## REVISED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation, does hereby prepare, declare, and publish this Mitigated Negative Declaration for the following described project:

Rio Linda Blvd Bridge Replacement Project (T15095200) - The project consists of replacing the Ria Linda Bridge; realigning Magpie Creek to allow for realigning Main Ave within the City's existing right-of-way to intersect with Rio Linda Blvd at a right angle; constructing left and right turn lanes from Main Ave onto Rio Linda Blvd, new crosswalks, access to the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail, and installation of a traffic signal. One through lane will be provided in each direction along Rio Linda Blvd with an additional receiving lane to accommodate the required dual left turns from Main Ave. The Rio Linda Blvd roadway profile will be raised slightly to provide the required hydraulic clearance.

The Rio Linda Blvd Bridge widening will require the overhead utilities along Main Ave and Rio Linda Blvd to be relocated. The water line currently attached to the barrier of the existing bridge will be relocated under the new Magpie Creek alignment. The existing Northern Sacramento Bike Trail Bridge over Magpie Creek will be removed and realigned due to the creek realignment and will connect with the new structure across Rio Linda Blvd. To allow equipment to access the project site, vegetation would be removed within the footprint of the proposed bridge. Traffic along both Main Ave and Rio Linda Blvd will be maintained during construction, Access to the adjacent businesses will be accommodated and remain open during construction. Removal of the existing bridge will require a portion of the new bridge to be constructed and traffic shifted over. The realignment of Magpie Creek will require a small portion of right-of-way acquisition on the east side of Rio Linda Blvd.

The project is located in the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, California. The existing bridge crosses Magpie Creek just south of the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue.

The Lead Agency is the City of Sacramento, The City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, has reviewed the proposed project and, on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project, with mitigation measures as identified in the attached Initial Study, will have a significant effect on the environment. This Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis. An Environmental Impact Report is not required pursuant to the Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Sections 21000, et seq., Public Resources Code of the State of California).

This Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.), CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq of the California Code of Regulations), the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento, and the Sacramento City Code. The public review period is June 13, 2013 to July 15, 2013. The attached Initial Study includes an appendix that includes written comments received during the public review period, and responses.

A copy of this document and all supportive documentation may be reviewed or obtained at the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, $3^{\text {rd }}$ Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (or 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with prior arrangement). The document is also available on the CDD website at: http:///www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/planning/environmental-review/eirs!


# Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project T15095200 

## INITIAL STUDYI MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR ANTICIPATED SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR

This Initial Study has been prepared by the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.), CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Section 15000 et seq. of the California Code of Regulations) and the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento.

## Organization of the Initial Study

This Initial Study is organized into the following sections:
SECTION I-BACKGROUND: Provides summary background information about the project name, location, sponsor, and the date this Initial Study was completed.

SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Includes a detailed description of the proposed project.

SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION: Reviews proposed project and states whether the project would have additional significant environmental effects (projectspecific effects) that were not evaluated in the Master EIR for the 2030 General Plan.

SECTION IV - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: Identifies which environmental factors were determined to have additional significant environmental effects.

SECTION V - DETERMINATION: States whether environmental effects associated with development of the proposed project are significant, and what, if any, added environmental documentation may be required.

REFERENCES CITED: Identifies source materials that have been consulted in the preparation of the Initial Study.

## Section I-Background

| Project Name and File Number: | Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Location: | The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement project is located in the City of Sacramento, California. The existing bridge crosses Magpie Creek just south of the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue. |
| Project Applicant: | City of Sacramento |
| Project Planner: | Jesse Gothan, Associate Engineer |
|  | City of Sacramento, Department of Public Works |
|  | Engineering Services |
|  | 915 I Street Rm 200 |
|  | Sacramento, CA 95814 |
|  | Phone: 916-808-6897 |
|  | E-mail: JGothan@cityofsacramento.org |
| Environmental Planner: | Scott Johnson, Environmental Planner |
|  | Community Development Department |
|  | Environmental Planning Services |
|  | 300 Richards Blvd., 3rd Floor |
|  | Sacramento, CA 95835 |
|  | Phone: (916) 808-5842 |
|  | E-mail: SRJohnson@cityofsacramento.org |

Date Initial Study Completed:

This Initial Study was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sections 1500 et seq.). The Lead Agency is the City of Sacramento.

The City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, has reviewed the proposed project and, on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR and is consistent with the land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site as set forth in the 2030 General Plan. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15176 (b) and (d).

The City has prepared the attached Initial Study to (a) review the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR to determine their adequacy for the project (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b),(c)) and (b) identify any potential new or additional project-specific significant environmental effects that were not analyzed in the Master EIR and any mitigation measures or alternatives that may avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a level of insignificance, if any.

As part of the Master EIR process, the City is required to incorporate all feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives appropriate to the project as set forth in the Master EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15177(d)). The Master EIR mitigation measures that are identified as appropriate are set forth in the applicable technical sections below.

This analysis incorporates by reference the general discussion portions of the 2030 General Plan Master EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(a)). The Master EIR is available for public review at the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811, and on the City's web site at: www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/planning/environmental-review/eirs/.

## Section II - Project Description

## Introduction

This Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project (project), located in the City of Sacramento, California (Figure1 Project Location and Figure 2 Project Features). The existing bridge crosses Magpie Creek just south of the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue. The project lies within the following: Township (T) 9North \& Range (R) 5East, Sections 10 \& 11 of the Rio Linda United States Geological Survey (USGS) $71 / 2$ Minute Quadrangles. The City of Sacramento (City), in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), proposes to replace the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge over Magpie Creek and make improvements to the Rio Linda Boulevard/Main Avenue intersection.

The existing Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge (Bridge \#24C-0129) is a two-lane, four span reinforced concrete slab bridge located just south of the intersection of Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard. Constructed in 1937, the bridge carries Rio Linda Boulevard over Magpie Creek. Main Avenue ties into Rio Linda Boulevard at an extreme skew to avoid the northeast-southwest trending Magpie Creek, causing Main Avenue to be outside of the City's existing right-of-way (ROW).

The existing Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge is rated "functionally obsolete and structurally deficient" by Caltrans under Federal Highway Administration due to a lack of shoulders, sub-standard railing, and poor approach geometrics. The bridge currently includes 30 -inch railings which do not meet Caltrans standard safety recommendation of a minimum height of 54 -inches. Additionally, the bridge contains no shoulders, the project will incorporate 6 -foot wide shoulder/bike lane, which is consistent with current City standards. The poor approach geometrics caused by the skewed intersection combined with a narrow bridge and lack of traffic signals cause vehicular congestion and hazardous travel conditions for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. A replacement bridge and realignment of Main Avenue/Rio Linda Boulevard intersection into a right-angle intersection will alleviate vehicular congestion and greatly improve safety conditions for both vehicles and pedestrians.

## Project Background

## Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion:

In 2009 the City of Sacramento drafted a Technical Memorandum analyzing two bridge alternatives. One alternative was eliminated prior to the Draft MND, while the other alternative has been developed further and is now the build alternative in the project discussed in this Draft MND. Below is a discussion of the alternative considered but eliminated from further discussion.

The alternative eliminated would require a structure of over 130 feet long to span the skewed crossing under the proposed intersection to avoid realigning the creek. The alternative eliminated included keeping the creek at its existing location. The proposed alternative was found not to meet the purpose and need objectives of the proposed project as identified in this Draft MND.

The alternative creek alignment was developed using existing studies/reports, information obtained through field surveys and observation, and input attained through meetings with City Staff.

- Technical Memorandum Alternative - Creek alignment conforms to the existing creek at a skewed crossing under the proposed intersection.

The alternative maintains the existing creek alignment, resulting in the proposed intersection spanning over the existing creek. The replacement structure would need to be over 130 feet long to span this skewed crossing under the proposed intersection. Construction staging and traffic control would be more difficult with the existing creek alignment alternative, given the concentration of work right at the intersection.

Due to the following factors this alternative is not recommended:

- Culvert would be closed bottom;
- Culvert would be over 130 feet long;
- Maintenance cost (debris would accumulate and be a hazard as well as a maintenance liability for the City) ;
- Attractive nuisance;
- Adverse impacts during construction (possible road closure); and
- Overall high cost of construction.


## Alternative Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion



Source: City of Sacramento Department of Public Works Technical Memorandum Main Avenue/Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement and Intersection Realignment Project; July 30, 2009. Prepared By: Dokken Engineering

## Project Description

The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement project is located in the City of Sacramento, California. The existing bridge crosses Magpie Creek just south of the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue. The City of Sacramento is the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) lead and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) lead.

## Project Need

The Caltrans Bridge Inspection Report dated January 31, 2012 for the existing bridge identifies a Sufficiency Rating (SR) of 48.9 and a status of "Structurally Deficient". The Local Assistance Program Guidelines recommends replacement of bridges with a SR < 50. The bridge currently has 30 " railings, which are sub-standard to Caltrans recommendation of a minimum height of 54". Currently Rio Linda Bridge has no shoulders; Caltrans standard recommends 6 foot shoulders. The poor approach geometrics cause vehicles traveling east on Main Avenue turning south onto Rio Linda Boulevard to turn into oncoming traffic and/or potentially damage the bridge railing. There is vehicle queuing within the Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue intersection. Also, currently there is poor pedestrian connectivity with the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail. There is a lack of a Class II bike lane through the project area.

## Project Purpose

The purpose of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project is to:

- Enhance safety on Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue by: 1) realign Main Avenue perpendicular to Rio Linda Boulevard; 2) widen the Rio Linda Boulevard bridge to meet standards; 3 ) increase the height of the bridge railing to meet Caltrans standards;
- Decrease vehicle queuing conflicts by increasing turn pocket length;
- Improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities by adding a Class II bike lane on Rio Linda Boulevard through the intersection and providing connectivity with the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail.

The existing bridge is a two-lane, four-span reinforced concrete slab (built in 1937) located just south of the intersection of Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard. The Rio Linda Boulevard/Main Avenue Intersection has three legs with all-way stop control and single lanes on each approach. Main Avenue ties into Rio Linda Boulevard at an extreme skew to avoid Magpie Creek causing Main Avenue to be outside of the City's existing right-of-way.

The proposed improvements will include realigning Magpie Creek to the south leg of the intersection with Main Avenue and will cross perpendicular to Rio Linda Boulevard. The improvements will also include realigning Main Avenue within the City's existing right-of-way and intersect Rio Linda Boulevard at a right angle, constructing left and right turn lanes from Main Avenue onto Rio Linda Boulevard, new crosswalks, access to the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail, and installation of a traffic signal. One through lane will be provided in each direction along Rio Linda Boulevard with an additional receiving lane to accommodate the required dual left turns from Main Avenue. The new structure will be constructed wide enough to allow for the future four lane roadway section and Class II bike lanes. The Rio Linda Boulevard roadway profile will be raised slightly to provide hydraulic clearance required for the design storm.

The roadway widening will require the overhead utilities along Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard to be relocated. The water line currently attached to the barrier of the existing bridge will be relocated under the new Magpie Creek alignment. The existing Northern Sacramento Bike Trail Bridge over Magpie Creek will be removed and realigned due to the creek realignment and will connect with the new structure across Rio Linda Boulevard.

To allow equipment to access the project site, vegetation would be removed within the footprint of the proposed bridge. The realignment activities would take place in a way that would allow for
the existing creek alignment to be closed the same day the new realigned creek channel would be opened. The creek realignment would only take place once the new bridge is constructed and grading has taken place for the new creek channel which would include it being graded to a natural undulating landscape.

Traffic along both Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard will be maintained during construction. The realignment of Magpie Creek will require a small portion of right-of-way acquisition on the east side of Rio Linda Boulevard. Access to the adjacent businesses will be accommodated and remain open during construction. Removal of the existing bridge will require a portion of the new bridge to be constructed and traffic shifted over. The contractor will be required to install temporary Best Management Practices (BMP's) to control any runoff or erosion from the project site, into the surrounding waterways. These temporary BMP's will be installed prior to any construction operations and will be in place for the duration of the contract.

## No-Build (No-Project) Alternative:

Under the No-Build (No Project) Alternative, the functionally obsolete and structurally deficient bridge would not be replaced. Widening the bridge to current standards, including shoulders and provision for future addition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, would not occur. The No-Build Alternative would not construct a new bridge over Magpie Creek and would keep the Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard in its existing extreme skewed location. Main Avenue would remain outside the City's existing right of way. The No-Build Alternative does not meet the proposed project's purpose and need.

## Construction Access, Staging and Methods:

## Project Access and Staging Areas

To allow equipment to access the project site, vegetation would be removed within the footprint of the proposed bridge. Access would be from the existing Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue roads. Construction and equipment staging is proposed to be at the southwest of the project area on the open field adjacent to Rio Linda Boulevard.

## Anticipated Construction Equipment

Typical construction equipment would include the following:

- Crane
- Backhoe
- Excavator
- Concrete saw (removal of existing road and bridge)
- Cement truck
- Paver
- Rollers
- Motor grader
- Dump truck
- Light tools (ie saws, jackhammer)

Most construction related noise would occur during the existing bridge and road removal. This operation would likely include noise from concrete hammers and jackhammers.

## Utilities

Relocation of utilities within the project area is anticipated (see Utilities Section). Existing utilities within the project limits include natural gas, water, sewer, and telecommunications service. Natural gas is provided by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG\&E). Sacramento Municipal

Utility District (SMUD) is an overhead utility providing electricity. The City provides municipal water service within the project area, while Sacramento County Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) provides wastewater collection (sewer) within the project area. Telecommunications services in the project area are provided by AT\&T and Comcast.

## Permits

The permits, reviews and approvals listed below would be required for project construction.
Table 1. Required

| Responsible Agency | Permit/Approval | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Clean Water Act Section 404 authorization for fill of waters of the United States | Early Site Visit held on November 13, 2012 (Lisa Gibson in attendance); Preliminary Creek Grading plan <br> e-mailed on April 12, 2013 |
| California Department of Fish and Wildlife | California Fish and Wildlife Code Section 1602 streambed alteration agreement | Early Site Visit held on November 13, 2012 (Amy Kennedy in attendance); Natural Environment Study e-mailed to Amy Kennedy on February 13, 2013; Preliminary Creek Grading plan e-mailed on April 12, 2013 |
|  Central <br> Regional Valley <br> Water  <br> Quality Control <br> Board  | Clean Water Act Section 401 water quality certification | Not yet initiated |
|   <br> Regional Water <br> Quality Control <br> Board  | National Pollutant  <br> Discharge Elimination  <br> System 402 General <br> Permit for Storm Water  <br> Discharges Associated  <br> with Construction Activity   | Not yet initiated |

## Early Coordination Efforts:

In an effort to involve agencies in the design and environmental process an early site visit was conducted with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The meeting was held at the project site on November 13, 2012. The attendees included: Amy Kennedy (CDFW), Lisa Gibson (USACE), Jesse Gothan (City of Sacramento), Scott Johnson (City of Sacramento), Adrian Engel (Mark Thomas \& Co), Aaron Silva (Mark Thomas \& Co), Namat Hosseinion (Dokken Engineering), and Carlene Grecco (Dokken Engineering).

During the site visit Ms Gibson (USACE) and Ms Kennedy (CDFW) both expressed the need for the project to result in creating an undulating natural landscape within the creek realignment. In order to develop this further the following enhanced project features have been included:

Enhanced Project Features:

- Creek Realignment designed using undulating landscape and natural topography (the project will avoid a flat bottom design, see image below);
- To mitigate for impacts to waters the project will be revegetated onsite;
- Revegetation of the realigned creek will only use native vegetation;
- The project would result in a net increase in function as well as total acres of creek habitat;
- The project will include the eradication of invasive species (ie Arundo donax).

Proposed Undulating Grading for Realigned Magpie Creek



FIGURE 1
Project Location


## Section III - Environmental Checklist and Discussion

## LAND USE, POPULATION AND HOUSING, AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY

## Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the Lead Agency to examine the effects of a project on the physical conditions that exist within the area that would be affected by the project. CEQA also requires a discussion of any inconsistency between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans.

An inconsistency between the proposed project and an adopted plan for land use development in a community would not constitute a physical change in the environment. When a project diverges from an adopted plan, however, it may affect planning in the community regarding infrastructure and services, and the new demands generated by the project may result in later physical changes in response to the project.

In the same manner, the fact that a project brings new people or demand for housing to a community does not, by itself, change the physical conditions. An increase in population may, however, generate changes in retail demand or demand for governmental services, and the demand for housing may generate new activity in residential development. Physical environmental impacts that could result from implementing the proposed project are discussed in the appropriate technical sections.

This section of the initial study identifies the applicable land use designations, plans and policies, and permissible densities and intensities of use, and discusses any inconsistencies between these plans and the proposed project. This section also discusses agricultural resources and the effect of the project on these resources.

## Discussion

## Land Use

The project site has been designated as "Suburban Center," and "Suburban Neighborhood Low," and "Parks and Recreation" in the 2030 General Plan, and is zoned R-1 Standard Single Family; C-2 General Commercial; and Agriculture. The project area is in the North Sacramento Community Plan Area.

The project site is located in an urbanized portion of the community. Development of the site as proposed would alter the existing landscape. Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Street are classified as "Collector" streets in the City of Sacramento 2030 General Plan and zoning code. The proposed project is consistent with the City of Sacramento General Plan as Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Street will continue to be "collector" streets and the project would not change the zoning designation of adjacent areas. Because the project does not create new connections or access to new areas, no impacts to growth, economics, affordable housing, or crime would occur.

## Agricultural Resources

The Master EIR discussed the potential impact of development under the 2030 General Plan on agricultural resources. See Master EIR, Chapter 6.2. In addition to evaluating the effect of the
general plan on sites within the City, the Master EIR noted that to the extent the 2030 General Plan accommodates future growth within the City limits; the conversion of farmland outside the City limits is minimized (Master EIR, page 6.2-13). The Master EIR concluded that the impact of the 2030 General Plan on agricultural resources within the City was less than significant.

The project site does not contain soils designated as Important Farmland (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance) (NRCS 2010). There are no Williamson Act contracts that affect the project site. While there is land zoned as Agricultural, the project would not affect operations of the current land use. No existing timber-harvest uses are located on or in the vicinity of the project site. Development of the site would result in no impacts on agricultural resources.

## Energy

Structures built as part of the project would be subject to Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which serve to reduce demand for electrical energy by implementing energyefficient standards for residential and non-residential buildings. The 2030 General Plan includes policies (see Policies 6.1.10 through 6.1.13) to encourage the spread of energy-efficient technology by offering rebates and other incentives to commercial and residential developers, and recruiting businesses that research and promote energy conservation and efficiency.

Policies 6.1.6 through 6.1.8 focus on promoting the use of renewable resources, which would reduce the cumulative impacts associated with use of non-renewable energy sources. In addition, Policies 6.1 .5 and 6.1 .12 call for the City to work closely with utility providers and industries to promote new energy conservation technologies.

The Master EIR evaluated the potential impacts on energy and concluded that the effects would be less than significant (See Impacts 6.11-9 and 6.11-10). The proposed project would not result in any impacts not identified and evaluated in the Master EIR.


| Issues: | Effect will be studied in the EIR | Effect can be mitigated to less than significant | No additional significant environmental effect |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. AIR QUALITY |  |  |  |
| Would the proposal: |  |  |  |
| A) Result in construction emissions of $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ above 85 pounds per day? |  |  | X |
| B) Result in operational emissions of $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ or ROG above 65 pounds per day? |  |  | X |
| C) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |  |  | X |
| C) Result in PM10 concentrations equal to or greater than five percent of the State ambient air quality standard (i.e., 50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) in areas where there is evidence of existing or projected violations of this standard? |  |  | X |
| E) Result in CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm ) or the 8 -hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm )? |  |  | X |
| F) $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Result in exposure of sensitive receptors to } \\ & \text { substantial pollutant concentrations? }\end{aligned}$ |  |  | X |
| G) $\begin{aligned} & \text { Result in TAC exposures create a risk of } 10 \text { in } \\ & 1 \text { million for stationary sources, or }\end{aligned}$ substantially increase the risk of exposure to TACs from mobile sources? |  |  | X |
| H) Impede the City or state efforts to meet AB32 standards for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions? |  |  | X |

## Environmental and Regulatory Setting

The project site is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), which is a valley bounded by the North Coast Ranges on the west and the northern Sierra Nevada on the east. The SVAB is subject to federal, state, and local air quality regulations under the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). SMAQMD is responsible for implementing emission standards and other requirements of federal and state laws. Air quality hazards are caused primarily by carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM), and ozone, primarily as a result of motor vehicles.

In December 2006 the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) revised the national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) for fine particle pollution to provide increased protection of public health and welfare. The revised standard is 35 micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) for particles less than or equal to 2.5 micrometers in diameter $\left(\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}\right)$, averaged over 24 hours. In December 2008 the EPA Administrator identified nonattainment areas, and in October 2009 confirmed the designations. Sacramento County is included on this list, along with portions of surrounding counties that contribute to the nonattainment conditions.

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The General Plan Master EIR includes extensive discussion of the potential effects of greenhouse gas (GHS) emissions that could occur as a result of development proposed under the General Plan. The Master EIR discussions regarding climate change are incorporated here by reference. See:

- Draft EIR: 6.1 Air Quality (Page 6.1-1)
- Final EIR: City Climate Change Master Response (Page 4-1)
- Errata No.2: Climate Change (Page 12)


## General Plan Policies Considered Mitigation

The following General Plan policy would avoid or lessen environmental impacts as identified in the Master EIR and is considered a mitigation measure for the following project-level and cumulative impacts.

Impact 6.1-6: Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could result in TAC emissions that could adversely affect sensitive receptors.
and
Impact 6.1-11: Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan, in conjunction with other development in the SVAB, would generate TAC emissions that could adversely affect sensitive receptors.

Mitigation Measure 6.1.6-General Plan Policy ER 6.1.8 - Development Near TAC Sources: The City shall ensure that new development with sensitive uses located adjacent to toxic air contaminant sources, as identified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), reduces potential health risks. In its review of these projects, the City shall consider current guidance provided by and consult with the CARB and the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.

## Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, air quality impacts may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan Mast EIR:

- construction emissions of $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ above 85 pounds per day;
- operational emissions of $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ or ROG above 65 pounds per day;
- violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ concentrations equal to or greater than five percent of the State ambient air quality standard (i.e., 50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) in areas where there is evidence of existing or projected violations of this standard. However, if project emissions of $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ and ROG are below the emission thresholds given above, then the project would not result in violations of the $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ ambient air quality standards;
- CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm ) or the 8 -hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm ); or
- exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Ambient air quality standards have not been established for toxic air contaminants (TAC). TAC exposure is deemed to be significant if:

- TAC exposures create a risk of 10 in 1 million for stationary sources, or substantially increase the risk of exposure to TACs from mobile sources.


## Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR addressed the potential effects of the 2030 General Plan on ambient air quality and the potential for exposure of people, especially sensitive receptors such as children or the elderly, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. See Master EIR, Chapter 6.1.

Policies in the 2030 General Plan in Environmental Resources were identified as mitigating potential effects of development that could occur under the 2030 General Plan. For example, Policy ER 6.1.1 calls for the City to work with the California Air Resources Board and the SMAQMD to meet state and federal air quality standards; Policy ER 6.1.12 requires the City to review proposed development projects to ensure that the projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions; Policy ER 6.1.11 calls for coordination of City efforts with SMAQMD; and Policy ER 6.1.15 requires the City to give preference to contractors using reduced-emission equipment.

The Master EIR identified exposure to sources of TAC as a potential effect. Policies in the 2030 general Plan would reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. The policies include ER 6.1.5, requiring consideration of current guidance provided by the Air Resources Board and SMAQMD; requiring development adjacent to stationary or mobile TAC sources to be designed with consideration of such exposure in design, landscaping and filters; as well as Policies ER 6.11.1 and ER 6.11.15, referred to above.

The Master EIR found that greenhouse gas emissions that would be generated by development consistent with the 2030 General Plan would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. The discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR are incorporated by reference in this Initial Study (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150).

The Master EIR identified numerous policies included in the 2030 General Plan that addressed greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. See Draft Master EIR, Chapter 8, and pages 849 et seq. The Master EIR is available for review at the offices of Development Services Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, $3^{\text {rd }}$ Floor, Sacramento, CA during normal business hours, and is also available online at http://www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/planning/environmental-review/eirs/.

Policies identified in the 2030 General Plan include directives relating to sustainable development patterns and practices, and increasing the viability of pedestrian, bicycle and public transit modes. A complete list of policies addressing climate change is included in the Master EIR in Table 8-5, pages 8-50 et seq; the Final Master EIR included additional discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in response to written comments. See changes to Chapter 8 at Final Master EIR pages 2-19 et seq. See also Letter 2 and response.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

## Question A

The proposed project would have short-term impacts resulting from the following constructionrelated sources: 1) construction and demolition equipment emissions; 2) dust from building operations; and 3) emissions from construction vehicles.

As shown in Table 2, the project is located in an area in nonattainment for 1-hour Ozone for State standards, nonattainment for 8-hour Ozone for both Federal and State standards, and nonattainment for Particulate Matter under 2.5 micrometers for Federal standards and State standards.

Table 2. Attainment at Project Location

| Criteria Pollutant | Attainment Status |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Federal | State |
| $\mathrm{O}_{3}-$ 1-hour | N/A | Nonattainment - Serious |
| $\mathrm{O}_{3}-8$-hour | Nonattainment | Nonattainment |
| $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ | Nonattainment | Nonattainment |
| $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ | Nonattainment | Nonattainment |
| CO | Unclassified/Attainment | Attainment |
| $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ | Unclassified/Attainment | Attainment |
| $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ | Unclassified | Attainment |
| Sulfates | N/A | Attainment |
| Lead | Attainment | Attainment |
| Hydrogen Sulfide | N/A | Unclassified |
| Visibility Reducing Particles | N/A | Unclassified |
| Source: California Air Resources | Board, 2011. |  |

## Temporary/Construction Impacts

During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions (airborne dust) generated by excavation, grading, hauling, and other activities related to construction. Emissions from construction equipment also are anticipated and would include $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{NO}_{x}$, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), directly-emitted particulate matter ( $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ ), and toxic air contaminants such as diesel exhaust particulate matter. Ozone is a regional pollutant that is derived from NOx and VOCs in the presence of sunlight and heat.

Heavy trucks and construction equipment powered by gasoline and diesel engines would generate $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{SO}_{2}, \mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$, VOCs and some soot particulate ( $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ ) in exhaust emissions. If construction activities were to increase traffic congestion in the intersection construction area, CO and other emissions from traffic would increase slightly while those vehicles are delayed. These emissions would be temporary and limited to the immediate area surrounding the construction site and detour area. The estimated construction related emissions of $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ is 36 lbs/day, this is well under the $85 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{day}$ threshold (see Appendix D for the Air Quality Model Results).

Dust generated will result in a temporary, local impact, limited to areas of construction. Dust control practices will be incorporated into the project to mitigate this potential impact. The dust control practices will comply with the current Caltrans' Standard Specifications as well as the City Code: 15.40.050 and 15.44.170; SMAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and their Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices. The general requirements of Rule 403 are:

301 Limitations: A person shall take every reasonable precaution not to cause or allow the emissions of fugitive dust from being airborne beyond the property line from which the emission originates, from any construction, handling or storage activity, or any wrecking, excavation, grading, clearing of land or solid waste disposal operation. Reasonable precautions shall include, but are not limited to:
301.1 Use, where possible, of water or chemicals for control of dust in the demolition of existing buildings or structures, construction operations, the construction of roadways or the clearing of land.
301.2 Application of asphalt, oil, water, or suitable chemicals on dirt roads, materials stockpiles, and other surfaces which can give rise to airborne dusts;
301.3 Other means approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

## Sacramento City Code Title 15 BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION*

15.40.050 Control of dust and mud.

Any person who has been issued a permit for any work covered by this code shall take reasonable precautions to prevent and control the movement of dust created by work activities to adjoining public or private property. Such dust shall be immediately settled by wetting the same. Work activities shall be stopped during periods of high winds that may carry dust from the job site before it can be settled by wetting.

The permittee shall be responsible for maintaining clean public streets, sidewalks and alleys in the immediate vicinity of the job site during and after the period of work activity. The permittee shall remove all mud and dust from any public property which was deposited there by any activity related to the work. In order to prevent mud and other material from entering any public
sewer, the permittee shall properly pond any affected gutter to permit such material to settle and shall remove such material from public property. This procedure shall be in accordance with the requirements and policies of the city water and sewer division. The permittee shall obtain any necessary permits for water from the manager of said division.

### 15.44.170 Dust control.

All dust resulting from wrecking or demolition operations shall be immediately settled by wetting the same with water of sufficient quantity to prevent the dust from leaving the site of the demolition or wrecking project. Demolition shall be stopped during periods of high winds that carry the dust from the site before it can be settled by wetting. The permittee shall be responsible for maintaining clean public streets during such operation. The permittee must obtain the necessary permits for water from the manager of the division of water and sewers and pay for such permits and for water used.

The permittee shall wash off public property to remove all silt and dust. In order to prevent such material from entering any public sewer, the permittee shall properly pond the gutter in order to permit such material to settle, and it shall be then cleaned up and hauled away. This procedure shall be followed in accordance with the requirements and policies of the water and sewers division.

Table 3. Construction Emissions (pounds per day)

| Phase | ROGs | CO | $\mathbf{N O}_{\mathbf{x}}$ | $\mathbf{P M}_{\mathbf{1 0}}$ | Exhaust $^{\mathbf{P M}_{\mathbf{1 0}}}$ | Fugitive Dust <br> $\mathbf{P M}_{\mathbf{1 0}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grubbing/Land Clearing | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Grading/Excavation | 9 | 35 | 34 | 12 | 2 | 10 |
| Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grad | 9 | 36 | 36 | 12 | 2 | 10 |
| Paving | 3 | 16 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Maximum (pound/day) | 9 | 36 | 36 | 12 | 2 | 10 |
| Total (tons/construction project) | 0.92 | 3.40 | 4.23 | 1.35 | 0.23 | 1.12 |
| Source: Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 5.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Permanent Impacts

The proposed project is not anticipated to change traffic volumes through the intersection. Under federal requirements, the project was found exempt from all project-level conformity requirements because it falls under exempt projects (widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges [no additional travel lanes]) listed in 40 CFR 93.126.

## Questions B and E

Because the proposed project would not increase the capacity of the roadway, no additional trips or delays are expected to result from the project. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in increased operational emissions. To ensure that the proposed project does not increase traffic congestion and increase air quality impacts, the following Best Management Practice (BMP) would be included to avoid construction related traffic congestion: Route and
schedule construction traffic to avoid peak travel times as much as possible to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads.

## Question C

Because construction and operational emissions are expected to be well below the thresholds, as discussed for Questions $A$ and $B$, the project is not expected to violate any air quality standards. The proposed project would not increase the capacity of the roadway, no additional trips or delays are expected to result from the project. The proposed project would not exceed the threshold for $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ ( $85 \mathrm{lbs} /$ day) (see Table 3 for all of the proposed construction emissions). There proposed project would not result in additional significant impact that was not addressed in the Master EIR.

## Question D

SMAQMD has established screen-level criteria for the assessment of significant impacts from construction-related emissions of fugitive dust. These criteria are based on a projects maximum actively disturbed area. Construction activities that would disturb less than 15.0 acres per day would be required to implement the appropriate level of mitigation, identified by the SMAQMD as "Basic Construction Emission Control Practices," for all projects to further minimize construction-related impacts regardless of the CEQA significance determination. Because the proposed project covers an area less than 15 acres, BMPs have been included from the "Basic Construction Emission Control Practices" to reduce construction-related emissions of fugitive dust. See Question A for the City Code: 15.40.050 and 15.44.170; SMAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and their Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices.
$\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ emissions are assumed to be below the thresholds because as discussed for Question A Construction $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ emissions are below the thresholds. There are no construction ROG thresholds, and both $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ and ROG operational thresholds are not expected to be exceeded. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an additional significant impact that was not addressed in the Master EIR.

## Questions F And G

Although the nearest sensitive receptor is located approximately 250 feet from the project area, construction activities, which involve the use of diesel-powered equipment, are short-term, and emissions are expected to be well below the thresholds. Operational emissions are not expected to increase, as discussed for Question B. Despite a low-impact expectation for this project, measures for construction activities are still recommended to further reduce impacts on sensitive receptors.

SMAQMD defines sensitive receptors as facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants or may experience adverse effects from unhealthful concentrations of air pollutants. Hospitals, clinics, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas are examples of sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site are residences approximately 250 feet northeast of the project site.

Construction activities are anticipated to involve the operation of diesel-powered equipment. In 1998, the CARB identified diesel exhaust as a TAC. Cancer health risks associated with exposures to diesel exhaust typically are associated with chronic exposure, in which a 70-year
exposure period often is assumed. Although elevated cancer rates can result from exposure periods of less than 70 years, acute exposure (i.e., exposure periods of 2 to 3 years) to diesel exhaust typically are not anticipated to result in an increased health risk because acute exposure typically does not result in exposure concentrations that would represent a health risk. Health impacts associated with exposure to diesel exhaust from project construction are not anticipated to be significant because construction activities are expected to occur well below the 70 -year exposure period used in health risk assessments. Therefore, construction of the project is not anticipated to result in an elevated cancer risk to exposed persons. No mitigation is required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an additional significant impact that was not addressed in the Master EIR.

## Question H

As part of its action in approving the 2030 General Plan, the City Council certified the Master EIR that evaluated the environmental effects of development that is reasonably anticipated under the new General Plan. The Master EIR includes extensive discussion of the potential effects of greenhouse gas emissions. The Master EIR discussions regarding climate change are incorporated here by reference. See, for example:

Draft EIR: 6.1 Air Quality (Page 6.1-1)
Final EIR: City Climate Change Master Response (Page 4-1)
Errata No. 2: Climate Change (Page 12)
These documents are available at www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/planning/environmentalreview/eirs/ and at the offices of Community Development Department at 300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor, Sacramento, California.

The proposed project is consistent with the land use designation for the project site. The project would result in the generation of greenhouse gases during construction and operation, as discussed below.

## Short-term Construction Emissions

During construction of the proposed project, GHG emissions would be emitted from the operation of construction equipment and from worker supply vendor vehicles. URBEMIS modeling was conducted to estimate the total $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions generated by the construction of the project. The total $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions would be approximately between 3,979 and 4,209 pounds per year, or 1.8 and 1.9 metric tons per year, for construction of the project. These emissions would equate to approximately 0.0000004 percent of the estimated GHG emissions for all sources in California (453 million metric tons) (CARB 2010). The results of the URBEMIS modeling for $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ are in Appendix E .

## Long-term Construction Emissions

Because the proposed project is a bridge replacement and does not increase capacity of the roadway, there are no long-term operational activities associated with the project. The project would not lead to changes in vehicular operations and associated emissions. While there may be maintenance visits to the project site, these visits are expected to be infrequent, and occur
for emergency repair or for repaving, which occurs after the lifetime of the installed pavement has been reached. Long term operational emissions are thus expected to be negligible.

## Ongoing Activities

The 2030 General Plan included direction to staff to prepare a Climate Action Plan for the City and, in February 2012, the City of Sacramento adopted the Climate Action Plan. The Climate Action Plan provided additional guidance for the City's ongoing efforts to reduce GHG emissions. For instance, the Climate Action Plan includes seven strategies and 31 measures to reduce GHG emissions.

To prevent the continued escalation of GHG emissions, the Climate Action Plan establishes a 2020 target ( 15 percent below 2005 levels) and 2030 and 2050 goals ( 38 percent and 83 percent below 2005 levels, respectively) to reduce annual emissions levels consistent with state laws and guidelines. According to the Climate Action Plan, the actions that could be quantified along with those that could not outline a path to meet the City's 2020 reduction target, consistent with state laws and guidelines. When combined with quantified state and federal legislative reductions, primary actions contained in the Climate Action Plan offer a potential reduction of about 1.37 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{e}\right)$ annually. This level of reduction exceeds the City's 2020 target of 15 percent by 6,227 metric tons of $\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{e}$, and is consistent with state laws.

In addition to the Climate Action Plan, GHG-reduction strategies continue at the state and federal level to combat climate change. In December 2009, the EPA listed GHG as harmful emissions under the Clean Air Act. This action could eventually result in regulations with a purpose of reducing such emissions.

The Master EIR concluded that GHG emissions that could be emitted by development that is consistent with the 2030 General Plan would be cumulatively considerable and unavoidable (Errata No. 2, Page 12). The Master EIR includes a full analysis of GHG emissions and climate change, and adequately addresses these issues. As indicated in the Master EIR, future development within the City of Sacramento will be required to comply with Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 2035 Metropolitan transportation Plan (MTP). The 2035 MTP is anticipated to meet the AB 32 goal of reaching 1990 transportation emissions by 2020. However, the City will need to reduce emission in other planning areas for the city as a whole to meet AB 32 goals. The City is anticipating an increase in GHG emission without the incorporation of reduction measures.

The proposed project must comply with the 2030 General Plan policies and measures for the reduction of GHGs to comply with the 2035 MTP and AB 32. Because the traffic from the proposed project was assumed in the 2035 MTP, and the 2035 MTP is anticipated to meet the goals of $A B 32$, the proposed project would comply with the 2035 MTP. AB 32 requires an approximate 29 percent reduction from existing emissions on a statewide level in order to achieve the goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. In order for this to occur, the existing and future operations of the City, as well as individual land uses, must reduce their emissions accordingly.

The MEIR for the 2030 General Plan assumed the realignment of Main Avenue with Rio Linda Boulevard. Therefore, the GHG emissions increase that would occur with implementation of the project has been accounted for in the General Plan. The project would not impede the City's efforts to comply with $A B 32$ requirements. Therefore, the projects cumulative impacts related to
construction and operation of the proposed project conflicting with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions would be less than significant. The project would not have any significant additional environmental effects relating to GHG emissions or climate change.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Air Quality.
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## Environmental Setting

The project site consists of non-native grassland, urban and developed areas, freshwater marsh and great valley-willow scrub. With the exception of a small portion of the project containing native wetland/riparian scrub vegetation, much of the project area is either developed or greatly disturbed as the project contains an active bike path (the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail) parallel with Rio Linda Boulevard, residences, commercial businesses, a frequently maintained earthen lined creek channel, and ruderal vegetation. Commercial and residential developments along the project consist of hardscape, compacted soils, and disturbed native and non-native vegetation. Much of the vegetation within the Biological Study Area (BSA) (Figure 4 Waters and Sensitive Habitats) is disturbed due to urbanization, pedestrian use (walking/cycling trails) and agricultural practices which have degraded the native vegetative communities and associated habitat. The project occurs within the Sacramento Valley floristic region and USFS ecological subsection 262Ag (Hardpan Terraces), which is a geologically characterized by low hills and alluvial plains.

A biologist carried out a preliminary database search and a pedestrian survey of the project area to characterize the environmental setting on and adjacent to the project. The preliminary database searches were performed to identify special-status species with the potential to occur within the project area. A pedestrian survey was conducted in May and October of 2012, to collect sitespecific data regarding habitat suitability for special-status species, as well as identification of potentially jurisdictional waters.

Prior to field work, literature research was conducted through the USFWS Planning Species List, CDFW, CNDDB and the CNPS Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants to identify habitats and special-status species having the potential to occur within the BSA for Rio Linda

USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle (Figure 2 Project Features and Figure 4 Waters and Sensitive Habitats). These database searches identified special-status species within the USFWS jurisdiction that may be affected by the proposed project. In addition, a query of the USFWS's Critical Habitat Portal was conducted to identify potential critical habitat designations within the vicinity of the project. A query of the CNDDB database provided a list of known occurrences for special-status species. The CNPS database search purpose was to identify special-status plant species with the potential to occur within the Rio Linda, California USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle.

## Sensitive Habitats

Sensitive habitats include sensitive natural plan communities and other habitats designated and/or regulated by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), wetlands and other waters of the U.S. are subject to the jurisdiction of USACE. Aquatic habitats may also receive protection under California statutes including Section 1602 of the California Fish and Wildlife Code and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

## Special-status Species

Special-status species are plants and animals in the following categories:

- Species that are listed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and/or California Endangered Species Act (CESA) as rare, threatened, or endangered;
- Species considered as candidates and proposed for state or federal listing as threatened or endangered;
- Wildlife designated by CDFW as species of special concern; and
- Plants ranked by CDFW as "rare, threatened, or endangered" in California.

The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), maintained by the CDFW, is considered as the most current and reliable tool for tracking occurrences of special-status species in California.

## Special Status Species Evaluation

The special status species evaluation considers those species identified as having relative scarcity and/or declining populations by the USFWS or CDFW. Special status species include those formally listed as threatened or endangered, those proposed for formal listing, candidates for federal listing, and those classified as Species of Concern by USFWS or Species of Special Concern by CDFW. Species considered to be "special animals" or "fully protected" by the CDFW or rare, threatened, or endangered in California by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) were also included in the evaluation.

## Regulatory Setting

The following city, State, and federal statues pertain to the proposed project:

- National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4321 et seq.)
- Federal Endangered Species Act (16 USC 1531-1543)
- Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251-1376)
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 USC 661-6660
- Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands (May 24, 1977)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (USC 703-711)
- California Environmental Quality Act (PRC 21000 et seq.)
- California Endangered Species Act (CDFW Code 2050 et seq.)
- Native Plant Protection Act (CDFW Code 1900-1913)
- City of Sacramento Heritage Tree Ordinance (SCC Section 12.64.10-12.64.70)
- City of Sacramento Street Tree Ordinance (SCC Section 12.56.10-12.56.170)


## Federal Endangered Species Act

The Federal Endangered Species Act defines 'take' (Section 9) and prohibits 'taking' of a listed endangered or threatened species (16 USC 1532, 50 CFR 17.30. If a federally listed species could be harmed by a project, Section 7 or 7 consultations must be initiated, and an Incidental Take Permit must be obtained (16 USC 1539, 50 CFR 13).

## Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Migratory birds are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 USC 703-711). The MBTA makes it unlawful to take, possess, buy, sell, purchase, or barter any migratory bird listed in 50 CFR Part 10 including feathers or other parts, nests, eggs, or products, except as allowed by implementing regulations (50 CFR 21). All migratory bird species are protected by the MBTA. Any removal of active nests during the breeding season or any disturbance that results in the abandonment of nestlings is considered a 'take' of the species under federal law.

## Setting and Methods

Queries of the USFWS Planning Species list, CNDDB Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, and CNPS database queries identified several special-status species with the potential to be impacted by the proposed project. Field surveys were conducted in May and October 2012 to document existing biological resources, detect potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and State, and search for suitable habitat and presence of Federal and State protected species. Potential impacts to resources were analyzed based on the proposed project design and ecological resources identified in the field surveys. Table 4 provides a summary of all species identified in the search results, a description of the habitat requirements for each species, and conclusions regarding the potential for each species to occur within the project area.
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Table 4: Special-status Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Vicinity

| Common Name | Scientific Name | Status |  | General Habitat Description | Potential for Occurrence and Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plant Species |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dwarf downingia | Downingia pusilla | Fed: CA: CNPS: | $\begin{array}{\|l} -- \\ -- \\ 2.2 \end{array}$ | An annual herb inhabiting vernal pools and mesic valley and foothill grassland communities. Flowers March-May (3-1,460 feet). | Presumed Absent; The BSA lacks the species' requisite vernal pools and mesic grassland community; habitat unsuitable for dwarf downingia. |
| Stinkbells | Fritillaria agrestis | Fed: CA: CNPS: | $4.2$ | A perennial bulb inhabiting clay, often serpentine, banks and depressions of chaparral, cismontane woodland, and valley and foothill grassland communities. Flowers MarchJune (33-5,102). | Presumed Absent; Soils within the project vicinity are loams and the BSA lacks requisite clay and serpentine soils; habitat unsuitable for stinkbells. |
| Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop | Gratiola heterosepala | Fed: CA: CNPS: | E 1B. 2 | An annual herb inhabiting clay soils and shallow waters of marshes and swamps, lake margins, and vernal pools. Flowers April-August (33-7792 feet). | Presumed Absent; Soils within the project vicinity are loams and the BSA lacks requisite clay soils; habitat unsuitable for Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop. |
| Woolly rosemallow | Hibiscus lasiocarpos var. occidentalis | Fed: CA: CNPS: | $\text { 1B. } 2$ | A perennial rhizomatous herb inhabiting freshwater wetlands, wet banks, and marshes. <br> Flowers June-September (0-394 feet). | Presumed Absent; The freshwater marsh within the BSA east of Rio Linda Boulevard is likely too densely vegetated by cattails and the Magpie Creek drainage channel is likely too regularly maintained for species occurrence. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 5 miles from project location; no occurrences of woolly rosemallow were observed during the May 29, 2012 spring blooming surveys. |
| Ahart's dwarf rush | Juncus leiospermus var. ahartii | Fed: CA: CNPS: | $\text { 1B. } 2$ | An annual herb inhabiting grassland swales, gopher mounds and vernal pool margins of mesic valley and foothill grassland communities. Flowers March - May (98-751 feet). | Presumed Absent; The BSA lacks the requisite vernal pools and mesic grassland community; habitat unsuitable for Ahart's dwarf rush. |
| Legenere | Legenere limosa | Fed: CA: CNPS: | $\text { 1B. } 1$ | An annual herb inhabiting wet areas, vernal pools, and ponds. Flowers May-June (0-2,887). | Presumed Absent; The Magpie Creek drainage channel within the BSA is likely too regularly maintained for species occurrence. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 1 mile from project location. No occurrences of Legenere were observed during the May 29, 2012 spring blooming surveys; species presumed absent. |


| Common Name | Scientific Name | Status |  | General Habitat Description | Potential for Occurrence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slender Orcutt grass | Orcuttia tenuis | Fed: CA: CNPS: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{T} \\ & \mathrm{E} \\ & 1 \mathrm{~B} .1 \end{aligned}$ | An annual herb inhabiting vernal pools. Flowers May-October (115-5,774 feet). | Presumed Absent; The BSA lacks the requisite vernal pools and site elevation is well outside the species range; habitat unsuitable for slender Orcutt grass. |
| Sacramento Orcutt grass | Orcuttia viscida | Fed: CA: CNPS: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{E} \\ & \text { 1B. } 1 \end{aligned}$ | An annual herb inhabiting vernal pools. Flowers April-July (98-328 feet). | Presumed Absent; The BSA lacks the requisite vernal pools and site elevation is outside the species range; habitat unsuitable for Sacramento Orcutt grass. |
| Bearded popcornflower | Plagiobothrys hystriculus | Fed: CA: CNPS: | $\text { 1B. } 1$ | An annual herb inhabiting mesic valley and foothill grassland, vernal pool margins and vernal swales. Flowers April-May (0-899 feet). | Presumed Absent; The BSA lacks the species' requisite vernal pools and mesic grassland community; habitat unsuitable for bearded popcorn-flower. |
| Sanford's arrowhead | Sagittaria sanfordii | Fed: CA: CNPS: | $\text { 1B. } 2$ | A perennial rhizomatous herb inhabiting freshwater marshes, swamps, ponds and ditches. Flowers May-October (0-2,132 feet). | Presumed Absent; The BSA contains Magpie Creek drainage channels potentially suitable for the species. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 1.5 miles from project location and believed possibly extirpated; no occurrences of Sanford's arrowhead were observed during the May 29, 2012 spring blooming surveys; species presumed absent. |
| Suisun Marsh aster | Symphyotrichum lentum | Fed: CA: CNPS: | $\text { 1B. } 2$ | A perennial rhizomatous herb inhabiting wetlands, freshwater marsh, and brackish-marsh communities. Flowers MayNovember (0-984 feet). | Presumed Absent; The freshwater marsh within the BSA east of Rio Linda Boulevard is likely too densely vegetated by cattails and the Magpie Creek drainage channel is likely too regularly maintained for species occurrence. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is over 10 miles from project location; no occurrences of Suisun Marsh aster were observed during the May 29, 2012 spring blooming surveys; species presumed absent. |
| Avian Species |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tricolored blackbird | Agelaius tricolor | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & \text {-- } \\ & \text { SSC } \end{aligned}$ | Prefers freshwater marsh, swamp and wetland communities, but utilize agricultural or upland habitats that can support large colonies often in the Central Valley area. Requires protected dense nesting habitat protected from predators, be within 3-5 miles to | Presumed Absent; The BSA contains a portion of the dense emergent wetland vegetation east of Rio Linda Boulevard which is large enough to contain a small tricolored blackbird breeding colony. However, the contiguous wetland is |


| Common Name | Scientific Name | Status |  | General Habitat Description | Potential for Occurrence and Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | a suitable foraging area with insect prey and within 0.3 miles of open water. Suitable foraging includes wetland, pastureland, rangeland, at dairy farms, and in some irrigated croplands (silage, alfalfa, etc.). Nests mid-march early August, but may extend until October/November in the Sacramento Valley region. | relatively small (1 acre), emergent vegetation is extremely thick with patches of shrubs and trees scattered throughout. In addition, the site does not appear to contain an adequate and accessible source of open water within 0.3 miles throughout the breeding season. Much of the surrounding area is urbanized or agriculture with potentially unsuitable foraging habitat; habitat unsuitable for species. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 4 miles from project location. |
| Golden eagle | Aquila chrysaetos | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & -- \\ & \text { FP } \end{aligned}$ | Inhabits grasslands, deserts, savannahs, and early successional stages of forest and shrub habitats. Requires open terrain for hunting, often utilizing rolling foothills and mountain terrain, wide arid plateaus deeply cut by streams and canyons, open mountain slopes, and cliffs and rock outcrops. Home range dependent on prey availability and habitat openness; estimated at $48 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$ in northern California. Species nests on cliffs and large trees in open areas; breeds January-August (0-11,000 feet). | Presumed absent; The BSA contains open grassland habitat contiguous with a larger tract of grassland outside the study area which historically may have been suitable for the species. However, the grassland habitat available within and adjacent to the BSA is no longer large enough to support the species and is in close proximity to urban development; habitat unsuitable for golden eagle. |
| Burrowing owl | Athene cunicularia | Fed: CA: DFG: | SSC | Species inhabits arid, open areas with sparse vegetation cover such as deserts, abandoned agricultural areas, grasslands, and disturbed open habitats. Requires friable soils for burrow construction (Below 5,300 feet). | Presumed Absent; Project site is disturbed, developed and too frequently managed for species occurrence; habitat unsuitable for burrowing owl. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 1.5 miles from the project. |
| Swainson's hawk | Buteo swainsoni | Fed: CA: DFG: | -- | Inhabits grasslands with scattered trees, juniper-sage flats, riparian areas, savannahs, and agricultural or ranch lands with groves or lines of trees. Requires adjacent suitable foraging areas such as grasslands, alfalfa or grain fields that support a stable rodent prey base. Breeds March to late August. | Low to Moderate; BSA contains open grassland habitat contiguous with a larger tract of grassland outside the study area potentially suitable for the species foraging. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 1 mile from project location. |
| Western yellowbilled cuckoo | Coccyzus americanus occidentalis | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{E} \end{aligned}$ | Species inhabits riparian forests, along broad, lower flood bottoms of larger river systems. Nests in large blocks of riparian jungles often mixed with cottonwoods. | Presumed absent; BSA lacks the requisite riparian forest habitat in proximity to a large river system; habitat unsuitable for western yellow- |


| Common Name | Scientific Name | Status |  | General Habitat Description <br> Nesting appears to be preferred in riparian forest habitats with a dense understory; requires water near nesting site. Breeds JuneAugust. | Potential for Occurrence and Rationale <br> billed cuckoo. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White-tailed kite | Elanus leucurus | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & -- \\ & \text { FP } \end{aligned}$ | Inhabits rolling foothills and valley margins with scattered oaks and river bottomlands or marshes next to deciduous woodland. Prefers open grasslands, meadows or marshes for foraging close to isolated, dense-topped trees for nesting and perching. Breeds Feb- Oct. | Low to Moderate; The BSA east of Rio Linda Boulevard contains an open grassy field potentially suitable for the species foraging. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 1 mile from project location. |
| Purple martin | Progne subis | Fed: CA: DFG: | SSC | Present in California as a summer migrant, arriving in March and departing by late September. Inhabits valley foothill and montane hardwood/hardwood-conifer, coniferous habitats and riparian habitats. Nests in tall, old, isolated trees or snags in open forest or woodland and in proximity to a body of water. Frequently nests within former woodpecker cavities; may nest in human-made structures such as nesting boxes, under bridges and in culverts. Breeds April-August. | Presumed absent; BSA lacks the requisite riparian forest or hardwood/hardwood conifer forest habitats; habitat unsuitable for purple martin. |
| Bank swallow | Riparia riparia | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & --\quad \\ & \text { T } \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | A migratory colonial nester inhabiting lowland and riparian habitats west of the desert during spring - fall. Majority of current breeding populations occur along the Sacramento and Feather rivers in the north Central Valley. Requires vertical banks or cliffs with fine textured/sandy soils for nesting (tunnel and burrow excavations). Nests exclusively near streams, rivers, lakes or the ocean. Breeds May-July. | Presumed absent; BSA lack the requisite vertical banks or cliffs for species nesting; habitat unsuitable for bank swallow. |
| Least Bell's vireo | Vireo bellii pusillus | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{E} \end{aligned}$ | Summer resident of southern California inhabiting low riparian habitats in the vicinity of water and dry river bottoms. Prefers willows, baccharis, mesquite and other low, dense vegetation as nesting sites (below 2000 feet). | Presumed absent; BSA lacks suitable riparian forest habitat for species occurrence; habitat unsuitable for Least Bell's vireo. |
|  | Mammal Species |  |  |  |  |
| American badger | Taxidea taxus | Fed: CA: DFG: | SSC | Prefers treeless, dry, open stages of most shrub and herbaceous habitats with friable soils and a supply of rodent prey. Species also inhabits forest | Presumed Absent; BSA contains open grassland habitat contiguous with a larger tract of grassland outside the study area with |


| Common Name | Scientific Name | Status |  | General Habitat Description | Potential for Occurrence and Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | glades and meadows, marshes, brushy areas, hot deserts, and mountain meadows. Species maintains burrows within home ranges estimated between 3381,700 acres, dependent on seasonal activity. Burrows are frequently re-used, but new burrows may be created nightly. Young are born in March and April within burrows dug in relatively dry, often sandy, soil, usually in areas with sparse overstory cover. Species is somewhat tolerant of human activity, but is sensitive to automobile mortality, trapping, and persistent poisons (up to 12,000 feet). | habitat components potentially suitable for the species. However, habitat contiguous with the BSA (approximately 64 acres) is too small to support the American badger. |
|  | Amphibian Species |  |  |  |  |
| California tiger salamander | Ambystoma californiense | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{T} \\ & \mathrm{~T} \\ & \mathrm{SSC} \end{aligned}$ | Inhabits annual grasslands and the grassy understory of valleyfoothill hardwood communities. Requires underground refuges, especially ground squirrel burrows and vernal pools or other seasonal water sources for breeding. | Presumed Absent; The site occurs within a disturbed urban area adjacent to residences, businesses and contains frequently disked fields and lacks the preferred grassy understory of valleyfoothill hardwood habitats; habitat unsuitable for California tiger salamander. CNDDB records show the nearest species occurrence is over 15 miles from the project study area. |
| California redlegged frog | Rana draytonii | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T } \\ & \text {-- } \end{aligned}$ | Inhabits lowlands and foothills in or near permanent sources of deep water with dense, shrubby or emergent riparian vegetation. Requires 11-20 weeks of permanent water for larval development and must have access to estivation habitat. <br> Occurs from elevations near sea level to $5,200 \mathrm{ft}$. | Presumed Absent; Magpie Creek in proximity to the BSA does not contain adequate deep water or estivation habitat for the species. CNDDB records show the nearest species occurrence is over 15 miles from the project study area. |
| Western spadefoot | Spea hammondii | Fed: CA: DFG: | SSC | Inhabits burrows within grassland and valley foothill hardwood woodland communities. Requires vernal, shallow, temporary pools formed by heavy winter rains for reproduction. Breeds late winterMarch. | Presumed Absent; Magpie Creek in proximity to the BSA does not contain preferred valley foothill hardwood woodland communities and adjcenct fields are frequently disked; habitat unsuitable for western spadefoot. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is over 10 miles from project location. |


| Common Name | Scientific Name | Status |  | General Habitat Description | Potential for Occurrence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reptile Species |  |  |  |  |  |
| Western pond turtle | Emys marmorata | Fed: CA: DFG: | ssc | A fully aquatic turtle of ponds, marshes, rivers, streams and irrigation ditches with aquatic vegetation. Requires basking sites and suitable (sandy banks or grassy open field) upland habitat for reproduction (Sea level-4,690 feet). | Presumed Absent; BSA contains open a freshwater marsh east of Rio Linda Boulevard, however the marsh is densely vegetated with cattails and lacks requisite basking sites; habitat unsuitable for western pond turtle. |
| Giant garter snake | Thamnophis gigas | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{T} \\ & \mathrm{~T} \end{aligned}$ | Inhabits marsh, swamp, wetland (including agricultural wetlands), sloughs, ponds, rice fields, low gradient streams and irrigation/drainage canals adjacent to uplands. Ideal habitat contains both shallow and deep water with variations in topography. Species requires adequate water during the active season (April-November), emergent, herbaceous wetland vegetation, such as cattails and bulrushes, for escape cover and foraging habitat and mammal burrows estivation. Requires grassy banks and openings in waterside vegetation for basking and higher elevation uplands for cover and refuge from flood waters during winter dormant season. Species is extremely shy and sensitive to disturbance. | Presumed Absent; The BSA contains Magpie Creek and an emergent wetland patch east of Rio Linda Boulevard. However, Magpie Creek does not contain adequate water during the species active season. The contiguous wetland is small (1 acre) and isolated, emergent vegetation is extremely dense with no openings throughout, and potential basking banks are bare of protective vegetation. In addition, the site is frequently used by bicyclists and pedestrians; habitat unsuitable for giant garter snake. The nearest CNDDB occurrence is 4 miles from the project location; no occurrences are documented within the Magpie Creek drainage. |
| Invertebrate Species |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conservancy fairy shrimp | Branchinecta conservatio | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} \\ & -- \\ & \hline- \end{aligned}$ | Inhabits relatively large and turbid clay bottomed playa vernal pools. Species requires pools to continuously hold water for a minimum of 19 days and must remain inundated into the summer months. Occupied playa pools typically are 1 to 88 acres in size, but species may to utilize smaller, less turbid pools. | Presumed Absent; BSA lacks requisite vernal pool habitat and clay soils; habitat unsuitable for conservancy fairy shrimp. |
| Vernal pool fairy shrimp | Branchinecta lynchi | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{T} \\ -- \\ \hline-- \end{gathered}$ | Endemic to the grasslands of the Central Valley, Central Coast mountains and South Coast Mountains, in astatic rain-filled pools. Inhabits small, clear-water sandstone-depression pools and grassed swale, earth slump, or basalt-flow depression pools. Species is dependent on seasonal fluctuations. | Presumed Absent; The BSA lacks requisite vernal sandstone-depression pools and grassed swale, earth slump, or basalt-flow depression pools required for vernal pool fairy shrimp; habitat unsuitable. |


| Common Name | Scientific Name | Status |  | General Habitat Description | Potential for Occurrence and Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valley elderberry longhorn beetle | Desmocerus californicus dimorphus | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T } \\ & \text {-- } \end{aligned}$ | Requires elderberry shrubs (Sambucus sp.) as host plants. Typically in moist valley oak woodlands associated with riparian corridors in the lower Sacramento River and upper San Joaquin River drainages. Prefers elderberries 2-8 inches in diameter; some preference toward 'stressed' elderberries. | Presumed Absent; The BSA lacks the requisite elderberry shrub habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle; habitat unsuitable. |
| Vernal pool tadpole shrimp | Lepidurus packardi | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text {-- } \end{aligned}$ | Inhabits vernal pools and swales containing clear to highly turbid waters such as pools located in grass bottomed swales of unplowed grasslands, old alluvial soils underlain by hardpan, and mud-bottomed pools with highly turbid water. | Presumed Absent; The BSA lacks requisite vernal pools and grassed swales required for vernal pool tadpole shrimp; habitat unsuitable. |
| Fish Species |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green sturgeon | Acipenser medirostris | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{T} \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{SSC} \end{aligned}$ | Most marine sturgeon species. Currently believed to only spawn in the Sacramento River, Rogue River, Klamath and Trinity Rivers (Klamath River basin) to spawn. Known to occupy other river bodies including the lower Feather River; spawning not recorded. Large cobbles preferred for spawning, but may utilize a range of substrates from bedrock to sand. Spawning occurs Mar-Jul. | Presumed Absent; Magpie Creek within and in proximity to the BSA does not provide adequate water, substrates, or connectivity to known river populations; habitat unsuitable for green sturgeon. |
| Sacramento perch | Archoplites interruptus | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & \text {-- } \end{aligned}$ | Inhabits sloughs, lakes, and slow moving rivers of the Central Valley. Prefers turbid lakes, reservoirs and ponds warmed by summer heat and absent of plants; may occasionally occur in clear water among beds of aquatic vegetation. Species tolerates high temperatures, high salinities, high turbidity, and low water clarity. Young require aquatic and overhanging vegetation for cover. Spawns March-August in water temperatures between $64-84^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. | Presumed Absent; Magpie Creek within and in proximity to the BSA does not provide adequate water to support the species; habitat unsuitable for Sacramento perch. |
| Delta smelt | Hypomesus transpacificus | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{T} \\ & \mathrm{E} \end{aligned}$ | Occurs within the SacramentoSan Joaquin Delta and seasonally within the Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait and San Pablo Bay. Most often occurs in partially saline waters. | Presumed Absent; Magpie Creek within and in proximity to the BSA is outside the range of the species; habitat unsuitable for delta smelt. |
| Central Valley steelhead | Oncorhynchus mykiss | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { T } \\ & \text {-- } \end{aligned}$ | Spawning occurs in small tributaries on coarse gravel beds in riffle areas. Central Valley steelhead are found in the | Presumed Absent; Magpie Creek within and in proximity to the BSA does not provide adequate water, substrates, |


| Common Name | Scientific Name | Status |  | General Habitat Description | Potential for Occurrence and Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Sacramento River system; the principal remaining wild populations spawn annually in Deer and Mill Creeks in Tehama County, in the lower Yuba River, a small population in the lower Stanislaus River and, though potentially extirpated, from the San Joaquin basin. | or connectivity to known river populations; habitat unsuitable for Central Valley steelhead. |
| Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon | Oncorhynchus tshawytscha | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{T} \\ & \mathrm{~T} \\ & \hline- \end{aligned}$ | Spring-run Chinook enter the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system to spawn, requiring larger gravel particle size and more water flow through their redds than other salmonids. Remaining runs occur in Butte, Mill, Deer, Antelope, and Beegum Creeks, tributaries to the Sacramento River. Known to occur in Siskiyou and Trinity counties. | Presumed Absent; Magpie Creek within and in proximity to the BSA does not provide adequate water, substrates, or connectivity to known river populations; habitat unsuitable for Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon. |
| Winter-run chinook salmon, Sacramento River | Oncorhynchus tshawytscha | Fed: CA: DFG: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{E} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Winter-run Chinook are currently restricted within the Sacramento River below Keswick dam; species does not spawn in tributaries. Species requires cold water over gravel beds to spawn. | Presumed Absent; Magpie Creek within and in proximity to the BSA does not provide adequate water, substrates, or connectivity to known river populations; habitat unsuitable for Central Valley winter-run Chinook salmon, Sacramento River. |
| Sacramento splittail | Pogonichthys macrolepidotus | Fed: CA: DFG: | SSC | Historically inhabited low moving rivers, sloughs, and alkaline lakes of the Central Valley; now restricted to the Delta, Suisun Bay and associated marshes. Species is adapted to fluctuating environments with tolerance to water salinities from 10-18 ppt., low oxygen levels (< $1.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) and temperatures of $41-75^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. Spawns late February- early July, with a peak in March-April; requires flooded vegetation for spawning activity and protective cover for young. | Presumed Absent; Magpie Creek within and in proximity to the BSA does not provide adequate water, and is outside the current known range of the species; habitat unsuitable for Sacramento splittail. |

Federal Designations (Fed):
(FESA, USFWS)
C: Federal candidate
D: Federally delisted
E: Federally listed, endangered
T: Federally listed, threatened

## State Designations (CA):

(CESA, CDFG)
E:State-listed, endangered
T:State-listed, threatened
FP: CDFG Fully Protected

Other Designations
DFG_SSC: DFG Species of Special Concern
DFG_FP: DFG Fully Protected
California Native Plant Society Designations:
*Note: according to CNPS (Skinner and Pavlik 1994), plants on Lists 1B and 2 meet definitions for listing as threatened or endangered under Section 1901, Chapter 10 of the CFG Code. This interpretation is inconsistent with other definitions.
1A: Plants presumed extinct in California.
1B: Plants rare and endangered in California and throughout their range.
2: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California but more common elsewhere in their range.
3: Plants about which need more information; a review list.
4: Plants of limited distribution; a watch list.
Plants 1B, 2, and 4 extension meanings:
_. 1 Seriously endangered in California (over 80\% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat)
. 2 Fairly endangered in California (20-80\% occurrences threatened)
. 3 Not very endangered in California ( $<20 \%$ of occurrences threatened or no current threats known)

## Potential for Occurrence Criteria:

Present: Species was observed on site during a site visit or focused survey.
High: Habitat (including soils and elevation factors) for the species occurs on site and a known occurrence has been recorded within 5 miles of the site.
Low-Moderate: Either low quality habitat (including soils and elevation factors) for the species occurs on site and a known occurrence exists within 5 miles of the site; or suitable habitat strongly associated with the species occurs on site, but no records were found within the database search.
Presumed Absent: Focused surveys were conducted and the species was not found, or species was found within the database search but habitat (including soils and elevation factors) do not exist on site, or the known geographic range of the species does not include the survey area.
Source: (CNDDB 2012), (CNPS 2012), (Miller and Hornaday 1999), (Shuford and Gardali 2008), (Kyle, Keiller 2011) (Zeiner 1988-1990), (University of California 2012), (University of California Davis 2012), (USFWS 2007, 2005, 2012a, 2012b)

## Standards of Significance

For purposes of this environmental document, an impact would be significant if any of the following conditions or potential thereof, would result with implementation of the proposed project:

- Creation of a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected;
- Substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal; or
- Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands).

For the purposes of this document, "special-status" has been defined to include those species, which are:

- Listed as endangered or threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (or formally proposed for, or candidates for, listing);
- Listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (or proposed for listing);
- Designated as endangered or rare, pursuant to California Fish and Wildlife Code (Section 1901);
- Designated as fully protected, pursuant to California Fish and Wildlife Code (Section 3511, 4700 , or 5050 );
- Designated as species of concern by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), or as species of special concern to California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW);
- Plants or animals that meet the definition of rare or endangered under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).


## Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Chapter 6.3 of the Master EIR evaluated the effects of the 2030 General Plan on biological resources within the general plan policy area. The Master EIR identified potential impacts in terms of degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status birds, through the loss of both nesting and foraging habitat.

Policies in the 2030 General Plan were identified as mitigating the effects of development that could occur under the provisions of the 2030 General Plan. Policy 2.1 .5 calls for the City to preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors and other riparian resources; Policy ER 2.1.10 requires the City to consider the potential impact on sensitive plants for each project and to require pre-construction surveys when appropriate; and Policy 2.1.11 requires the City to coordinate its actions with those of the CDFW, USFWS, and other agencies in the protection of resources.

The Master EIR concluded that the cumulative effects of development that could occur under the 2030 General Plan would be significant and unavoidable as they related to effects on special-status plant species (Impact 6.3-2), reduction of habitat for special-status invertebrates (Impact 6.3-3), loss of habitat for special-status birds (Impact 6.3-4), loss of habitat for specialstatus amphibians and reptiles (Impact 6.3-5), loss of habitat for special-status mammals (Impact 6.5-6), special-status fish (Impact 6.3-7) and, in general, loss of riparian habitat, wetlands and sensitive natural communities such as elderberry savannah (Impacts 6.3-8 through 10).

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that apply to the Project

The following General Plan policies would avoid or lessen environmental impacts as identified in the Master EIR and are considered mitigation measures for the following project-level and cumulative impacts.

Impact 6.3-8: Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could result in the loss or modification of riparian habitat, resulting in a substantial adverse effect.

Mitigation Measure 6.3-8 - General Plan Policy ER 2.1.5-Riparian Habitat Integrity: The

City shall preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors, canals, and drainage ditches that support riparian resources by preserving native plants and, to the extent feasible, removing invasive, non-native plants. If not feasible, adverse impacts on riparian habitat shall be mitigated by the preservation and/or restoration of this habitat at a 1:1 ratio, in perpetuity.

Impact 6.3-9: Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could result in a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands and/or waters of the United States through direct removal, filling, or hydrological interruption.

Mitigation Measure 6.3-9 - General Plan Policy ER 2.1.6 - Wetland Protection: The City shall preserve and protect wetland resources including creeks, rivers, ponds, marshes, vernal pools, and other seasonal wetland, to the extent feasible. If not feasible, the mitigation of all adverse impacts on wetland resources shall be required in compliance with State and Federal regulations protecting wetland resources, and if applicable, threatened or endangered species. Additionally, the City may require either on- or off-site permanent preservation of an equivalent amount of wetland habitat to ensure no-net-loss of value and/or function.

General Plan Policy ER-2.1.9: The City shall preserve, protect, and avoid impacts to wildlife corridors. If corridors are adversely affected, damaged habitat shall be replaced with habitat of equivalent value.

General Plan Policy ER-1.1.7: The City shall minimize disturbances of natural water bodies and natural drainage systems, protect areas of disturbance from erosion and sediment loss, and comply with the City's erosion and sediment control ordinance and stormwater management and discharge control ordinance.

General Plan Policy ER-3.1.3: The City shall protect in place all heritage trees, defined under Sacramento City Code Title 12, Chapter 12.64 Heritage Trees as follows:

1. Any tree of any species with a trunk diameter at breast height (dbh) of thirty-two (32) inches or more, which is of good quality in terms of health, vigor of growth and conformity to generally accepted horticultural standards of shape and location for its species.
2. Any native Oak (Quercus sp.), California buckeye (Aesculus californica) or California sycamore (Platanus racemosa), having a dbh of eleven and a half (11.5) inches or greater when a single trunk, or a cumulative dbh of 11.5 inches or greater when a multi-trunk, which is of good quality in terms of health, vigor of growth and conformity to generally accepted horticultural standards of shape and location for its species.
3. Any tree with an eleven and a half (11.5) inches dbh or greater in a riparian zone. The riparian zone is measured from the centerline of the water course to thirty (30) feet beyond the high water line.
4. Any tree, grove of trees or woodland trees designated by resolution of the city council to be of special historical or environmental value or of significant community benefit.
Where tree removal cannot be avoided, the project shall replace removed trees or provide suitable mitigation.
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## ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

## Questions A and C

The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project would have no additional significant environmental effect to the surrounding environment, creating a hazard to plant or animal populations. Based upon the biologist's database search and a pedestrian survey of the project area, and as described in Table 4, all Special Status Species, except white-tailed kite and Swainson's hawk were presumed absent due to lack of suitable habitat. In order to ensure that no additional significant environmental effects are caused due to the project Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be put in place to protect the project area. To protect nocturnal riparian species during construction, no night work shall be permitted within 100 feet of the Magpie Creek corridor. To minimize permanent lighting within the Magpie Creek corridor, all bridge and trail lighting proposed to be established within 50 feet of Magpie Creek shall be shielded and directed away from the creek. Should any sensitive plant species be found within the project area, specimens shall be Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) fenced or relocated as determined by the appropriate regulatory agency. All landscaping installed as part of the project shall consist of a biologist approved plant palette from native, locally adapted species. Prior to arrival at the project site and prior to leaving the project site, construction equipment that may contain invasive plants and/or seeds shall be cleaned to reduce the spreading of noxious weeds.

## Species of Special Concern:

White-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus) is a CDFW Species of Special Concern. During the May and October biological surveys, no sign of the white-tailed kite was observed. While approximately 8 acres of ruderal vegetation dominated by non-native grassland are potentially suitable for species foraging. Surveys also revealed a high level of human activity within the BSA including transient residence, frequent use of the Sacramento Northern Bike Trail, and a high volume of vehicular travel on Rio Linda Boulevard. This high level of human activity greatly reduces the suitability of observed trees for nesting activities within the BSA. In addition trees present within the BSA lack the density preferred for breeding activities. The nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 1 mile from project site.

Although no white-tailed kites were observed during the May and October 2012 surveys, the species could occur within the project vicinity. Most impacts to potential foraging habitat would be temporary (approximately 1.2 acres), with minimal permanent impacts (approximately 0.2 acre); nesting is not anticipated to occur within BSA. Considering the amount of development and hardscape in the BSA, the current frequency and volume of human activity, the amount of affected foraging habitat within the project limits, anticipated absence of species nesting, and implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 \& BIO-2 the project would not impact the viability of the overall population.

The Swainson's hawk is a State threatened species. During the May and October biological surveys, no sign of the Swainson's hawk was observed. However, red-tailed hawk (Buteo jamaicensis), which forages in similar habitats as the Swainson's hawk, was observed within the BSA. Although the BSA is not located within or near a preferred riparian system, trees potentially suitable for nesting ( 10 feet or taller and containing a dbh of 2 inches or greater) are scattered throughout and approximately 8 acres of ruderal vegetation dominated by non-native grassland are potentially suitable for species foraging. Surveys revealed a high level of human
activity within the BSA including transient residence, frequent use of the Sacramento Northern Bike Trail, and a high volume of vehicular travel on Rio Linda Boulevard which greatly reduces the suitability of observed trees for nesting activities within the BSA. The nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 1 mile from project site.

Although no Swainson's hawk were observed during the May and October 2012 surveys, the species could occur within the project vicinity. Most impacts to potential foraging habitat will be temporary (approximately 1.2 acres), with minimal permanent impacts (approximately 0.2 acre); nesting is not anticipated to occur within the BSA. Considering the amount of development and hardscape in the BSA, the current frequency and volume of human activity, the amount of affected foraging habitat within the project limits, anticipated absence of species nesting, and implementation of minimization and avoidance measures BIO-1 \& BIO-2, the project will not impact the viability of the overall population.

## Potential Waters of the U.S.

## Permanent Impacts

The project would result in permanent impacts ( 0.11 acre Magpie Creek [wetland] and 0.01 acre Magpie Creek [non-wetland]) to Magpie Creek-a water of the U.S. and State. Table 5 is a compilation of anticipated impacts to waters of the U.S. and State within the project area. Realignment of the Rio Linda Bridge and improvements to the Rio Linda Boulevard/Main Avenue intersection over Magpie Creek would permanently modify the natural bottomed Magpie Creek channel. Further, realignment of the creek channel would create approximately 0.21 acre waters of the U.S. and State.

Table 5: Anticipated Impacts to Waters Within the Project Area

|  | Waters of the U.S. |  | Waters of the State |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feature | Temporary | Permanent | Temporary | Permanent |
| Magpie Creek <br> (non-wetland) | 0 | 0.01 acre | 0 | 0.01 |
| Magpie Creek <br> (wetland) | Less than 0.01 | 0.11 | Less than <br> 0.01 | 0.11 |
| Total | Less than $\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 2}$ acre | Less than $\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 2}$ acre |

## Temporary Impacts

The project would result in temporary impacts (less than 0.01 acre Magpie Creek [wetland] and 0 acre Magpie Creek [non-wetland]) to Magpie Creek- a water of the U.S. and State.

## Sensitive Habitats

## Freshwater Marsh:

The freshwater marsh community occurs outside the project construction limits and no permanent impacts are anticipated. Table 6 is a compilation of anticipated impacts to sensitive habitats within the project area.

## Great Valley Willow Scrub:

The Great Valley Willow Scrub community occurs within the project construction limits and a small amount (less than 0.01 acre) of permanent impacts is anticipated to accommodate the realigned bike path and road crossings. The proposed project has been designed to minimize all
permanent impacts to the maximum extent practicable. As a result, permanent impacts would be minimized through the realignment of Magpie Creek and onsite revegetation to restore and improve the existing wetland/riparian vegetation.

Table 6: Anticipated Impacts to Sensitive Habitats Within the Project Area

|  | Waters of the U.S. |  | Waters of the State |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feature | Temporary | Permanent | Temporary | Permanent |
| Freshwater <br> Marsh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Great Valley <br> Willow Scrub | 0.01 acre | Less than 0.01 <br> acre | 0.02 acre | Less than 0.01 <br> acre |
| Total | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ acre | Less than 0.01 <br> acre | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2}$ acre | Less than 0.01 <br> acre |

To further reduce project-specific impacts, implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4 through BIO-8ㅍ would ensure that construction activities would avoid impacts on species of special concern as well as regulatory waters and that the project would compensate for loss of waters within the impact area.
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## Question B

The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project would not result in substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animals. There is low to moderate potential for the Swainson's hawk, a State threatened species to occur within the BSA. There is also low to moderate potential for the white-tailed kite, a CDFW Species of Special Concern to occur within the BSA. Considering the amount of development and hardscape in the BSA, the current frequency and volume of human activity, the amount of affected foraging habitat within the project limits, anticipated absence of species nesting, and the implementation of minimization and avoidance measures incorporated into the project design, the project would not impact the viability of the overall population and further consultation under CESA is not anticipated. To minimize and avoid potential impacts to Swainson's hawk and white-tailed kite, the project would comply with mitigation measures BIO1. BIO-2 and BIO-3 to ensure protection of migratory nesting birds.

## Mitigation Measures

BIO-1: If construction is planned to occur during the raptor nesting season (February 15th September 15th) a preconstruction raptor nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 7 days prior to vegetation removal. Vegetation surveyed shall include all trees, 10 feet or taller and containing a dbh of 2 inches or greater. Within 2 weeks of the nesting raptor survey, all vegetation cleared by the biologist shall be removed by the contractor.

A minimum 500 foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established around any active raptor nest to limit the impacts of construction activities. The contractor shall immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established and is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by the project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged.

BIO-2: If ground disturbance or vegetation removal is to take place during the breeding season (February 15th - September 15th), a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 7 days prior to vegetation removal. Vegetation surveyed shall include all trees, bushes, tall grasses and emergent vegetation. Within 2 weeks of the nesting bird survey, all vegetation cleared by the biologist shall be removed by the contractor.

A minimum 100 foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established around any active nest to limit the impacts of construction activities. The contractor shall immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established and is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by the project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged.

BIO-3: If construction on the existing bridge is planned to occur during the swallow nesting season, measures shall be taken to avoid impacts to migratory swallows. To protect migratory swallows, unoccupied nests will be removed from the existing bridge structure prior to the nesting season (February 15th - September 15th). During the nesting season, the bridge structure shall be maintained through the active removal of partially
constructed nests. Swallows can complete nest construction in approximately 3 days. After a nest is completed, it can no longer be removed until an approved biologist has determined that all birds have fledged and the nest is no longer being used.

BIO-4: The Magpie Creek Channel and all associated wetland vegetation shall be marked as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) and either staked or fenced with orange snow fencing to ensure the construction areas will not encroach further than the work limits designated in the environmental permits (to be obtained prior to construction). During the construction period, a qualified biologist shall inspect the construction limits periodically to ensure sensitive locations remain undisturbed.

BIO-5: Per City of Sacramento General Plan ER-2.1.5 the project shall preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors, canals, and drainage ditches that support riparian resources by preserving native plants and, to the extent feasible, removing invasive nonnative plants. Adverse impacts on riparian habitat shall be mitigated by the preservation and/or restoration of this habitat at a 1:1 ratio, in perpetuity.

BIO-67: Per City of Sacramento General Plan ER-2.1.6 the project shall preserve and protect wetland resources to the greatest extent feasible. Mitigation of all adverse impacts on wetland resources shall be in compliance with State and Federal regulations protecting wetland resources. Additionally, the City shall require either on- or off-site permanent preservation of an equivalent amount of wetland habitat to ensure no-netloss of value and/or function.

BIO-78: At construction completion, the Magpie Creek channel within the project impact area shall be revegetated with native riparian trees and understory and/or wetland marsh. Species selected for revegetation shall be selected from reference sites located within the region. Also, creek contours would be designed in an natural and undulating manor as mitigation grading (see Figure 6).

## Findings

All significant environmental effects of the project relating to Biological Resources can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.


|  | Effect will <br> be studied <br> in the EIR | Effect can be <br> mitigated to <br> less than <br> significant |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3.CULES: | No additional <br> Significant <br> Wenvironmental the project: <br> effect |  |  |
| A)Cause a substantial adverse change in the <br> significance of a historical or archaeological <br> resource as defined in § 15064.5? |  |  |  |
| B) $\quad$Directly or indirectly destroy a unique <br> paleontological resource? |  | X |  |

## Environmental Setting

An Area of Potential Effects (APE) was established considering areas of permanent and temporary disturbance, including construction staging, utility relocations, and grading. The APE has been greatly disturbed and modified by residential and commercial development, the construction and maintenance of roadways, vegetation maintenance, agricultural and field planting maintenance, the construction and maintenance of the Sacramento Northern Railroad (SNRR) (now the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail), buried utilities, monitoring wells, previous realignment of Magpie Creek and the adjacent agricultural fields. The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge (Bridge \#24C-0129) is a two-lane, four span reinforced concrete slab bridge located just south of the intersection of Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard. Constructed in 1937, the bridge carries Rio Linda Boulevard over Magpie Creek. The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

## Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, cultural resource impacts may be considered significant if the proposed project would result in one or more of the following:

1. Cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or
2. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource. Answers to Checklist Questions

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of development under the 2030 General Plan on prehistoric and historic resources. See Chapter 6.4. The Master EIR identified significant and unavoidable effects on historic resources and archaeological resources.

General plan policies identified as reducing such effects call for identification of resources on project sites (Policy HCR 2.1.1), implementation of applicable laws and regulations (Policy HCR 2.1.2 and HCR 2.1.15), early consultation with owners and land developers to minimize effects (Policy HCR 2.1.10 and encouragement of adaptive reuse of historic resources (Policy HCR 2.1.13). Demolition of historic resources is deemed a last resort. (Policy HCR 1.1.14)

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that apply to the Project

None.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

## Question A

A Historic Property Survey Report was prepared in March 2013 to evaluate the potential impacts this project could have on cultural resources. As part of the Historic Property Survey Report, an Archaeological Survey Report was prepared to evaluate the potential for archaeological resources in the project area. As part of the Archaeological Survey Report aerial photos were reviewed to determine the natural topography of the project area before it was transformed by modern development. The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge was observed in the historic aerial photos as it was constructed in 1937. Although the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge was constructed in 1937 it is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Also, the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge is not eligible as a historic resource under State or Local levels (California and City registers). Archaeological field surveys were conducted on October 15,2012 for the purposes of identifying and recording archaeological resources in the project area. This field survey consisted of ten meter-wide transects to inspect the ground surface within the APE. The filed survey did not identify cultural resources requiring further evaluation within the APE. Based on this report, no archaeological resources are expected to be encountered during project construction. Mitigation measure CR-1 would further minimize the potential for impacts to archaeological resources should they be encountered during construction activities.

Disturbance to human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries is not anticipated because the project site is already highly disturbed from existing roadways and development. Measure CR-2 would further minimize the potential for impacts as a result of discovery of human remains during construction.

## Question B

The proposed project is not anticipated to impact paleontological resources. The project area has been disturbed previously by construction of the surrounding development and agricultural uses. As documented in the Master EIR, the general Sacramento area is not considered sensitive for paleontological resources.

## Mitigation Measures

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

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

## Findings

With implementation of the mitigation, the environmental effects of the project relating to Cultural Resources would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

| Issues: | Effect will <br> be studied <br> in the EIR | Effect can be <br> mitigated to less <br> than significant | No additional <br> significant <br> environmental <br> effect |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4.GEOLOGY AND SOILS <br> Would the project allow a project to be built that will <br> either introduce geologic or seismic hazards by allowing <br> the construction of the project on such a site without <br> protection against those hazards? |  |  |  |

## Environmental Setting

Geological formations of the project vicinity include Basin deposits (Qb), Riverbank Formation (Qr) and Modesto-Riverbank Formations (Qmr) (Wagner et.al 1981).

Surface faulting or ground rupture tends to occur along lines of previous faulting. The nearest fault is the Foothill Fault System, located approximately 24 miles north east of the project area. Since previously identified fault lines are not within or near the project area, the possibility of fault rupture is negligible within the site, but in the event of an earthquake on a nearby fault, the project site could experience ground shaking. The California Geological Survey (CGS) probabilistic seismic hazards maps shows that the seismic ground-shaking hazard for the city is relatively low, and is among the lowest in the State.

## Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact is considered significant if it allows a project to be built that will either introduce geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on such a site without protection against those hazards.

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative
Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Chapter 6.5 of the Master EIR evaluated the potential effects related to seismic hazards, underlying soil characteristics, slope stability, erosion, existing mineral resources and paleontological resources in the general plan policy area. Implementation of identified policies in the 2030 General Plan reduced all effects to a less-than-significant level. Policies EC 1.1.1 through 1.1.3 require regular review of the City's seismic and geologic safety standards, geotechnical investigations for project sites and retrofit of critical facilities such as hospitals and schools.

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that apply to the Project

None.

## Answers to Checklist Question

The project area is located approximately 34 miles northwest of the nearest active fault and is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Therefore, the change of fault rupture within the project area is very low. Since previously identified fault lines are not within or near the project site, the possibility of fault rupture is negligible within the project site, but in the event of an earthquake on a nearby fault, the project site could experience ground shaking.

General Plan Goal EC 1.1 and Policies 1.1.1 to 1.1.3 would ensure that lives and property within the project area protected from seismic hazards. These policies include regular review and enforcement of seismic and geologic safety standards, and geotechnical investigations to determine potential for hazards such as ground rupture, ground shaking, and liquefaction due to seismic events, as well as expansive soils and subsidence problems on sites where these hazards may be present. This impact is within the scope of the General Plan and was analyzed in the Master EIR. By complying with the General Plan policies and City Code, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on exposing life and property to seismic hazards. The project site is relatively level, so there would be no impacts related to the possibility of landslides.

The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) permits all regulated construction activities under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity projects with more than 1 acre of ground disturbance. The project's construction activities would be required to comply with the City's Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. Compliance under this ordinance includes preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan that identifies and implements a variety of best management practices to reduce the potential for erosion or sedimentation.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Geology and Soils.
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## Environmental and Regulatory Setting

The information provided in this section is based on the Initial Site Assessment (ISA) prepared for the project in January 2013. The project area includes a mixture of public roads with associated ROW, retail and commercial development, public-use property, public municipal property, and undeveloped land. The ISA was prepared to evaluate whether potential sources or indications of hazardous substances contamination are present in the areas of right-of-way and construction for the proposed project. This investigation included a field inspection of the project area and a review of listings of Federal and State regulatory agencies that are responsible for recording incidents of hazardous material contamination.

Information obtained from the City, and review of historical documents, indicate that the Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard roadways were constructed during the early to mid-1910s. Sections of the Right of Way (ROW) adjacent to these roadways are unpaved and may contain concentrations of Aerially Deposited Lead (ADL) related to historical automotive emissions. In addition, lead and chromium have historically been used in yellow paint and thermoplastic striping similar to that used along Main Avenue, Rio Linda Boulevard, and the bike trail.

Review of regulatory and historical information indicates that the former Nolan's Self Serve gasoline station was operated from at least 1960 to 1992 on the northwestern project area, near the northwestern corner of the Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard intersection.

## Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact is considered significant if the proposed project would:

- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities;
- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials; or
- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities.


## Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR evaluated effects of development on hazardous materials, emergency response and aircraft crash hazards. See Chapter 6.6. Implementation of the General Plan may result in the exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction activities, and exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during the life of the General Plan. Impacts identified related to construction activities and operations were found to be less than significant. Policies included in the 2030 general Plan, including PHS 3.1.1 (investigation of sites for contamination) and PHS 3.1.2 (preparation of hazardous materials actions plans when appropriate) were effective in reducing the identified impacts.

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that apply to the Project

None.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

## Question A

Sections of the Right of Way (ROW) adjacent to these roadways are unpaved and may contain concentrations of Aerially Deposited Lead (ADL) related to historical automotive emissions. In addition, lead and chromium have historically been used in yellow paint and thermoplastic striping similar to that used along Main Avenue, Rio Linda Boulevard, and the bike trail. A fuel leak associated with the Former Nolan's Self Serve gasoline station's Underground Storage Tank (UST) and dispensing system was reported to the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department (SCEMD) in 1992. In 1999 and 2000 seven USTs and the fuel piping and dispensing facilities were removed, and the gasoline station was closed. Results of environmental investigation conducted at the former gasoline station indicated the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons in the underlying soil and groundwater. Concentrations of total petroleum hydrocarbons are referenced to gasoline (TPHg), and diesel (TPHd), gasoline constituents, and fuel oxygenates were reported in samples collected from onsite soil at depths ranging from 3 to 65 feet. Concentrations of TPHg, benzene, and 1,2-dichloroethane (1,2-DCA) were reported in soil samples collected beneath the former gasoline station from 1999 to 2009 at concentrations up to $9,300 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}, 12 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, and $0.16 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, respectively. Concentrations of these constituents reportedly extended horizontally from the location of the former onsite fuel storage and dispensing area to the Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard ROWs and possibly roadways. No remediation activities (other than soil excavated from the former UST pits and piping trenches in 1999 and 2000) have been conducted to remove petroleum hydrocarbons and/or fuel oxygenates from soil beneath the former gasoline station.

With the incorporation of HAZ-1 through HAZ-3 there would be a less-than-significant impact to people in regards to exposure of existing contaminated soil and lead during construction activities.

## Question B

Review of information available through the USGS and the CGS indicated that nearest ultramafic rock formation which may be associated with naturally occurring asbestos is approximately 19 miles northeast of the project area, along the eastern banks of Folsom Lake (USGS, 2011 and CGS, 2011).

Observations made during the site reconnaissance indicate that the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge and the bike trail bridge are constructed with unpainted concrete supports, abutments, and barriers, with concrete and/or asphalt decks. Therefore, analysis for lead-containing prior to removal of these structures is not warranted.

## Question C

Groundwater monitoring conducted since 2003 indicates that generally, TPHg and 1,2-DCA have typically been detected in groundwater samples collected from onsite wells at the former gasoline station. Although TPHg concentrations have not been detected in samples collected from the onsite wells since August 2008, concentrations of 1,2-DCA have been reported in groundwater samples collected as recently as February 2012. Groundwater is reportedly situated at a depth of approximately 57 feet beneath the former gasoline station and flows in a generally southeastern direction (toward the Main Avenue and Rio Lind Boulevard intersection). No remediation activities have been conducted to remove TPHg or 1,2-DCA from groundwater.

Although the presence of 1,2-DCA in groundwater beneath and downgradient (southeast) of the former onsite gasoline station represents an Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC) associated with the project area, the proposed construction activities associated with the bridge replacement project are not likely to encounter groundwater, which is situated at a depth of approximately 57 feet. Therefore, assessment of groundwater conditions beneath the Site prior to design and construction of the bridge replacement is not warranted.

The bridge replacement project may require construction within the areas where monitoring wells associated with the former gasoline station groundwater monitoring program have been located along the north side of Main Avenue and west side of Rio Linda Boulevard. At least one monitoring well (MW-5) appears to be located within the proposed realignment of Main Avenue. It is possible that the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department (SCEMD) and the former gasoline owner (the entity financially responsible for the ongoing groundwater monitoring program) may require that the City replace monitoring wells damaged or removed during the bridge replacement project construction activities.

## Mitigation Measures

HAZ-1: Prior to ground disturbing activities at the affected areas, ADL testing shall be completed within the unpaved ROW along Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard. Testing shall be completed prior to the start of construction and will be performed.

The City of Sacramento will perform ADL testing during final design of the project. If testing results are positive for substantial amounts of ADL (pursuant to DTSC standards)

Caltrans Standard Special Provisions (SSPs) will be provided outlining proper remediation of the contaminated soils.

SSPs will be required to ensure worker protection from lead exposure and/or whether soil being excavated or disturbed will require handling or disposal as a hazardous material to comply with Federal and State regulations.

HAZ-2: Prior to roadway demolition and excavation, a preliminary investigation shall be completed to assess the potential presence of lead and chromium in the yellow paint and thermoplastic striping used along Main Avenue, Rio Linda Boulevard, and the bike trail that will be removed as part of the bridge replacement project. The striping investigation should be conducted to evaluate whether Caltrans SSPs require implementation to ensure worker protection from metals exposure and/or whether the striping being removed will require handling or disposal as hazardous materials to comply with Federal and State regulations.

HAZ-3: Prior to construction ground disturbing activities, a preliminary investigation shall be completed to assess the potential presence of motor vehicle fuels and fuel oxygenates in soil associated with the former onsite gasoline station that will be excavated or disturbed as part of the bridge replacement project. The preliminary soil investigation should be conducted to assess the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons and fuel oxygenates in soil beneath the Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard ROWs and possibly roadways adjacent to the former onsite gasoline station to ensure worker protection from exposure to these constituents and/or whether soil being excavated or disturbed will require handling or disposal as a hazardous material to comply with Federal and State regulations.

## Findings

All significant environmental effects of the project relating to Hazards can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

$\left.$|  |  | Effect will be <br> studied in the <br> EIR | Effect can be <br> mitigated to <br> less than <br> significant |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Issues: |  |  |  | | No additional |
| :--- |
| significant |
| environmental |
| effect | \right\rvert\,-| 6. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY |
| :--- |
| Would the project: |
| A)Substantially degrade water quality and violate <br> any water quality objectives set by the State <br> Water Resources Control Board, due to <br> increases in sediments and other contaminants <br> generated by construction and/or development <br> of the project? |

## Environmental Setting

The project area is within the Valley-American hydrologic unit and the Lower Sacramento River Watershed. Downstream Magpie Creek is affluent to Steelhead Creek (formerly known as Natomas East Main Drainage Canal (NEMDC)), then confluence with the greater Sacramento River. Magpie Creek is not 303(d) listed and it has no associated TMDL restrictions. (Caltrans, 2010)

The Sacramento River and its tributary channels beneficial uses are municipal and domestic supply, agriculture, industry, recreation, freshwater habitats (migration and spawning of fish), and wildlife habitat according to the Basin Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, 1998).

The proposed project is not located within one of California's four sole source aquifers. The project is located in Sacramento County which does not have a sole source aquifer.

## General Plan Policies Considered Mitigation

The following General Plan policy would avoid or lessen environmental impacts as identified in the Master EIR and is considered a mitigation measure for the following project-level and cumulative impacts.

Impact 6.7-3: Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could increase exposure of people and/or property to risk of injury and damage from a localized 100-year flood.

Impact 6.7-6: Implementation of the 2030 General Plan, in addition to other projects in the watershed, could result in increased numbers of residents and structures exposed to a localized 100-year flood event.

Mitigation Measure 6.7-6 - General Plan Policy ER 1.1.5-No Net Increase: The City shall require all new development to contribute no net increase in stormwater runoff peak flows over existing conditions associated with a 100- year storm event.

## Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to hydrology and water quality may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan Master EIR:

- substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the Specific Plan or
- substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Chapter 6.7 of the Master EIR evaluates the potential effects of the 2030 General Plan as they relate to surface water, groundwater, flooding, stormwater and water quality. Potential effects include water quality degradation due to construction activities (Impacts 6.7-1, 6.7-2), and exposure of people to flood risks (Impacts 6.7-3, 6.7-4). Policies included in the 2030 General Plan, including a directive for regional cooperation (Policies ER 1.1.2, EC 2.1.1, EC 2.1.1), comprehensive flood management (Policy EC 2.1.14), and construction of adequate drainage facilities with new development (Policy U 4.1.1) were identified that reduced all impacts to a less-than-significant level.

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that apply to the Project

None.

## ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

## Questions A and B

Realignment of Magpie Creek would disturb approximately 0.5 acre of soil. Construction activities would not substantially degrade water quality and would not violate any water quality objectives by the State Water Resources Control Board. BMPs will be put in place to prevent sediment and other contaminants generated by construction from impacting Magpie Creek.

The proposed project would have an insignificant impact to the existing 100-year floodplain of Lower Magpie Creek within the project vicinity. The project is located within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Zone AE, which represents areas with a 1\% annual chance of flooding and where the base flood elevation (BFE) is determined. The project area is also within Zone X, which represents areas of $0.2 \%$ annual chance flood; areas of $1 \%$ annual change flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 1\% annual chance flood. The project site is located at the limit of the detailed study conducted by FEMA (as shown on the Flood Insurance Rate Map in Appendix A).

The Flood of October 1962 was the largest that has been recorded at Roseville gaging station on Dry Creek, which runs from east to west and north of the project site. During this storm, flood waters from Magpie Creek bypassed the upper portion of the diversion levee and flowed into

Lower Magpie Creek, causing flooding in the area between Dry Creek Road and Raley Boulevard. During a 500-year flood event, some flood waters will overtop the levee on Lower Magpie Creek Diversion and flow south toward the Project site. The Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) shows the 100-year flood flows are contained within Lower Magpie Creek. The FIRM is included in Appendix A.

A Location Hydraulic Study was prepared for the proposed project in which analysis of the bridge replacement took place. Based on the analysis, the proposed project would result in a slight decrease in water surface elevation upstream of the bridge and a slight increase in water surface elevation downstream of the bridge. However, these changes in water surface elevation are considered to be insignificant.

Table 7: Summary of 100-year Water Surface Elevations

| Location | Water Surface Elevation (ft NGVD 29) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing | Proposed |
| Upstream, east, of the bridge | 34.4 | 34.1 |
| Upstream <br> (RS 280 for Existing) <br> (RS 330 for Proposed) | 34.0 | 33.8 |
| Downstream <br> (RS 233 for Existing) <br> (RS 233 for Proposed) | 33.7 | 33.4 |
| Downstream, west, of the bridge | 32.8 | 32.8 |

Note: RS = River Station
Source: Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project; Draft Location Hydraulic Study Report; Prepared by: WRECO for the City of Sacramento, March 2013

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Hydrology and Water Quality.
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## Environmental Setting

Sensitive viewer groups in the project area include existing commercial customers along Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue as well as bike trail users on the east side of Rio Linda Boulevard. The Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue intersection currently has a flashing red stop light and one standard street light.

## Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, aesthetics impacts may be considered significant if the proposed project would result in one or more of the following:

Glare. Glare is considered to be significant if it would be cast in such a way as to cause public hazard or annoyance for a sustained period of time.

Light. Light is considered significant if it would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses.

## Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR described the existing visual conditions in the general plan policy area, and the potential changes to those conditions that could result from development consistent with the 2030 general Plan. See Master EIR, Chapter 6.13, Urban design and Visual Resources.

The Master EIR identified potential impacts for glare (Impact 6.13-1). Mitigation Measure 6.13-1, set forth below, was identified to reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.

Light cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses was identified as a potential impact (Impact 6.13-2). The Master EIR identified Policy LU 6.1.14 (Compatibility with Adjoining Uses) and its requirement that lighting must be shielded and directed downward as reducing the potential effect to a less-than-significant level.

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that Apply to Project

General Plan Policy ER 7.1.5 Lighting. The City shall minimize obtrusive light by limiting outdoor lighting that is misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary.

General Plan Policy ER 7.1.6 Glare. The City shall require that new development avoid the creation of incompatible glare through development design features.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

## Questions A AND B

The project would not create a source of glare that would cause a public hazard or annoyance. While the new bridge would have a widened bridge surface, this widening would not be substantial enough to create a new source of reflective daytime or nighttime glare. The roadway and bridge surfaces would be of materials typically seen by drivers. No substantially reflective surfaces are proposed. Project implementation would require that existing vegetation be removed along the existing roadway within the project area to allow for the creek realignment, thereby increasing the effects of glare and reducing the available shade for roadway surfaces. However, the project would not include the construction of structures that could reflect or concentrate sunlight, thereby increasing glare.

The project would not create a substantial new source of light that would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses. The project includes the installation of a traffic signal which would replace a flashing red stop light currently at the intersection. The traffic signal would be of standard dimensions and materials typically seen by drivers; it would not be a substantial new source of bright light and would not constitute a hazard or annoyance. New street lights would be added to the intersection to increase visibility over the bridge and along Rio Linda Boulevard. Light casting onto oncoming traffic or residential areas would not result, as all lighting added in the project area would be shielded with downcasting, consistent with the City of Sacramento Master EIR lighting requirements.

As part of the project, street lighting would be added to increase visibility over the bridge and along Rio Linda Boulevard.

These impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in additional significant impacts on light and glare that were not addressed or considered in the Master EIR.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to light and glare.

Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project
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## Environmental Setting

The noise environment near the proposed project is dominated by traffic sources. Background noise levels are influenced by Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue, existing surrounding residential uses, bike trail activities. Traffic remains the dominant noise source at the project site.

The vicinity of the project area is most similar to that of "normal suburban residential urban," and "normal urban residential." Normal suburban residential urban areas have a typical noise level of 50-55 dBA while Normal Urban Residential has a typical noise level of 60 dBA (Cowan 1984, Hoover and Keith 1996).

## Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts due to noise may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the proposed project would result in the following impacts
that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan Master EIR:

- result in exterior noise levels in the project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the project's noise level increases;
- result in residential interior noise levels of $45 \mathrm{dBA} \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{dn}}$ or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project;
- result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance;
- permit existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction;
- permit adjacent residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations; or
- permit historic buildings and archaeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inches per second due to project construction and highway traffic.


## Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR evaluated the potential for development under the 2030 General Plan to increase noise levels in the community. New noise sources include vehicular traffic, aircraft, railways, light rail and stationary sources. The general plan policies establish exterior (Policy EC 3.1.1) and interior (EC 3.1.3) noise standards. A variety of policies provide standards for the types of development envisioned in the general plan. See Policy EC 3.1.8, which requires new mixed-use, commercial and industrial development to mitigate the effects of noise from operations on adjoining sensitive land use, and Policy 3.1.9, which calls for the City to limit hours of operations for parks and active recreation areas to minimize disturbance to nearby residences. Notwithstanding application of the general plan policies, noise impacts for exterior noise levels (Impact 6.8-1) and interior noise levels (Impact 6.8-2), and vibration impacts (Impact 6.8-4) were found to be significant and unavoidable.

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that apply to the Project

The following General Plan policies would avoid or lessen environmental impacts as identified in the Master EIR and are considered mitigation measures for the following project-level and cumulative impacts.

Impact 6.8-4: Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could permit existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction.

Impact 6.8-9: Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could result in cumulative construction vibration levels that exceed the vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second.

General Plan Policy EC 3.1.6 - Vibration Screening Distances: The City shall require new residential and commercial projects located adjacent to major freeways, hard rail lines, or light rail
lines to follow the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) screening distance criteria.
Impact 6.8-6: Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could permit historic buildings and archeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.25 inches per second due to project construction, highway traffic, and rail operations.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

## Question A, B and C

During construction of the project, noise from construction activities may intermittently dominate the noise environment in the immediate area of construction. Construction noise is regulated by the City of Sacramento. Construction activity that occurs outside the exempt hours of the day (7am to 6 pm from Monday through Saturday, and 9am to 6 pm on Sundays) could result in noise that exceeds the 50-dBA daytime standard or 45-dBA nighttime standard. The contractor would be required to comply with the noise ordinance during construction activities. Construction noise is exempt as long as there is compliance with the noise code requirements pursuant to the City Code Section 8.68 .080 . However, if construction activities generate noise in violation of the timeframes described above, the contractor will be required to obtain the proper variances as outlined in Sections 8.68 .250 and 8.68 .260 . The project would include construction methods, structure designs, and operational methods that would reduce the potential noise and vibration impacts to less than significant levels.

Generally, noise levels at construction sites can vary from 55 dBA to a maximum of nearly 96 dBA when heavy equipment is used. Construction noise of this project would be intermittent, and noise levels would vary depending on the type of construction activity. For this project, lowest construction equipment-related noise levels would be 55 dBA at a distance of 50 ft for sound from a pick-up truck. Highest noise levels would be up to 90 dBA (at a distance of 50 ft ) for a concrete saw for pavement removal. A jackhammer, which would be up to 89 dBA at a distance of 50 ft , would also be utilized during the proposed project.

The project is not anticipated to increase noise levels in the long term. The proposed project is a realignment project of an existing intersection and is not a new road. The project would not significantly change the horizontal or vertical alignment of the road. The closest residences to the project site are approximately 250 feet northeast of the bridge (see Figure 3). The proposed project would not move the road closer to the residences. A receiving lane for left turn movements will be added to Main Avenue, but this does not qualify as capacity increasing as no new through lane is being added to the intersection. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to substantially change the amount of traffic through the intersection.

The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on noise based on: 1) the project is not anticipated to change traffic; 2) Proposed construction duration is temporary; and 3) construction of the project would use proposed minimization methods. No adverse noise impacts from construction are anticipated because construction would be conducted in accordance with the City of Sacramento Codes and would be short term and intermittent.

## Question D through F

The project site is level, and does not include buildings or structures that would require unusual construction techniques that would cause substantial vibration. The project would not result in
additional significant environmental effects. Substantial levels of vibration are not anticipated because traffic volumes will be similar to the existing situation.

The project would generate some vibration due to construction activities, but it would not include construction activities that could generate significant ground vibration, such as pile driving. There are no historic structures within the project area that would be affected by constructionrelated vibration, this impact would not exceed the impact disclosed in the Master EIR.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

All significant environmental effects of the project relating to Noise can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

|  | Effect will be <br> studied in the <br> EIR | Effect can be <br> mitigated to <br> less than <br> significant | No additional <br> significant <br> environmental <br> effect |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Issues: |  |  |  |
| 9. PUBLIC SERVICES |  |  |  |
| Would the project result in the need for new or <br> altered services related to fire protection, police <br> protection, school facilities, roadway maintenance, or <br> other governmental services beyond what was <br> anticipated in the 2030 General Plan? |  |  |  |

## Environmental Setting

## Fire

The City of Sacramento provides fire protection services, to the project area and it is likely that the project would be served by Fire Station 17. Fire Station 17 is located at 1311 Bell Avenue approximately 1.25 miles from the proposed project site. The Fire Department operates approximately 21 stations. Fire stations are located so as to provide a maximum effective service radius of two miles (SGPU DEIR, M-1). This service radius virtually assures blanket coverage of the City. Typical response time to fire calls is four minutes (SGPU DEIR, M-1).

## Police

The City of Sacramento provides police protection service approximately 2 miles from the project area. The William J. Kinney Police Facility is the police station that would service the project area. It is located at 3550 Marysville Boulevard.

## School District

The proposed project site is within the Robla Elementary School District and the Twin Rivers Unified School District. The proposed project area is located approximately 0.5 miles from Norwood Junior High School. Rio Linda Boulevard would remain open throughout construction; no detour would be implemented due to the proposed project.

## Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, roadway maintenance, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan.

## Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of the 2030 General Plan on various public services. These include parks (Chapter 6.9) and police, fire protection, schools, libraries and emergency services (Chapter 6.10).

The general plan provides that adequate staffing levels for police and fire are important for the long-term health, safety and well-being of the community (Goal PHS 1.1, PHS 2.1). The Master EIR concluded that effects would be less than significant.

General Plan policies that call for the City to consider impacts of new development on schools (see, for example, Policy ERC 1.1.2 setting forth locational criteria, and Policy ERC 1.1.5 that encourages joint-use development of facilities) reduced impacts on schools to a less-thansignificant level. Impacts on library facilities were also considered less than significant (Impact 6.10-8).

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that apply to the Project

None.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

The project would not result in the need for new public services beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan. The project does not propose a new housing or commercial development requiring additional school facilities, police, and/or fire services. Road maintenance would continue at the new intersection, as is currently done with the existing. Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Street are classified as "Collector" streets in the City of Sacramento 2030 General Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the City of Sacramento General Plan as Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Street will continue to be "collector" streets and the project would not change the zoning designation of adjacent areas. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and land use designations for the project site. Impacts of development that could be anticipated pursuant to the general plan were evaluated in the Master EIR. Cumulative effects of development on public services were discussed and evaluated. See Master EIR Chapter 6.10.

The impact would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an additional significant impact that was not addressed or considered in the Master EIR.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Public Services.

|  | Effect will be <br> studied in the <br> EIR | Effect can be <br> mitigated to <br> less than <br> significant | No additional <br> significant <br> environmental <br> effect |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10. RECREATION <br> Would the project: <br> A) <br> Cause or accelerate substantial physical <br> deterioration of existing area parks or <br> recreational facilities? |  |  |  |
| B)Create a need for construction or expansion <br> of recreational facilities beyond what was <br> anticipated in the 2030 General Plan? |  | X |  |

## Environmental Setting

The North Sacramento Community Plan area is served by a variety of recreational resources. Recreational resources include rivers, ponds, bike trails, and parks maintained by the City of Sacramento. The Northern Sacramento Bike Trail is publicly owned bikeway used as a recreational resource within the project area.

## Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to recreational resources are considered significant if the proposed project would do either of the following:

- cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities; or
- create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan.


## Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Chapter 6.9 of the Master EIR considered the effects of the 2030 General Plan on the City's existing parkland, urban forest, recreational facilities and recreational services. The general plan identified a goal of providing an integrated park and recreation system in the City (Goal ERC 2.1). New residential development will be required to dedicate land, pay in-lieu fees or otherwise contribute a fair share to the acquisition and development of parks and recreation facilities. (Policy ERC 2.2.4) Impacts were considered less than significant after application of the applicable policies. (Impacts 6.9-1 and 6.9-2).

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that apply to the Project

None required.

## ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

## QUESTIONS A AND B

The project would not cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities. In order to realign the Magpie Creek channel, a segment of the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail would be realigned slightly to the west, closer to Rio Linda Boulevard. This Class II bike trail would remain at a general north-south route. A Temporary Occupancy Letter has been obtained from the City of Sacramento Parks and Recreation Department per federal Section 4(f) requirements regarding effects to public parks and recreational facilities. The Temporary Occupancy Letter (included in Appendix B) states that there is not a change in ownership of the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail; work to be completed would be minor and construction activities concerning the bike trail would take less time than the full construction period for the project. The Temporary Occupancy letter also supports that the bike trail realignment would not have an adverse effect on the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail.

As a bridge replacement and intersection realignment, the project does not propose new residential or commercial developments creating a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan. Further, the Northern Sacramento bike trail will remain open throughout construction.

While the existing Class II bike trail, which parallels Rio Linda Boulevard would be realigned, this recreational facility would not be adversely affected in the long term. The bike trail will continue along a general north-south alignment. A Temporary Occupancy Letter has been obtained from the City of Sacramento Parks and Recreation Department, which satisfies Section 4(f) requirements.

These impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in additional significant impacts on recreation that were not addressed or considered in the Master EIR.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Recreation.

| Issues: | Effect remains significant with all identified mitigation | Effect can be mitigated to less than significant | No additional significant environmental effect |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION <br> Would the project: <br> A) Roadway segments: degrade peak period Level of Service (LOS) from A,B,C or D (without the project) to E or F (with project) or the LOS (without project) is $E$ or $F$, and project generated traffic increases the Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C ratio) by 0.02 or more. |  |  | X |
| B) Intersections: degrade peak period level of service from A, B, C or D (without project) to E or $F$ (with project) or the LOS (without project) is $E$ or $F$, and project generated traffic increases the peak period average vehicle delay by five seconds or more.? |  |  | X |
| C) Freeway facilities: off-ramps with vehicle queues that extend into the ramp's deceleration area or onto the freeway; project traffic increases that cause any ramp's merge/diverge level of service to be worse than the freeway's level of service; project traffic increases that cause the freeway level of service to deteriorate beyond level of service threshold defined in the Caltrans Route Concept Report for the facility; or the expected ramp queue is greater than the storage capacity? |  |  | X |
| D) Transit: adversely affect public transit operations or fail to adequately provide for access to public? |  |  | X |
| E) Bicycle facilities: adversely affect bicycle travel, bicycle paths or fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle? |  |  | X |
| F) Pedestrian: adversely affect pedestrian travel, pedestrian paths or fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians? |  |  | X |

## Environmental Setting

The project site is located on Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue intersection in the City of Sacramento. The project parallels the Northern Sacramento Bike trail. The bridge currently has no shoulders, a substandard condition which is in violation of Caltrans standard recommendation of 6 -foot wide shoulders. The poor approach geometrics caused by the skewed intersection combined with a narrow bridge and lack of traffic signals cause vehicular congestion and
hazardous travel conditions for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. A replacement bridge and realignment of Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard intersection into a right-angle intersection will alleviate vehicular congestion and greatly improve safety conditions for both vehicles and pedestrians.

## Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts resulting from changes in transportation or circulation may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan Master EIR:

## Roadway Segments

A) the traffic generated by a project degrades peak period Level of Service (LOS) from A,B,C or D (without the project) to E or F (with project) or
B) the LOS (without project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C ratio) by 0.02 or more.

## Intersections

- the traffic generated by a project degrades peak period level of service from $A, B, C$ or $D$ (without project) to E or F (with project) or
- the LOS (without project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the peak period average vehicle delay by five seconds or more.


## Freeway Facilities

Caltrans considers the following to be significant impacts.

- off-ramps with vehicle queues that extend into the ramp's deceleration area or onto the freeway;
- project traffic increases that cause any ramp's merge/diverge level of service to be worse than the freeway's level of service;
- project traffic increases that cause the freeway level of service to deteriorate beyond level of service threshold defined in the Caltrans Route Concept Report for the facility; or
- the expected ramp queue is greater than the storage capacity.


## Transit

- adversely affect public transit operations or
- fail to adequately provide for access to public transit.


## Bicycle Facilities

- adversely affect bicycle travel, bicycle paths or
- fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle.


## Pedestrian Circulation

- adversely affect pedestrian travel, pedestrian paths or
- fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians.


## Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Transportation and circulation were discussed in the Master EIR in Chapter 6.12. Various modes of travel were included in the analysis, including vehicular, transit, bicycle, pedestrian and aviation components. The analysis included consideration of roadway capacity and identification of levels of service, and effects of the 2030 General Plan on the public transportation system. Provisions of the 2030 General Plan that provide substantial guidance include Goal Mobility 1.1, calling for a transportation system that is effectively planned, managed, operated and maintained, promotion of multimodal choices (Policy M 1.2.1), identification of level of service standards (Policy M 1.2.2), development of a fair share funding system for Caltrans facilities (Policy M 1.5.6) and development of complete streets (Goal M 4.2).

While the general plan includes numerous policies that direct the development of the City's transportation system, the Master EIR concluded that the general plan development would result in significant and unavoidable effects. See Impacts 6.12-1, 6.12-8 (roadway segments in the City), Impacts 6.12-2, 6.12-9 (roadway segments in neighboring jurisdictions), and Impacts 6.12-3, 6.12-10 (freeway segments).

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that apply to the Project

None.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

## Questions A through C

It is anticipated that long-term traffic operations would not be adversely affected by the proposed project. A Traffic Signal Concept Report was prepared by Fehr and Peers for the City of Sacramento to analyze traffic related to the proposed project. The project will improve traffic operations, reduce vehicle queuing, realign Main Avenue into the existing City right-of-way, and improve pedestrian connectivity with Northern Sacramento Bike Trail. The proposed project is consistent with the City of Sacramento General Plan as Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Street will continue to be "collector" streets. One through-lane will be provided in each direction along Rio Linda Boulevard with an additional receiving lane to accommodate the required dual left turns from Main Avenue.

The proposed land use is consistent with the existing land use designation in the General Plan and generally consistent with the land use designation in the Community Plan. The project is not anticipated to create additional vehicle trips. Therefore, no additional volume would be generated and would not result in any new traffic impacts.

While construction of the proposed project would generate short-term impacts through the intersection, construction activities would be temporary, intermittent, and have a minimal impact on surrounding traffic flows. Such short-term construction impacts are considered less than significant. The intersection is 0.94 miles from I-80 (there is no direct connection between Rio Linda Boulevard and I-80) and would not adversely affect the operations of any freeway facility. Neither Main Avenue nor Rio Linda Boulevard directly connects to I-80. The intersection would remain open during construction to maintain access to local businesses. Prior to construction a Traffic Management Plan will be developed by the contractor, which would include items such
as signage and other construction related information for continuing traffic operations through the project site.

## QUESTIONS D THROUGH F

The proposed project development would not conflict with transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. The Northern Sacramento Bike Trail would be realigned and allowed to stay open during construction, as discussed under Subsection 10-Recreation of this Initial Study. While pedestrian use is not substantial at this intersection, staging will allow for similar access across the streets during construction. In the long-term, pedestrian access may be improved with the inclusion of crosswalks.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Transportation and Circulation.

|  | Effect will be <br> studied in the <br> EIR | Effect can be <br> mitigated to <br> less than <br> significant | No additional <br> significant <br> environmental <br> effect |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS <br> Would the project: <br> A) <br> Result in the determination that adequate <br> capacity is not available to serve the project's <br> demand in addition to existing commitments? |  |  |  |
| B)Require or result in either the construction of <br> new utilities or the expansion of existing <br> utilities, the construction of which could <br> cause significant environmental impacts? |  | X |  |

## Environmental Setting

Existing utilities within the project limits include natural gas, water, sewer, and telecommunications service. Natural gas is provided by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG\&E). The City provides municipal water service, and wastewater collection (sewer) within the project area. Telecommunications services in the project area are provided by AT\&T.

## Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, or school facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan:

- result in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the project's demand in addition to existing commitments or
- require or result in either the construction of new utilities or the expansion of existing utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.


## Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master Eir, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR evaluated the effects of development under the 2030 General Plan on water supply, sewer and storm drainage, solid waste, electricity, natural gas and telecommunications. See Chapter 6.11.

The Master EIR evaluated the impacts of increased demand for water that would occur with development under the 2030 General Plan. Policies in the general plan would reduce the impact generally to a less-than-significant level (see Impact 6.11-1) but the need for new water supply facilities results in a significant and unavoidable effect (Impact 6.11-2). The potential need for expansion of wastewater treatment facilities was identified as having a significant and unavoidable effect (Impacts 6.11-4, 6.11-5Impacts on solid waste facilities were less than significant (Impacts 6.11-7, 6.11-8). Implementation of energy efficient standards as set forth in

Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations for residential and non-residential buildings, would reduce effects for energy to a less-than-significant level.

## Mitigation Measures from 2030 General Plan Master Eir that apply to the Project

None.

## ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

## QUESTIONS A AND B

The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan roadway designations and zoning for the project site and would not create a demand for new utility facilities during construction or operation. During construction, the project would generate solid waste as a result of demolition of the old bridge and roadway, and removal of debris. Construction and demolition waste would be disposed of at a landfill based on market conditions and capacity.

Within the project area an existing twelve inch water line is anchored to the side of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge and will need to be relocated as a result of the bridge replacement. Other possible relocations may include PG\&E's four inch gas line located along the west side of the bridge, AT\&T's telecommunication lines located near the road along both sides of the bridge, and the forty-eight inch sewer line located along the east side of the bridge. Also, Comcast overhead lines run along the sides of the bridge and may need to be relocated due to the proposed project. The roadway widening will require the overhead utilities along Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard to be relocated. These impacts would be less than significant. Utility coordination will take place prior to construction to avoid affecting these services. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in additional significant impacts on public utilities that were not addressed or considered in the Master EIR.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Utilities and Service Systems.

## Mandatory Findings of Significance

|  |  | Effect <br> remains <br> significant <br> with all <br> identified <br> mitigation | Isfect can be <br> mitigated to <br> less than <br> significant |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A.) | No additional <br> significant <br> environmental <br> effect |  |  |
|  | Does the project have the potential to <br> degrade the quality of the environment, <br> substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or <br> wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife <br> population to drop below self-sustaining <br> levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal <br> community, reduce the number or restrict the <br> range of a rare or endangered plant or <br> animal or eliminate important examples of <br> the major periods of California history or <br> prehistory? |  | X |

## Answers to Checklist Questions

## Question A

As discussed in this study, the proposed project could result in impacts on biological resources, and potential impacts on cultural resources. Construction of the bridge would also result in temporary construction noise impacts. Mitigation measures included in this study would reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels.

There is no potential for Federal or State threatened or endangered species to occur within the BSA and no designated Critical Habitat occurs within the project vicinity. There is a low to moderate potential for Swainson's hawk, a State-threatened species, and white-tailed kite, a CDFW Species of Special Concern, to occur within the BSA. Considering the amount of development and hardscape in the BSA, the current frequency and volume of human activity,
the amount of affected foraging habitat within the project limits, anticipated absence of species nesting, and the implementation of mitigation measures as well as best management practices, the project will not impact the viability of the overall population.

No cultural or historic resources have been identified on the project site, and mitigation would ensure that discovery of unknown resources during project development would be identified and appropriate steps taken regarding treatment.

## Question B

The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and the findings in the Master EIR and would not result in individually limited but collectively significant impacts. Therefore, the project would not cause any additional environmental effects.

## Question C

As described in the resource sections of the Initial Study, the project would not result in either direct or indirect substantial adverse effects on human beings. Hazards and noise can be reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of the mitigation measures included in this study.

## Section IV - Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project.

|  | Aesthetics | X | Hazards |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Air Quality |  | Noise |
| X | Biological Resources |  | Public Services |
| X | Cultural Resources |  | Recreation |
|  | Energy and Mineral Resources |  | Transportation/Circulation |
|  | Geology and Soils |  | Utilities and Service Systems |
|  | Hydrology and Water Quality |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | None Identified |  |  |

## PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

On the basis of the initial study:
I find that (a) the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR; (b) the proposed project is consistent with the 2030 General Plan land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site; and (c) the proposed project will not have any project-specific additional significant environmental effects not previously examined in the Master EIR, and no new mitigation measures or alternatives will be required. Mitigation measures from the Master EIR will be applied to the proposed project as appropriate. Notice shall be provided pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15087. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15177(b))

X I find that (a) the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR; (b) the proposed project is consistent with the 2030 General Plan land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site; (c) that the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the Master EIR are adequate for the proposed project; and (d) the proposed project will have additional significant environmental effects not previously examined in the Master EIR. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared. Mitigation measures from the Master EIR will be applied to the project as appropriate, and additional feasible mitigation measures and alternatives will be incorporated to revise the proposed project before the negative declaration is circulated for public review, to avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a level of insignificance. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b))

I find that (a) the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR; (b) the proposed is consistent with the 2030 General Plan land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site; (c) that the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the Master EIR are adequate for the proposed project; and (d) the proposed project will have additional significant environmental effects not previously examined in the Master EIR. A focused EIR shall be prepared which shall incorporate by reference the Master EIR and analyze only the project-specific significant environmental effects and any new or additional mitigation measures or alternatives that were not identified and analyzed in the Master EIR. Mitigation measures from the Master EIR will be applied to the project as appropriate. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(c))

I find that (a) the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR; (b) the proposed project is consistent with the 2030 General Plan land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site; (c) that the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the Master EIR are not adequate for the proposed project; and (d) the proposed project will have additional significant environmental effects not previously examined in the Master EIR. An EIR shall be prepared, which shall tier off of the Master EIR to the extent feasible. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(e))


Scott Johnson
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## APPENDIX B

March 6, 2013

Jim Combs, Director
Department of Parks and Recreation
915 I Street, Fifth Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

## Subject: Main Avenue/Rio Linda Boulevard Intersection Realignment Project Section 4(f) Temporary Occupancy of the Northern Sacramento Bike trail

Dear Mr. Combs,
The City of Sacramento proposes to replace the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge (No. 24C0129) over Magpie Creek. Construction of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project will use federal funds administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and, as a result, compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is required. Caltrans is the lead NEPA agency through assignment of authority by the Federal Highway Administration.

In accordance with NEPA, Caltrans is preparing a Categorical Exclusion to assess potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project, and the project is required to comply with Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 ("Section 4(f)"). Codified in federal law at 49 United States Code (USC) 303, the Section $4(f)$ states that "[i]t is the policy of the United States Government that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges and historic sites."

The potential Section 4(f) resource is the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail owned and managed by the City of Sacramento Department of Parks and Recreation. During environmental review of the project, Caltrans determined the need to evaluate temporary construction-related effects to this protected recreation land. The boundaries of the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail within the project area are from approximately 100 feet north of, and approximately 200 feet south of, the existing Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue intersection.

Replacement of the bridge would include realigning Magpie Creek to the south leg of the intersection and will cross perpendicular to Rio Linda Boulevard. The improvements will also include realigning Main Avenue within the City's existing right-of-way and intersect Rio Linda Boulevard at a right angle, constructing left and right turn lanes from Main Avenue onto Rio Linda Boulevard, new crosswalks, access to the Northern Sacramento

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Jim Combs, Director } \\
& \text { Department of Parks and Recreation } \\
& 915 \text { I Street, Fifth Floor } \\
& \text { Sacramento, CA } 95814
\end{aligned}
$$



## APPENDIX C



Photograph 1. Representative hardscape and commercial use looking east at the Rio Linda Boulevard/Main Avenue intersection; west of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge.


Photograph 2. Representative hardscape and commercial use looking south at the Rio Linda Boulevard/Main Avenue intersection; north of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge.


Photograph 3. Representative Northern Sacramento Bike Trail over Magpie Creek; east of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge, facing north.


Photograph 4. Representative Northern Sacramento Bike Trail and vegetatively maintained shoulders; northeast of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge, facing south.


Photograph 5. Representative Bing’s Market ruderal vegetation; southwest of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge, facing northeast.


Photograph 6. Representative ruderal vegetation; east of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge, facing north.


Photograph 7. Representative willow scrub, pedestrian trail, and ruderal vegetation; east of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge, facing west.


Photograph 8. Representative willow scrub, pedestrian trails, and dumped trash; east of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge, facing east.


Photograph 9. Representative Magpie Creek, maintained banks and emergent wetland vegetation in late May; west of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge, facing east.


Photograph 10. Representative Magpie Creek, maintained banks and emergent wetland vegetation in late October; west of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge, facing east.


Photograph 11. Representative freshwater marsh; east of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge, facing east.


Photograph 12. Representative freshwater marsh, maintained dirt access road, compacted soils and residences; east of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge, facing east.

## APPENDIX D

| Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 5.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Emission Estimates for -> Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Projec |  |  |  |  | ExhaustPM10 (lbs/day) | Fugitive Dust PM10 (lbs/day) |  |
| Project Phases (English Units) | ROG (Ibs/day) | CO (lbs/day) | NOX (lbs/day) | PM10 (lbs/day) |  |  |  |
| Grubbing/Land Clearing | 0 | 3 | ) | 10 | 0 | 10 |  |
| Grading/Excavation | 9 | 35 | 34 | 12 | 2 | 10 |  |
| Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade | 9 | 36 | 36 | 12 | 2 | 10 |  |
| Paving | 3 | 16 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Maximum (pounds/day) | 9 | 36 | 36 | 12 | 2 | 10 |  |
| Total (tons/construction project) 0.92 3.40 4.23 1.35 0.23 1.12 <-tons <br> Notes: Project Start Year -> 2014      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lrc}\text { Notes: } & \text { Project Start Year -> } & 2014 \\ & \text { Project Length (months) -> } & 12\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Project Area (acres) -> 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum Area Disturbed/Day (acres) -> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Soil Imported/Exported (yd ${ }^{3} /$ day $)$-> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM10 estimates assume $50 \%$ control of fugitive dust from watering and associated dust control measures if a minimum number of water trucks are specified. Total PM10 emissions shown in column F are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns H and I . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emission Estimates for -> Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Projec |  |  |  |  | Exhaust Fugitive Dust <br> PM10 (kgs/day) <br> PM10 (kgs/day)  |  | <-megagrams |
| Project Phases (Metric Units) | ROG (kgs/day) | CO (kgs/day) | NOx (kgs/day) PM10 (kgs/day) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grubbing/Land Clearing | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 |  |
| Grading/Excavation | 4 | 16 | 16 |  | 1 | 5 |  |
| Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade | 4 | 16 | 17 |  | 1 | 5 |  |
| Paving | 1 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Maximum (kilograms/day) | 4 | 16 | 17 | 6 | 1 | 5 |  |
| Total (megagrams/construction project) | 0.83 | 3.08 | 3.84 | 1.22 | 0.20 | 1.02 |  |
| Notes: Project Start Year -> <br> Project Length (months) -> <br> Total Project Area (hectares) -> <br> Maximum Area Disturbed/Day (hectares) -> <br> Total Soil Imported/Exported (meters ${ }^{3} /$ day)-> | 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM10 estimates assume $50 \%$ control of fugitive dust from watering and associated dust control measures if a minimum number of water trucks are specified. <br> Total PM10 emissions shown in column F are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns H and I. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX E

EMFAC2011 Emission Rates
Region Type: Air District
Region: Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD Calendar Year: 2014
Season: Summer
Vehicle Classificatio
Vehicle Classification: EMFAC2011 Categories
Region CalYr Season Veh_Class Fuel






| 314.5873459 | 272.7179 | 0.06789 | 0.062458 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 466.4187 | 0.003734 | 0.003403 |  |
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| 141.8687758 | 139.7407 | 0.000607 | 0.000486 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 133.9350454 | 131.926 | 0.000585 | 0.000468 |
| 129.983371 | 128.0336 | 0.00059 | 0.000471 |
| 129.8476148 | 127.8999 | 0.000623 | 0.000498 |
| 133.73413 | 131.7281 | 0.00069 | 0.000551 |
| 142.2810706 | 140.1469 | 0.000801 | 0.000639 |
| 156.7022698 | 154.3517 | 0.000974 | 0.000777 |
| 179.0592507 | 176.3734 | 0.00124 | 0.00099 |
| 212.7451358 | 209.554 | 0.001653 | 0.00132 |
| 2154.392164 | 2027.543 | 0.014633 | 0.013482 |
| 470.0921766 | 433.3444 | 0.105181 | 0.096767 |
| 1599.157668 | 1504.996 | 0.009424 | 0.008678 |
| 433.2782833 | 399.9712 | 0.092703 | 0.085287 |
| 1221.205756 | 1149.332 | 0.006395 | 0.005886 |
| 377.9221837 | 349.7887 | 0.073331 | 0.067464 |
| 971.351756 | 914.1979 | 0.00457 | 0.004204 |
| 340.6280012 | 315.9801 | 0.059413 | 0.05466 |
| 804.7055937 | 757.36 | 0.003436 | 0.003159 |
| 316.4003299 | 294.0167 | 0.049297 | 0.045353 |
| 692.1600878 | 651.4378 | 0.002717 | 0.002497 |
| 302.2208092 | 281.1624 | 0.041891 | 0.03854 |
| 619.1946141 | 582.7623 | 0.002259 | 0.002074 |
| 296.4145166 | 275.8988 | 0.036464 | 0.033547 |
| 571.2493639 | 537.6477 | 0.001973 | 0.001811 |
| 298.3167503 | 277.6232 | 0.032527 | 0.029924 |
| 549.7499531 | 517.4129 | 0.001811 | 0.001662 |
| 308.1439728 | 286.532 | 0.029752 | 0.027372 |
| 551.4331425 | 518.9892 | 0.001747 | 0.001602 |
| 327.0353942 | 303.6578 | 0.027934 | 0.025699 |
| 571.7439545 | 538.1048 | 0.001771 | 0.001624 |
| 357.2763969 | 331.0725 | 0.026962 | 0.024805 |
| 609.9357113 | 574.0672 | 0.001888 | 0.00173 |
| 402.7642981 | 372.309 | 0.026813 | 0.024668 |
| 689.3903084 | 648.8212 | 0.002116 | 0.001939 |
| 469.8529738 | 433.1275 | 0.027563 | 0.025358 |
| 707.6487429 | 666.11 | 0.002284 | 0.002093 |
| 568.8331831 | 522.857 | 0.029426 | 0.027071 |
| 2513.497394 | 2475.795 | 0.016423 | 0.014705 |
| 2380.430518 | 2344.724 | 0.687989 | 0.63295 |
| 2036.128392 | 2005.586 | 0.013225 | 0.011842 |
| 2161.437999 | 2129.016 | 0.574884 | 0.528894 |
| 1392.429516 | 1371.543 | 0.008847 | 0.007922 |
| 1774.722189 | 1748.101 | 0.390966 | 0.359689 |
| 1006.068466 | 990.9774 | 0.006169 | 0.005524 |
| 1456.364245 | 1434.519 | 0.263435 | 0.242361 |
| 768.0121559 | 756.492 | 0.004484 | 0.004015 |
| 1306.278276 | 1286.684 | 0.212486 | 0.195487 |


| Aggregatec | 30 | 18623.64 | 2.13508 | 2.345078 | 18.94676 | 0.973294 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aggregatec | 35 | 33506.81 | 2.041693 | 2.241265 | 19.21691 | 0.990442 |
| Aggregatec | 40 | 38764.46 | 2.042857 | 2.241901 | 20.18533 | 1.01509 |
| Aggregatec | 45 | 19185.61 | 2.150708 | 2.360431 | 22.51952 | 1.044048 |
| Aggregatec | 50 | 19585.46 | 2.379398 | 2.611397 | 26.61773 | 1.078039 |
| Aggregatec | 55 | 30812.12 | 2.755196 | 3.022276 | 32.83066 | 1.118721 |
| Aggregatec | 60 | 30090.8 | 3.334823 | 3.656818 | 42.18114 | 1.167531 |
| Aggregatec | 65 | 3551.426 | 4.274342 | 4.691551 | 60.10559 | 1.22121 |
| Aggregatec | 70 | 1175.347 | 5.603831 | 6.144489 | 80.11211 | 1.294659 |
| Aggregatec | 5 | 2288.441 | 0.564097 | 0.801886 | 7.720962 | 0.697482 |
| Aggregater | 5 | 2.275794 | 0.128343 | 0.14611 | 0.840873 | 0.641351 |
| Aggregatec | 10 | 22999.05 | 0.367991 | 0.520735 | 6.645694 | 0.593154 |
| Aggregatec | 10 | 22.87194 | 0.113025 | 0.128671 | 0.703025 | 0.589561 |
| Aggregatec | 15 | 65245.94 | 0.249031 | 0.351564 | 5.707821 | 0.510976 |
| Aggregatec | 15 | 64.88535 | 0.089307 | 0.10167 | 0.509454 | 0.51044 |
| Aggregatec | 20 | 249882.1 | 0.177599 | 0.250789 | 5.009999 | 0.450157 |
| Aggregatec | 20 | 248.5011 | 0.072323 | 0.082335 | 0.386769 | 0.455637 |
| Aggregatec | 25 | 707454.5 | 0.13439 | 0.1893 | 4.50055 | 0.407705 |
| Aggregatec | 25 | 703.5446 | 0.060016 | 0.068324 | 0.306939 | 0.418783 |
| Aggregatec | 30 | 449277.3 | 0.107606 | 0.150534 | 4.104621 | 0.379128 |
| Aggregatec | 30 | 446.7942 | 0.051036 | 0.058101 | 0.254021 | 0.396335 |
| Aggregatec | 35 | 808319.4 | 0.089986 | 0.125822 | 3.78312 | 0.357777 |
| Aggregater | 35 | 803.8523 | 0.044485 | 0.050644 | 0.218749 | 0.386114 |
| Aggregatec | 40 | 935155.2 | 0.0782 | 0.109407 | 3.466397 | 0.342219 |
| Aggregatec | 40 | 929.987 | 0.039767 | 0.045272 | 0.195673 | 0.387557 |
| Aggregatec | 45 | 462834.3 | 0.072403 | 0.100843 | 3.26214 | 0.337327 |
| Aggregater | 45 | 460.2764 | 0.036487 | 0.041538 | 0.181631 | 0.40027 |
| Aggregatec | 50 | 472480.3 | 0.070668 | 0.098137 | 3.135535 | 0.339781 |
| Aggregatec | 50 | 469.8691 | 0.034407 | 0.03917 | 0.174927 | 0.42581 |
| Aggregatec | 55 | 743312.5 | 0.071317 | 0.099443 | 3.013774 | 0.34507 |
| Aggregatec | 55 | 739.2045 | 0.033408 | 0.038033 | 0.17492 | 0.467124 |
| Aggregatec | 60 | 725911.6 | 0.074675 | 0.104583 | 2.891658 | 0.354974 |
| Aggregatec | 60 | 721.8998 | 0.033494 | 0.03813 | 0.18188 | 0.528925 |
| Aggregatec | 65 | 85674.74 | 0.086289 | 0.119735 | 3.021513 | 0.385924 |
| Aggregatec | 65 | 85.20124 | 0.034808 | 0.039626 | 0.19706 | 0.618106 |
| Aggregatec | 70 | 28354.1 | 0.084995 | 0.120412 | 2.715538 | 0.377828 |
| Aggregatec | 70 | 28.1974 | 0.037701 | 0.042921 | 0.222998 | 0.749334 |
| Aggregatec | 5 | 629.9728 | 1.37515 | 1.608238 | 31.14105 | 0.704155 |
| Aggregatec | 5 | 94.87341 | 1.860068 | 2.117564 | 2.762853 | 18.83576 |
| Aggregatec | 10 | 3166.879 | 1.107584 | 1.293953 | 25.17468 | 0.7221 |
| Aggregatec | 10 | 472.2442 | 1.413362 | 1.609018 | 2.320031 | 15.7142 |
| Aggregatec | 15 | 4000.311 | 0.746268 | 0.869698 | 17.44127 | 0.756589 |
| Aggregatec | 15 | 637.3657 | 0.733855 | 0.835445 | 1.607737 | 11.05409 |
| Aggregatec | 20 | 4149.305 | 0.51992 | 0.606847 | 12.61972 | 0.792385 |
| Aggregatec | 20 | 675.9495 | 0.339556 | 0.386562 | 1.126575 | 8.559365 |
| Aggregatec | 25 | 4623.285 | 0.378431 | 0.441606 | 9.663617 | 0.826414 |
| Aggregatec | 25 | 703.9745 | 0.244032 | 0.277814 | 0.922805 | 7.870274 |





















|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 17 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 1280.045 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1153. | 1136.346 |  |  |
|  | 1084.536 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 1010.894 |  |  |
|  | 1025.883 |  |  |
|  | 2549.727 |  |  |
|  | 2106.274 |  |  |
|  | 1729.434 |  |  |
| 1385.128038 | 1364.351 | 0.107917 | 0.099284 |
| 1292.355417 | 272.97 | 0.09 | 0.088504 |
|  | 1194.8 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 1040.305 |  |  |
|  | 1015.353 |  |  |
|  | 1003.68 |  |  |
|  | 1005.3 |  |  |
|  | 1020.213 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 1739.0 | 0.15 |  |
|  | 1371.934 | 0.09 |  |
|  | 1280.045 |  |  |
|  | 1201.515 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 1020.9 |  |  |
|  | 1009.265 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 21 |  |  |
|  | 172 |  |  |
|  | 1364.351 |  |  |
|  | 1272.97 |  |  |
| 1213.07098 | 11 |  |  |
|  | 1130.066 |  |  |
| 1094.966658 |  |  |  |
| 256.146773 |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 42.79205 | 0.5 | 0.615873 |  |  |
|  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |
|  | 47.2 | 0.18 |  |  |  |
|  | 56.831 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 67.011 |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | 83.184 | 0.1137 | 0.12 |  | 4.302 |
| 45 | 68.11697 | 0.1008 | 0.1148 |  |  |
|  | 76.2339 | 0.093 | 0.10692 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 134.243 | 0.09 |  |  |  |
|  | 21.126 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20.800 | 2.03 |  |  |  |
|  | 103.539 | 1.1874 | 1.3518 |  |  |
|  | 139.74 | 0.6042 | 0.687 |  |  |
|  | 148.20 |  |  |  | 5717 |
|  | 154.345 | 0.2151 | 0.244924 | 0.7104 |  |
| 30 | 185.588 | 0.1 | 0.207973 | 0.649813 | 3.260075 |
| 35 | 218.83 | 0.1 | 0.1774 |  |  |
|  | 271.64 | 0.13 |  |  |  |
|  | 222.44 | 0.11 |  |  |  |
|  | 248.94 | 0.109 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0.104 |  |  |  |
|  | 438. | 0.106 |  |  |  |
| 55 | 68.9892 | 0.1130 | 0.128 |  |  |
|  | 3.6518 | 1.79 | 2.041 |  |  |
|  | 18.17 | 1.05 | 1.2006 |  |  |
|  |  | 0.54 |  |  |  |
|  | 26.0187 | 0.2238 | 0.2548 |  |  |
|  | 27.097 | 0.1875 | 0.2134 | 0.65 |  |
|  | 32.5825 | 0.15 | 0.1787 |  |  |
|  |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |
|  | 47.691 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 39.052 | 0.100 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |
|  | 64.047 | 0. |  |  |  |
|  | 76 | 0.097 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0.108 |  |  |  |
|  | 11.925 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 80.1168 | 0.60 | 0.6879 |  |  |
|  | 84. | 0.25323 | 0.2 | . 86382 | 3.87 |
|  | 88.48962 | 0.2151 | 0.244924 |  |  |
|  | 106.4016 | 0.182 |  |  |  |
|  | 125.4615 | 0.15 |  |  |  |
|  | 155. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 127. |  |  |  |  |




| 1030.815071 | 1015.353 | 0.104187 | 0.09585 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1018.971554 | 1003.687 | 0.119098 |  |
| 1020.616221 | 100 | 0.1 |  |
|  | 1020.213 | 0.162236 |  |
|  | 2578.098 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 160.0 |  |  |  |
| 1107.150292 | 1090.543 | 0.095531 | 0.087888 |
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|  | 21 | 0.36 |  |
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| J. | State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit/ Central Valley <br> Flood Protection Board | $25-28$ |

Comment A
Clarice Werner (received at open house held on June 26, 2013)

SACRAMENTO
Department of Public Works

Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement

Please provide any general thoughts, comments, or questions about the project.
Georgia ${ }^{1952}$ Rown, pat Frequson at myself.dinerea Der wet (1976) are The loners Residents an mon ane. IT self - The Traffic concurs us-spaed limits 40 mpH but Hot Raddas / \&How offs LOE about 50-55 \&Somefumes fasting - With vo carve we envision no M. PA!! yow dow. Clive Here, yow daviT SEq it! I ser maybe a Total of bicycles in a werk-Sometimes NONe - They use Bell AUE, NoT Here: 10 wHEalaRs dort witize This Road like in The past, waw we Euvision more of that use To fix pot holes, claus STRIPES but This is Needles-
Please provide your thoughts, comments, or questions on the environmental document for the project.
Flooding \& WATEA dRaw off down main ave.
By changing mage is creek's flow yow also in volva hue local Animal Habitant- y es, We still Howe squirrels, opposum, Rabbits, phesint, gop hes snakes - 2 years of messing ARound while destroy Bris masketis biz el \& Do Not Destroy wis History makers of That bRed $E$ ClARICE WGWNE- 530 MAN AVE

$$
925-0412
$$

Can we follow up with you? To ARGue OR fiNd better


You may submit your comments to staff tonight or directly to Cara Zanze by July 15 th at czanze@aimconsultingco.com or fax (916) 442-1186.

## Response A

Thank you for your comments; they have been included in the final environmental document.
Response 1: The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project has been designed in a way that design speeds are 45 mph , however, the signed speed will be maintained at 40 mph . The Main Avenue/Rio Linda Boulevard intersection will be formally signalized as well.

Response 2: The new bridge will be designed to withstand a 100-year flood event as well as in a way which allows water to drain properly into Magpie Creek. The Magpie Creek realignment will be designed in such a way that encourages flows and prevents standing water from occurring within the creek. During the environmental document process a Natural Environment Study was prepared to evaluate the biological conditions within the project area. Biologists conducted field surveys in May and October 2012 to document existing biological resources, detect potential jurisdictional waters of the United States (U.S.) and State, and search for suitable habitat and presence of Federal and State protected species. Potential impacts to resources were analyzed based on the proposed project design and ecological resources identified in the field surveys. With the implementation of mitigation measures no adverse impacts are expected to occur as a result of the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project.

Response 3: The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project has been designed for Rio Linda Boulevard to remain open throughout construction; no detour would be implemented due to the project. This will allow traffic to be maintained to Bings Market throughout the proposed 18 month construction duration.

Response 4: The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge has been rated as Structurally Deficient by the California Department of Transportation and is therefore recommended for replacement. The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project will enhance safety on Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue by: 1) realigning Main Avenue perpendicular to Rio Linda Boulevard; 2) widening the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge to meet standards; 3) increasing the height of the bridge railing to meet Caltrans standards.

Comment B
Anonymous (received at open house held on June 26, 2013)

COMMENT CARD
Please provide any general thoughts, comments, or questions about the project.
am a longtime visidert on Santos Ara ques and although
slam fully in four of the longoverdue budge proves d um concerned about the increased traffic that well be turning onto Santa Anon Cue during the Construction Santa Con car is a very ngrow Street, that basely has room fo two Cars to pass? There are no Adewabtes, Be no gutter, And nowhere for popple to walk During the lain Season the puddes grow so bi sometimes they meetacrossthe trad Speed pumps were inttuled Penal yaws ago, but newer inuentuined to they av burly a bump and clout. Show anyone down anymore
Please provide your thoughts, comments, or questions on the environmental document for the project. V
When the Stop sign came in, the traffic turninjoff foo dendablece. in the mooring greatly increased and it is now a very Unsafe street for peopel to walk, bike etc, el would like to Lee some improvements to the Streets, Id dwalks, re paving highe speed Dumps at the least fill in the holes on the Sides af the load so the puddes anent bo big. This is alvach ane accident waitmsto happen, and this Consmuctron will one y Increase that risk

Can we follow up with you?
Name $\qquad$
Address $\qquad$
Phone $\qquad$ E-mail $\qquad$ or fax (916) 442-1186.

## Response B

Thank you for your comment; they have been included in the final environmental document.
Response 1: The project is designed to accommodate traffic through the intersection while it is being modified and constructed. While work on Santa Ana Avenue is outside the scope of this project, the City of Sacramento Department of Public Works--Street Services has been informed of your concerns about the condition of Santa Ana Avenue.

## Comment C

# Army Corps of Engineers (received via mail on June 26, 2013) 



Dear Mr. Johnson:
We are responding to your June 13, 2013, request for comments on the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement project. The project is located near the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue, along Magpie Creek, in Section 7, Township 9 North, Range 5 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, Latitude $38.654791^{\circ}$, Longitude $-121.447928^{\circ}$, City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, California. Your identification number is SPK-2012-01206.

The Corps of Engineers' jurisdiction within the study area is under the authority of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. Waters of the United States include, but are not limited to, rivers, perennial or intermittent streams, lakes, ponds, wetlands, vernal pools, marshes, wet meadows, and seeps. Project features that result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States will require Department of the Army authorization prior to starting work.

To ascertain the extent of waters on the project site, the applicant should prepare a wetland delineation, in accordance with the "Minimum Standards for Acceptance of Preliminary Wetlands Delineations", under "Jurisdiction" on our website at the address below, and submit it to this office for verification. A list of consultants that prepare wetland delineations and permit application documents is also available on our website at the same location.

The range of alternatives considered for this project should include alternatives that avoid impacts to wetlands or other waters of the United States. Every effort should be made to avoid project features which require the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. In the event it can be clearly demonstrated there are no practicable alternatives to filling waters of the United States, mitigation plans should be developed to compensate for the unavoidable losses resulting from project implementation.

Please refer to identification number SPK-2012-01206 in any correspondence concerning this project. If you have any questions, please contact me at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Division, California South Branch, 1325 J Street, Room 1350, Sacramento,

California 95814-2922, email Mary.R.Pakenham-Walsh@usace.army.mil, or telephone 916-5577718. For more information regarding our program, please visit our website at www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory aspx.

Sincerely,
Merype Patkelam-LJily

Mary R. Pakenham-Walsh
Senior Project Manager,
California South Branch

## Response C

Thank you for your comments; they have been included in the final environmental document.
Response 1: A 404 Permit will be obtained prior to construction to address fill into Magpie Creek.

Response 2: A Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation was submitted to Army Corps of Engineers on July 17, 2013 for approval from the Army Corps of Engineers. The environmental document also discusses a No-Build Alternative which would not replace the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge. This alternative avoids all impacts to wetlands. Under the No-Build (No Project) Alternative, the functionally obsolete and structurally deficient bridge would not be replaced. Widening the bridge to current standards, including shoulders and provision for future addition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, would not occur. The No-Build Alternative would not construct a new bridge over Magpie Creek and would keep the Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard in its existing extreme skewed location. Main Avenue would remain outside the City's existing right of way. The No-Build Alternative does not meet the proposed project's purpose and need.

A preliminary alternative was considered that attempted to not realign Magpie Creek and is discussed on page 4 of the Initial Study. This option was eliminated from further consideration because; it would still have required a closed bottom culvert as well as grading at the channel.

## Comment D

Claiborne Dukes (received via e-mail on June 25, 2013)

```
2523 | Street Suite 201
Sacramento, CA 95816
(916) 442-1168 Office
(916) 442-1186 Fax
www.aimconsultingco.com
<image001.jpg>
```

From: Claiborne Dukes Jr [mailto:clay@goldstate.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2013 10:19 AM
To: Ciara Zanze
Cc: awarren@cityofsacramento.org; 'Daniel Savala'
Subject: RE: City of Sacramento - Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project
Ciara,
On the east side of the bike trail, beginning at the south side of Magpie creek and going south for about a block is an area that was used as a dumping ground for large pieces of reinforced concrete. Is it possible to get the removal of all that debris done as a part of the bridge project? Access to the area, and the equipment to remove the debris would be there during the bridge project. Heavy equipment access to the area has been one of the big stumbling blocks to removal of the debris in the past. After removal of the debris a constant fire hazard would be taken care of because I can then mow the grasses in that area. I also can then plant or replant trees in the area. The removal of the debris would get rid of the biggest eyesore on the bike trail and add greatly to the beautification of the area
Thank You,
Clay Dukes

From: Leo Lujan [mailto:leolujan@att.net]
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2013 12:32 PM
To: undisclosed recipients:
Subject: City of Sacramento - Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project
FYI
This meeting is at Robla Elementary School, 5:30-7:00 pm, 5200 Marysville, Blvd.
LL

## Response D

Thank you for your comments; they have been included in the final environmental document.
Response 1: During project construction attempts will be made to remove some of the rock adjacent to the trail. Soil will be added to the area in order to allow for vegetation to more easily be planted adjacent to the bicycle trail. This will add to the beautification on the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail.

## Comment E

Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (received via mail July 9, 2013)

909 12th St, Ste. 116 Sacramento, CA 95814
sachike.org sabaOsacbike.org 816 444-6600

July 9, 2013
Scott Johnson, Associate Planner
City of Sacramento, Community Development Department
300 Richards Boulevard
Sacramento, CA 95811-0218
sriohnson@cityofsacramento.ors
Subject: Notice of Availability/Intent to Adopt-Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project (File No. T15095200)

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the subject Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). This project will enhance bicycle access to the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail from Rio Linda Boulevard. The project's purposes are stated on Page 6 of the Initial Study. The $3^{\text {rd }}$ purpose states that pedestrian and bicycle facilities will be improved by "adding a Class 2 bike lane on Rio Linda Boulevard through the intersection and providing connectivity with the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail." We request that this $3^{\text {nd }}$ purpose be expanded to explicitly include "providing access from Main Avenue to the bike trail."

The project features shown on Figure 2 of the initial Study show cross-walks extending across Rio Linda Boulevard from both sides of Main Avenue and paved ramps extending eastward from the cross-walks to the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail. Bicyclists entering or leaving the bike trail to connect to or from Main Avenue will use these ramps and cross-walks to cross Rio Linda Boulevard. Vehicle traffic exiting Main Avenue will make either left or right turns onto Rio Linda Boulevard across the cross-walks. Thus, the predominant bicycle movements from and to Main Avenue will conflict with the primary vehicle movements from Main Avenue during the same signal phase.

It is critical that pedestrians and bicyclists connecting to and from Main. Avenue to the bike trail be given separate traffic signal phases from vehicles to avoid conflicts between turning vehicles from Main Avenue and pedestrians and bicyclists using the cross-walks. Because bicyclists will cross Rio Linda Boulevard much more rapidly than pedestrians, we recommend specific bicycle signal heads be provided to give bicyclists explicit permission to use the cross-walks at the same time as pedestrians (see http://nacto.org/cities-for-eycling/design-guide/bicycle-signals/bicycle-signal-heads//). It also may be beneficial to paint designated sections of the cross-walks for pedestrians and bicyclists to separate their use of the cross-walks.

SABA works to ensure that bicycling is safe, convenient, and desirable for everyday transportation. Bicycling is the healthiest, cleanest, cheapest, quietest, most energy efficient, and least congesting form of transportation.

Thank you for considering our comments.
Sincerely,


Jordan Lang
Project Analyst

## Response E

Thank you for your comments; they have been included in the final environmental document.
Response 1: Thank you for your comments. The request proposed was not added. There will be access to the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail from Main Avenue via a combined pedestrian/bicycle pushbutton crosswalk. This will allow for separate traffic signal phase for bicyclists and pedestrians from vehicles.

Response 2: There will be access to the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail from Main Avenue via a combine pedestrian/bicycle pushbutton crosswalk. This will allow for separate traffic signal phase for bicyclists and pedestrians from vehicles.

## Comment F

Amy Kennedy at CDFW (received via e-mail July 12, 2013)

## Scott Johnson

| From: | Carlene Grecco [cgrecco@dokkenengineering.com](mailto:cgrecco@dokkenengineering.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, July 12, 2013 8:48 AM |
| To: | Jesse Gothan |
| Cc: | Matt Brogan; Namat Hosseinion; Aaron Silva; Scott Johnson |
| Subject: | FW: Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project |
|  |  |
| FYI |  |

From: Kennedy, Amy@Wildlife [mailto:Amy.Kennedy@wildlife.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 8:47 AM
To: Carlene Grecco
Subject: RE: Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project
Carlene, I did receive the documents and had no comments.

Thanks
Amy Kennedy
Environmental Scientist
California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife-R2
1701 Nimbus Road. Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
916-358-2842 FAX 916-358-2912

From: Carlene Grecco [mailto:carecco@dokkenengineering.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2013 10:57 AM
To: Kennedy, Amy@Wildlife
Cc: JGothan@cityofsacramento.org; Namat Hosseinion; Matt Brogan; Scott Johnson; Aaron Silva
Subject: Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project
Hi Amy,
I wanted to follow up and see if you had received the Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project. The City of Sacramento sent a hard copy to you personally on June 13, 2013. Please let me know if you have any questions/comments or need any additional information. Thank you.

Carlene Grecco, M.S.
Environmental Planner
Dokken Engineering
110 Blue Ravine Road, Suite 200, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (916) 858-0642 - Fax: (916) 858-0643

## Response F

Thank you for your comment; it has been included in the final environmental document.

## Comment G

Central Valley Flood Protection Board (received via mail July 11, 2013)

| STATE OF CALIFORNIA - CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY | EDMUND G. BROWN JR., GOVERNOR |
| :---: | :---: |
| CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION BOARD |  |
| 3310 El Camino Ave., Rm. 151 |  |
| SACRAMENTO, CA 95821 |  |
| (916) 574-0609 FAX (916) 574-0682 |  |
| PERMITS: (916) 574-2380 FAX: (916) 574-0682 |  |

July 11, 2013
Mr. Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd
Sacramento, California 95811
Subject: Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project SCH Number: 2013062024
Document Type: Mitigated Negative Declaration
Dear Mr. Johnson:
Staff of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) has reviewed the subject document and provides the following comments:

The proposed project is located adjacent to or within Magpie Creek, which is under the jurisdiction of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. The Board is required to enforce standards for the construction, maintenance, and protection of adopted flood control plans that will protect public lands from floods. The jurisdiction of the Board includes the Central Valley, including all tributaries and distributaries of the Sacramento River, the San Joaquin River, and designated floodways (Title 23 California Code of Regulations (CCR), Section 2).

A Board permit is required prior to starting the work within the Board's jurisdiction for the following:

- The placement, construction, reconstruction, removal, or abandonment of any landscaping, culvert, bridge, conduit, fence, projection, fill, embankment, building, structure, obstruction, encroachment, excavation, the planting, or removal of vegetation, and any repair or maintenance that involves cutting into the levee (CCR Section 6);
- Existing structures that predate permitting, or where it is necessary to establish the conditions normally imposed by permitting. The circumstances include those where responsibility for the encroachment has not been clearly established or ownership and use have been revised (CCR Section 6);
- Vegetation plantings will require the submission of detailed design drawings; identification of vegetation type; plant and tree names (i.e. common name and scientific name); total number of each type of plant and tree; planting spacing and irrigation method that will be utilized within the project area; a complete vegetative management plan for maintenance to prevent the interference with flood control, levee maintenance, inspection, and flood fight procedures (CCR Section 131).

Vegetation requirements in accordance with Title 23, Section 131 (c) states "Vegetation must not interfere with the integrity of the adopted plan of flood control, or interfere with maintenance, inspection, and flood fight procedures."

Mr. Scott Johnson
July 11, 2013
Page 2 of 2

The accumulation and establishment of woody vegetation that is not managed has a negative impact on channel capacity and increases the potential for levee over-topping. When a channel develops vegetation that then becomes habitat for wildlife, maintenance to initial baseline conditions becomes more difficult as the removal of vegetative growth is subject to federal and State agency requirements for on-site mitigation within the floodway. The project should include mitigation measures to avoid decreasing floodway channel capacity.

Hydraulic Impacts - Hydraulic impacts due to encroachments could impede flood flows, reroute flood flows, and/or increase sediment accumulation. The project should include mitigation measures for channel and levee improvements and maintenance to prevent and/or reduce hydraulic impacts. Off-site mitigation outside of the State Plan of Flood Control should be used when mitigating for vegetation removed within the project location.

The permit application and Title 23 CCR can be found on the Central Valley Flood Protection Board's website at hitp://www.cvfpb.ca.gov/. Contact your local, federal and State agencies, as other permits may apply.

The Board's jurisdiction, including all tributaries and distributaries of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River, and designated floodways can be viewed on the Central Valley Flood Protection Board's website at http://gis.bam.water.ca.gov/bam/.

If you have any questions, please contact me by phone at (916) 574 -0651, or via e-mail at iherota@water.ca.gov.

## Sincerely,



James Herota
Staff Environmental Scientist
Projects and Environmental Branch
cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, California 95814

## Response G

Thank you for your comments; they have been included in the final environmental document.
Response 1: An encroachment permit application will be submitted to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board for approval prior to construction activities. A Revegetation Plan would be submitted to the Board for approval with the encroachment permit application.

The Magpie Creek realignment will be designed in such a way that encourages flows and prevents standing water encouraging proper flows. A Location Hydraulic Study has been prepared for the project to ensure proper hydraulic design. As discussed on page 66 of the Initial Study, changes in water surface elevation would be insignificant.

## Comment H



Rational: If not properly constucted, managed or raaintained, poorly designed and maintained facilities and systems maybreed mosquitoes which can have an adverse effect on public health and welfare and may have a direct impact to local economies.

The District has developed and ado pted a Mosquito Reducing ' Best Maragement Practices(BMP) Manual which can be downioaded from the District's website at: hitp:/frrons fighthebite ne iphysical-control. Please review and implement the District's BMP's for design and mamtenance guide lines of all proposed projects to rectuce or prevent the breeding of mosyuitoes.

Failure to address these issues and potential mosquito breeding soumes duing the planning and construction process may result in enforce ment actions to the landowner after the project has been completed. The District has the authonity to abate a public nuisance as de fined in the Califomia Health and SafetyCode (HSC) Section§ 2010 and may pursue enforcement actions poustant to Sections § 2060 of the (HSC) which can involve civil fines of up to $\$ 1000$ /per dayy.

Should you have any questions or concemis please feel free to contact me.
Sincerely

Kevin Combo
Ecological Management Department
Sacramento Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District
kcombo(ofight The Bite.net

## Response H

Thank you for your comments; they have been included in the final environmental document.
Response 1: The Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project will be designed in a way which would prevent standing water from occurring. The project would implement the Sacramento Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District's Best Management Practices for design and maintenance guidelines to reduce or prevent the breeding of mosquitoes. The final project design will be completed to prevent or eliminate unnecessary standing water that stands for more than 72-96 hours during mosquito season which can start as easily as March and extend through October depending on weather.

## Comment I

State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit (received via mail July 12, 2013)


July 15, 2013

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd
Sacramento, CA 95811
Subject: Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project
SCH\#: 2013062024

Dear Scott Johnson:
The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on July 12, 2013, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:
"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.


1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
(916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

## Document Details Report

## State Clearinghouse Data Base

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { SCH\# } \\ \text { Project Title } \\ \text { Lead Agency } \end{array}$ | 2013062024 <br> Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project Sacramento, City of |
| :---: | :---: |
| Type | MND Mitigated Negative Declaration |
| Description | The project consists of replacing the Rio Linda; realigning Magpie Creek to allow for realigning Main Ave within the City's existing right-of-way to intersect with Rio Linda Blvd at a right angle; constructing left and right turn lanes from Main Ave onto Rio Linda Blvd, new crosswalks, access to the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail, and installation of a traffic signal. One through lane will be provided in each direction along Rio Linda Blvd with an additional receiving lane to accommodate the required dual left turns from Main Ave. <br> The Rio Linda Blvd roadway profile will be raised slightly to provide the required hydraulic clearance. The Rio Linda Blvd Bridge replacement will require the overhead utilities along Main Ave and Rio Linda Blvd to be relocated. |
| Lead Agency Contact |  |
| Name | Scott Johnson |
| Agency | City of Sacramento |
| Phone | 9168085842 Fax |
| emall |  |
| Address | 300 Richards Blvd |
| City | Sacramento State CA Zip 95811 |
| Project Location |  |
| County | Sacramento |
| City | Sacramento |
| Region |  |
| Lat/Long | $38^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 17.95^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} / 121^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 51.89^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$ |
| Cross Streets | Rio Linda Blvd and Main Ave |
| Parcel No. | 23700400560, 2260240016 |
| Township | 9N Range 5E Section 10/11 Base |
| Proximity to: |  |
| Highways Airports Railways |  |
| Waterways | Magpie Creek |
| Schools Land Use | Suburban, Suburban Neighborhood Low, and Parks and Recreation |
| Project Issues | Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Wetland/Riparian; Landuse |
| Reviewing Agencies | Resources Agency; Department of Boating and Waterways; Department of Fish and Wildilife, Region 2; Department of Parks and Recreation; Central Valley Flood Protection Board; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 3 S; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Sacramento); Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission; Delta Stewardship Council |

Date Received 06/12/2013 Start of Review 06/13/2013 End of Review 07/12/2013

July 11, 2013
Cisal

Mr. Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd
Sacramento, California 95811
Subject: Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project
SCH Number: 2013062024
Document Type: Mitigated Negative Declaration
Dear Mr. Johnson:
Staff of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) has reviewed the subject document and provides the following comments:

The proposed project is located adjacent to or within Magpie Creek, which is under the jurisdiction of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. The Board is required to enforce standards for the construction, maintenance, and protection of adopted flood control plans that will protect public lands from floods. The jurisdiction of the Board includes the Central Valley, including all tributaries and distributaries of the Sacramento River, the San Joaquin River, and designated floodways (Title 23 California Code of Regulations (CCR), Section 2).

A Board permit is required prior to starting the work within the Board's jurisdiction for the following:

- The placement, construction, reconstruction, removal, or abandonment of any landscaping, culvert, bridge, conduit, fence, projection, fill, embankment, building, structure, obstruction, encroachment, excavation, the planting, or removal of vegetation, and any repair or maintenance that involves cutting into the levee (CCR Section 6);
- Existing structures that predate permitting, or where it is necessary to establish the conditions normally imposed by permitting. The circumstances include those where responsibility for the encroachment has not been clearly established or ownership and use have been revised (CCR Section 6);
- Vegetation plantings will require the submission of detailed design drawings; identification of vegetation type; plant and tree names (i.e. common name and scientific name); total number of each type of plant and tree; planting spacing and irrigation method that will be utilized within the project area; a complete vegetative management plan for maintenance to prevent the interference with flood control, levee maintenance, inspection, and flood fight procedures (CCR Section 131).

Vegetation requirements in accordance with Title 23, Section 131 (c) states "Vegetation must not interfere with the integrity of the adopted plan of flood control, or interfere with maintenance, inspection, and flood fight procedures."

Mr. Scott Johnson
July 11, 2013
Page 2 of 2

The accumulation and establishment of woody vegetation that is not managed has a negative impact on channel capacity and increases the potential for levee over-topping. When a channel develops vegetation that then becomes habitat for wildlife, maintenance to initial baseline conditions becomes more difficult as the removal of vegetative growth is subject to federal and State agency requirements for on-site mitigation within the floodway. The project should include mitigation measures to avoid decreasing floodway channel capacity.

Hydraulic Impacts - Hydraulic impacts due to encroachments could impede flood flows, reroute flood flows, and/or increase sediment accumulation. The project should include mitigation measures for channel and levee improvements and maintenance to prevent and/or reduce hydraulic impacts. Off-site mitigation outside of the State Plan of Flood Control should be used when mitigating for vegetation removed within the project location.

The permit application and Title 23 CCR can be found on the Central Valley Flood Protection Board's website at http://www.cvfpb.ca.gov/. Contact your local, federal and State agencies, as other permits may apply.

The Board's jurisdiction, including all tributaries and distributaries of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River, and designated floodways can be viewed on the Central Valley Flood Protection Board's website at http://gis.bam.water.ca.gov/bam/.

If you have any questions, please contact me by phone at (916) 574-0651, or via e-mail at jherota@water.ca.gov.

Sincerely,


James Herota
Staff Environmental Scientist
Projects and Environmental Branch
cc: $\sqrt{ }$ Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, California 95814

## Response I

Thank you for your comments; they have been included in the final environmental document.
Response 1: Thank you for forwarding the comment.
Response 2: Please see response to Comment G.

## Comment J

State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit (received via mail July 16, 2013)


STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning And Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit
EDMUND G. BROWN JR GoverNor

July 16,2013

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd
Sacramento, CA 95811
Subject: Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project
SCH\#: 2013062024
Dear Scott Johnson:
The enclosed comment (s) on your Mitigated Negative Declaration was (were) received by the State Clearinghouse after the end of the state review period, which closed on July 12, 2013. We are forwarding these comments to you because they provide information or raise issues that should be addressed in your final environmental document.

The California Environmental Quality Act does not require Lead Agencies to respond to late comments. However, we encourage you to incorporate these additional comments into your final environmental document and to consider them prior to taking final action on the proposed project.

Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions concerning the environmental review process. If you have a question regarding the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number (2013062024) when contacting this office.


Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

## CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION BOARD

3310 El Camino Ave., Rm. 151
SACRAMENTO, CA 95821
(916) 574-0609 FAX (916) 574-0682

PERMITS: (916) 574-2380 FAX: (916) 574-0682

July 15, 2013
Mr. Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento 300 Richards Blvd Sacramento, California 95811



Subject: Rio Linda Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project SCH Number: 2013062024
Document Type: Mitigated Negative Declaration
Dear Mr. Johnson:
Staff of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) has reviewed the subject document and provides the following comments:

The proposed project is located adjacent to or within Magpie Creek which is under the jurisdiction of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. The Board is required to enforce standards for the construction, maintenance, and protection of adopted flood control plans that will protect public lands from floods. The jurisdiction of the Board includes the Central Valley, including all tributaries and distributaries of the Sacramento River, the San Joaquin River, and designated floodways (Title 23 California Code of Regulations (CCR), Section 2).

A Board permit is required prior to starting the work within the Board's jurisdiction for the following:

- The placement, construction, reconstruction, removal, or abandonment of any landscaping, culvert, bridge, conduit, fence, projection, fill, embankment, building, structure, obstruction, encroachment, excavation, the planting, or removal of vegetation, and any repair or maintenance that involves cutting into the levee (CCR Section 6);
- Existing structures that predate permitting, or where it is necessary to establish the conditions normally imposed by permitting. The circumstances include those where responsibility for the encroachment has not been clearly established or ownership and use have been revised (CCR Section 6);
- Vegetation plantings will require the submission of detailed design drawings; identification of vegetation type; plant and tree names (i.e. common name and scientific name); total number of each type of plant and tree; planting spacing and irrigation method that will be utilized within the project area; a complete vegetative management plan for maintenance to prevent the interference with flood control, levee maintenance, inspection, and flood fight procedures (CCR Section 131).

Mr. Scott Johnson
July 15, 2013
Page 2 of 2

Vegetation requirements in accordance with Title 23, Section 131 (c) states "Vegetation must not interfere with the integrity of the adopted plan of flood control, or interfere with maintenance, inspection, and flood fight procedures. ${ }^{n}$

The accumulation and establishment of woody vegetation that is not managed has a negative impact on channel capacity and increases the potential for levee over-topping. When a channel develops vegetation that then becomes habitat for wildlife, maintenance to initial baseline conditions becomes more difficult as the removal of vegetative growth is subject to federal and State agency requirements for on-site mitigation within the floodway. The project should include mitigation measures to avoid decreasing floodway channel capacity.

Hydraulic Impacts - Hydraulic impacts due to encroachments could impede flood flows, reroute flood flows, and/or increase sediment accumulation. The project should include mitigation measures for channel and levee improvements and maintenance to prevent and/or reduce hydraulic impacts. Off-site mitigation outside of the State Plan of Flood Control should be used when mitigating for vegetation removed within the project location.

The permit application and Title 23 CCR can be found on the Central Valley Flood Protection Board's website at http://www.cvfpb.ca.gov/. Contact your local, federal and State agencies, as other permits may apply.

The Board's jurisdiction, including all tributaries and distributaries of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River, and designated floodways can be viewed on the Central Valley Flood Protection Board's website at http://gis.bam.water.ca.gov/bam/.

If you have any questions, please contact me by phone at (916) 574-0651, or via e-mail at jherota@water.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, California 95814

## Response J

Thank you for your comments; they have been included in the final environmental document.
Response 1: Thank you for forwarding the comment.
Response 2: Please see response to Comment G.

