

**Addendum to the San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plan
Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2011052074)**

**Fiber Optic Connection
File No. PP15-040**

Prepared by



October 2015

**ADDENDUM TO
THE SAN JOSÉ/SANTA CLARA WATER POLLUTION
CONTROL PLAN MASTER PLAN FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT (SCH# 2011052074)**

Pursuant to Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of San Jose has prepared an Addendum to the San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plan Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (PMP FEIR) because minor changes made to the project, as described below, do not raise important new issues about the significant impacts on the environment.

File Number and Project Name: PP15-040 Fiber Optic Connection

Extension of an existing 2,300 feet fiber optic conduit by 460 feet for an approximate total of 2,760 feet. **Location:** The project area extends southward from a lot immediately north of the Silicon Valley Water Purification Center to Thomas Foon Chew Way along the east side of Zanker Road and westward from Thomas Foon Chew Way to the west side of Zanker Road.

Assessor's Parcel Number: 015-31-063, 015-31-28, 015-31-061. **Council District:** 4.

The environmental impacts of this project were addressed by a Final EIR entitled, "San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plan Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report," and findings were adopted by City Council Resolution No. 76858 on November 19, 2013. Specifically, the following impacts were reviewed and found to be adequately considered by the EIR:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Traffic and Circulation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soils and Geology | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urban Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biotics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Airport Considerations | <input type="checkbox"/> Microclimate |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Relocation Issues | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Construction Period Impacts |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Facilities and Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | | |

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project was analyzed for environmental impacts resulting from extending the existing fiber optic conduit to 2,760 feet and was found to be adequately analyzed in all resource areas by the San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plan Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report.

No new or more significant environmental impacts beyond those identified in the San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plan Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report have been identified, nor have any new mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the PMP FEIR been identified.

This Addendum will not be circulated for public review, but will be attached to San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plan Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15164(c).

Harry Freitas, Director
Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

10/28/15
Date

Meenaxi R.P.
Deputy

Project Manager: Kieulan Pham

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The purpose of this Addendum to the San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (PMP FEIR)¹ is to analyze the impacts of extending the 2,300 foot fiber optic conduit to 2,760 feet within the Plant Master Plan's Economic Development Area.

The project aligns with the Plant Master Plan Objectives and Intended Benefits² including the following:

- Increased Reliability in Plant Operations, and
- Economic Development

The fiber optic conduit could potentially support the future economic development of the project area including office R&D³ and light industrial uses identified in the PMP FEIR. The project area is planned for offices and light industrial businesses that would likely use fiber optic cables to access their computer networks and interchange with customers and other businesses through the internet. Through construction of the fiber optic cable, the project provides an option for future businesses to connect to the City's public high speed network.

The CEQA Guidelines §15162 states that when an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

¹ The San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant is also referenced as the Plant. The San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant is also referenced as the Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility (RWF) in various documents.

² Refer to *Section 3.3, Project Goals, Objectives, and Benefits* of the PMP FEIR for more information.

³ Office R&D is a land use designation for research and development uses.

- b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
- c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

CEQA Guidelines §15164 states that the lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in §15162 (see above) calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

Based on the review of the proposed project and environmental review prepared for the PMP FEIR, the City has concluded that the proposed project would not result in any new impacts not previously disclosed in the PMP FEIR and would not result in a substantial increase in the magnitude of any significant environmental impacts previously identified. For these reasons, an addendum to the PMP FEIR has been prepared for the proposed project.

This addendum will not be circulated for public review, but will be attached to the PMP FEIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15164(c).

SECTION 2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

2.1 PROJECT TITLE

Fiber Optic Connection

2.2 LEAD AGENCY ADDRESS AND LEAD AGENCY CONTACT

City of San José
Department of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement
200 E. Santa Clara Street
San Jose, CA 95113

Kieulan Pham, Planner
Kieulan.Pham@sanjoseca.gov
Phone: 408-535-3844

2.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located within the City of San José and extends from the Silicon Valley Advance Water Purification Center to Thomas Foon Chew Way on the east side of Zanker Road and onto a buffer land/open space area west of Zanker Road.

APN: 015-31-063, 015-31-28, 015-31-061

2.4 PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS

City of San José
Environmental Services Department
City Hall, 200 East Santa Clara Street, 10th Floor
San José, CA 95113-1905

2.5 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION AND ZONING DISTRICT

General Plan Land Use Designation:

Public/Quasi Public
Industrial Park

Zoning District:

Light Industrial,
Planned Development
Agriculture/Open Space

2.6 SURROUNDING LAND USES

North:	<i>Light Industrial, Agriculture/Open Space, Heavy Industrial</i>	South:	<i>Planned Development</i>
East:	<i>Light Industrial, Planned Development</i>	West:	<i>Agriculture/Open Space</i>

2.7 HABITAT PLAN DESIGNATION

Land Cover Designation:	Grain, Row-Crop, Hay and Pasture, Disked/Short-term Fallowed
Development Zone:	Urban Development Equal to or Greater Than 2 Acres Covered
Fee Zone:	Zone A – Ranchlands and Natural Lands
Owl Conservation Zone:	Burrowing Owl Surveyed Area and Fee Zone

2.8 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project proposes to extend an existing 2,300 feet fiber optic conduit by 460 feet for an approximate total of 2,760 feet. The 2,760 feet foot long fiber optic conduit would connect to an existing transmission pump station and control room located at the water purification center. Approximately 210 feet of new fiber optic conduit would be installed on the northern portion of the existing conduit and 250 feet would be installed on the southern portion. The existing conduit has multiple manholes and pullboxes. The project, as proposed, would be underground and would include one new manhole and two new pullboxes.

During construction (less than 12 months), the contractor staging area would be located in a lot directly north of the water purification center and would encompass approximately 10,000 square feet (sf). Installation of the new fiber optic conduit would require trenching up to three feet below ground surface (bgs). Construction trucks and vehicles would utilize existing roadways (i.e., Zanker Road and Thomas Foon Chew Way) and an existing service road to the water purification center for construction activities.

SECTION 3.0 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

3.1 AESTHETICS

Setting

The project site is relatively flat and primarily undeveloped and consists of ruderal vegetation. A water purification facility is on the northern portion of the project site. The southern portion of the project site extends to Thomas Foon Chew Way and Zanker Road.

Aesthetics Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X		1-5
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X		1-5
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X		1, 2
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X		1, 2

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-D

The project proposes to extend an existing 2,300 feet fiber optic conduit by 460 feet for an approximate total of 2,760 feet. The 2,760 feet foot long fiber optic conduit would connect to an

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

existing transmission pump station and control room located at the water purification center. The project, as proposed, would be underground with access from manholes and pullboxes.

Because the proposed conduit would be underground, implementation of the proposed project would not affect any scenic resources (including vistas) and would not impact the visual character or quality of the project site and surrounding area. In addition, the project would not include any light sources or building materials that would result in substantial light or glare in the project area.

Consistent with the analysis in the PMP FEIR, the proposed project would result in a less than significant aesthetics impact. [**Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)**]

3.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Setting

There are no existing agricultural lands or forest resource areas located on or near the project site. The project site and surrounding areas are primarily open space/buffer lands and designated as *Grazing Land* on the *Santa Clara County Importance Farmland Map 2012*.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
<p>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY 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 Department 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 forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>						
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?				X		1-3
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X		1-3
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))?				X		1-3
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses?				X		1-3
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X		1-3

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-E

The project proposes to extend an existing 2,300 feet long fiber optic conduit by approximately 460 feet for a total of 2,760 feet. The project site is located within multiple zoning districts including *Light Industrial, Planned Development, and Agriculture/Open Space*. The southern portion of the

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

project site is located in the *Agriculture/Open Space* zoning district and is currently utilized as open space/buffer lands. Implementation of the proposed project, therefore, would not impact agricultural resources within the City.

There are no agricultural or forest land uses on the project site or in the surrounding area. According to the General Plan FEIR, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural operations or facilitate unplanned conversion of farmland elsewhere in the City of San José to non-agricultural uses. The project would not conflict with a Williamson Act contract. In addition, the project is not utilized as forest lands and would not convert forest land to non-forest uses. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would have no agricultural or forestry resources impacts. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Setting

The project is located within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and is subject to the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan.

The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is a residential development located approximately 0.3 miles southwest.

Air Quality Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
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:						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X		1-5
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X		1-5
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X		1-5
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X		1-5
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X		1,

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-E

The proposed extension of the existing 2,300 feet conduit to 2,760 feet would be installed up to two feet underground⁴ and would not result in any daily operational emissions. Maintenance vehicles would visit the project site to inspect and maintain the fiber optic connection and may result in vehicle emissions on an occasional basis. Due to the infrequent operational emissions, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality plans or violate any air quality

⁴ Trenching would result in soil disturbance of up to three feet underground.

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

standard. Additionally, there are no odors resulting from the project that would affect the City's population and no sensitive receptors near the project area. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]**

Construction Impacts

Ground disturbance activities during construction, including grading and trenching would generate dust and other particulate matter which could result short-term air quality impacts. The project would implement the following standard permit conditions to reduce construction-related impacts to a less than significant level.

Standard Permit Conditions: The project would be developed in conformance with General Plan policies and the following standard BAAQMD dust control measures during all phases of construction on the project site to reduce dustfall and other particulate emissions:

- All active construction areas shall be watered twice daily or more often if necessary. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles-per-hour.
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads and parking and staging areas at construction sites.
- Cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, and any other materials that can be windblown. Trucks transporting these materials shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- Subsequent to clearing, grading, or excavating, exposed portions of the site shall be watered, landscaped, treated with soil stabilizers, or covered as soon as possible.
- Installation of sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- Replanting of vegetation in disturbed areas as soon as possible after completion of construction.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the City of San José regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

Please refer to *Section 3.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance*, for a discussion of cumulative air quality impacts.

Sensitive Receptors

The project site is not located in proximity to any land uses or facilities that would have sensitive receptors (i.e., schools, residences, assisted living, senior centers, and hospitals). Implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on sensitive receptors. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Biological Resources Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X		1-5
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X		1-5
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X		1-5
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?				X		1-5
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X		1-5
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?				X		1-5

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A, B, D

The project proposes to extend an existing underground 2,300 feet fiber optic conduit by 460 feet for an approximate total of 2,760 feet. The 2,760 feet foot long fiber optic conduit would connect to an existing transmission pump station and control room located at the water purification center. The project, as proposed, would be underground and would include one new manhole and two new pullboxes to access the new sections of the conduit.

While the project is not in proximity to any riparian habitat, it is located within an akali grassland habitat as identified in Figure 4.7-1 of the PMP FEIR and a burrowing owl foraging habitat as identified in Figure 4.7-3 of the PMP FEIR. Burrowing owls and Congdon's tarplants, a special-status species, has been identified in the akali grassland habitat and could be affected during project construction.

Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in *Section 4.7, Biological Resources* of the PMP FEIR would reduce construction impacts to the Congdon's tarplant and the burrowing owl habitat to a less than significant level. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)]**

Checklist Question C,E

The project site does not include any existing trees or wetlands. The nearest wetland to the project is approximately 945 feet west of the proposed construction staging area. Implementation of the proposed project, therefore, would not result in impacts to wetlands or trees in the project area and would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting these biological resources. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

Checklist Question F

The project site is located within the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan area and is within the identified burrowing owl foraging habitat (see Figure 4.7-3 of the PMP FEIR). The project would implement the mitigation measures outlined in *Section 4.7, Biological Resources* of the PMP FEIR to comply with the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)]**

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural Resources Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:						
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA 15064.5?				X		1-5
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA 15064.5?				X		1-5
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X		1-5
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X		1-5

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A,C

According to *Section 4.14, Cultural Resources* of the PMP FEIR, the project site and immediate project area is does not contain any built-environment historic resources or at-depth paleontological resources. Construction of the project would not exceed three feet below the ground surface and, therefore, would not encounter potential paleontological resources, which can generally be found at 10 feet below the ground surface. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

Checklist Questions B,D

According to *Section 4.14, Cultural Resources* of the PMP FEIR, ground disturbance in the project area could result in an accidental discovery of archaeological resources, including a potential for human remains. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in *Section 4.14.3.4* of the PMP FEIR would result in a less than significant impact on subsurface cultural resources. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)]**

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Geology and Soils Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:						
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:						
i) Rupture of a know 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?				X		1-5
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X		1-5
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X		1-5
iv) Landslides?				X		1-5
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X		1-5
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?				X		1-5
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?				X		1-5
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X		1

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-D

The project proposes to extend an existing 2,300 feet long fiber optic conduit by approximately 460 feet for a total of 2,760 feet. As described in *Section 4.8, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity* and Figure 4.8-1 of the PMP FEIR, the project site is primarily compose of late Holocene alluvial fan deposits

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

and has a high liquefaction potential. Since the project site is relatively flat, construction of the project would not result in landslides.

While the project site is within a seismic active region of the United States, there are no faults zoned under the Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, or any other active faults pass through the project site. Quaternary age Silver Creek Fault runs through the PMP area and is buried beneath hundreds of feet of mud and sediment. The probability of rupture on the fault is remote, according to the PMP FEIR.

As identified in Section 4.8 the PMP FEIR, the proposed project would adhere to the City's municipal code, including Chapter 17.04 and 17.10, which regulates engineering and construction of developments subject to geologic hazards. Implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant geologic and soil impacts. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]**

Checklist Question E

The project would not require any septic or wastewater disposal system. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:						
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				X		1-5
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X		1-5

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-B

The proposed extension of the existing 2,300 feet conduit to 2,760 feet would be installed up to two feet underground⁵ and would not result in any daily operational emissions. Maintenance vehicles would visit the project site to inspect and maintain the fiber optic connection and may result in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from vehicles on an occasional basis. Due to the infrequent operational emissions, the project, therefore, would result in a less than significant GHG emissions impact. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]**

Construction Impacts

Project construction would result in minor increases in GHG emissions from construction-related sources including construction equipment and emissions from construction workers’ personal vehicles traveling to and from the construction site. Construction-related GHG emissions vary depending on the level of activity, length of the construction period, specific construction operations, types of equipment, and number of personnel. Neither the City of San José or BAAQMD have established a quantitative threshold or stand for determine whether a project’s construction-related GHG emissions are significant. Because the project construction would be a temporary condition (less than 12 months) and involve limited periods of heavy equipment use for grading and trenching, the temporary increase in GHG emissions would be less than significant. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]**

⁵ Trenching would result in soil disturbance of up to three feet underground.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Hazards and Hazardous Materials Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:						
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X		1-5
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?				X		1-5
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?				X		1-5
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?				X		1,2,4,5
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X		1-5
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X		1-5
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X		1-5
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X		1-5

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-F,H

The project proposes to extend an existing underground 2,300 feet fiber optic conduit by 460 feet for an approximate total of 2,760 feet. The 2,760 feet foot long fiber optic conduit would connect to an existing transmission pump station and control room located at the water purification center. The project, as proposed, would be underground with access from manholes and pullboxes.

Operation of the fiber optic conduit would not result in transportation, use, disposal, or emission of hazardous materials. According to *Section 4.11* of the PMP FEIR, there are no schools within a quarter mile of the project site or public airports and private airstrips within two miles of the site that could be affected by construction or operations of the project. In addition, the project site is not located on any hazardous materials database or near any wildlands that could expose the project to fire hazards. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]**

Checklist Question G

According to *Section 4.11* of the PMP FEIR, Santa Clara County does not have an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan in the project area. Nevertheless, access to the proposed project, primarily for occasional maintenance, would use existing service roads and roadways and would not interfere with emergency vehicle access to the project site and properties in the project area. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]**

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Hydrology and Water Quality Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:						
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X		1-5
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local ground water table level (for example, the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X		1-5
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.				X		1-5
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X		1-5
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X		1-5
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X		1-5
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood-hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X		1
h) Place within a 100-year flood-hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X		1
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X		1-5

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X		1

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-F

The project proposes to extend an existing underground 2,300 feet fiber optic conduit by 460 feet for an approximate total of 2,760 feet. The 2,760 feet foot long fiber optic conduit would connect to an existing transmission pump station and control room located at the water purification center. The project, as proposed, would be underground and would include one new manhole and two new pullboxes to access the new sections of the conduit. The expansion of the existing underground conduit and the additional manhole and pullboxes would have a minimal effect on existing surface drainage patterns in the project area. The trenched areas during construction would be covered to stabilize the disturbed surface per the City’s standard permit conditions. Operation of the proposed fiber optic conduit would not affect any water quality or discharge standards, the groundwater supply, or contribute to stormwater runoff. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]**

Construction Impacts

Construction of the proposed project, including grading and trenching activities, may result in temporary impacts to surface water quality. When disturbance to underlying soils occurs, the surface runoff that flows across the site may contain sediments that are ultimately discharged into the storm drainage system. Construction of the project would disturb less than one acre of soil and, therefore, would not require a NPDES General Permit for Construction Activities.

All development projects in San José shall comply with the City’s Grading Ordinance whether or not the projects are subject to the NPDES General Permit for Construction Activities. The City of San José Grading Ordinance requires the use of erosion and sediment controls to protect water quality while a site is under construction. Prior to issuance of a permit for grading activity occurring during the rainy season (October 15 to April 15), the applicant is required to submit an Erosion Control Plan to the Director of Public Works for review and approval. The Plan must detail the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be implemented to prevent the discard of stormwater pollutants.

Standard Permit Conditions: Consistent with the General Plan and identified in *Section 4.9, Hydrology* of the PMP FEIR, standard permit conditions that shall be implemented to prevent stormwater pollution and minimize potential sedimentation during construction include, but are not limited to the following:

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

- Utilize on-site sediment control BMPs to retain sediment on the project site;
- Utilize stabilized construction entrances and/or wash racks;
- Implement damp street sweeping (if applicable);
- Provide temporary cover of disturbed surfaces to help control erosion during construction; and
- Provide permanent cover to stabilize the disturbed surfaces after construction has been completed.

In addition to the standard permit conditions, the project must comply with the City of San José Department of Public Works' Standard Specifications as identified in the PMP FEIR to reduce construction impacts to hydrology and water quality. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]**

Checklist Questions G-J

The proposed fiber optic conduit would be underground and would not place housing or expose people or structures to flood or inundation hazards. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

3.10 LAND USE

Setting

The project site is located in the following General Plan designations and zoning districts:

- General Plan Land Use Designation
 - *Public/Quasi Public*
 - *Industrial Park*

- Zoning District
 - *Light Industrial*
 - *Planned Development*
 - *Agriculture/Open Space*

Land Use Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:						
a) Physically divide an established community?				X		1
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X		1-5
c) Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?				X		1,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-B

The project proposes to extend an existing 2,300 feet long fiber optic conduit by approximately 460 feet for a total of 2,760 feet. The fiber optic conduit would be approximately two feet underground and would not physically divide an established community or conflict with any existing land use plan, policy, or regulation in the City of San José. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

Checklist Question C

The project site is located within the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan area and is within the identified burrowing owl foraging habitat (see Figure 4.7-3 of the PMP FEIR). The project would implement the mitigation measures outlined in *Section 4.7, Biological Resources* of the PMP FEIR to comply with the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)]**

3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

Setting

Within the City of San José, Communications Hill is the only designated mineral resource area by the State Mining and Geology Board under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA).

Mineral Resources Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:						
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?				X		1,2,4,5
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?				X		1,2,4,5

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-B

As discussed in *Section 4.8.1.3, Mineral Resources* of PMP FEIR, the project site is not located within a designated mineral resource area in the City of San José. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resources. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

3.12 NOISE

Noise Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
12. NOISE. Would the project result in						
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?				X		1-5
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?				X		1-5
c) Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X		1-5
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X		1-5
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X		1-5
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X		1-5

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-F

Operational Impacts

Operation of the proposed fiber optic conduit would not generate any noise or groundborne vibration. The project, therefore, would not result in a permanent or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project area or expose persons to noise levels above standards in the San Jose Municipal Code. In addition, the project site is not located within any airport land use plan or private airstrip and would not expose the project site to excessive noise levels from aircraft operations. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

Construction Impacts

Since construction activities would be less than 12 months and the project site is not within 500 feet of residential uses or 200 feet of commercial uses, construction of the fiber optic conduit would result in a less than significant noise impact as discussed *Section 4.4, Noise* of the PMP FEIR. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]**

3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Setting

The City of San José had an estimated population of 1,016,479 in January 2015.⁶ According to the General Plan EIR, the projected population is approximately 1.3 million persons by 2035.

Population and Housing Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:						
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)?				X		1-5
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X		1-5
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X		1-5

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-C

The project proposes to extend an existing fiber optic conduit up to 2,760 feet long underground to improve network services at the RWF. Implementation of the proposed project would not induce population growth and would not result in displacement of housing or people with the City of San José. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

⁶ State of California, Department of Finance, *E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State with Annual Percent Change — January 1, 2014 and 2015*. Sacramento, California, May 2015. <<http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-1/view.php>> Accessed October 20, 2015.

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

Setting

The nearest public services (including fire and police protection, schools, parks, community centers, and libraries) are approximately 0.5 miles from the project site.

Public Services Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or 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:						
a) Fire protection?				X		1-5
b) Police protection?				X		1-5
c) Schools?				X		1-5
d) Parks?				X		1-5
e) Other public facilities?				X		1-5

Impacts Evaluation

The project area is not located near any fire or police stations, schools, park, or other public facilities (i.e., libraries and community centers). Construction of the project would be located on buffer lands and roadways and, therefore, would not impact any public facilities or services in the City of San José. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

3.15 RECREATION

Recreation Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
15. RECREATION. Would the project:						
a) 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?				X		1-5
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X		1-5

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-B

The project proposes to extend an existing 2,300 feet fiber optic conduit by 460 feet for an approximate total of 2,760 feet. The 2,760 feet foot long fiber optic conduit would connect to an existing transmission pump station and control room located at the water purification center. The project, as proposed, would be underground with access from manholes and pullboxes. The project does not propose any new housing and, therefore, would not increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities within the City. In addition, the project site is not located near any planned or existing recreational facilities and would have no impact on recreational facilities in the project area or in the City of San José. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

3.16 TRANSPORTATION

Transportation Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:						
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				X		1-5
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X		1-5
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X		1-5
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (for example, sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (for example, farm equipment)?				X		1-5
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X		1-5
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X		1-5

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-F

The project proposes to extend an existing underground 2,300 feet fiber optic conduit by 460 feet for an approximate total of 2,760 feet. The 2,760 feet foot long fiber optic conduit would connect to an existing transmission pump station and control room located at the water purification center. The project, as proposed, would be underground with access from manholes and pullboxes. For

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

occasional maintenance purposes, maintenance vehicles would use the existing service roads and roadways to access the project area. In addition, project construction would require a temporary staging area north of the water purification center. Construction vehicles would utilize the existing service roads and roadways to access the project site. The project, therefore, would not increase hazards due to a design feature.

The proposed fiber optic conduit would be installed underground and would have no impact on existing air traffic patterns. Implementation of the proposed project would not affect or conflict with any existing policies, plans, or programs relating to circulation, congestion management, public transit, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. As a result, the project would have less than significant transportation impacts. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (Less Than Significant Impact)]**

3.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Utilities and Service Systems Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:						
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X		1
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction or which could cause significant environmental effects?				X		1
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X		1
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X		1
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?				X		1
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?				X		1
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X		1

Impacts Evaluation

Checklist Questions A-G

The proposed fiber optic conduit would increase the reliability of the existing Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility and could potentially support the future economic development of the project area including office R&D and light industrial uses identified in the PMP FEIR.

Section 3.0 –Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

Implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on the existing wastewater services, water supply, and solid waste collection services in the City of San José. The project, therefore, would not affect federal, state, or local regulations on solid waste and wastewater treatment requirements. **[Same Impact as Previously Considered Project (No Impact)]**

3.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Mandatory Findings Environmental Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Previously Considered Project	Less Impact Than Previously Considered Project	Source(s)
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:						
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X		1-5
b) 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 the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.				X		1-5
c) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X		1-5

Checklist Question A – Project Impacts

As discussed in the individual sections of this Initial Study, the proposed project would have no new impacts on aesthetics, agricultural and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, or utilities and service systems beyond what was addressed in the PMP FEIR.

Checklist Question B – Cumulative Considerable Impacts

Under Section 15065(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, a lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the environmental where there is substantial evidence that the project has potential environmental effects “that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.” As defined in Section 15065(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, a lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the environmental where there is substantial evidence that the project has potential environmental effects “that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.” As

Section 3.0 – Environmental Checklist and Impacts Evaluation

defined in Section 15065(a)C(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, cumulatively considerable means “that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.” In addition, under Section 15152(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, where a lead agency has determined that a cumulative effect has been adequately addressed in a prior EIR, the effect is not treated as significant for purposes of later environmental review and need not be discussed in detail.

With implementation of mitigation measures identified in the PMP FEIR, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact on biological and archaeological resources.

The proposed project may require service vehicles to travel to the site for occasional routine maintenance and would result in operational GHG emissions. The limited emissions from occasional visits would not result in a cumulatively considerable GHG emissions impact.

Checklist Question C – Short-term Environmental Goals vs. Long-term Environmental Goals

The project site includes the water purification center and an undeveloped lot on the northern portion and buffer land open space on the rest of the site. The project proposes to extend an existing 2,300 foot fiber optic conduit by 460 feet for an approximate total of 2,760 feet to increase the network speed at RWF. In addition, extension of the existing fiber optic conduit is consistent with the long-term goals for site as identified in the PMP FEIR.

The project would result in temporary air quality, water quality, and noise impacts during construction. It is anticipated that these short-term effects would be substantially off-set by meeting the long-term environmental goals for this site as identified in the PMP FEIR. With implementation of the identified standard permit conditions and compliance with City General Plan policies, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Checklist Question D – Direct or Indirect Adverse Effects on Human Beings

Consistent with Section 15065(a)(4) of the CEQA Guidelines, a lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the environment where there is substantial evidence that the project has the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings (directly or indirectly). Under this standard, a change to the physical environment that might otherwise be minor must be treated as significant if people would be significantly affected. This factor relates to adverse changes to the environment of human beings generally, and not to effects on particular individuals.

While changes to the environment that could indirectly affect human beings would be represented by all of the designated CEQA issue areas, those that could directly affect human beings from the proposed project include air quality, hazardous materials, and water quality. However, implementation of mitigation measures and General Plan policies identified in the PMP FEIR and City standard permit conditions would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. No other direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings have been identified.

Checklist Sources

1. Professional judgment and expertise of the environmental specialists preparing this assessment, based upon a review of the site and surrounding conditions, as well as a review of the project plans.
2. City of San José. *Envision San José 2040 General Plan. Integrated Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Envision San José 2040 General Plan*. November 2011.
3. City of San José. *City of San José, CA Code of Ordinances. San Jose Municipal Code: Title 20 Zoning*. Available at: <<https://sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?nid=1751>>. Accessed October 28, 2015.
4. City of San José. *San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant Master Plan DEIR*. January 2013.
5. City of San José. *San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant Master Plan DEIR First Amendment*. October 2013.

SECTION 4.0 REFERENCES

City of San José. *Envision 2040 General Plan*. November 2011.

City of San José. *Integrated Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Envision San José 2040 General Plan*. June 2011.

City of San José. *City of San José, CA Code of Ordinances. San Jose Municipal Code: Title 20 Zoning*. Accessed October 28, 2015. <<https://sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?nid=1751>>.

City of San José. *San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant Master Plan DEIR*. January 2013.

City of San José. *San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant Master Plan DEIR First Amendment*. October 2013.

SECTION 5.0 AUTHORS AND CONSULTANTS

5.1 LEAD AGENCY

City of San José

Department of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement

Harry Freitas, Director

Meenaxi Pakkal, Planner – Environmental Review

Kieulan Pham, Planner – Environmental Review