

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: I.S. 7005		LOCAL AGENCY 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): Briza Sholars, Planner		Area Code: 559	Telephone Number: 600-4207		Extension: -0-
Applicant (Name): Fresno County Design Division		Project Title: HCD 1998-1999 Community Development Block Grant Program Houghton Canal Bridge Replacement Project			
Project Description: <p>The proposed federally funded project consists of replacing the Houghton Canal Bridge on N. Chateau Fresno Avenue. The project will replace a structurally deficient timber bridge, with posted load limits, with a bridge that meets current safety standards. Road approach improvements will start at approximately 700 feet on both sides of the bridge. Due to low traffic volumes and reasonably short detour of three miles, the roadway will be closed to public traffic. Traffic will be detoured around the project site by way of Belmont Avenue, Grantland Avenue, and SR 180. It is anticipated the contractor will stage on the roadway. The Houghton Canal Bridge on N. Chateau Fresno Avenue is located approximately 0.5 miles south of Belmont Avenue, near Kerman in Fresno County. (SUP. DIST.: 1)</p>					
Justification for Negative Declaration: <p>Initial Study Application No. 7005 indicates there is no evidence in the record that demonstrates that the project will have a significant effect on the environment. Potential impacts to cultural and archaeological resources were addressed by the applicant accepting mitigation measures requiring that archaeological resources remain undisturbed and any construction work be halted in the event archaeological resources or human remains are unearthed until an archaeologist and the Fresno County Coroner can evaluate the findings. Potential impacts to water quality will be addressed by the proper permits to be obtained from the Army Corps of Engineers. Potential impacts regarding hazardous materials were addressed by the mitigation measures incorporated by the Health department from the Adanta Initial Site Assessment. Based on the Initial Study, staff has concluded that preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is not required. A Notice of Intent of Mitigated Negative Declaration was published on November 6, 2015. Approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is recommended and is subject to approval by the decision-making body. A Board of Supervisors hearing is scheduled for December 15, 2015.</p>					
FINDING: The proposed project will not have a significant impact on the environment.					
Newspaper and Date of Publication: Fresno Business Journal, November 6, 2015			Review Date Deadline: December 7, 2015		
Date: November 6, 2015	Type or Print Signature: Eric VonBerg, Senior Planner		Submitted by (Signature):		

State 15083, 15085

**LOCAL AGENCY
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**
(not to exceed one page)

County Clerk File No. _____

**Houghton Canal 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	1:	If cultural resources are discovered during construction, all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery will be diverted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Prior to Construction
Hazards	1.	No disposal of excess soil outside of project area shall be allowed without proper testing for disposal requirements.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Prior to Construction
		All construction materials deemed hazardous as identified in the demolition process shall be characterized and disposed of in accordance with current federal, state and local requirements. These substances shall also be disposed of at an approved disposal facility as determined by the characteristics.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Prior to Construction
Notes					
Air Quality	1	A non-standard specification - Air Quality NESHAP Notification should be included for air quality compliance. In compliance with Standard Specifications Section 14-9.01, the Contractor must notify the appropriate agencies as required by the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) at 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart M, and California health and Safety Code section 39658(b)(1). Notification must take place a minimum of 10 working days prior to starting demolition or renovation activities as defined in the NESHAP regulations.			
		Conditions that indicate a potential for contamination that might possibly affect the project are recognized and include the following: -It is probable that existing paint striping on the surface of North Chateau Fresno Avenue and the white paint on the concrete structure on either side of the bridge contain lead, as well as chromium and zinc.			

Mitigation Measures

Impact	No.	Mitigation Measure Language	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Time Span
		<p>-The California Air Resources Board and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution District have taken the position that all concrete contains asbestos. Concrete structures that are intended for demolition need to be sampled for asbestos content. The bridge should be inspected for asbestos-containing materials (including shims, pads, and concrete). This study will require a Certified Asbestos Consultant.</p> <p>-The majority of the project area has been used for agricultural purposes for many years. Therefore, there is the potential that pesticides, herbicides, and/or fertilizers were applied to soils, or stored at, the Study Area.</p> <p>-The bridge was constructed with treated wood beam supports. In addition, the support structures for the metal railing are treated wood. Caltrans and California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) require that treated wood is handled and disposed in a specific manner.</p>			
Biology		A 401 permit would be required due to the work in the Houghton Canal.	Applicant	Fresno County Design Division, Department of Public Works and Planning	Prior to construction
Hazards		Follow management of asbestos containing materials (hazardous waste guidelines)			
Noise		Follow County Noise Ordinance for construction in an areas with sensitive receptors/residential dwellings.			
Erosion		Standard Best Management Practices (BMP's) shall be implemented and incorporated into the project.			



County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING
ALAN WEAVER, DIRECTOR

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title:

*Houghton Canal Bridge Replacement Project, Initial Study Application No. 7005
Bridge Project #: 42C0486
Caltrans Bridge Project #: 42C-0486
Fresno County Bridge No. 04-030
BRLO-5942(237)*

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:

Briza Sholars, (559) 600-4207

4. Project location:

The proposed bridge project is located on N. Chateau Fresno Avenue, located approximately 0.5 miles south of Belmont Avenue, near the City of Kerman. The project is located in unincorporated western Fresno County. (SUP. DIST.: 1)

5. Project Applicant's name and address:

Fresno County Design Division

6. General Plan designation:

Agriculture

7. Zoning:

Exclusive Agriculture (AE) 20-acre district

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 federally funded project consists of replacing the Houghton Canal Bridge on N. Chateau Fresno Avenue, located approximately 0.5 miles south of Belmont Avenue in Fresno County. The project will replace a structurally deficient timber bridge, with posted load limits, with a bridge that meets current safety standards. Road approach improvements will start at approximately 700 feet on both sides of the bridge. Due to low traffic volumes and reasonably short detour of three miles, the roadway will be closed to public traffic. Traffic will be detoured around the project site by way of Belmont Avenue, Grantland Avenue, and SR 180. It is anticipated the contractor will stage on the roadway.

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

The roadway is surrounded by Agricultural land. Presently the farmlands include fallow land, row crop agriculture, farm equipment, and a residence with a pool. This bridge on North Chateau Avenue is over the Houghton Canal. The site is flat at approximately 256 msl elevation.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION

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.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input type="checkbox"/> 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:

Briza Sholars, Planner

Eric VonBerg, Senior Planner

Date: _____

Date: _____

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
(7005)**

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:

- 1 a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- 1 b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- 1 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?
- 3 e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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 standard (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:

- 2 a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- 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 Game 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?
- 2 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?
- 2 e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- 2 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) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 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?
- 1 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?

- 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?
- 2 e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
- 2 f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- 2 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?
- 2 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) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- 1 a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- 1 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:

- 2 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?
- 2 c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- 3 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) For a project located within an Airport Land Use Plan or where such a Plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- 1 f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- 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 of waste discharge requirements?
- 2 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?

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- 1 a) Physically divide an established community?
- 1 b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, Specific Plan, local coastal program, or Zoning Ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- 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 of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or Noise Ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- 2 b) Expose of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne 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:

- 1 a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
 - 1 i) Fire protection?
 - 1 ii) Police protection?
 - 1 iii) Schools?
 - 1 iv) Parks?
 - 1 v) 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)?
- 1 e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- 1 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?

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).

- Department of Transportation Cultural Memo, John Whitehouse, May 28, 2015
- Department of Transportation NEPA Hazardous Waste Regulations, Verpermann, June 30, 2015
- Design Division, Fresno County, Visual Impact Assessment, Design staff, February 2, 2015

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- 2 a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- 2 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 stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- 2 d) Have sufficient water supplies available to service the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- 2 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:

- 2 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?

Adanta, Initial Site Assessment, March 7, 2015
Fresno County General Plan, Policy Document and Final EIR
Fresno County Zoning Ordinance
Fresno County Important Farmlands Map
FEMA Flood Maps
Soil Survey of Eastern Fresno Area, CA
Final National Priorities List (NPL) Sites website
Superfund Information Systems CERCLIS website
Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map

County of Fresno



DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING
ALAN WEAVER
 DIRECTOR

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Fresno County Design Division

APPLICATION NO.: Houghton Canal Bridge Replacement Project,
 Initial Study Application No. 7005
 Caltrans Bridge Project #: 42C-0486
 Fresno County Bridge No. 04-030
 BRLO-5942(237)

DESCRIPTION: The proposed federally funded project consists of replacing the Houghton Canal Bridge on N. Chateau Fresno Avenue. The project will replace a structurally deficient timber bridge, with posted load limits, with a bridge that meets current safety standards. Road approach improvements will start at approximately 700 feet on both sides of the bridge. Due to low traffic volumes and reasonably short detour of three miles, the roadway will be closed to public traffic. Traffic will be detoured around the project site by way of Belmont Avenue, Grantland Avenue, and SR 180. It is anticipated the contractor will stage on the roadway.

LOCATION: The Houghton Canal Bridge on N. Chateau Fresno Avenue is located approximately 0.5 miles south of Belmont Avenue, near the City of Kerman in Fresno County. (SUP. DIST.: 1)

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The existing bridge is currently in use, and a new bridge will be constructed in the same location. The area surrounding the project has been in rural agricultural use since construction of the bridge in 1925. The project site is not located along a designated Scenic Highway, and no scenic vistas or scenic resources were identified near the proposal.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION

- C. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal entails the replacement of an existing two lane timber bridge with a new two lane bridge that meets current construction standards. The land surrounding the bridge is in agriculture and zoned Agriculture Exclusive (AE) 20-acre District. The proposal will not significantly damage any scenic resource or degrade the visual character of the site or its surroundings. A Visual Impact Assessment was prepared which scored 6-9 points. No noticeable visual changes to the environment are proposed and no further analysis is required.

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

NO IMPACT:

The project will be constructed during daylight hours and no additional lighting will be utilized at the site as a result of this proposal.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

- A. Would the project convert prime or unique farmlands or farmland of statewide importance to non-agricultural use; or
- B. Would the project conflict with existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act Contracts; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Study Area has remained in rural agricultural use since construction of the bridge in 1925. A 1923 topographic map was reviewed that depicted the area as being rural. It was also likely in agricultural use at that time.

- 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 project site is not located on forest land, timberland or timberland that is zoned Timberland Protection. The project will not convert farmland to an non-agricultural use. The bridge will be replaced in the same footprint.

III. AIR QUALITY

- A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or
- B. Would the project isolate 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:

This proposal was reviewed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District) which concluded in their comments dated August 11, 2015 that project specific criteria pollutant emissions would have no significant adverse impact on air quality. There may be temporary dust during construction however compliance with Air District Rules will reduce air quality impacts of the subject project to a less than significant level. National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) notification is included for air quality compliance:

Project Note:

In compliance with Standard Specifications, the Contractor must notify agencies as required by NESHAP. A copy of the notification forms and attachments shall be provided to the Engineer prior to submittal. Notification shall take place a minimum of 10 working days prior to starting demolition or renovation activities as defined in the NESHAP regulations.

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; or
- 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 Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project is to replace an existing bridge on North Chateau Fresno over the Houghton Canal with a new bridge that meets current standards. The County and Caltrans

conducted a field review at the project and no biological resources were identified and impacts to wetlands are not anticipated.

An Initial Site Assessment was prepared by Adanta in March of 2015 and found that sensitive biological resources including special status species or evidence thereof were absent from the site.

- 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; or
- 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; or
- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This project would not likely significantly affect any potential waters of the United States however the project could require a Section 401 Water Quality Certification due to work in the canal. This has been included as a Project Note in the MMRP. This proposal will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or any provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan.

Project Note: A 401 Permit would be required for work within the Houghton Canal before construction.

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 a 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?

- E. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION:

An Archaeological Memo was prepared by John Whitehouse at Caltrans May 28, 2015 after a field review of the project area was conducted. The project is located in an agricultural area approximately five miles west of downtown Fresno. The Chateau Fresno Houghton Canal Bridge (Br. No. 42C-0486) has been determined not to be eligible for the National Registry of Historic Places as documented in the 2014 update of the Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory. Land use in the project area is agricultural. There are no resources within the project boundaries potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Comments from the Fresno County Public Library historian dated July 31, 2015 includes the following mitigation measure:

Mitigation Measure:

Although the subject parcel is located in an area of low archeological sensitivity and has been extensively disturbed, if previously unidentified cultural materials are unearthed during construction, all work shall be halted in that area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. Additional archaeological surveys shall be needed if project limits are extended beyond the present survey limits.

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?

(a.) Strong seismic ground shaking?

(b.) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

(c.) Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Soils within the Project area are categorized as very deep, well drained soils that formed in moderately coarse and coarse textured alluvium derived from granite and mixed rock sources. The project will not expose persons or structures to geology impacts.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal entails the replacement of an existing two lane timber bridge with a new two lane concrete bridge. Further, the site is flat and over the Houghton Canal. As such, there will be no significant erosion impacts resultant of this proposal. BMP's are required and included as a Project Note in the MMRP.

- C. Would the project result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; or
- D. Would the project be located on expansive soils creating substantial risks to life or property?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not located within an area of known risk of landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse, or within an area of known expansive soils.

- 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:

This proposal entails the replacement of an existing two lane timber bridge with a new two lane concrete bridge. Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division has reviewed the project with no concerns related to water or sewer.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District) has reviewed this proposal and expressed no concerns related to greenhouse gas emissions. .

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- A. Would the project create a significant public hazard through routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials; or
- B. Would the project create a significant public hazard involving accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment; or
- C. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of a school?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal entails the replacement of an existing two lane timber bridge with a new two lane concrete bridge. The project will not create a significant public hazard through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project will not create a significant hazard involving accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Compliance with the Clean Water Act will ensure that any asphalt or oil that occurs in the waterway is properly disposed of. There are no schools within one-quarter mile of the project site.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The Adante Inc. Initial Site Assessment (ISA) dated March 7, 2015 identifies potential hazardous substances contained within the existing bridge structure: lead, chromium, zinc, asbestos and other hazardous substances used in the preservation of wood (creosols, tars, etc.). It is probable that existing paint striping on the surface of North Chateau Fresno Avenue and the white paint on the concrete structure on either side of the bridge contain lead, as well as chromium and zinc. The California Air Resources Board and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution District have taken the position that all concrete contains asbestos. Concrete structures that are intended for demolition need to be sampled for asbestos content. The bridge shall be inspected for asbestos-containing materials (including shims, pads, and concrete). This study will require a Certified Asbestos Consultant. The majority of the project area has been used for agricultural purposes for many years. Therefore, there is the potential that pesticides, herbicides, and/or fertilizers were applied to soils, or stored at, the Study Area. The bridge was constructed with treated wood beam supports. In addition, the support structures for the metal railing are treated wood. Caltrans and California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) require that treated wood is handled and disposed in a specific manner. The Environmental Health Department commented July 29, 2015 that they had reviewed the ISA and provided the mitigation measures below:

Mitigation Measures:

All construction materials deemed hazardous as identified in the demolition process shall be characterized and disposed of in accordance with current federal, state and local requirements. These substances shall also be disposed of at an approved disposal facility as determined by the characteristics.

No disposal of excess soil outside of project area shall be allowed without proper testing for disposal requirements.

E. Would a project be 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; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Plan or in the vicinity of a public or private use airport.

- G. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal will not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within a wildland area.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise degrade water quality?
- 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?
- 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; or
- E. Would the project create or contribute run-off which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off?
- F. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Houghton Canal Bridge on N Chateau Fresno Avenue was classified as “structurally deficient” by Caltrans and has weight limits for crossing the bridge. The purpose of the proposed project is to replace the bridge with a structure that meets current design and loading standards. A Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Report was done nearby. Based on the report, depth to groundwater in this vicinity is estimated at 72 feet below ground surface based on recent measurements taken from groundwater monitoring wells at the corner of Hughes and Whitesbridge.

Potential water quality effects from Project-related construction activities can be minimized and reduced through implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and compliance with existing regulatory requirements. Construction activities associated with the proposed project could have the potential of impacting the water quality of the canal. The potential impacts to water quality can be attributed to suspended solids being introduced into surface waters from grading activities or movement of construction equipment. Minimization measures for construction and long-term impacts would focus on the control of sediment and suspended solids from entering waterways. Commonly used construction activity BMPs would be required to minimize any potential impacts to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). Additionally the requirement for a 401 permit is included above.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project is for the existing two lane timber bridge to be replaced with a new two lane concrete bridge that meets current standards. The project does not include any housing and is not in a floodplain.

- I. Would the project expose persons or structures to levee or dam failure; or
- J. Would the project inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No such impacts were identified in the project analysis.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- A. Will the project physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal will not physically divide a community. The subject project is for a bridge replacement located within unincorporated Fresno County.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is surrounded with an area designated Agriculture in the adopted Fresno County General Plan. The proposed project is for the replacement of an existing bridge over the Fresno Canal.

- C. Will the project conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal will not conflict with any Land Use Plan or Habitat or Natural Community Conservation Plan. No such Plans were identified in the project analysis.

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:

No mineral resource impacts were identified in the project analysis.

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 level; 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:

The subject project is for the replacement of an existing bridge replacement located within unincorporated Fresno County. Temporary noise may occur during construction however there will not be any long term significant impacts. This proposal was reviewed by the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division, which

expressed concern for the potential for noise impacts to neighboring noise sensitive receivers during construction activities. A Project Note is included below:

Project Note: The project will be constructed in accordance with Fresno County Noise Ordinance applicable noise standards (construction activities shall not take place before 6:00am or after 9:00pm).

- 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 in the vicinity of an airport and is not impacted by airport noise.

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:

This proposal will not result in an increase of housing, nor will it otherwise induce population growth.

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal was reviewed by the Fresno County Fire Protection District, which did not express any significant concerns with the project. The subject project is for a bridge replacement located within unincorporated Fresno County.

- 2. Police protection?
- 3. Schools; or

4. Parks; or
5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No impacts on the provision of other services were identified in the project analysis.

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:

No such impacts were identified in the project analysis.

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:

North Chateau Fresno Avenue is a rural two lane road running north/south that crosses the Houghton Canal. The structurally deficient timber bridge which currently has posted load limits would be replaced with a new two lane concrete bridge that meets current construction standards. The existing bridge was built in 1925 and currently has truck weight limits of 12 tons for a two axle truck, 19 tons for a semitrailer truck and 24 tons for a tandem-trailer truck. It is anticipated that due to low traffic volumes and a reasonable short detour that the roadway will be closed to public traffic during construction. Public traffic will be detoured around the study area using Belmont Avenue, Grantland Avenue, and State Highway 180. The project is included in in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program adopted by Fresno County Council of Governments on June 26, 2014.

Project Note:

Per Caltrans comments dated August 13, 2015, regarding the traffic that will be detoured to SR 180 during construction, coordination with the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is required. Contact Florencia Allenger at (559) 488-4348 or Florencia.allenger@dot.ca.gov

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

D. Would the project substantially increase traffic hazards due to design features?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This project was reviewed by Road Maintenance and Operations Division and this project will benefit the road system and that they will be involved in the review of the design of the bridge replacement. The existing two lane timber bridge would be replaced with a new two lane concrete bridge that meets current standards. The existing structure is in poor condition and should be replaced due to its age and hydraulic deficiencies. The project will improve the condition of the current bridge and the safety of the area.

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: NO IMPACT:

No such impacts were identified in the project analysis.

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 a new water or wastewater treatment facilities?

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

D. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

E. Would the project result in a determination of inadequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve project demand?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

There is an overhead telephone line on the west side and an overhead 12KV electrical line on the east side of North Chateau Fresno Avenue. Clearance to the 12KV electrical line will have to be maintained during construction, but does not appear to interfere with the proposed bridge. A natural gas line runs along the easterly side of North Chateau Fresno Avenue and

continuing north. Care will need to be taken during construction activities adjacent to the gas line however it appears that the gas line will not interfere with the proposed bridge. A privately owned underground canal known as the Kearney High No. 290 runs southerly along the east side of North Chateau Fresno Avenue, but appears to be clear of the proposed improvements.

The project will not generate the need for utilities beyond those already existing. The replacement of a bridge will not utilize individual water and sewer systems and will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project will not require new or expanded water entitlements or result in a determination of inadequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve project demand.

- 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 was reviewed by the Resources Division with no indication of insufficient landfill capacity or significant solid waste related impacts. Disposal sites, if required, will be accomplished from existing commercial facilities.

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 SIGNIFICATION IMPACT:

No potential impacts to cultural resources or biological were identified, however the standard cultural mitigation measure applies if something archaeological is unearthed while grading/construction.

- B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No cumulatively considerable impacts were identified in the project analysis. The project is included in in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program adopted by Fresno County Council of Governments on June 26, 2014.

- C. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No substantial adverse impacts on human beings were identified in the project analysis.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study 7005, 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 aesthetics, agricultural, greenhouse gasses, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, and recreation.

Potential impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biology, geology and soils, noise, utilities and service systems, and transportation and traffic have been determined to be less than significant. Potential impacts relating to cultural resources and hazards and hazardous materials have been determined to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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.