



County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING
STEVEN E. WHITE, DIRECTOR

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title:

Initial Study No. 7217 - Sand Creek Bridge Replacement

2. Lead agency name and address:

*Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning
Development Services Division
2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor, Fresno CA 93721-2104*

3. Contact person and phone number:

Christina Monfette, (559) 600-4245

4. Project location:

The bridge is located on Ennis Road, 0.3 miles south of George Smith Road

5. Project Applicant's name and address:

*Fresno County Design Division
2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor
Fresno, CA 93721-2104*

6. General Plan designation:

Foothill Rural Residential (South Sierra Regional Plan)

7. Zoning:

AE-5 (Exclusive Agricultural 5-acre minimum parcel size)

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The proposed project consists of replacing and realigning the Sand Creek Bridge. The project will replace the existing functionally obsolete, single-span bridge with non-standard guard rail with a new bridge that meets current safety standards. Hummingbird Lane will be realigned near its intersection with Ennis Road to meet current standards. Closing Ennis Road during construction is anticipated. Staging is expected to occur on the existing roadway. The proposed bridge will be a single-span, cast in place concrete box girder approximately 100 feet in length and 24 feet in width with 24 foot wide approaches. The curves at the approaches will be softened and bridge alignment will be raised approximately 10 feet to increase site distance at the bridge.

Verizon has buried copper facilities that will need to be identified and field verified prior final design. There are existing PG&E utility lines and joint utility poles along Ennis Road and Hummingbird Lane. The storm drain pipe that runs under Hummingbird Lane will need to be relocated to match the new Hummingbird Lane and Ennis Road Intersection. Utility relocation is anticipated. Temporary and permanent right of way acquisition is anticipated.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The surrounding parcels range in size between three and six acres and consist of rural residential uses.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Aesthetics | ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources |
| ☐ Air Quality | ☐ Biological Resources |
| ☐ Cultural Resources | ☐ Geology/Soils |
| ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials | ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality |
| ☐ Land Use/Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources |
| ☐ Noise | ☐ Population/Housing |
| ☐ Public Services | ☐ Recreation |
| ☐ Transportation/Traffic | ☐ Utilities/Service Systems |
| ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance | ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions |

DETERMINATION OF REQUIRED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment. **A NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.**
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the Mitigation Measures described on the attached sheet have been added to the project. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.**
- ☐ I find the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required
- ☐ I find that as a result of the proposed project, no new effects could occur, or new Mitigation Measures would be required that have not been addressed within the scope of a previous Environmental Impact Report.

PERFORMED BY:**REVIEWED BY:**


Christina Monfette, Planner


Marianne Mollring, Senior Planner

Date: 11/7/2018

Date: 11-8-18

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
(Initial Study Application No. 6950 and
Classified Conditional Use Permit
Application No. 3489)**

The following checklist is used to determine if the proposed project could potentially have a significant effect on the environment. Explanations and information regarding each question follow the checklist.

1 = No Impact

2 = Less Than Significant Impact

3 = Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

4 = Potentially Significant Impact

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

- 2 a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- 2 b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- 2 c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- 1 d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 1 a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- 1 b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?
- 1 c) Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production?
- 1 d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- 1 e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:

- 2 a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?
- 2 b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- 2 c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standards (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- 2 d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- 2 e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 3 a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- 2 b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- 2 c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- 1 d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- 1 e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- 1 f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan?

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 3 a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 15064.5?
- 3 b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 15064.5?
- 3 c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?
- 3 d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
- 3 e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074?

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - 1 i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
 - 1 ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - 1 iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - 1 iv) Landslides?
- 2 b) Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?
- 2 c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?
- 1 d) Be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

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

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- 2 a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- 2 b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- 1 a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- 2 b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- 1 c) Create hazardous emissions or utilize hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- 1 d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- 1 e) Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area for a project located within an Airport Land Use Plan or, where such a Plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport?
- 1 f) Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
- 1 g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan?
- 1 h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- 2 a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- 1 b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
- 2 c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
- 2 d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?
- 1 e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage

systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- 1 f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- 1 g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
- 1 h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- 1 i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- 1 j) Cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- 1 a) Physically divide an established community?
- 3 b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the General Plan, Specific Plan, local coastal program, or Zoning Ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- 1 c) Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 1 a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- 1 b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, Specific Plan or other land use plan?

XII. NOISE

Would the project:

- 2 a) Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or Noise Ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- 2 b) Expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?
- 2 c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- 2 d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- 1 e) Expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels, for a project located within an Airport Land Use Plan or, where such a Plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport?
- 1 f) Expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip?

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- 1 a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- 1 b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- 1 c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

- 1 a) Fire protection?
- 1 b) Police protection?
- 1 c) Schools?
- 1 d) Parks?
- 1 e) Other public facilities?

XV. RECREATION

Would the project:

- 1 a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- 1 b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC

Would the project:

- 2 a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
- 2 b) Conflict with an applicable Congestion Management Program including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- 1 c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, which results in substantial safety risks?
- 2 d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- 2 e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Documents Referenced:

This Initial Study is referenced by the documents listed below. These documents are available for public review at the County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning, Development Services Division, 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, Fresno, California (corner of M & Tulare Streets).

Fresno County General Plan Policy Document, Background Report, and Final EIR, Fresno County Zoning Ordinance
 Important Farmland 2014 Map, State Department of Conservation
 Historic Property Survey prepared by Applied Earthworks, Inc. (K. Asselin (6/2016); reviewed by J. Whitehouse (6/2016))
 Hazardous Waste Initial Site Assessment prepared by Haro Environmental (E. Haro (11/2015); reviewed by T. Nelligan (11/2015))
 Natural Environment Study prepared by S. McMurty (8/2016); approved by Elmer Llamas (8/2016) and S. Gunn (8/2016)
 Water Quality Technical Memo prepared by S. McMurty (2/2016); approved by S. Gunn (3/2016)
 BSK Associates Final Report A6H0673 (8/25/16) prepared by Michelle Kawaguchi

- 2 f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- 1 a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- 1 b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- 1 c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- 1 d) Have sufficient water supplies available to service the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- 1 e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- 1 f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- 1 g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

- 3 a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- 1 b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)
- 1 c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?



County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING
STEVEN E. WHITE, DIRECTOR

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning, Design Division

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 7217

DESCRIPTION: The County of Fresno (County), with funding from the Federal State Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP), proposes to replace Bridge 42C0099 over Sand Creek on Ennis Road in Fresno. The project is 0.3 miles south of George Smith Road near the community of Squaw Valley. The County proposes to replace and realign the functionally obsolete, single-span structure with a bridge that meets current safety standards. Plans for the replacement bridge have not been finalized. The project will involve pole driving, structure demolition, and excavation and stream channel work. In addition, Hummingbird Lane will be realigned near its intersection with Ennis Road to meet current standards. Staging is expected to occur on the existing roadway and Ennis Road will be closed during construction. The existing Sand Creek Bridge on Ennis Road is a two-lane single-span wooden structure. The proposed bridge will be a single-span, cast in place concrete box girder approximately 100 feet in length and 24 feet in width with 24-foot wide approaches. The curves at the approaches will be softened and bridge alignment will be raised approximately 10 feet. Four PG&E power poles will be relocated as a result of this project. The existing storm drainpipe and other utilities may be relocated.

LOCATION: Ennis Road, 0.3 miles south of George Smith Road

This Initial Study was originally published on June 21, 2017. Since that time, revisions to the Mitigation Measures and Project Description represent a significant revision, which required the removal and addition of mitigation measures. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5, recirculation of the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is required.

I. AESTHETICS

- A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; or
- B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway; or
- C. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The existing Sand Creek Bridge on Ennis Road was constructed in 1975. It is a two-lane single-span wooden structure approximately 30 feet in length and 23 feet in width, located at the bottom of a sag curve. The existing approach roadway is 11.6 feet wide including the shoulders. The proposed bridge will be a single-span, cast in place concrete box girder approximately 100 feet in length and 24 feet in width with 24-foot wide approaches.

The curves at the approaches will be softened and bridge alignment will be raised approximately 10 feet to increase sight distance at the bridge. The new bridge will be approximately 1 foot wider than the existing bridge. The length will be increased approximately 70 feet; however, this is a less than significant impact to the aesthetics at the site because the increase in bridge length will be paved and painted to match the existing road. The new bridge will be functionally the same as the old bridge, except that the new bridge will meet current safety standards.

Ennis Road is not designated a scenic or landscaped drive by the Fresno County General Plan. Four power poles will need to be relocated because of the realignment; their existing positions will be offset by one or two feet. Therefore, this will not cause a significant change from the baseline view along Ennis Road or Hummingbird Lane.

- D. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There is no lighting proposed as part of this project. The bridge replacement will not create new sources of glare. The limited increase in the elevation of the bridge will not impact views because the bridge is currently at the valley of two inclines; the slope is uphill in both directions along Ennis Road and along Hummingbird Lane.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

- A. Would the project convert prime or unique farmlands or farmland of state-wide importance to non-agricultural use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

As part of the project, additional right-of-way may be acquired by the County. The land around the project site has been designated by the County of Fresno Important Farmlands Map (2014) as Grazing Land and Rural Residential land. Therefore, no prime or unique farmland, or farmland of state-wide importance would be converted to non-agricultural uses.

- B. Would the project conflict with existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act Contracts; or
- C. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or
- D. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or
- E. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The scope of this project is limited to replacing the existing bridge that crosses Sand Creek at Ennis Road. Parcels in this area are between three and six acres, which is consistent with the AE-5 (Exclusive Agricultural 5-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. None of the surrounding parcels are restricted by Williamson Act Contracts or zoned for Timberland production.

A review of historic aerial photographs, topographic maps, and city directory listings by Haro Environmental, Inc. indicate the project site was undeveloped as of 1924, and developed with Ennis Road in 1970. Surrounding land use has been converted from undeveloped land to rural residential as early as 1970 with development expanding slowly to the present configuration. Following completion of the project, the replacement of this bridge is not expected to contribute to the loss of additional agricultural or forest land.

III. AIR QUALITY

- A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or
- B. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation; or
- C. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under a Federal or State ambient air quality standard; or

- D. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
- E. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Construction has the potential for short-term effects on the local area; however, the project will not change the alignment or increase the number of through lanes, therefore, would not cause the continuous release of criteria pollutants to the area. The project will not increase capacity, or cause or contribute to any new localized Carbon Monoxide (CO) or Particulate Matter (PM)-10 violations or increase the frequency or severity of any existing CO or PM-10 non-attainment. The project specifications would require actions during construction to reduce particulate matter in accordance with the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District's Regulation VIII, reducing the impact of construction to less than significant. The replacement bridge is not expected to release any objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The Biological Study Area (BSA) includes the Project Impact Area (PIA) and approximately 100 feet beyond the County right-of-way. In addition, the BSA includes a 408-square foot temporary construction permit area and a 126-square foot area where a guy wire and pole will be installed. This additional area was added after the June 21, 2017 publication of the Notice of Intent and the original circulation of this document.

There are four distinct physical conditions present within the BSA. These include woodland, herbaceous-dominated, aquatic, and rural-developed. Of these conditions, the woodland, herbaceous-dominated, and aquatic habitats contain biological diversity, while the rural-developed area contains very limited to no diversity. The additional area is part of the woodland habitat and the mitigation originally proposed to reduce impacts to special-status species will be sufficient to address impacts to species in these areas.

There are numerous special-status species known to occur within the region. Some species require localized micro-habitats, while others are highly mobile and may occur throughout the region. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) documents eight special status species and habitats within a five-mile radius of the bridge site and 22 special status species documented within a ten-mile radius of the bridge site. The US Fish and Wildlife Service's Environmental Conservation Online System (ECOS) documents eight federally listed endangered, threatened, or candidate species that are known to or are believed to occur in project vicinity. It is unlikely, but conceivable, that San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*) could be in the vicinity of the bridge site, and construction activities could therefore disrupt individuals. This species has not been

observed within a ten-mile radius of the BSA and the field surveys did not reveal the presence of this species or any denning sites in the immediate vicinity; however, this species is highly mobile and could travel through the BSA in the future. With the implementation of avoidance measures, preconstruction surveys, and establishment of buffers if necessary, there would be no adverse effect.

The proposed project is located in an area with documented occurrences of Cooper's hawk, and other raptors. A raptor (red-tailed hawk) was observed near the BSA. Appropriate foraging habitat for raptors, including Cooper's hawk, exists in the regional vicinity of the project site. Construction activities are not expected to remove foraging habitat for these protected birds, although construction activities could temporarily make the land within the BSA to be less desirable for foraging while construction occurs. There was no evidence of active or remnant raptor nests located in the BSA. With the implementation of appropriate avoidance and minimization measures, there would be no adverse effect on raptors, including Cooper's hawk.

Construction activities could affect nesting migratory birds within 250 feet of this bridge site. Migratory birds in this area are not used to high frequency of disturbance associated with the human activity because of the rural nature of the area and construction would temporarily elevate such activities. Construction activities could affect any migratory bird if they were using the BSA for foraging at the commencement of construction. The effect would be expected to be temporary and associated with the noise and activities required to rebuild the bridge. At the completion of construction, the migratory birds would have use of the BSA similar to the existing conditions. With the implementation of avoidance measures, preconstruction surveys, and establishment of buffers if necessary, there would be no adverse effect.

There are three CNDDDB-documented special-status mammals (hoary bat, western red bat, and Yuma myotis) that occur within a ten-mile radius of the BSA. Bridges and other structures in the regions provide habitat for a variety of bat species, such as Mexican free-tailed (*Tadarida brasiliensis*), Big Brown bats (*Eptesicus fuscus*), and Myotis bats (*Myotis* sp). Bats will utilize the crevices in bridges for roosting. Bat mating and maternal roosting period is generally between May and August. When work on a bridge is performed between these months preconstruction surveys are necessary given that a bridge can be used by these sensitive species even if there is not a history of maternal roosting in the past. Additionally, it is very common for a bridge to be used for night or day roosting, and there was evidence of guano at the bridge. Exclusionary devices can be installed prior to construction to ensure that no bats are affected if the bridge is used for non-maternal roosting. With the implementation of preconstruction surveys, maternal avoidance measures, and installation of exclusionary devices if presence is discovered prior to construction, there would be no adverse effect on special status bats.

There are seven CNDDDB documented special-status plant that occur within a ten-mile radius of the BSA. These include American manna grass (*Glyceria grandis*), aromatic canyon gooseberry (*Ribes menziesii* var. *ixoderme*), Kings River buckwheat (*Eriogonum nudum* var. *regirivum*), San Joaquin adobe sunburst (*Pseudobahia peirsonii*), San Joaquin Valley Orcutt grass (*Orcuttia inaequalis*), slender-stalked monkeyflower (*Mimulus gracilipes*), spiny-sepaled button-celery (*Eryngium spinosepalum*), and

Winter's sunflower (*Helianthus winteri*). A series of three surveys were performed in the appropriate blooming season for special status plants known to occur within the region (April, May, and June). At the conclusion of the three surveys, it was determined that none of these species was present within the biological study area.

* **Mitigation Measures**

1. *In order to avoid impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds, project activities will occur, where possible, outside the nesting season. The nesting season is generally February 15-September 1. If project activities must occur during the nesting season (February 15-September 1), a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys within the Biological Study Area (BSA) for active raptor and migratory bird nests within 30 days of the onset of these activities. If no active nests are found within the BSA, no further mitigation is required.*
2. *Should any active nests be discovered within the BSA, the biologist shall determine the appropriate construction setback distances based on applicable CDFW guidelines and/or the biology of the affected species. Construction-free buffers will be identified on the ground with flagging, fencing, or by other easily visible means, and will be maintained until the biologist has determined that the young have fledged.*
3. *In order to avoid impacts to bats, construction should seek to avoid the maternal roosting period if possible (generally May – August). If their roosting period cannot be accommodated, exclusionary devices shall be installed prior to the maternal roosting period so the bats cannot use the bridge for maternal roosting during the construction period. If construction is planned outside the maternal roosting period (generally September – February), exclusionary devices will be installed at least seven days before work can commence. By waiting the seven days, the bats can exit the bridge and relocate to another location in the vicinity. Once these devices have been installed, they must be maintained and kept in good working order. Work on the bridge deck can occur anytime without work window restrictions.*
4. *In order to avoid impacts to the California Tiger Salamander (CTS), the following measures shall be implemented:*
 - a. *Retain a biologist to conduct a preconstruction survey*
 - b. *Install drift fences around the perimeter of the project impact area to prevent any CTS from moving into the area*
 - c. *Retain a biologist to monitor the BSA during construction to ensure that no CTS are harmed.*
 - d. *Retain a biologist to provide construction worker education for CTS.*
5. *Preconstruction surveys for foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylei*) and western pond turtle (*Emys marmorata*) shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to*

the beginning of ground disturbance and/or construction activities. Surveys for the yellow-legged frog shall be conducted in accordance with "A Standardized Protocol for Surveying Aquatic Amphibians" (Fellers and Freel, 1995) and "The Declining Amphibian Task Force Fieldwork Code of Practice" (DAPTF 1998). Written results of preconstruction surveys must be maintained by the County within five days after survey completion and prior to the start of ground disturbance and/or construction activities. If these species are discovered, the County shall consult with the CDFW to obtain the appropriate guidance to avoid this species. If take is unavoidable, the Applicant shall obtain an Incidental Take Permit, issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

6. *The project shall implement the "Standardized Recommendations for Protection of the Endangered San Joaquin kit fox Prior to or During Ground Disturbance" (USFWS 2011).*

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Riparian and aquatic habitat in the region is primarily comprised of Sand Creek, and other drainages. Riparian and aquatic habitat in the region are closely associated to one another. These areas are inundated either permanently with flow, or intermittently with storm events. Purely aquatic habitats generally do not support rooted-emergent or woody plant species, while riparian habitat is located along the edges of aquatic habitat. The riparian and aquatic habitat within the BSA is located within Sand Creek.

Sand Creek, which flows directly through the BSA, contains extensive riparian habitat. The riparian habitat is average quality for the foothill region, being that it is largely undisturbed. The proposed project will require a direct disturbance to the Sand Creek and the surrounding riparian habitat associated with construction activities at this bridge site. These activities would require compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The exact engineering has not yet been completed so the exact acreage of riparian habitat affected cannot be calculated. Formal wetland delineation must be prepared once the engineering plans (i.e. the exact alignment) is known. Restoration of temporary effects to the riparian habitat must be implemented prior to completion of the construction activities.

- C. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Sand Creek is jurisdictional water. Streamflow within Sand Creek was measured by the U.S. Geological survey at station (USGS 11212000 Sand Creek) downstream from the BSA. This station has been discontinued, however, max flow data from 1997 (Jan. 02,

1997) indicated that the maximum historical flow was 411 CFS. Additionally, two field measurements were taken in 1992 (04-08 and 02-19) that recorded a streamflow of 0.82 CFS and 3.86 CFS respectively. The data shows significant variations in flows, which will affect the high water mark within the creek channel. The Sand Creek is a jurisdictional facility and any fill activity associated with construction activities at this bridge site would require compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. It is anticipated that the project activities are eligible for a nationwide permit authorized by the Clean Water Act (NWP 14 Linear Transportation Projects).

It should also be noted that any work performed at the BSA would require a Section 401 Water Quality certification to be issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and a Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement to be issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

- D. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no CNDDDB-documented special-status fish documented within a ten-mile radius of the BSA. Sand Creek does not contain protected anadromous fish such as Chinook salmon or steelhead. There is one USFWS documented special-status fish within region: Delta smelt. This species is found in the freshwater-saltwater mixing zone of estuaries (i.e. Delta system), except during its spawning season, when it migrates upstream into the freshwater of the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers following winter "first flush" flow events (generally March to May). This species is not known to inhabit the small Sierra Nevada foothill tributaries and is not present in Sand Creek.

There are three CNDDDB documented special-status invertebrates within a five-mile radius of the BSA: mid-valley fairy shrimp, longhorn fairy shrimp, and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. The USFWS also lists longhorn fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp within the region. These species require vernal pool habitat, which is not present within the BSA. During the field survey no special-status invertebrates were observed, nor are they expected to be present based on the habitat conditions of the BSA.

There are two CNDDDB documented special-status amphibians that occur within a five-mile radius of the BSA, and an additional three that occur within a ten-mile radius. This includes the California tiger salamander and western spadefoot. The USFWS lists the California tiger salamander (CTS) and California red-legged frog within the region. None of these species are documented within the BSA of the bridge site and none were observed during field surveys.

CTS are not documented in the BSA, but are documented approximately 1.4 miles to the west and within the Sand Creek drainage. There is a very well documented presence of CTS within the 527-acre Sand Creek Conservation Bank, which contains 23 acres of naturally occurring vernal pools and vernal swales. The BSA does not contain suitable aquatic breeding habitat given that the stream is an intermittent fast-

flowing stream during the rainy season. While CTS can potentially travel up to a mile to reach suitable habitat, the steep terrain, fast flowing streams, lack of occurrences within the BSA, and lack of upland and aquatic habitat within the BSA makes it unlikely that the species would disperse within the BSA.

There is also a well-documented presence of western spadefoot within the 527-acre Sand Creek Conservation Bank. The BSA does not contain appropriate aestivation or aquatic breeding habitat. There are no indications that western spadefoot disperses up the Sand Creek drainage through the BSA to potential aestivation habitat in surrounding lands; however, dispersal range for this species is not well documented. The known breeding sites are located 1.4 miles to the west of the BSA. The BSA is within the range of elevations where this species generally occurs.

The California red-legged frog (CRLF) is federally listed as threatened and a state species of special concern. Populations are known to exist in isolated localities in the Sierra Nevada, north Coast, and northern Transverse Ranges from sea level to elevations of 5,200 feet. The known occurrences of CRLF in Fresno County are limited to the western portion of the County in the Diablo range. This species is not documented within 10 miles of the BSA and none was observed during field surveys.

The northern leopard frog (state species of special concern) occurs east of Sierra Nevada-Cascade crest near permanent or semi-permanent water in variety of habitats. They are aquatic species typically found along shoreline cover. Submerged and emergent aquatic vegetation are important habitat characteristics. There are no documented occurrences of this species within a five-mile radius and the BSA is not within the native range of this species.

- E. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or
- F. Would the project Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not be in conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and the site is not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved conservation plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; or
- B. Would the project cause of substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or

- C. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or
- D. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; or
- E. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Applied Earthworks (Æ) performed the Historic Property Survey Report for this project. A records search by the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System and Æ's review of inventories, registers, and other cultural resources lists available online did not reveal any previously recorded cultural resources within the APE.

Constructed in 1975, Bridge 42C0099 is listed in the Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory as Category 5, determined not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Archaeological surveys on November 9, 2015 and May 26, 2016, encountered no archaeological sites, features, or artifacts on the surface within the APE. Along with the findings of the field survey, the results of the records search, archival research, and Native American consultation strongly suggest that the likelihood of exposing buried intact archaeological remains during construction is low. Æ reached out to 16 Tribal Representatives and requested a Sacred Lands File search. No Tribe requested formal consultation under the provisions of AB 52 and there were no recorded sacred sites within or adjacent to the area of potential effects (APE) of the project.

The small increase to the APE will not increase the potential for damage to known resources. The areas are located directly adjacent to the footprint of the previous APE, but are more distant from the shores of the creek, where resources are most likely to be present. On March 16, 2018, a staff member from Applied Earthworks performed an intensive pedestrian survey of the additional area and identified no archeological or historical built environment resources.

However, the potential exists for artifacts or cultural resources to be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. Therefore, a mitigation measure requiring that all work halt if a find is uncovered will be included:

* **Mitigation Measure**

1. In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the area of the find. An Archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during ground disturbing activities, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Sheriff-Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. All

normal evidence procedures should be followed by photos, reports, video, etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours. The applicant shall contact the Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government by email at ledgerrobert@ymail.com

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

1. Rupture of a known earthquake?
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located along a known fault-line, according to the Department of Conservation's Fault Activity Map (2010). According to figure 9-5 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FGGPBR), the project site is not located in an area of probable seismic hazards. According to figure 9-6 (FGGPBR), the project site is not located in an area of moderate or high landslide hazards.

B. Would the project result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil; or

C. Would the project result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Grading and site preparation involved in construction of the Sand Creek Bridge could decrease vegetative cover and increase the potential for soil erosion, and thereby could cause a temporary increase in suspended solids in runoff to local receiving waters. Surfaces disturbed during construction would be paved or vegetated under operational conditions and the potential for erosion would be very low after construction has been completed. During operation, the improvements made could increase the overall amount of impervious surface in the project area, thereby increasing runoff. Standard conditions including the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), adherence to the Fresno County grading and earthmoving standards (Ordinance Code, Chapter 15.28 Grading and Excavation), and the implementation of Best Management Practices as required by the General Construction permitting process, would ensure that the impacts related to erosion and runoff and pollutants entering the watercourse would be reduced to less than significant levels.

- D. Would the project be located on expansive soils, creating substantial risks to life or property?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Soils at the project area include the Fallbrook sandy loam series. These soils have layers impeding downward movement of water, are well drained, and have sandy loam surface textures and slow infiltration rates. According to Figure 7-1 (FGGPBR), the project site is not located in an area where soils exhibit moderately high to high expansion potential.

- E. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative disposal systems where sewers are not available for wastewater disposal?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no septic tanks or alternative disposal systems proposed as part of this bridge replacement project.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

- A. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- B. Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Once the new bridge is operational, there will be no greenhouse gas emissions. Emissions during construction are considered less than significant due to their temporary nature. The project does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- A. Would the project create a significant public hazard through routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The scope of this project is limited to the replacement of the existing bridge. There will be no routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials associated with this project.

- B. Would the project create a significant public hazard involving accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

After the new bridge is completed, there is no additional operation or construction involving hazardous materials. Testing for lead and asbestos was completed by BKS Associated on July 14, 2016.

Two samples were taken from the soil at the northeastern corner of Sand Creek Bridge, one from a depth between 0-6 inches and one from a depth of 6-12 inches. Both samples were tested using method EPA 6010, which showed that the amount of lead in both samples was below the detectable limit of 50 mg/kg.

Two samples of the bridge structure, one from the northeast wing wall and one from the western edge of the bridge deck, were tested for asbestos via EPA 600/R-93/116 Method using polarized light microscopy. No asbestos was detected.

In compliance with Caltrans policies and procedures as described by the *Construction Manual*, paint removed from the bridge will be tested for the presence of lead prior to disposal. If testing determines that lead or other toxic substances are present, the paint will be disposed of at a hazardous waste facility.

With compliance to Caltrans regulations regarding the treatment and disposal of potentially hazardous materials, impacts to the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment is less than significant.

- C. Would the project create hazardous emissions or utilize hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one quarter-mile of a school?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The scope of this project is limited to the replacement of the existing bridge. There will be no routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials associated with this project. The project will not create a significant public hazard involving accidental release of hazardous materials or release hazardous emissions or substances within one quarter-mile of a school.

- D. Would the project be located on a hazardous materials site?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The National Pipeline Mapping System maintained by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration was reviewed for the presence of gas and hazardous liquid transmission pipelines, and the results indicate there are no mapped pipelines located within a one-mile radius of the project area. A database search was requested from Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) which researched the Federal National Priority List (NPL); the Federal Delisted NPL Deletions; the Federal Comprehensive

Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS); the Federal CERCLIS No Further Remedial Action Planned, Federal Corrective Action Reports; Federal Resource and Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) generators list; state- and tribal-equivalent NPL and CERCLIS, state and tribal leaking storage tank lists, voluntary cleanup sites, and brownfields sites; US Brownfield lists; and local lists of landfill/solid waste disposal sites. The project site and other parcels in the vicinity were not listed on any of the sites researched.

- E. Would a project located within an airport land use plan or, absent such a plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; or
- F. Would a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within two miles of a public or private airport or within an airport land use plan. Reviews of aerial photos of the site do not indicate the presence of any private airstrips.

- G. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan; or
- H. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

After construction, the new bridge will perform essentially the same function as the currently defunct bridge. Therefore, it will not impair implementation of or interfere with any Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan. Additionally, the project will not expose people and structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise degrade water quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

During operation, the improvements made could increase the overall amount of impervious surface in the project area, thereby increasing runoff. The most common contaminants found in roadway runoff are heavy metals, inorganic salts, aromatic hydrocarbons, and suspended solids that accumulate on the road surface as a result of

regular roadway operation and maintenance activities. Ordinary operations and the wear and tear of vehicles result in the dropping of oil, grease, rust, hydrocarbons, rubber particles, and other solid materials on the roadway surface. These materials are washed off the roadway during rain events. Receiving surface waters are susceptible to contamination from these sources. Additionally, pollutants would tend to be flushed from impervious surfaces where they accumulate (e.g., paving) into drainage conveyances. Stormwater runoff from road surfaces would be expected to contain oils, grease, and debris.

Local, state, and federal agencies require the development of practical measures in response to the potential impacts of construction activities and ongoing project operations that discharge sediment and other undesirable elements to existing waterways. These include the required compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements, preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), as well as County ordinances (e.g., erosion and grading ordinance). Project design features are currently unknown as the project is in the design phase, however, standard conditions include the application of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to include measures that can be incorporated into the design of the project to avoid, minimize, or reduce potential environmental impacts to Sand Creek.

- B. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge so that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There is no use of water proposed as part of this application. The bridge replacement will not result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the groundwater table.

- C. Would the project substantially alter existing drainage patterns, including alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site; or
- D. Would the project substantially alter existing drainage patterns, including alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The reconstruction of the bridge has the potential to affect the course of Sand Creek; however, the applicant must obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement, issued by the CDFW, which will ensure that Sand Creek is not altered in such a manner as to cause on, or off-site flooding. This has been included as a project note for the Applicant's reference.

- E. Would the project create or contribute run-off which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off?

F. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The new bridge will perform the same function as the original bridge and will not contribute to an increase in polluted run-off because there is no increase in traffic from the previous operational baseline of approximately 675 vehicles per day (2% truck traffic).

G. Would the project place housing within a 100-year floodplain; or

H. Would the project place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There is no housing proposed with this application and the proposed bridge will be above the base flood elevation for Sand Creek.

I. Would the project expose persons or structures to levee or dam failure; or

J. Would the project cause inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located in an area that is not at risk of inundation from the 100-year flood. According to Figure 9-8 (FCGPBR), the project site is not in an area at risk of inundation due to dam failure.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

A. Will the project physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to replace a functionally obsolete bridge with a new one that meets current safety standards. The project site is limited to the area surrounding the bridge, which includes the realignment of Hummingbird Avenue to meet safety standards. Functionally, the bridge serves as a road and connection between residences and businesses on both sides of Sand Creek and will not divide an established community.

B. Will the project conflict with any Land Use Plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The Fresno County General Plan is a comprehensive, long-term policy framework that includes guidance for the protection of the county's natural resources. The following policies directly relate to the Sand Creek Bridge project:

- Policy OS-A.25: The County shall minimize sedimentation and erosion through control of grading, cutting of trees, removal of vegetation, placement of roads and bridges, and use of off-road vehicles. The County shall discourage grading activities during the rainy season unless adequately mitigated to avoid sedimentation of creeks and damage to riparian habitat.
- Policy OS-A.26: The County shall continue to require the use of feasible and practical best management practices (BMPs) to protect streams from the adverse effects of construction activities and urban runoff.

The project will be consistent with these policies with adherence to the proposed design, which requires that the applicant adopt BMPs as part of their federal permitting. The Draft Wetlands Report prepared for submission to the Army Corps of Engineers as part of the permitting process identifies that the existing bridge covers 832.64 square feet of Sand Creek and the new bridge will be built largely in the same location but will cover 916.62 square feet, which will result in a permanent increase of affected riparian habitat of 84 square feet. It is anticipated that approximately 15 trees will be removed as part of this project.

* **Mitigation Measures**

1. *The disturbance or removal of riparian and other vegetation shall not exceed the minimum necessary to complete operations (with the exception of non-native, invasive plant species) and shall only occur within the defined work area. Precautions shall be taken to avoid other damage to vegetation by people or equipment. The disturbed portions of the streambed, banks or channel shall be restored to as near their original condition as possible (see Restoration below).*
2. *Native riparian shrubs and trees, and oak trees with trunks greater than or equal to four (4) inches diameter measured at breast height (DBH), if removed during Project activities shall be mitigated for by implementation of a Revegetation Plan described in Restoration below.*
3. **Restoration** *shall include the revegetation of all disturbed soils and new fill, including recontoured slopes and all other cleared areas, with riparian vegetation or other plants as appropriate. The Applicant shall have a qualified biologist prepare and implement a Revegetation Plan and submit it to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for approval prior to commencement of the proposed work. The Revegetation Plan shall address the following:*

A. *Compensation for removed trees by:*

- * *Identifying species damaged or removed during Project activities.*

- * *Describing how, where and when replacement shrubs and trees will be planted:*
 - *Riparian trees (i.e. willow, cottonwood, poplar, alder, ash, etc.) and shrubs shall be replaced in-kind, at a minimum replacement ratio of 4:1, and planted in the nearest suitable location to the area where they were removed.*
 - *Oaks having a DBH of greater than four (4) inches shall be replaced in-kind, at a minimum ratio of 4:1, and planted during the winter dormancy period in the nearest suitable location to the area where they were removed. Heritage trees greater than 24 inches DBH shall be replaced at a minimum 10:1 ratio.*
 - *Non-native, invasive plant species (i.e., arundo and tree-of-heaven) may be removed and replaced with native riparian species.*
- * *Proposing measures to be taken (i.e. irrigation methods if necessary and maintenance) to ensure a performance criteria of 75 percent survival of planted trees for a period of three (3) consecutive years and an additional two (2) years without assistance.*

B. Seeding and mulching exposed slopes, or stream banks not revegetated with riparian shrubs or trees, with a blend of a minimum of three (3) locally native grass species:

- * *One (1) or two (2) sterile non-native perennial grass species may be added to the seed mix provided that the amount does not exceed 25 percent of the total seed mix by count.*
 - * *Locally native wildflower and/or shrub seeds may also be included in the seed mix.*
 - * *Seeding shall be completed as soon as possible, but no later than November 15 of the year construction ends.*
 - * *A seed mixture shall be submitted to the Department for approval prior to application. At the discretion of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, all exposed areas where seeding is considered unsuccessful after 90 days shall receive appropriate soil preparation and a second application of seeding, straw, or mulch as soon as is practical on a date mutually agreed upon.*
4. *Where suitable vegetation cannot be reasonably expected to become established, non-erodible materials shall be used for such stabilization. Any installation of non-erodible materials not described in the original Project description shall be coordinated with the*

Department. Coordination may include the negotiation of additional Agreement Provisions for this activity.

5. *Operator shall submit annually a Restoration Monitoring Report. The Restoration Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the Department in December of each year until the performance criteria described in the Revegetation Plan is met. The report shall assess the revegetation status, effectiveness of maintenance methods, whether or not revegetation is expected to achieve the performance criteria, and shall propose additional measures that will be taken to achieve the performance criteria during the next year. Photo documentation of monitoring and maintenance for each year shall be part of the annual reports.*
- C. Will the project conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not in conflict with any such plans. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans applicable to this project.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

- A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource; or
- B. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site designated on a General Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The scope of this project is limited to the replacement of an old bridge. No known mineral resources will be removed and the location is not a recovery site designated by Figure 7-7(FCGPBR).

XII. NOISE

- A. Would the project result in exposure of people to severe noise levels; or
- B. Would the project result in exposure of people to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels; or
- C. Would the project cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity; or
- D. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Following the construction activity, the operational aspect of the bridge will not generate severe noise levels or ground-borne vibration. No increase to the ambient noise is anticipated.

Demolition and construction of the bridge has the potential to affect adversely several nearby residences; however, construction will be performed during times when construction noise is exempted from the noise ordinance (Monday to Friday between 6 AM and 9 PM and Saturday/Sunday between 7 AM and 5 PM). Therefore, due to the temporary nature of construction and demolition and the existing exemptions to the noise ordinance, impacts to the increase in noise levels will be less than significant.

- E. Would the project expose people to excessive noise levels associated with a location near an airport or a private airstrip; or
- F. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located near a public or private airstrip.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- A. Would the project induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly; or
- B. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing; or
- C. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of housing elsewhere?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The replacement of Sand Creek Bridge at Ennis road will not induce population growth. No increase to the use of the bridge is expected. The project will not displace substantial numbers of housing or people.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- A. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically-altered public facilities in the following areas:
 - 1. Fire protection;
 - 2. Police protection;
 - 3. Schools;
 - 4. Parks; or

5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The replacement of the bridge will not require any changes or expansions to existing fire and police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities.

XV. RECREATION

- A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks; or
- B. Would the project require the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or require the construction or expansion of facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- A. Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation; or
- B. Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demands measures?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

It is possible that the bridge will be closed during construction. This temporary closure does not create a significant impact on the circulation system because area roads can accommodate a temporary increase in traffic. Drivers may detour through Mistletoe Road to cross Sand Creek. The additional time that results from this detour is not considered a significant impact on the circulation system.

- C. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The replacement of the bridge will not cause a change in air traffic patterns. The proposed increase in the bridge's height will not conflict with any passing air traffic.

- D. Would the project substantially increase traffic hazards due to design features; or
- E. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access; or

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

After construction activities, when the bridge is operational, it will serve the same function as the bridge it replaced. There will be no changes to the existing traffic on the road or impacts to the performance of the circulation system. No roads will be removed and no traffic hazards will be created.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- A. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements; or
- B. Would the project require construction of or the expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No wastewater will be generated as part of this proposal.

- C. Would the project require or result in the construction or expansion of new storm water drainage facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The expansion of the bridge is predominately along its length, which is currently paved. The increase the impervious surfaces is not large enough to require the construction or expansion of new storm water drainage facilities.

- D. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed; or
- E. Would the project result in a determination of inadequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve project demand; or
- F. Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity; or
- G. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not produce any wastewater or solid waste in the course of normal operation.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California prehistory or history?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The replacement of the existing bridge will require the disturbance of natural landscape, which may cause adverse impacts to local endangered plant and animal communities. No impacts to fish were identified. With adherence to the mitigation measures listed under "Biological Resources," the impacts will be less than significant. Construction activities may cause adverse impacts on important examples of the major periods of California prehistory or history. This impact is less than significant with the inclusion of the Mitigation Measure detailed under "Cultural Resources."

* **Mitigation Measures**

1. See Sections IV and V.

- B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable; or
- C. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Following construction activities, which generate less than significant impacts, the project will not contribute to any cumulatively considerable impact or cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon this Initial Study, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. It has been determined that there would be no impacts to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Mineral Resources, Recreation, Public Services, Population and Housing, and Utilities and Service Systems. Potential impacts related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Transportation/Traffic have been determined to be less than significant. Potential impacts relating to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Land Use and Planning, and Hazards and Hazardous Waste have been determined to be less than significant with compliance with the Mitigation Measures identified above.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration is recommended and is subject to approval by the decision-making body. The Initial Study is available for review at 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, Street Level, located on the southeast corner of Tulare and “M” Street, Fresno, California.

CMM

Y:\Projects - Road & Bridge Folders\HBP - Sand Creek on Ennis (I11112)\CEQA, NEPA\CEQA IS-MND-MMRP-NOI-NOD\Board January 2019\IS 7217 Writeup.docx

File original and one copy with: Fresno County Clerk 2221 Kern Street Fresno, California 93721		Space Below For County Clerk Only. CLK-2046.00 E04-73 R00-00	
Agency File No: IS 7217	LOCAL AGENCY PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION		County Clerk File No: E-
Responsible Agency (Name): Fresno County	Address (Street and P.O. Box): 2220 Tulare St. Sixth Floor		City: Fresno Zip Code: 93721
Agency Contact Person (Name and Title): Christina Monfette, Planner		Area Code: 559	Telephone Number: 600-4245 Extension: N/A
Applicant (Name): Fresno County Design Division		Project Title: IS 7217: Sand Creek Bridge Replacement	
Project Description: The County of Fresno (County), with funding from the Federal Highway Bridge Program, proposes to replace Bridge 42C0099 over Sand Creek on Ennis Road in Fresno. The project is 0.3 miles south of George Smith Road near the community of Squaw Valley. The County proposes to replace and realign the functionally obsolete, single-span structure with nonstandard guardrail with a bridge that meets current standards. Plans for the replacement bridge have not been finalized. The project will involve pile driving, structure demolition, and excavation and stream channel work. In addition, Hummingbird Lane will be realigned near its intersection with Ennis Road to meet current standards. Due to the low daily traffic and short 4-mile detour length, closing Ennis Road during construction is anticipated. Staging is expected to occur on the existing roadway.			
Justification for Negative Declaration: Based upon this Initial Study, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. It has been determined that there would be no impacts to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Recreation, Public Services, Population and Housing, and Utilities and Service Systems. Potential impacts related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Transportation/Traffic have been determined to be less than significant. Potential impacts relating to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazards and Hazardous Waste have determined to be less than significant with compliance with the Mitigation Measures identified above.			
FINDING: The proposed project will not have a significant impact on the environment.			
Newspaper and Date of Publication: Fresno Business Journal – November 14, 2018		Review Date Deadline: Board of Supervisors – January 8, 2019	
Date:	Type or Print Signature: Christina Monfette Planner	Submitted by (Signature):	

State 15083, 15085

County Clerk File No.: _____

**LOCAL AGENCY
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**Sand Creek Bridge Replacement Project
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
and Project Notes**

Mitigation Measures					
Impact	No.	Mitigation Measure Language	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Time Span
Cultural Resources	1.	In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the area of the find. An Archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during ground disturbing activities, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Sheriff-Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. All normal evidence procedures should be followed by photos, reports, video, and etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours. The applicant shall contact the Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government by email at ledgerrobert@ymail.com	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	During all ground-disturbing activities
Biological Resources	2.	In order to avoid impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds, project activities will occur, where possible, outside the nesting season. The nesting season is generally February 15-September 1. If project activities must occur during the nesting season (February 15-September 1), a qualified biologist will conduct pre-construction surveys within the BSA** for active raptor and migratory bird nests within 30 days of the onset of these activities. If no active nests are found within the BSA, no further mitigation is required.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	February 15 through September 1
	3.	Should any active nests be discovered within the BSA**, the biologist shall determine the appropriate construction setback distances based on applicable CDFW guidelines and/or the biology of the affected species. Construction-free buffers will be identified on the ground with flagging, fencing, or by other easily visible means, and will be maintained until the biologist has determined that the young have fledged.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	

Biological Resources	4.	In order to avoid impacts to bats, construction should seek to avoid the maternal roosting period if possible (generally May – August). If that period cannot be accommodated, exclusionary devices shall be installed prior to the maternal roosting period so the bats cannot use the bridge for maternal roosting during the construction period. If construction is planned outside the maternal roosting period (generally September – February), exclusionary devices will be installed at least seven days before work can commence. By waiting the seven days, the bats can exit the bridge and relocate to another location in the vicinity. Once these devices have been installed, they must be maintained and kept in good working order. Work on the bridge deck can occur anytime without work window restrictions.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	May through August
Biological Resources	5.	In order to avoid affects to the California Tiger Salamander (CTS), the following measures shall be implemented: a. Retain a biologist to conduct a preconstruction survey b. Install drift fences around the perimeter of the project impact area to prevent any CTS from moving into the area c. Retain a biologist to monitor the BSA** during construction to ensure that no CTS are harmed. d. Retain a biologist to provide construction worker education for CTS.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Ongoing
Biological Resources	6.	Preconstruction surveys for foothill yellow-legged frog (<i>Rana boylei</i>) and western pond turtle (<i>Emys marmorata</i>) shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the beginning of ground disturbance and/or construction activities. Surveys for the yellow-legged frog shall be conducted in accordance with “A Standardized Protocol for Surveying Aquatic Amphibians” (Fellers and Freel, 1995) and “The Declining Amphibian Task Force Fieldwork Code of Practice” (DAPTF 1998). Written results of preconstruction surveys must be maintained by the County within five days after survey completion and prior to the start of ground disturbance and/or construction activities. If these species are discovered, the County shall consult with the CDFW to obtain the appropriate guidance to avoid this species. If take is unavoidable, the Applicant shall obtain an	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Less than 14 days prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities

		Incidental Take Permit, issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.			
Biological Resources	7.	The project shall implement the “Standardized Recommendations for Protection of the Endangered San Joaquin kit fox Prior to or During Ground Disturbance” (USFWS 2011).	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Ongoing
Land Use and Planning	8.	The disturbance or removal of riparian and other vegetation shall not exceed the minimum necessary to complete operations (with the exception of non-native, invasive plant species) and shall only occur within the defined work area. Precautions shall be taken to avoid other damage to vegetation by people or equipment. The disturbed portions of the stream bed, banks or channel shall be restored to as near their original condition as possible (see Restoration below).	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Ongoing
Land Use and Planning	9.	Native riparian shrubs and trees, and oak trees with trunks greater than or equal to four (4) inches diameter measured at breast height (DBH), if removed during Project activities shall be mitigated for by implementation of a Revegetation Plan described in Restoration below.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Prior to operation
Land Use and Planning	10.	Restoration shall include the revegetation of all disturbed soils and new fill, including recontoured slopes and all other cleared areas, with riparian vegetation or other plants as appropriate. The Applicant shall have a qualified biologist prepare and implement a Revegetation Plan and submit it to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for approval prior to commencement of the proposed work. The Revegetation Plan shall address the following: A. Compensation for removed trees by: * Identifying species damaged or removed during Project activities. * Describing how, where and when replacement shrubs and trees will be planted: - Riparian trees (i.e. willow, cottonwood, poplar, alder, ash, etc.) and shrubs shall be replaced in-kind, at a minimum replacement ratio of 4:1, and planted in the	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Prior to operation

		nearest suitable location to the area where they were removed. - Oaks having a DBH of greater than four (4) inches shall be replaced in-kind, at a minimum ratio of 4:1, and planted during the winter dormancy period in the nearest suitable location to the area where they were removed. Heritage trees greater than 24 inches DBH shall be replaced at a minimum 10:1 ratio. - Non-native, invasive plant species (i.e., arundo and tree-of-heaven) may be removed and replaced with native riparian species. * Proposing measures to be taken (i.e. irrigation methods if necessary and maintenance) to ensure a performance criteria of 75 percent survival of planted trees for a period of three (3) consecutive years and an additional two (2) years without assistance. B. Seeding and mulching exposed slopes, or stream banks not revegetated with riparian shrubs or trees, with a blend of a minimum of three (3) locally native grass species: * One (1) or two (2) sterile non-native perennial grass species may be added to the seed mix provided that the amount does not exceed 25 percent of the total seed mix by count. * Locally native wildflower and/or shrub seeds may also be included in the seed mix. * Seeding shall be completed as soon as possible, but no later than November 15 of the year construction ends. * A seed mixture shall be submitted to the Department for approval prior to application. At the discretion of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, all exposed areas where seeding is considered unsuccessful after 90 days shall receive appropriate soil preparation and a second application of seeding, straw, or mulch as soon as is practical on a date mutually agreed upon.			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Land Use and Planning	11.	Where suitable vegetation cannot be reasonably expected to become established, non-erodible materials shall be used for such stabilization. Any installation of non-erodible materials not described in the original Project description shall be coordinated with the Department. Coordination may include the negotiation of additional Agreement Provisions for this activity.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Prior to operation
Land Use and Planning	12	Applicant shall submit annually a Restoration Monitoring Report. The Restoration Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife in December of each year until the performance criteria described in the Revegetation Plan is met. The report shall assess the revegetation status, effectiveness of maintenance methods, whether or not revegetation is expected to achieve the performance criteria, and shall propose additional measures that will be taken to achieve the performance criteria during the next year. Photo documentation of monitoring and maintenance for each year shall be part of the annual reports.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	

**The Biological Study Area (BSA) includes the Project Impact Area and approximately 100 feet beyond the County Right-of-Way.

Notes					
Hazards and Hazardous Waste	1.	As for all projects proposing excavation or grading, the potential exists for unknown hazardous contamination to be encountered during the project construction. Therefore, for any previously unknown hazardous waste/material encountered as part of construction of the proposed project, the procedures outlined in Appendix E (Caltrans Unknown Hazards Procedures) shall be followed.			
Hydrology and Water Quality	2.	The project is anticipated to be eligible for a Nationwide Permit (NWP) 14 Linear Transportation Projects. A Pre-construction Notification is required only for projects over 0.1 acres under the NWP 14.			
Hydrology and Water Quality	3.	The project requires a Section 401 Water Quality certification to be issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.			
Hydrology and Water Quality	4.	The project requires a Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement to be issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.			

Hydrology and Water Quality	5.	The Proposed Project requires a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit for Discharges of storm water associated with construction activities. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall also be developed and implemented as part of the Construction General Permit.
-----------------------------	----	--

CMM:

Y:\Projects - Road & Bridge Folders\HBP - Sand Creek on Ennis (I11112)\CEQA, NEPA\CEQA IS-MND-MMRP-NOI-NOD\Board January 2019\IS 7217 MMRP.docx