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Project Description
The Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes to conduct a scour prevention and railing replacement project on Bridge No. 52-0065 over the San Antonio Creek located on State Route 33 at Post Mile 7.58, south of the City of Ojai, in unincorporated Ventura County.

The purpose of this project is to extend the life and serviceability of the San Antonio Creek bridge.

Determination
Caltrans has prepared a focused Initial Study for this project and following public review and comment, determined that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

- The proposed project would have minimal or no effect on land use, agricultural resources, air quality, hazardous waste, noise, socio-economic features, cultural resources, scenic resources, population and housing, visual aesthetics, utilities/service systems, seismic exposure, open space or parklands and transportation/traffic.
- The proposed project would have a less than significant effect on topography, hydrology/water quality, floodplains and wetlands.
- The proposed project would have a less than significant effect on biological resources with the appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures incorporated.
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Initial Study

1.0 Proposed Project

Project Title
San Antonio Creek Bridge Improvement Project

Lead Agency Name, Address and Contact Person
California Department of Transportation
100 S. Main St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Susan Tse, Associate Environmental Planner
Div. of Environmental Planning, District 7
(213) 897-1821

Project Location
The proposed project site is located on Bridge No. 52-0065 over the San Antonio Creek located on State Route 33, at Post Mile 7.58, south of City of Ojai, in unincorporated Ventura County (Figure 1).

Purpose and Need
A Structure Replacement and Improvement Needs Report, issued in May 2012, identified the San Antonio Creek Bridge in need of scour mitigation and a bridge railing replacement. Improvements from this project will extend the life and serviceability of the San Antonio Creek Bridge.

The purpose of this project is to extend the life and serviceability of the San Antonio Creek bridge.

Description of Project
The existing bridge (Bridge No. 52-0065) is a 2-lane bridge with one 12-feet wide lane in each direction, and 5-feet wide shoulders in each direction.

The scope of work includes the construction of outrigger cast-in-drilled-hole (CIDH) piles at both ends of the four existing pier walls, with girders on top to accommodate the widening of the bridge on the west and east ends. The bridge will be widened by 5 feet in both sides (total of 10 feet). The shoulders of the approach and trail end of the bridge in the northbound and southbound direction, will be constructed and tapered. In the northbound direction, the length of taper will be 25 feet at approach and no taper at the trailing end, in the southbound direction, the length of taper will be 25 feet at approach end and 120 feet at the trailing end. The existing wooden bridge railing will be upgraded with a concrete barrier type 80. The project will also include vegetation removal for equipment access. Trees that are removed, will be replaced at an appropriate replanting ratio after consultation with resource agencies (Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife). Utilities will be temporarily relocated as part of this project, and this includes temporary relocation of two
telephone lines on each side of the bridge and a protect-in-place gas line. Temporary Construction Easements (TCE) will be needed for staging and construction of the project. Please refer to Figures 2-8 for details on these features.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting**
The project setting includes the existing bridge, the SR-33 roadway, and native riparian habitat along the creek. Within the project area the creek has intermittent flow with a natural-bottom, consisting of cobble, gravel, sand, and a few boulders. San Antonio Creek Bridge is located approximately 800 feet east of the confluence of the San Antonio Creek and the Ventura River. There are undeveloped foot paths which connect to both the creek channel and the Ojai Valley Trail, as well as multi-use pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian trail, located approximately 300 feet to the west of the Biological Study Area (BSA). There is also a horse ranch along the north bank of the creek on both sides of the existing bridge, and adjacent to the project area. The majority of the project area is zoned as open space, while adjacent land to the north and east is zoned as rural exclusive and rural agricultural, respectively (County of Ventura, 2016). The topography of the project area is relatively flat, the elevation in the creek channel varies from 324 to 310 feet above mean-sea-level (mls), and the adjacent riparian forest and understory varies from 313 to 330 feet above mls. With the exception of the creek channel bank along the northern boundary on both sides of SR-33, the southern creek bank to the east of SR-33 and the right-of-way along both sides of SR-33.

**Permits and Approvals Needed**
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Section 404 Nationwide Permit
- State Water Quality Control Board (SWQCB), Section 401 Water Quality Certification
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement
- U.S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Section 7 Concurrence Letter
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Section 7 Concurrence Letter

**Zoning**
The majority of the project area is zoned as open space, while the adjacent land to the north and east is zoned as rural exclusive and rural agricultural, respectively (County of Ventura, 2016). There is no right-of-way acquisition required for this project.
Figure 1: Project Vicinity Map
**Figure 2:** Project Plans
Figure 3: San Antonio Creek Bridge Access Road

Figure 4: San Antonio Creek Bridge Access Road
Figure 5: San Antonio Creek Bridge Access Road

Figure 6: San Antonio Creek Bridge- Dry Creek Bed
Figure 7: San Antonio Creek Bridge- Dry Creek Bed
Figure 8: San Antonio Creek Bridge- Wood Railing That Will Be Replaced
2.0 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

2.1 Aesthetics
State Route 33 is designated as a scenic highway. The project includes upgrading the existing wooden bridge railing with a concrete barrier type 80 and removing vegetation for equipment access.

There is no potential for impacts on scenic or visual resources as any trees that are removed as the project site will be re-vegetated at a 2:1 ratio or replanted at an appropriate re-planting ratio based on species per the recommendations from CDFW and USFWS. Direct loss of these plant communities will result in the purchase of mitigation parcels off-site to be preserved in perpetuity, and will be purchased with the guidance of CDFW and USFWS staff.

2.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources
No agricultural or farmland would be converted with the proposed project, therefore there is no potential for impacts to agricultural resources.

2.3 Air Quality
The Air Quality Assessment has determined that the proposed project is deemed listed in Table 2 under the subtitle “safety” and classification “Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes)”. There for pursuant to 40 CFR 93.126, this project is deemed classified and is exempt from the requirements to determine conformity. The proposed project is exempt from Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol. It is a type of project that is not anticipated to involve a significant number or result in an increase in the number of diesel vehicles or increase in vehicle idling therefore it is unlikely to result in adverse impacts to PM 10 and PM2.5. It is not anticipated to cause an increase in Mobile Source Air Toxic (MSAT). The proposed project is located within the boundary of Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) and therefore this project must comply with the VCAPCD Fugitive Dust Rule 55 to minimize temporary emissions during construction of the project as applicable and appropriate.

2.4 Biological Resources
The proposed project may affect, and likely to adversely affect California Red-Legged Frog and its designated critical habitat. The project may affect, not likely to adversely affect the federally listed Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, Least Bell’s Vireo and critical habitat for the Southern California Steelhead. Because this project will be limited to working during the dry season when no surface water is present, there will be no impacts to federally listed fish species. This project has no impact on state listed species.

2.4.1 Regulatory Setting
The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has regulatory responsibility for the protection of special-status plant and animal species. Special-status species are species that have been given varying levels of regulatory protection. In California the highest level of protection is given to Fully Protected (FP) species, while at the federal level the highest level of protection is given to species listed as Threatened or Endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA).
State and Federal laws and regulations pertaining to wildlife include the following:
- California Environmental Quality Act
- National Environmental Policy Act
- Sections 1600-1603 and 2080-2081 of the Fish and Wildlife Code
- Section 4150 and 4152 of the Fish and Wildlife Code
- Section 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act
- Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act
- California Endangered Species Act
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act

2.4.2 Affected Environment

The Natural Environment Study for the proposed project was prepared in January 2017.

The proposed project is located on SR-33 at PM 7.58 where SR-33 crosses San Antonio Creek, in the unincorporated community of Oak View within Ventura County. The existing bridge (Bridge #52-0065) is a 2-lane bridge with one 12-foot wide lane in each direction and 5-foot wide shoulders.

The Biological Study Area (BSA) was defined during development of the project’s Purpose and Need. The BSA is roughly a 500 foot radius buffer in every direction, where access is granted, centered on San Antonio Creek Bridge along SR-33 at PM 7.58. The BSA was determined to take into account the biological resources that surround the project area and the potential impacts from construction related noise and vibration from the proposed project. The total area within the BSA is approximately 8.41 acres.

However, the actual physical project limits, including the permanent and temporary impact areas, extend no more than 80 feet on either the east or west side of San Antonio Creek Bridge. This physical impact area is approximately 1 acre in size.

Physical features within the BSA include the existing bridge, the SR-33 roadway, approximately 500 feet to the north and south of the bridge along both sides of the highway, and undeveloped riparian habitat along the creek. Within the project area the creek has intermittent flow with a natural-bottom, consisting of cobble, gravel, sand, and a few boulders. San Antonio Creek Bridge is located approximately 800 feet east of the confluence of San Antonio Creek and the Ventura River. There are undeveloped foot paths which connect to both the creek channel and the Ojai Valley Trail, a multi-use pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian trail, located approximately 300 feet to the west of the BSA. There is also a horse ranch along the north bank of the creek on both sides of the existing bridge, and adjacent to the project area.

The majority of the project area is zoned as open space, while adjacent land to the north and east is zoned as rural exclusive and rural agricultural, respectively (County of Ventura, 2016). With the exception of the creek channel bank along the northern boundary on both sides of SR-33, the southern creek bank to the east of SR-33 and the right of way along both sides of SR-33, the topography of the project area is relatively flat. The elevation in the creek channel varies from 324 to 310 feet above mean sea level (msl), and adjacent riparian forest and understory varies from 313 to 330 feet above msl.
When studies for this document were initiated, the State of California was in the middle of a severe drought. Because of this, San Antonio Creek, although generally a perennial creek at this location, had not seen typical surface flows during the rainy season. The 2017 winter rains, however, brought above normal surface flows to the creek and created favorable conditions for California red-legged frog. A general survey was conducted in February 2017 to observe site conditions following the winter rains. The survey found that San Antonio Creek was exhibiting flow and the previously existing vegetation within the creek bed prior to the rain was washed downstream.

2.4.3 Regional Species and Habitats of Concern
Regional species and habitats of concern obtained from the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Species List were used to determine species to study for the project (Appendix I). The California Endangered Species Act requires state lead agencies to consult with CDFW during the CEQA process to avoid jeopardy to Threatened or Endangered species. Caltrans has determined that direct impacts to state-listed species from proposed project activities are not anticipated. However, formal consultation is needed for potential impacts to the California red-legged frog, a federally listed species, and its designated critical habitat. Informal consultation is needed for the southwestern willow flycatcher and its designated critical habitat, least Bell’s vireo, and designated habitat for Southern California steelhead. The proposed project may affect and likely to adversely affect California red-legged frog and its critical habitat and may affect, not likely to adversely affect the southwestern willow flycatcher and its critical habitat, least Bell’s vireo, and critical habitat for Southern California steelhead.

Special-Status Species
Special-status plant and animal species that were listed in the CNDDB or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service species list were further studied to determine the potential impacts that the project may have on them and these are discussed below.

Special Status Plant Species
A total of thirty-six (36) special status plant species were identified as being potentially present within the quadrangle and neighboring quadrangles of the BSA. Based upon habitat requirements four (4) of special status plant species were determined to have the potential to occur within the BSA. During focused surveys, no special-status plants were detected. However, a discussion on the four special-status plants that have the potential to occur within the project limits are described below.

California satintail (*Imperata brevifolia*)
Suitable habitat for this species occurs within the BSA. Focused rare plant surveys took place for the proposed project in the spring/summer of 2016 during the known blooming period of this plant species. No individuals of this species were detected during focused surveys.
Robinson’s Pepper-grass (*Lepidium virginicum var. robinsonii*)
Suitable habitat for this species occurs within the BSA. Focused rare plant surveys took place for the proposed project in the spring/summer of 2016 during the known blooming period of this plant species. No individuals of this species were detected during focused surveys.

Hubby’s Phacelia (*Phacelia hubyi*)
Suitable habitat for this species occurs within the BSA. Focused rare plant surveys took place for the proposed project in the spring/summer of 2016 during the known blooming period of this plant species. No individuals of this species were detected during focused surveys.

Salt Spring Checkerbloom (*Sidalcea neomexicana*)
Suitable habitat for this species occurs within the BSA. Focused rare plant surveys took place for the proposed project in the spring/summer of 2016 during the known blooming period of this plant species. No individuals of this species were detected during focused surveys.

**Special Status Animal Species Occurrences**
A total of thirty-two (32) special status animal species were identified as potentially occurring within the quadrangle and neighboring quadrangles of the BSA. Of these, only eight (8) special status animal species were determined to have the potential to occur within the BSA based upon habitat requirements. During focused surveys only one special status animal species, yellow warbler (*Dendroica petechia*), was detected within the BSA. A discussion on the eight special status animals that have the potential to occur within the project limits are discussed below.

**Southern California Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*)**
The life cycle of steelhead generally involves rearing in freshwater for one to three years before migrating to the ocean and spending from one to four years maturing in the marine environment before returning to spawn in freshwater. The ocean phase provides a reproductive advantage because individuals that feed and mature in the ocean grow substantially larger than freshwater residents, and larger females produce proportionately more eggs; however, the freshwater phase provides protected rearing environment, relatively free of competition and predators. This life history strategy is referred to as “fluvial-anadromous”. Out-migration to the ocean (i.e., emigration) usually occurs in the late winter and spring. In some watersheds, juveniles may rear in a lagoon or estuary for several weeks or months prior to entering the ocean. The timing of emigration is influenced by a variety of factors such as photoperiod, streamflow, temperature, and breaching of the sandbar at the river’s mouth. These out-migrating juveniles, termed smolts, live and grow to maturity in the ocean for two to four years before returning to freshwater to reproduce (NMFS 2011).

Steelhead trout are unique in their ability to spawn more than once before they die. The Southern California Steelhead distribution range stretches from the Santa Maria River at its north most extent to San Mateo Creek in San Diego County. Southern California Steelhead likely have great physiological tolerances to warmer water and more variable conditions. Federal listing refers to populations from Santa Maria River, South to the Southern extent of its range from San Mateo Creek in San Diego County (CNDDB).
Migration and life history patterns of Southern California steelhead depend more strongly on rainfall and stream flow than is the case for steelhead populations farther north. River entry ranges from early November through June, with peaks in January and February. Spawning primarily begins in January and continues through early June, with peak spawning in February and March. Average rainfall is substantially lower and more variable in the Southern California Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESU) than in regions to the north, resulting in increased duration of sand berms across the mouths of streams and rivers and, in some cases, complete dewatering of the marginal habitats.

**California Red-legged Frog** (*Rana draytonii*)

California red-legged frog (CRLF) is listed as threatened under ESA and designated by CDFW as a species of special concern. This subspecies of red-legged frog occurs from sea level to elevations of about 1,500 meters (5,200 feet). Nearly all sightings have occurred below 1,050 meters (3,500 feet) (Natural Diversity Database 2001). It has been extirpated from 70 percent of its former range and now is found primarily in coastal drainages of central California, from Marin County, California, south to northern Baja California, Mexico. Potential threats to the species include elimination or degradation of habitat from land development and land use activities and habitat invasion by non-native aquatic species.

The CRLF requires a variety of habitat elements with aquatic breeding areas embedded within a matrix of riparian and upland dispersal habitats. Breeding sites of the CRLF are in aquatic habitats including pools and backwaters within streams and creeks, ponds, marshes, springs, sag ponds, dune ponds, and lagoons. Additionally, CRLF frequently breed in artificial impoundments such as stock ponds (USFWS 2002).

CRLF are primarily pond frogs, but they also inhabit marshes, streams, and lagoons during the breeding season. During other parts of the year, some frogs remain at breeding sites while others disperse to other areas. Non-breeding habitat includes nearly any area within 1.2-1.8 miles (2–3 km) of a breeding site that stays moist and cool through the summer. This includes coyote bush and California blackberry thickets, and root masses associated with willow and California bay trees (CNDDB).

**Western Pond Turtle** (*Emys marmorata*)

Western pond turtles are designated as a species of special concern by CDFW, but are not listed under ESA or CESA. They are often found in slow-moving waterways where movement to upland habitat and presence of basking sites is necessary. Upland habitat is necessary as that is where egg laying occurs. They also burrow underground over winter. Basking occurs in the warmer months on logs and boulders. They are aquatic and require a perennial water source for breeding. Their carapace is dark brown to olive colored, with a lack of prominent markings.

**Two-striped Gartersnake** (*Thamnophis hammondii*)

The two-striped gartersnake is designated as a species of special concern by CDFW and Sensitive (S) by USFS, but is not listed under ESA or CESA. This species is aquatic in nature and typically resides in areas of permanent or semi-permanent water with vegetative cover. Suitable habitat for this species occurs within the BSA and marginal habitat occurs within the project limits.
Discussion of Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo (Coccyzus americanus occidentalis)
This species is designated as federally threatened under ESA and is state endangered under CESA. Western yellow-billed cuckoos prefer dense riparian thickets that require 50 acres for breeding and foraging (USFWS 2014) with low-level foliage near slow-moving water sources.

Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus)
This species is listed as federally endangered under ESA and state endangered under CESA. This species typically resides and breeds within dense riparian vegetation, occurring along streams often dominated by willows equal to or greater than 10 feet tall.

Yellow Warbler (Setophaga petechia)
The yellow warbler is designated as a species of special concern by CDFW but is not listed under ESA or CESA. This species prefers riparian woodland or forests dominated by cottonwoods and willows. Nesting habitat for this species must contain dense understory vegetation.

Least Bell’s Vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus)
The least Bell’s vireo is listed under both ESA and CESA as endangered and is protected under the MBTA. This species typically resides and breeds within shrubby riparian vegetation, often dominated by willows. Marginal foraging and nesting habitat for this species occurs within the BSA.

2.4.4 Project Impacts
California satintail (Imperata brevifolia), Robinson’s Pepper-grass (Lepidium virginicum var. robinsonii), Hubby’s Phacelia (Phacelia hubbyi) Salt Spring Checkerbloom (Sidalcea neomexicana) and Salt Spring Checkerbloom (Sidalcea neomexicana) were not detected within the BSA, therefore no impacts to individuals of these plant species are expected to occur with the implementation of the proposed project.

Southern California Steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus)
This project is not expected to impact individuals of this species since work will be limited to the dry season when San Antonio Creek has no surface flow.

Designated critical habitat for this species will be temporarily impacted by the implementation of the proposed project.

California Red-legged Frog (Rana draytonii)
This project is not expected to impact individuals of this species since work will be limited to the dry season when San Antonio Creek has no surface flow. Designated critical habitat for this species will be temporarily impacted by the implementation of the proposed project.

Western Pond Turtle (Emys marmorata)
This project is not expected to impact individuals of this species since work will be limited to the dry season when San Antonio Creek has no surface flow.
Two-striped Gartersnake (*Thamnophis hammondii*)
This project is not expected to impact individuals of this species since work will be limited to the dry season when San Antonio Creek has no surface flow.

Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*)
The implementation of the proposed project has the potential to impact this species during the construction phase of this project. Because this species has the ability to fly away, direct impacts to individual adults are not expected during the construction phase of this project. Potential exists for impacts to nesting birds should they be present. With the implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures stated described in Section 2.4.6 *Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures*, impacts to this species will be minimized.

Temporal impacts to this species foraging habitat are expected to occur with the implementation of the proposed project.

Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*)
The implementation of the proposed project has the potential to impact this species during the construction phase of this project. Because this species has the ability to fly away, direct impacts to individual adults are not expected during the construction phase of this project. Potential exists for impacts to nesting birds should they be present. With the implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described in Section 2.4.6 *Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures*, impacts to this species will be minimized.

The project limits are located within designated critical habitat for this species and due to the project scope, the project will temporarily impact this species foraging habitat.

Yellow Warbler (*Setophaga petechia*)
The implementation of the proposed project has the potential to impact this species during the construction phase of this project. Because this species has the ability to fly away, direct impacts to individual adults are not expected during the construction phase of this project. Potential exists for impacts to nesting birds should they be present. With the implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described in Section 2.4.6 *Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures*, impacts to this species will be minimized.

Temporal impacts to this species foraging habitat are expected to occur with the implementation of the proposed project.

Least Bell’s Vireo (*Vireo Bellii Pusillus*)
The implementation of the proposed project has the potential to impact this species during the construction phase of this project. Because this species has the ability to fly away, direct impacts to individual adults are not expected during the construction phase of this project. Potential exists for impacts to nesting birds should they be present. With the implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures on described in Section 2.4.6 *Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures*, impacts to this species will be minimized.
Temporal impacts to this species foraging habitat are expected to occur with the implementation of the proposed project.

2.4.5 Cumulative Effects

**California satintail (Imperata brevifolia)**
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this plant species.

**Robinson’s Pepper-grass (Lepidium virginicum var. robinsonii),**
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this plant species.

**Hubby’s Phacelia (Phacelia hubyi)**
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this plant species.

**Salt Spring Checkerbloom (Sidalcea neomexicana)**
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this plant species.

**Southern California Steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus)**
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this species.

**California Red-legged Frog (Rana draytonii)**
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this species.

**Western Pond Turtle (Emys marmorata)**
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this animal.

**Two-striped Gartersnake (Thamnophis hammondii)**
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this species.
Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*)
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this species.

Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*)
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this species.

Yellow Warbler (*Setophaga petechia*)
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this species.

Least Bell’s Vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*)
Future capacity increasing projects are not proposed at this time within the general vicinity. The only reasonable foreseeable projects are maintenance related, with no long-term impacts to this species.

2.4.6 Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures

California satintail
It should be noted that surveys occurred within a drought year; therefore, surveys shall be conducted prior to construction to determine presence. Should pre-construction surveys determine presence of this species, a qualified biologist will establish ESA fencing surrounding the areas where individuals of this plant species are found. If impacts cannot be avoided, individual specimens of this species shall be collected and propagated at preapproved nurseries and replanted onsite, whenever possible.

Hubby’s Phacelia
It should be noted that surveys occurred within a drought year; therefore, surveys shall be conducted prior to construction to determine presence. Should pre-construction surveys determine presence of this species, a qualified biologist will establish ESA fencing surrounding the areas where individuals of this plant species are found. If impacts cannot be avoided, individual specimens of this species shall be collected and propagated at preapproved nurseries and replanted onsite, whenever possible.

Salt Spring Checkerbloom
It should be noted that surveys occurred within a drought year; therefore, surveys shall be conducted prior to construction to determine presence. Should pre-construction surveys determine presence of this species, a qualified biologist will establish ESA fencing surrounding the areas where individuals of this plant species are found. If impacts cannot be avoided, individual specimens of this species shall be collected and propagated at preapproved nurseries and replanted onsite, whenever possible.
Southern California Steelhead
In order to avoid impacts to this species and its habitat, work will be limited to the dry season where there is no surface flow and construction equipment within the channel of San Antonio Creek will be minimized to the maximum extent feasible.

California Red-legged Frog (CRLF)
1. In order to avoid impacts to this species and its habitat, work will be limited to the dry season when no surface flow is present and construction equipment within the channel of San Antonio Creek will be minimized to the maximum extent feasible.

2. A biologist with experience in the identification of all life states of the California red-legged frog, and its critical habitat, will survey the project site no more than 48 hours before the onset of work activities. If any life stage of the California red-legged frog is detected the Service will be notified prior to the start of construction. If Caltrans and USFWS determine that adverse effects to the California red-legged frog or its critical habitat cannot be avoided, the proposed project will not commence until Caltrans completes the appropriate level of consultation with USFWS.

3. Work activities will take place during the dry season, between April 1 and November 1, when water levels are at their lowest, and California red-legged frogs are likely to be more detectable.

4. Before work begins, a biologist with experience in the ecology of the California red-legged frog, as well as the identification of all its life stages, will conduct a training session for all construction personnel, which will include a description of the California red-legged frog, its critical habitat, and specific measures that are being implemented to avoid adverse effects to the subspecies during the proposed project.

5. During project activities, all trash that may attract predators will be properly contained, removed from the work site, and disposed of regularly. Following construction, all trash and construction debris will be removed from work areas.

6. Prior to the onset of work, Caltrans will ensure that a plan is in place for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills. All workers will be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to implement should a spill occur.

7. All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles will occur at least 60 feet from aquatic or riparian habitat and not in a location from where a spill would drain directly toward aquatic habitat. The monitor will ensure contamination of aquatic or riparian habitat does not occur during such operations by implementing the spill response plan described in the previous measure.
8. Plants used in re-vegetation will consist of native riparian that is suitable for the area. Locally collected plant materials will be used to the extent practicable. Invasive, exotic plants will be controlled to the maximum extent practicable. This measure will be implemented in all areas disturbed by activities associated with the project, unless Caltrans and USFWS determine that it is not feasible or practical.

9. Habitat contours will be returned to their original configuration at the end of project activities in all areas that have been temporarily disturbed by activities associated with the project, unless Caltrans and USFWS determine that it is not feasible or modification of original contours would benefit the California red-legged frog.

10. The number of access routes, size of staging areas, and the total area of the activity will be limited to the minimum necessary to achieve the project goals. Environmentally Sensitive Areas will be delineated to confine access routes and construction areas to the minimum area necessary to complete construction, and minimize the impact to habitat for the California red-legged frog; this goal includes locating access routes and construction areas outside of aquatic habitat and riparian areas to the maximum extent practicable.

11. To control sedimentation during and after project implementation, Caltrans will implement best management practices outlined in any authorizations or permits, issued under the authorities of the Clean Water Act that it receives for this project.

**Western Pond Turtle**
In order to avoid impacts to this species and its habitat, work will be limited to the dry season when no surface flow is present and construction equipment within the channel of San Antonio Creek will be minimized to the extent feasible.

**Two-striped Gartersnake**
In order to avoid impacts to this species and its habitat, work will be limited to the dry season where there is no surface flow and construction equipment within the channel of San Antonio Creek will be minimized to the extent feasible.

**Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo (YBCU)**
This species has the potential to occur during the construction phase of this project and therefore the following avoidance and minimization measures should be implemented:

1. A qualified biologist will recommend approved limits of disturbance, including construction staging areas and access routes, to minimize impacts to adjacent habitat. To ensure the avoidance of impacts to migratory birds, the following measures will be implemented pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Clearing and grubbing of vegetation will be conducted outside of bird-nesting season. If clearing and grubbing of vegetation needs to be conducted during bird-
nesting season (February 15th to September 1st), a qualified biologist will monitor construction during clearing, grading and/or trenching activities for any occurrence of birds nesting. In the event active nests are found, construction shall stop until it is determined that the fledglings have left their nests. If this is not possible, coordination with the a qualified biologist should take place in order to minimize the risk of violating the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the following minimization measure put in place: an ESA fencing buffer of 150 ft. for songbirds, and 500 ft. for raptors which must be maintained during all phases of construction.

2. A biological monitor shall be present a minimum of one week prior to clearing and grubbing activities in order to survey the proposed areas to be cleared and grubbed and dispel animals that have the ability to flee.

3. An approved avian biologist will monitor all work within riparian areas. This biologist will monitor clearing and grubbing activities and will designate approved work areas and demarcate the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) with obvious, orange ESA exclusion fencing to avoid impacts to potential special-status bird species habitat. This measure applies to all work activities in or around riparian vegetation.

4. Standard BMPs will be implemented by Caltrans to protect ecologically important resources in the construction zone. General stormwater BMPs and conservation measures would be implemented during project construction to avoid any potential for downstream sedimentation effects on all riparian habitat. The BMPs of the storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) will be designed to avoid potential indirect effects to all riparian habitat.

5. Prior to the initiation of construction activities, all project personnel will be educated regarding YBCU and its habitat within and adjacent to the project area and will be provided with an information handout with photos of YBCU, species description, avoidance, minimization measures, Caltrans biologist’s contact information and the environmental commitments. Construction personnel are to remain outside of riparian habitat, unless within the approved work area.

6. In compliance with EO 13112, a weed abatement program will be developed to minimize the importation of nonnative plant material during and after construction to avoid impacts to riparian vegetation downstream. Eradication strategies would be employed should an invasion occur.

7. All riparian habitat that is either permanently or temporarily impacted by the implementation of the proposed project will be replanted at a 2:1 or 1:1 ratio, respectively.

**Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (SWWF)**

This species has the potential to occur during the construction phase of this project and therefore the following avoidance and minimization measures should be implemented:
1. A qualified biologist will recommend approved limits of disturbance, including construction staging areas and access routes, to minimize impacts to adjacent habitat. To ensure the avoidance of impacts to migratory birds, the following measures will be implemented pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Clearing and grubbing of vegetation will be conducted outside of bird-nesting season. If clearing and grubbing of vegetation needs to be conducted during bird-nesting season (February 15th to September 1st), a qualified biologist will monitor construction during clearing, grading and/or trenching activities for any occurrence of birds nesting. If in the event birds are observed nesting, construction should stop until it is determined that the fledglings have left their nests. If this is not possible, coordination with the a qualified biologist should take place in order to minimize the risk of violating the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the following minimization measure put in place: an ESA fencing buffer of 150 ft. for songbirds, and 500 ft. for raptors which must be maintained during all phases of construction.

2. A biological monitor shall be present a minimum of one week prior to clearing and grubbing activities in order to survey the proposed areas to be cleared and grubbed and dispel animals that have the ability to flee.

3. An approved avian biologist will monitor all work within riparian areas. This biologist will monitor clearing and grubbing activities and will designate approved work areas and demarcate the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) with obvious, orange ESA exclusion fencing to avoid impacts to potential special-status bird species habitat. This measure applies to all work activities in or around riparian vegetation.

4. Standard BMPs will be implemented by Caltrans to protect ecologically important resources in the construction zone. General stormwater BMPs and conservation measures would be implemented during project construction to avoid any potential for downstream sedimentation effects on all riparian habitat. The BMPs of the storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) will be designed to avoid potential indirect effects to all riparian habitat.

5. Prior to the initiation of construction activities, all project personnel will be educated regarding SWWF and its habitat within and adjacent to the project area and will be provided with an information handout with photos of SWWF, species description, avoidance, minimization measures, Caltrans biologist’s contact information and the environmental commitments. Construction personnel are to remain outside of riparian habitat, unless within the approved work area.

6. In compliance with EO 13112, a weed abatement program will be developed to minimize the importation of nonnative plant material during and after construction to avoid impacts to riparian vegetation downstream. Eradication strategies would be employed should an invasion occur.
7. All riparian habitat that is either permanently or temporarily impacted by the implementation of the proposed project will be replanted at a 2:1 or 1:1 ratio, respectively.

Yellow Warbler
This species has the potential to occur during the construction phase of this project and therefore the following avoidance and minimization measures should be implemented:

1. A qualified biologist will recommend approved limits of disturbance, including construction staging areas and access routes, to minimize impacts to adjacent habitat. To ensure the avoidance of impacts to migratory birds, the following measures will be implemented pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Clearing and grubbing of vegetation will be conducted outside of bird-nesting season. If clearing and grubbing of vegetation needs to be conducted during bird-nesting season (February 15th to September 1st), a qualified biologist will monitor construction during clearing, grading and/or trenching activities for any occurrence of birds nesting. In the event birds are observed nesting, construction should stop until it is determined that the fledglings have left their nests. If this is not possible, coordination with the a qualified biologist should take place in order to minimize the risk of violating the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the following minimization measure put in place: an ESA fencing buffer of 150 ft. for songbirds, and 500 ft. for raptors which must be maintained during all phases of construction.

2. A biological monitor shall be present a minimum of one week prior to clearing and grubbing activities in order to survey the proposed areas to be cleared and grubbed and dispel animals that have the ability to flee.

3. An approved avian biologist will monitor all work within riparian areas. This biologist will monitor clearing and grubbing activities and will designate approved work areas and demarcate the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) with obvious, orange ESA exclusion fencing to avoid impacts to potential special-status bird species habitat. This measure applies to all work activities in or around riparian vegetation.

4. Standard BMPs will be implemented by Caltrans to protect ecologically important resources in the construction zone. General stormwater BMPs and conservation measures would be implemented during project construction to avoid any potential for downstream sedimentation effects on all riparian habitat. The BMPs of the storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) will be designed to avoid potential indirect effects to all riparian habitat.

5. Prior to the initiation of construction activities, all project personnel will be educated regarding yellow warbler and its habitat within and adjacent to the project area and will be provided with an information handout with photos of yellow warbler, species description, avoidance, minimization measures, Caltrans biologist’s contact
information and the environmental commitments. Construction personnel are to remain outside of riparian habitat, unless within the approved work area.

6. In compliance with EO 13112, a weed abatement program will be developed to minimize the importation of nonnative plant material during and after construction to avoid impacts to riparian vegetation downstream. Eradication strategies would be employed should an invasion occur.

7. All riparian habitat that is either permanently or temporarily impacted by the implementation of the proposed project will be replanted at a 2:1 or 1:1 ratio, respectively.

Least Bell’s Vireo (LBVI)
This species has the potential to occur during the construction phase of this project and therefore the following avoidance and minimization measures should be implemented:

1. A qualified biologist will recommend approved limits of disturbance, including construction staging areas and access routes, to minimize impacts to adjacent habitat. To ensure the avoidance of impacts to migratory birds, the following measures will be implemented pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Clearing and grubbing of vegetation will be conducted outside of bird-nesting season. If clearing and grubbing of vegetation needs to be conducted during bird-nesting season (February 15th to September 1st), a qualified biologist will monitor construction during clearing, grading and/or trenching activities for any occurrence of birds nesting. In the event birds are observed nesting, construction should stop until it is determined that the fledglings have left their nests. If this is not possible, coordination with the qualified biologist should take place in order to minimize the risk of violating the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the following minimization measure put in place: an ESA fencing buffer of 150 ft. for songbirds, and 500 ft. for raptors which must be maintained during all phases of construction.

2. A biological monitor shall be present a minimum of one week prior to clearing and grubbing activities in order to survey the proposed areas to be cleared and grubbed and dispel animals that have the ability to flee.

3. An approved avian biologist will monitor all work within riparian areas. This biologist will monitor clearing and grubbing activities and will designate approved work areas and demarcate the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) with obvious, orange ESA exclusion fencing to avoid impacts to potential special-status bird species habitat. This measure applies to all work activities in or around riparian vegetation.

4. Standard BMPs will be implemented by Caltrans to protect ecologically important resources in the construction zone. General stormwater BMPs and conservation measures would be implemented during project construction to avoid any potential for downstream sedimentation effects on all riparian habitat. The BMPs of the storm
water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) will be designed to avoid potential indirect effects to all riparian habitat.

5. Prior to the initiation of construction activities, all project personnel will be educated regarding LBVI and its habitat within and adjacent to the project area and will be provided with an information handout with photos of LBVI, species description, avoidance, minimization measures, Caltrans biologist’s contact information and the environmental commitments. Construction personnel are to remain outside of riparian habitat, unless within the approved work area.

6. In compliance with EO 13112, a weed abatement program will be developed to minimize the importation of nonnative plant material during and after construction to avoid impacts to riparian vegetation downstream. Eradication strategies would be employed should an invasion occur.

7. All riparian habitat that is either permanently or temporarily impacted by the implementation of the proposed project will be replanted at a 2:1 or 1:1 ratio, respectively.

2.5 Cultural Resources
The project has no potential to affect historic properties listed for or listed in the National Register or Historic Places, and is exempt from further review pursuant to the Section 106 PA Stipulation VII and Attachment 2. Section 106 compliance process, CEQA cultural resources component, and PRC 5024 compliance are complete.

2.6 Geology and Soils.
The job site is located within several California Geological Survey (CGS) designated Earthquake Fault Zone (EFZ). Since no known fault crosses the job site, the potential for ground rupture at this site due to fault movement is negligible.

The groundwater table is assumed to be at the ground surface at the location. USGS Matilija Quadrangle Map dated April 17, 2003 indicate that the location is a potential liquefiable site. The project however, will not induce liquidation.

2.7 Green House Gas Emissions
While Caltrans has included this good faith effort in order to provide the public and decision-makers as much information as possible about the project, it is Caltrans determination that in the absence of further regulatory or scientific information related to GHG emissions and CEQA significance, it is too speculative to make a significance determination regarding the project’s direct and indirect impact with respect to climate change. Caltrans does remain firmly committed to implementing measures to help reduce the potential effects of the project.

2.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
There is no potential for impacts on hazards and hazardous materials as there are no active hazardous waste site or source of hazardous waste contamination within 1000 feet radius of the project area. The closest oil well is approximately 2,200 feet from the project site. Because of the
proximity of the site near current or abandoned oil wells in the area, it is reasonable to assume the possibility that the proposed CIDH piles may encounter naturally occurring petroleum hydrocarbon and hydrogen sulfide. A site investigation will be needed in the Plans, Specification and Estimation (PS&E) phase. Ground water will also need to be tested during the PS&E phase to obtain information required by the NPDES permit. Special provisions will also need to be applied to address Treated Wood Waste handling, storage, transportation and disposal and a Lead Compliance Plan will be needed to handle disposal of the yellow strips during the PS&E phase.

2.9 Hydrology and Water Quality
The analysis of the Hydraulic Model (SRH-2D) computed water surface and showed that there were no significant changes in the Water Surface Elevation (WSEL) due to the widening of the existing bridge. Therefore the widening of the existing bridge will have no impact to the San Antonio Creek waterway.

2.10 Land Use and Planning
The project has no potential for impacts on land use and planning. No new right-of-way will need to be acquired as part of this project. A flier describing the project was sent on September 14, 2016 to affected individuals and agencies and no comments were received (See Appendix II).

2.11 Mineral Resources
There is no potential for impacts on mineral resources based on project research.

2.12 Noise
Based on the scope of the project, this project is not considered a Type I project as defined by 23 CFR 772. Therefore, no further study is required and the “No Impact” determinations would apply.

2.13 Populations and Housing
There is no potential for impacts on population and housing based on the scope and location of the project. No relocations or displacements will occur with this project. A flier describing the project was sent on September 14, 2016 to affected individuals and agencies and no comments were received (See Appendix II).

2.14 Public Services
The proposed project may result in changes to response times on SR-33. There will be a temporary lane closure within the project limits, however, through traffic will be maintained.

2.15 Recreation
The project would not include public recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The project does not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such as substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. There is a private horse ranch which provides recreational activities to a local girls scout troupe, however, construction noise would be temporary and the project team would work with the ranch to minimize noise impacts. A flier describing the project was sent to the affected individuals and agencies were sent on September 14, 2016. The flier described the project was sent to affected
individuals and agencies and no comments were received (See Appendix II). No comments or inquiries were received.

2.16 Transportation/ Traffic
There is no potential for impacts on traffic and transportation. This project does not increase the number of through lanes. There will be a temporary lane closure during construction however, through traffic will be maintained.

2.17 Tribal Cultural Resources
The project has no potential to affect historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

2.18 Utilities and Services
There are no significant impacts to utility and service system.

2.19 Mandatory Findings of Significance
Based on our review and analysis, the San Antonio Creek Bridge Improvement Project does not 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. The proposed project would have minimal or no effect on land use, agricultural resources, air quality, hazardous waste, noise, socio-economic features, cultural resources, scenic resources, population and housing, visual aesthetics, utilities/ service systems, seismic exposure, open space or parklands and transportation/ traffic. The proposed project would have a less than significant effect on topography, hydrology/ water quality, floodplains and wetlands. The proposed project would have a less than significant effect on biological resources with the appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures incorporated.
This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

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) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality 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? □ □ □ ☒

State Route 33 is designated as a scenic highway. The project includes upgrading the existing wooden bridge railing with a concrete barrier type 80 and removing vegetation for equipment access.

There is no potential for impacts on scenic or visual resources as any trees that are removed as the project site will be re-vegetated at a 2:1 ratio or replant at an appropriate re-planting ratio based on species based on the recommendations from CDFW and USFWS. Direct loss of these plant communities will result in the purchase of mitigation parcels off-site to be preserved in perpetuity, and will be purchased with the guidance of CDFW and USFWS staff.
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause re zoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No agricultural or farmland would be converted with the proposed project, therefore there is no potential for impacts to agricultural resources.

III. 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>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</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) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Air Quality Assessment has determined that the proposed project is deemed listed in Table 2 under the subtitle “safety” and classification “Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes)”. There for pursuant to 40 CFR 93.126, this project is deemed classified and is exempt from the requirements to determine conformity. The proposed project is exempt from Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol. It is a type of project that is not anticipated to involve a significant number or result in an increase in the number of diesel vehicles or increase in vehicle idling therefore it is unlikely to result in adverse impacts to PM 10 and PM2.5. It is not anticipated to cause an increase in Mobile Source Air Toxic (MSAT). The proposed project is located within the boundary of Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) and therefore this project must comply with the VCAPCD Fugitive Dust Rule 55 to minimize temporary emissions during construction of the project as applicable and appropriate.

IV. 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?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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?

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?
The proposed project may affect, and likely to adversely affect California Red-Legged Frog and its designated critical habitat. The project may affect, not likely to adversely affect the federally listed Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, Least Bell's Vireo and critical habitat for the Southern California Steelhead. Because this project will be limited to working during the dry season when no surface water is present, there will be no impacts to federally listed fish species. This project has no impact on state listed species.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: 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) 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) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project has no potential to affect historic properties listed for or listed in the National Register or Historic Places, and is exempt from further review pursuant to the Section 106 PA Stipulation VII and Attachment 2. Section 106 compliance process, CEQA cultural resources component, and PRC 5024 compliance are complete.

VI. 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>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

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?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

The job site is located within several California Geological Survey (CGS) designated Earthquake Fault Zone (EFZ). Since no known fault crosses the job site, the potential for ground rupture at this site due to fault movement is negligible.

The groundwater table is assumed to be at the ground surface at the location. USGS Matilija Quadrangle Map dated April 17, 2003 indicate that the location is a potential liquefiable site. The project, however, will not induce liquidation.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

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

NO

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

NO

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant Impact Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

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?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

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?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

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?

*There is no potential for impacts on hazards and hazardous materials as there are no active hazardous waste site or source of hazardous waste contamination within 1000 feet radius of the project area. The closest oil well is approximately 2,200 feet from the project site. Because of the proximity of the site near current or abandoned oil wells in the area, it is reasonable to assume the possibility that the proposed CIDH piles may encounter naturally occurring petroleum hydrocarbon and hydrogen sulfide. A site investigation will be needed in the Plans, Specification and Estimation (PS&E) phase. Ground water will also need to be tested during the PS&E phase to obtain information required by the NPDES permit. Special provisions will also need to be applied to address Treated Wood Waste handling, storage, transportation and disposal and a Lead Compliance Plan will be needed to handle disposal of the yellow strips during the PS&E phase.*

### IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of the Hydraulic Model (SRH-2D) computed water surface and showed that there were no significant changes in the Water Surface Elevation (WSEL) due to the widening of the existing bridge. Therefore the widening of the existing bridge will have no impact to the San Antonio Creek waterway.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project has no potential for impacts on land use and planning. No new right-of-way will need to be acquired as part of this project. A flier describing the project was sent on September 14, 2016 to affected individuals and agencies and no comments were received (See Appendix II).

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</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) 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>
<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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no potential for impacts on mineral resources based on project research.

XII. 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
1) 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? ☒

*Based on the scope of the project, this project is not considered a Type I project as defined by 23 CFR 772. Therefore, no further study is required and the “No Impact” determinations would apply.*

### XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is no potential for impacts on population and housing based on the scope and location of the project. No relocations or displacements will occur with this project. A flier describing the project was sent on September 14, 2016 to affected individuals and agencies and no comments were received (See Appendix II).*

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒
- Other public facilities? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒
The proposed project may result in changes to response times on SR-33. There will be a temporary lane closure within the project limits, however, through traffic will be maintained.

XV. RECREATION:

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? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

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 would not include public recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The project does not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such as substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. There is a private horse ranch which provides recreational activities to a local girls scout troupe, however, construction noise would be temporary and the project team would work with the ranch to minimize noise impacts. A flier describing the project was sent to the affected individuals and agencies were sent on September 14, 2016. The flier described the project was sent to affected individuals and agencies and no comments were received (See Appendix II). No comments or inquiries were received.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: 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>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

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

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

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? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
There is no potential for impacts on traffic and transportation. This project does not increase the number of through lanes. There will be a temporary lane closure during construction however, through traffic will be maintained.

2.17 Tribal Cultural Resources

XVII. 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:

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.

The project has no potential to affect historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
There are no significant impacts to utility and service system.

**XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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?

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [x]
- [ ]

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)?

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [x]

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

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [x]
4.0 Consultation
Early coordination phone conferences occurred between Caltrans and resource agencies such as U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The purpose of this coordination was to provide agency personnel with the latest project design information, proposed surveys and protocol, and impact analysis.

On 3/22/16 Caltrans biologist spoke with CDFW representative Jamie Jackson regarding the project and the potential impacts to species within the project limits. Appropriate focused surveys that should be conducted were discussed.

On 3/24/16 Caltrans biologist Andrew Johnstone spoke with Mark Elvin of USFWS regarding the project and the potential impacts to species within the project limits. Further coordination with Mark Elvin resulted in guidance towards survey needs.

On 9/12/16, an informational fact sheet of the proposed project was sent to the following resource agencies: CDFW, USFWS, and RWQCB.

On 11/21/16 Caltrans biologist Andrew Johnstone spoke with Mark Elvin of USFWS regarding effects determinations towards listed species that may have the potential of occurring within the project limits.

Also, see United States Fish and Wildlife Service, February 6, 2016 (Appendix III) and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, February 15, 2016 (Appendix IV)
5.0 List of Preparers

The following Caltrans District 7 staff contributed to the preparation of this Initial Study:

Ron Kosinski, Deputy District Director, Environmental Planning
Garrett Damrath, Office Chief, Environmental Planning
Ed Aguilar, Branch Chief, Environmental Planning
Susan Tse, Associate Environmental Planner-Preparer
Cesar Moreno, Associate Environmental Planner- Reviewer
Andrew Johnstone, Associate Biologist
Jia-Lung Yu, Project Manager
Mansoor Khan, Design Manager
Fred Dastmalchi, Hydraulics Engineer
Victor Ponce, Design Engineer
Nathan Chou, Hazardous Waste Engineer
Caprice Harper, Cultural Specialist
Dr. Ngar Kok James Lee, Transportation Engineer
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