatering and fish relocation activities need to occur. Caltrans shall submit the plan to NMFS for review and approval a minimum of 30 days prior to installation of a temporary diversion structure within the Old Calaveras River channel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to construction activities</th>
<th>Caltrans/County</th>
<th>Caltrans/County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**BIO-25:** Caltrans shall notify NMFS within 24 hours if CCV steelhead are observed, encountered, or relocated during fish relocation activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During construction activities</th>
<th>Caltrans/County/Construction Contractor</th>
<th>Caltrans/County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**BIO-26:** If a temporary diversion structure is installed and fish relocation activities occur, then within 60 days after completion of fish relocation activities and removal of the temporary diversion structure, Caltrans shall submit a report to NMFS that describes and summarizes fish relocation activities. This report shall include a description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During and after construction activities</th>
<th>Caltrans/County</th>
<th>Caltrans/County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
of the conservation measures that were implemented to reduce the potential for fish injury and mortality, and summarize all the fish species that were observed, encountered, and relocated.

| Project implementation has the potential to impact special status aquatic/semi-aquatic species. | BIO-27: San Joaquin County will purchase credits from approved banks for impacts to riparian habitat at a 3:1 ratio for permanent impacts, and a 1:1 ratio for temporary impacts. Potential banks include Bullock Bend Mitigation Bank and Fremont Landing Conservation Bank. | Prior to construction activities | County | County |
| Project implementation has the potential to impact riparian habitat and tree preservation policies. | BIO-28: Caltrans should protect existing, and wherever practicable, establish new riparian vegetation to enhance shading, cover, terrestrial food supply, and supply of instream woody material. | During construction activities | County/Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |
| Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources. | BIO-29: Caltrans should require contractors to use biodegradable lubricants and hydraulic fluid in construction machinery entering the Old Calaveras River channel. The use of petroleum alternative can greatly reduce the risk of contaminants from entering the aquatic ecosystem. | During construction activities | County/Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |
| Project implementation has the potential to impact riparian habitat and tree preservation policies. | BIO-30: Bank erosion control should use vegetation methods or “soft” approaches (such as vegetative plantings and placement of woody material) to shoreline modifications whenever feasible. Hard bank protection should be a last resort and the following options should be explored: tree revetments, stream flow deflectors, and vegetative riprap. | During construction activities | County/Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

Construction and ground-disturbing activities may encounter historical, archaeological, and/or paleontological resources.

| Construction and ground-disturbing activities may encounter historical, archaeological, and/or paleontological resources. | CR-1: If previously unidentified cultural materials are unearthed during construction, work shall be halted in that area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and develop a plan for documentation and removal of resources if necessary. Additional archaeological survey will be needed if Project limits are extended beyond the present survey limits. | During construction activities | County/Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |
### Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP)

#### Pezzi Road Bridge Replacement Project
San Joaquin County
October 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction and ground-disturbing activities may encounter historical, archaeological, and/or paleontological resources.</th>
<th>CR-2: Section 5097.94 of the PRC and Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code protect Native American burials, skeletal remains and grave goods, regardless of age and provide method and means for the appropriate handling of such remains. If human remains are encountered, work should halt in that vicinity and the county coroner should be notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist should be contacted to evaluate the situation. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the coroner must notify the NAHC within twenty-four hours of such identification. CEQA details steps to be taken if human burials are of Native American origin.</th>
<th>During construction activities</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction and demolition activities would generate temporary greenhouse gas emissions.</th>
<th>GHG-1: According to the Caltrans’ Standard Specification Section 14-9.02, the contractor must comply with air pollution control rules, regulations, ordinances, and statutes that apply to work performed under the Contract, including air pollution control rules, regulations, ordinances, and statutes provided in Govt Code § 11017 (Pub Cont Code § 10231).</th>
<th>During construction activities</th>
<th>Construction Contractor</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction activities involve reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions that may subject the public and environment to the release of hazardous materials.</th>
<th>HAZ-1: There is a potential that the proposed Project could affect yellow thermoplastic pavement markings and other types or colors of street or municipal markings containing lead-based paint. If such markings are affected as a result of the Project, samples will be collected, tested, and/or disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. Therefore, to avoid impacts from pavement striping during construction, it is recommended that testing and removal requirements for yellow striping and pavement marking materials be performed in accordance with Caltrans SSPs for removing traffic stripes and pavement markings.</th>
<th>Prior to and During construction activities</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
<th>County/Construction Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Construction activities involve reasonably | HAZ-2: Any leaking transformers observed during the course of the Project should be considered a potential polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hazard. | Prior to construction activities | County/Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |
foreseeable upset and accident conditions that may subject the public and environment to the release of hazardous materials.

A detailed inspection of individual electrical transformers was not conducted for this ISA. However, should leaks from electrical transformers (that will either remain within the construction limits or will require removal and/or relocation) be encountered during construction, the transformer fluid should be sampled and analyzed by qualified personnel for detectable levels of PCB's. Should PCBs be detected, the transformer should be removed and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency. Any stained soil encountered below electrical transformers with detectable levels of PCB’s should also be handled and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency.

Construction activities involve reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions that may subject the public and environment to the release of hazardous materials.

HAZ-3: As is the case for any project that proposes excavation, the potential exists for unknown hazardous contamination to be revealed during Project construction. For any previously unknown hazardous waste/material encountered during construction, the procedures outlined in Appendix E (Caltrans Unknown Hazard Procedures) shall be followed.

During construction activities

County/Construction Contractor

County/Construction Contractor

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources.

WQ-1: BMPs will be incorporated into Project design and Project management to minimize impacts on the environment including the release of pollutants (oils, fuels, etc.):

- The area of construction and disturbance would be limited to as small an area as feasible to reduce erosion and sedimentation.
- Measures would be implemented during land-disturbing activities to reduce erosion and sedimentation. These measures may include mulches, soil binders and erosion control blankets, silt fencing, fiber rolls, temporary berms, sediment desilting basins, sediment traps, and check dams.

Prior to and during construction activities

County/Construction Contractor

County/Construction Contractor
- Existing vegetation would be protected where feasible to reduce erosion and sedimentation. Vegetation would be preserved by installing temporary fencing, or other protection devices, around areas to be protected.
- Exposed soils would be covered by loose bulk materials or other materials to reduce erosion and runoff during rainfall events.
- Exposed soils would be stabilized, through watering or other measures, to prevent the movement of dust at the Project site caused by wind and construction activities such as traffic and grading activities.
- All construction roadway areas would be properly protected to prevent excess erosion, sedimentation, and water pollution.
- All vehicle and equipment maintenance procedures would be conducted off-site. In the event of an emergency, maintenance would occur away from the Calaveras River.
- All concrete curing activities would be conducted to minimize spray drift and prevent curing compounds from entering the waterway directly or indirectly.
- All construction materials, vehicles, stockpiles, and staging areas would be situated outside of the stream channel as feasible. All stockpiles would be covered, as feasible.
- Energy dissipaters and erosion control pads would be provided at the bottom of slope drains. Other flow conveyance control mechanisms may include earth dikes, swales, or ditches. Stream bank stabilization measures would also be implemented.
- All erosion control measures and storm water control measures would be properly maintained until the site has returned to a pre-construction state.
- All disturbed areas would be restored to pre-construction contours and revegetated, either through hydroseeding or other means, with native or approved non-invasive exotic species.
| Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources. | NOISE |
|---|---|---|
| WQ-2: Any requirements for additional avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures will be adhered to from all required regulatory agencies. | NOI-1: To minimize the construction-generated noise, abatement measures from Standard Specification 14-8.02 “Noise Control” and SSP 14-8.02 must be followed: • Do not exceed 86 dBA at 50 feet from the job site activities from 9 p.m. to 6 a.m. • Equip an internal combustion engine with the manufacturer recommended muffler. | |
| Prior to, during, and after construction activities | During construction | |
| County/Construction Contractor | Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |
| | | |
| WQ-3: The Project limits in proximity to the Calaveras River will be marked as an ESA or either be staked or fenced with high visibility material to ensure construction activities will not encroach further beyond established limits. | |
| Prior to construction activities | |
| County/Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |
| | |
| WQ-4: The construction contractor will adhere to the SWRCB Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ NPDES Permit pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA. This permit authorizes storm water and authorized non-storm water discharges from construction activities. As part of this Permit requirement, a SWPPP or Water Pollution Control Plan (if ground disturbance is less than 1 acre) will be prepared prior to construction consistent with the requirements of the RWQCB. This SWPPP/Water Pollution Control Plan will incorporate all applicable BMPs to ensure that adequate measures are taken during construction to minimize impacts to water quality. | |
| Prior to construction activities | |
| County/Construction Contractor | County/Construction Contractor |
| | |
| WQ-5: Storm water systems will be designed to prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials or other elements that might degrade or harm biological resources. | |
| Prior to construction activities | |
| County | County |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources.</th>
<th>Mitigation Monitoring &amp; Reporting Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources.</td>
<td>October 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation has the potential to impact water resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Do not operate an internal combustion engine on the job site without the appropriate muffler.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and demolition activities would generate temporary traffic impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA-1: Temporary impacts to traffic flow as a result of construction activities would be minimized through construction phasing and signage and a traffic control plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County/Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>