Meeting Date: **12/10/2013**

Report Type: Consent

Report ID: 2013-00856

City of SACRAMENTO

City Council Report
915 I Street, 1st Floor
www.CityofSacramento.org

Title: Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project (K15105000) – Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Reporting Program and Approval of the Preliminary Design (Continued from 12/03/2013)

Location: Guy West Bridge over the American River between California State University Sacramento and University Avenue; Districts 3 and 6

Issue: The Guy West Bridge needs repair and repainting to ensure it continues to serve as a safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian facility for travel across the American River. Staff has completed the environmental review of the project and is requesting that the City Council adopt the findings in the environmental document and approve the preliminary design.

Recommendation: 1) Pass a Resolution adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Reporting Program for the Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project (K15105000) (SCH#: 2013102021); and 2)pass a Resolution approving the preliminary design.

Contact: Ricky Chuck, Associate Civil Engineer, (916) 808-5050; Nicholas Theocharides, Engineering Services Manager, (916) 808-5065, Department of Public Works

Presenter: None

Department: Public Works Department

Division: Civil & Electrical Design

Dept ID: 15001131

Attachments:

1-Description/Analysis
2-Background
3-Resolution - Approving Mitigated Negative Declaration
4-Mitigation Reporting Program
5-Resolution - Approving Preliminary Engineering Plan
6-Exhibit A (Location Map)
7-Exhibit B (Preliminary Engineering Plan)
8-Mitigated Negative Declaration

City Attorney Review

Approved as to Form
Gerald Hicks
11/21/2013 4:01:22 PM

City Treasurer Review

Reviewed for Impact on Cash and Debt
Russell Fehr
11/15/2013 2:23:04 PM

Approvals/Acknowledgements

Department Director or Designee: Jerry Way - 11/20/2013 11:33:12 AM

Description/Analysis

Issue: A Maintenance and Rehabilitation Study for the Guy West Bridge was conducted in March 2011. In November 2011, the Final Study Report identified various bridge deficiencies and recommended repairs including minor truss and deck repair, replacement of bearing pads, handrail repairs, and the full removal and replacement of the failing lead-based paint system.

Staff has completed the environmental review of the project and is requesting that the City Council adopt the findings in the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and the Mitigation Reporting Program and to approve the preliminary plans for the project. Upon adoption of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) findings by City Council, staff will proceed with the final design. Staff anticipates the project will start construction in early summer 2014.

Policy Considerations: The action requested is consistent with the City's General Plan for improving public safety, achieving sustainability and enhanced livability by repairing a community asset that promotes walking and biking.

Economic Impacts: None.

Environmental Considerations:

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA): The Initial Study (IS) determined that the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project of the 2030 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report (Master EIR), that the proposed project is consistent with the 2030 General Plan use for the project site, that the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the Master EIR are adequate for the proposed project. The Environmental Services Manager has determined that the Project, as proposed, will not have a significant impact to the environment; therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been prepared. In compliance with Section 15070 (B) of CEQA guidelines, the City has incorporated mandatory mitigation measures into the project plans to avoid identified impacts or to mitigate such impacts to a point where clearly no significant impacts will occur. These mitigation measures are included in the Mitigation Reporting Plan, and address impacts to air quality; biological resources; hydrology and water quality; noise, and transportation and circulation. The MND was available for public review and comment for a 30-day period from October 14, 2013, through November 13, 2013.

Staff has received eight comment letters regarding the project The comments are from the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDF&W), California State Lands Commission (State Lands), County of Sacramento, Breathe California, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (SABA), Walk Sacramento, and Barbara Bravos. The comment letters and responses are included as an Appendix (Appendix A) to the MND, which is an attachment to this staff report.

The comments raised do not change the environmental determination made in the Initial Study and MND. The Environmental Services Manager has determined that adoption of the MND and Mitigation Reporting Program are appropriate actions under CEQA. The Initial Study/MND for the Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation project is available at the Community Development Department's webpage located at the following link:
http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports.aspx

Sustainability Considerations: The project is consistent with the City's Sustainability Master Plan Goal of reducing dependence on automobiles by ensuring the Guy West Bridge is properly maintained so that bicyclists and pedestrians will have use of the bridge for future generations to come.

Other: None.

Commission/Committee Action: None.

Rationale for Recommendation: In 2011, an in-depth inspection and subsequent need assessment report identified various bridge deficiencies and recommended repairs including truss and deck repair, replacement of bearing pads, handrail repairs, and the complete removal and replacement of the failed lead-based paint system.

Approval of the preliminary plans and adoption of the environmental document findings will allow staff to move forward with the project's final design.

Financial Considerations: The Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project (K15105000) is estimated to cost $3,022,288. To date $380,245 has been expended and staff anticipates an additional $2,642,043 will be needed to complete the project. As of October 24, 2013, the unobligated balance is

$2,642,043, which is sufficient to complete environmental documentation, design and construction.

There are no general funds planned or allocated for this project.

Emerging and Small Business Enterprise (E/SBE): Not applicable as no goods or services are being purchased.

Background:

The Guy West Bridge is a steel suspension bridge over the American River, which was constructed in 1966 for use by pedestrians and bicyclists. In 1987, broken wires were discovered in three vertical suspender ropes. Investigation by the City concluded the broken wires were due to fatigue failure. In 1990, all the vertical suspender ropes were replaced with a similar design. It was expected that an in-kind replacement of the original design would provide a similar suspender rope service life of approximately 20 years.

In 2011, an in-depth inspection and subsequent needs assessment report identified various deficiencies of the bridge and recommended repairs. In 2012, sampling and testing of fractured wire samples, applying banding to the cables to prevent strand unraveling, and relocating the out of position main cable spacer was completed. The current proposed project will complete the remaining recommended repairs which include minor truss and deck repair, replacement of bearing pads, handrail repairs, and the full removal and replacement of the failing lead-based paint system. The proposed improvements will bring the bridge to current standards and will result in a sustainable landmark structure.

In order to ensure the public was aware and notified of the project, a community open house was held on September 25, 2013, at the Sierra Oaks Elementary School (171 Mills Road, Sacramento). Community open house post cards were mailed to over 650 local residents and businesses. In addition, notification flyers were sent via e-mail to vicinity businesses, community groups, neighborhood associations, and interested individuals. Press releases including Sacramento State Facebook Page, California State University Sacramento Monday Briefing, Rocklin and Roseville Today, and KCRA article were coordinated through and distributed by the City of Sacramento, Department of Public Works. Several community members attended the open house, which was organized as a series of information stations. Attendees were encouraged to visit the stations where project team members were available to answer questions and discuss the project. Attendees were given a project informational brochure and a comment card to provide input on the project and the environmental document.

RESOLUTION NO. 2013-

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

ADOPT THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND THE MITIGATION REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE GUY WEST BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROJECT (K15105000) (SCH#: 2013102021)

BACKGROUND

A. On November 26, 2013, the City Council conducted a public hearing, for which notice was given pursuant Sacramento City Code and received and considered evidence concerning the Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project (K15105000).

BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council finds as follows:

A. The Project's Initial Study determined, based on substantial evidence, that the Project is a subsequent project identified and described in the 2030 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report (Master EIR); that the Project is consistent with the 2030 General Plan land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site; that the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the Master EIR are adequate for the Project; and that the Project would have additional potentially significant environmental effects not previously examined in the Master EIR. Mitigation measures from the Master EIR were applied to the Project as appropriate, and revisions to the Project made by or agreed to by the Project applicant before the proposed mitigated negative declaration and Initial Study were released for public review were determined by City's Environmental Planning Services to avoid or reduce the potentially significant effects to a less than significant level, and, therefore, there was no substantial evidence that the Project as revised and conditioned may have a significant effect on the environment. A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Project was then completed, noticed and circulated in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines and the Sacramento Local Environmental Procedures as follows:

1. On October 14, 2013, a Notice of Intent (NOI) to adopt the MND was circulated for public comments for 30 days. The NOI was sent to those public agencies that have jurisdiction by law with respect to the proposed project and to other interested parties and agencies, including property owners within 500 feet of the boundaries of the proposed project. The comments of such persons and agencies were sought.

2. On October 14, 2013, the NOI was published in the Daily Recorder, a newspaper of general circulation, and on October 15, 2013, the NOI was posted in the office of the Sacramento County Clerk.

Section 2. The City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in the MND, including the initial study, the revisions and conditions incorporated into the Project, and the comments received during the public review process and the hearing on the Project. The City Council has determined that the MND constitutes an adequate, accurate, objective and complete review of the environmental effects of the proposed project.

Section 3. Revisions have been made to the Initial Study that merely clarify, amplify, or make insignificant modifications to the MND in response to public comments received and recirculation is not required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5(c).

Section 4. Based on its review of the MND and on the basis of the whole record, the City Council finds that the MND reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis and that there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment.

Section 5. The City Council adopts the MND for the Project.

Section 6. Pursuant to CEQA section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines section 15074, and in support of its approval of the Project, the City Council adopts a Mitigation Reporting Program to require all reasonably feasible mitigation measures, including mitigation measures from the Master EIR as appropriate, be implemented by means of Project conditions, agreements, or other measures, as set forth in the Mitigation Reporting Program.

Section 7. Upon approval of the Project, the City Manager shall file or cause to be filed a Notice of Determination with the Sacramento County Clerk and, if the project requires a discretionary approval from any state agency, with the State Office of Planning and Research, pursuant to section 21152(a) of

the Public Resources Code and section 15075 of the State EIR Guidelines adopted pursuant thereto.

Section 8. Pursuant to Guidelines section 15091(e), the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council has based its decision are located in and may be obtained from, the Office of the City Clerk at 915 I Street, Sacramento, California. The City Clerk is the custodian of records for all matters before the City Council.

Table of Contents:

Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project
(K15105000)(SCH#: 2013102021)
Mitigation Reporting Program

In January 1989, Assembly Bill 3180 went into effect requiring the City to monitor all mitigation measures applicable to this project and included in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. For this project, mitigation reporting will be performed by the City of Sacramento Department of Utilities in accordance with the monitoring and reporting program developed by the City to implement AB 3180.

This Mitigation Reporting Program is being prepared for the Community Development Department, Environmental Planning Services, 300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines, Section 21081.

Project Number: K15105000

Project Name: Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project.

Project Location: The Guy West Bridge is located in the City of Sacramento, California. The existing bridge crosses American River between California State University Sacramento and University Avenue in the Campus Commons Community.

Project Description: The project consists of repairs of minor truss and deck repair, repairs of suspender ropes and sockets, repairs of handrail, replacement of bearing pads, and full removal and replacement of the failing lead based paint system.

.

MITIGATION REPORTING PROGRAM CHECKLIST FOR THE GUY WEST BRIDGE RESTORATION PROJECT (K15105000) (SCH#: 2013102021)

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	Verification of Compliance	
			Initials	Date
AIR QUALITY **AQ-1: Implement Construction-related Emission Control Practices.** The project applicant shall implement all SMAQMD basic construction emission control practices and requirements of SMAQMD Rule 403 during bridge maintenance activities, including the following: • Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads. • Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered. • Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible track-out mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. • Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph). • All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, parking lots to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. • Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes [required by California Code of Regulations, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485]. Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site. • Maintain all equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determine to be running in proper condition before it is operated.	Prior to and during construction. Mitigation measures shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.	City of Sacramento Department of Public Works and Contractor		
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES **BR-1: Coordination with USFWS.** Based on field surveys conducted at the project sites, at least nine (9) elderberry shrubs occur within 20 feet of the project impact area, and would require formal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act with the USFWS. The City shall coordinate with the USFWS to determine an appropriate avoidance plan for all elderberry shrubs located within 20 feet of the construction disturbance zone.	Preparation and approval of an elderberry shrub avoidance plan prior to construction activities.	City of Sacramento Department of Public Works and USFWS		
BR-2: Implement Avoidance Measures for Valley Elderberry Shrubs. The construction contractor shall maintain a setback of 100 feet from all elderberry shrubs to	Prior to and during	City of Sacramento		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	Verification of Compliance	
			Initials	Date
avoid impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle. If the 100 foot setback is not feasible, the construction contractor shall implement a number of avoidance measures (in consultation and approval by the City and the USFWS). Such measures may include installing fencing around the shrubs, providing construction worker awareness training, transplanting of shrubs, and requiring biological monitoring during construction. The 1999 *Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle* (USFWS, 1999) provides applicable avoidance and minimization measures. No construction shall occur within 100 feet of all elderberry shrubs identified onsite until final approvals are received from the USFWS (Biological Opinion or concurrence letter). Upon City and USFWS approvals, the construction contractor shall create a 20-foot buffer around each potentially affected shrub. Work crews shall be briefed on the status of the beetle, the need to protect its host plant (elderberries), requirements to avoid damaging elderberry shrubs, and possible penalties for not complying with identified avoidance and minimization measures. In addition, construction workers should be made aware of the habitat needs of VELB and the location of protection areas on the site.	construction. Mitigation measures shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.	Department of Public Works and Contractor		
BR-3: Conduct Pre-Construction Nesting Surveys. For construction activities expected to occur during the nesting season (February-August), a pre-construction survey shall be conducted to determine if active nests are present on or within 500 feet of the project site. The survey should be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to the onset of construction. If active nests are found on or within 500 feet of the project site during pre-construction surveys, then CDFW should be consulted for additional mitigation measures that may be required. Typically CDFW will recommend that no construction activities occur within 500 feet of the nests, until the young have fledged or until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. Additionally, depending on the conditions specific to each nest, and the relative location and rate of construction activities, it may be feasible for construction to occur as planned within the buffer without impacting the breeding effort. In this case (to be determined on an individual basis by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW), the nest(s) shall be monitored by a qualified biologist during construction within the buffer. Construction activities may be halted at any time if, in the professional opinion of the biological monitor, construction activities are negatively impacting the breeding effort. Implementation of the pre-construction surveys should also be consistent with the protocol standards devised by the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and endorsed by the CDFW (Swainson's Hawk TAC, 2000). If no active nests are identified during the pre-construction survey, no further mitigation is necessary. If construction activities are proposed to occur during the non-breeding season (September-January), a pre-construction survey is not required and no further studies are	Preparation of a nesting survey report prior to the start of construction.	City of Sacramento Department of Public Works and Contractor		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	Verification of Compliance	
			Initials	Date
necessary.				
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY **HWQ-1: Implement Water Quality Best Management Practices.** The project contractor would be required to obtain a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Central Valley Region. As part of the permit, the contractor would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP into their construction plans, prior to initiating construction activities, identifying BMPs to be used to avoid or minimize any adverse effects before, during, and after construction to surface waters. The following BMPs will be incorporated into the project as part of the construction specifications: • Implement appropriate measures to prevent debris, soil, rock, or other material from entering the water. Use a water truck or other appropriate measures to control dust on applicable access roads, construction areas, and stockpiles. • Properly dispose of oil or other liquids. • Fuel and maintain vehicles in a specified area that is designed to capture spills. This area cannot be near any ditch, stream, or other body of water or feature that may convey water to a nearby body of water. • Fuels and hazardous materials would not be stored on site. • Inspect and maintain vehicles and equipment to prevent the dripping of oil or other fluids. • Schedule construction to avoid the rainy season as much as possible. Ground disturbance activities are expected to begin in the spring/summer of 2014. If rains are forecasted during construction, additional erosion and sedimentation control measures would be implemented. • Maintain sediment and erosion control measures during construction. Inspect the control measures before, during, and after a rain event. • Train construction workers in storm water pollution prevention practices. • Revegetate disturbed areas in a timely manner to control erosion.	Prior to and during construction. Mitigation measures shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.	City of Sacramento Department of Public Works and Contractor		
NOISE **N-1: Implement Construction-related Noise Reduction Measures.** The project applicant shall implement the following noise reducing measures: • Maintenance equipment and vehicle noise would be minimized during project	Prior to and during construction. Mitigation	City of Sacramento Department of		

Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible Party	Verification of Compliance	
			Initials	Date
construction by muffling and shielding intakes and exhaust on maintenance/construction equipment (per the manufacturer's specifications) and by shrouding or shielding paint application/recycling equipment. • All equipment, haul trucks, and worker vehicles would be turned off when not in use for more than 10 minutes. • Residences and businesses would be notified about the type and schedule of maintenance activities at least two weeks prior to mobilization.	measures shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.	Public Works and Contractor		
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION **TC-1: Implement Traffic Control Plan.** The project contractor would be required to develop a Traffic Control Plan, which would be reviewed and approved by the City of Sacramento prior to construction. This plan would include the following measures: • Do not permit construction vehicles to block any roadways or private driveways. • Provide access for emergency vehicles at all times. • Select travel routes to avoid schools, parks, and high pedestrian use areas when possible. Crossing guards provided by the contractor would be used when truck trips coincide with schools hours and when travel routes cross student travel path. • Obey all speed limits, traffic laws, and transportation regulations during construction. If speed limits are not posted, construction vehicles would not exceed 15 miles per hour on unpaved levee roads. • Use signs and flagmen, as needed, to alert motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians to avoid conflict with construction vehicles or equipment. • Construction employee parking would be restricted to the designated staging areas. • No road closures are anticipated; however, in the event that road closures are necessary, local agencies and affected organizations would be notified prior to construction. • Closure of levee roads, construction sites, and public access areas for construction use would be clearly fenced and delineated with appropriate closure signage. • Require cyclists to dismount and walk bikes when bike/pedestrian path is narrowed to eight feet.	Prior to and during construction. Mitigation measures shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.	City of Sacramento Department of Public Works and Contractor		

RESOLUTION NO. 2013-

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PLANS FOR THE GUY WEST BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROJECT (K15105000)

BACKGROUND

A. City staff has developed preliminary engineering plans and environmental documentation for the Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project (K15105000). Approval of the preliminary plans and adoption of the environmental document findings will allow staff to move forward with the project's final design.

BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

1. The preliminary engineering plan for the Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project (K15105000) is approved.

Table of Contents:

EXHIBIT A

Location Map for

Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project (K15105000)



Public Works
CITY OF SACRAMENTO

Map Contact: S/Tobin
Map Date: DEC/12

0 500 1,000 2,000 Feet

CITY OF SACRAMENTO

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

GUY WEST BRIDGE OVER THE AMERICAN RIVER REHABILITATION

BETWEEN CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO AND UNIVERSITY AVENUE
PROJECT NUMBER: K15105000

APPROVED BY: _____ _____

TIM MAR RCE 45946
SUPERVISING ENGINEER

DATE



VICINITY MAP
NO SCALE

GENERAL NOTES

1. ALL MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION SHALL CONFORM TO THE PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS, CITY OF SACRAMENTO STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS, DATED JUNE 2007 AND ALL UPDATES, ADDENDUMS, AND MEMORANDUMS TO THEM, AND THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS, ADOPTED MAY 2010 AND ALL ITS AMENDMENTS.
2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE IN RECEIPT OF CITY APPROVED PLANS PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF CONSTRUCTION.
3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES AND FOR PROTECTION OF AND REPAIR OF DAMAGES TO THEM.
4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE COMPLETELY RESPONSIBLE FOR PROTECTING EXISTING STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS NOT SCHEDULED TO BE REMOVED. DAMAGE TO EXISTING PROPERTY SHALL BE REPAIRED AT THE CONTRACTOR'S EXPENSE.
5. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR BARRICADES, SAFETY DEVICES, AND CONTROL OF VEHICULAR AND/OR PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC WITHIN THE CONSTRUCTION AREA. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE SOLELY AND COMPLETELY RESPONSIBLE FOR FURNISHING, INSTALLING, AND MAINTAINING ALL WARNING SIGNS AND DEVICES NECESSARY TO SAFEGUARD THE GENERAL PUBLIC AND THE WORK, AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE PROPER AND SAFE ROUTING OF THE VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC DURING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK. THIS REQUIREMENT SHALL APPLY CONTINUOUSLY AND NOT BE LIMITED TO NORMAL WORKING HOURS. THE USE OF FLAGMEN, BARRICADES AND CONSTRUCTION SIGNING SHALL COMPLY WITH THE CURRENT EDITION OF MANUAL OF UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES (MUTCD).
6. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS AND REQUIREMENTS OF ALL PROJECT PERMITS.
7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL POSSESS A CLASS 'A' LICENSE, OR A COMBINATION OF CLASSES REQUIRED BY THE CATEGORIES AND CLASSES OF WORK INCLUDED IN THIS CONTRACT.



PROJECT AREA MAP
NO SCALE

INDEX OF PLANS

SHEET No.	DESCRIPTION
1	TITLE SHEET
2	CONSTRUCTION ACCESS MAP
3	STAGING & DETOUR PLAN
4	STAGING & DETOUR DETAILS

STRUCTURE PLANS

X-X	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX BRIDGE

_____ _____

PROJECT ENGINEER
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER

DATE

PLANS APPROVAL DATE

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
VALUE
No. VALUE
Exp. _____
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.

65% SUBMITTAL

REVISIONS NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY

FIELD BOOK

SCALE
HORIZ. VALUE
VERT. VALUE

QUINCY ENGINEERING
3247 RAMOS CIRCLE SACRAMENTO, CA 95827-2501

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

DRAWN BY: DCP DATE: VALUE
DESIGN BY: MLK DATE: VALUE
CHECKED BY: VALUE DATE: VALUE

GUY WEST BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROJECT

TITLE SHEET

PN: RR16

SHEET 1 OF X

DATE PLOTTED: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 TIME PLOTTED: 10:27:41 AM, Craig Polglase

CAD FILE S:\Client\Soc City\S49-700 Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation\CAD\S49-700-rab-001.dwg

NOTES:

1. THIS SHEET ACCURATE FOR PROJECT ACCESS ONLY. AERIAL IS NOT GEOREFERENCED.



65% SUBMITTAL

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
No. ---
Exp. CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CAD FILE S:\Client\Sac City\S49-700 Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation\CAD\S49-700-rba-001.dwg

REVISIONS NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY

FIELD BOOK

SCALE
HORIZ. 1"=500'
VERT. N/A

QUINCY ENGINEERING
3247 RAMOS CIRCLE SACRAMENTO, CA 95827-2501

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

DRAWN BY: DCP DATE: 8/13/13
DESIGN BY: MLK DATE: .
CHECKED BY: . DATE: .

GUY WEST BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROJECT
CONSTRUCTION ACCESS MAP

PN: RR16

SHEET 2 OF X

DATE PLOTTED: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 TIME PLOTTED: 10:27:45 AM, Craig Polglase

NOTES:

1. THIS SHEET ACCURATE FOR CONSTRUCTION ACCESS AND STAGING ONLY. AERIAL IS NOT GEOREFERENCED.
2. FOR SECTION A–A, SECTION B–B AND SECTION C–C, SEE "STAGING DETAILS" SHEET.
3. FOR UTILITY INFORMATION, SEE "UTILITY PLAN" SHEET. THE EXISTENCE AND LOCATION OF ALL UTILITIES TO BE VERIFIED BY THE CONTRACTOR.
4. FOR ADDITIONAL SIGNAGE INFORMATION, SEE "SIGN DETAILS" SHEET.
5. TREES AND VEGETATION WITHIN THE PROJECT LIMITS SHALL BE REMOVED ONLY AS DETERMINED BY THE ENGINEER.
6. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FURNISHING AND MAINTAINING ALL WARNING SIGNS, DEVICES AND FEATURES NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC.
7. CONTRACTOR SHALL MANAGE CONSTRUCTION TO ALLOW SAFE ROUTING OF VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC FOR THE DURATION OF CONSTRUCTION.

LEGEND:

- TFESA — TEMPORARY FENCE ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA (ESA)
- —x—x—x—x—x— TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION FENCE CHAIN LINK
- TEMPORARY FIBER ROLL
- xx TSF — TEMPORARY SILT FENCE
- ELDERBERRY SHRUB
- CONSTRUCTION AREA SIGN

C2 (CA) SIGN PANEL MOUNTED TO TYPE III BARRICADE

ROAD CLOSURE DETAIL
NO SCALE

65% SUBMITTAL

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER — No. ——— Exp. ——— CIVIL — STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CAD FILE S:\Client\Soc City\S49-700 Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation\CAD\S49-700-rea-001.dwg

REVISIONS NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY

FIELD BOOK

SCALE HORIZ NO SCALE VERT. N/A

QUINCY ENGINEERING
3247 RAMOS CIRCLE SACRAMENTO, CA 95827-2501

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

DRAWN BY: DCP DATE: 8/13/13
DESIGN BY: MLK DATE: .
CHECKED BY: . DATE: .

GUY WEST BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROJECT
EASTERN STAGING LAYOUT PLAN

PN: RR16

SHEET 3 OF X

DATE PLOTTED: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 TIME PLOTTED: 10:27:51 AM, Craig Polglase

NOTES:

1. THIS SHEET ACCURATE FOR CONSTRUCTION ACCESS AND STAGING ONLY. AERIAL IS NOT GEOREFERENCED.
2. FOR SECTION A–A, SECTION D–D AND SECTION E–E, SEE "STAGING DETAILS" SHEET.
3. FOR UTILITY INFORMATION, SEE "UTILITY PLAN" SHEET. THE EXISTENCE AND LOCATION OF ALL UTILITIES TO BE VERIFIED BY THE CONTRACTOR.
4. FOR ADDITIONAL SIGNAGE INFORMATION, SEE "CONSTRUCTION AREA SIGNS" SHEET.
5. TREES AND VEGETATION WITHIN THE PROJECT LIMITS SHALL BE REMOVED ONLY AS DETERMINED BY THE ENGINEER.
6. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FURNISHING AND MAINTAINING ALL WARNING SIGNS, DEVICES AND FEATURES NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC.
7. CONTRACTOR SHALL MANAGE CONSTRUCTION TO ALLOW SAFE ROUTING OF VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC FOR THE DURATION OF CONSTRUCTION.

LEGEND:

- TFESA — TEMPORARY FENCE ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA (ESA)
- —x—x—x—x—x— TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION FENCE CHAIN LINK
- TEMPORARY FIBER ROLL
- xx TSF — TEMPORARY SILT FENCE
- ELDERBERRY SHRUB



65% SUBMITTAL

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER — No. — Exp. — CIVIL — STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CAD FILE S:\Client\Sac City\S49-700 Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation\CAD\S49-700-rea-002.dwg

REVISIONS NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY

FIELD BOOK

SCALE HORIZ. NO SCALE VERT. N/A

QUINCY ENGINEERING
3247 RAMOS CIRCLE SACRAMENTO, CA 95827-2501

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

DRAWN BY: DCP DATE: 8/13/13
DESIGN BY: MLK DATE: .
CHECKED BY: . DATE: .

GUY WEST BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROJECT
WESTERN STAGING LAYOUT PLAN

PN: RR16

SHEET 4 — OF — X

DATE PLOTTED: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 TIME PLOTTED: 10:27:56 AM, Craig Polglase



SECTION A-A
1/2" = 1'-0"

NOTES:

1. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROTECT AND PRESERVE ALL EXISTING PROPERTY. UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION, ALL TEMPORARY FILL SHALL BE REMOVED AND ALL GRADES AND SLOPES RESTORED TO PREVIOUS CONDITION.
2. CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN PUBLIC ACCESS ON BRIDGE DURING CONSTRUCTION WITH THE EXCEPTION OF FULL CLOSURE PERIODS. CONTRACTOR MUST OBTAIN THE ENGINEER'S APPROVAL AND ESTABLISH DETOUR ROUTES WITH SIGNAGE AND PROVIDE NOTICE PRIOR TO FULL CLOSURE PERIODS.
3. FOR ADDITIONAL STAGING AND LOAD LIMITATIONS ON THE BRIDGE, SEE BRIDGE PLANS.



SECTION B-B
1" = 5'



SECTION C-C
1" = 5'



SECTION D-D
1" = 5'



SECTION E-E
1" = 5'

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
No.
Exp. CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

65% SUBMITTAL

REVISIONS NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY

FIELD BOOK

SCALE
HORIZ. AS SHOWN
VERT. N/A

QUINCY ENGINEERING
3247 RAMOS CIRCLE SACRAMENTO, CA 95827-2501

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

DRAWN BY: DCP DATE: 8/13/13
DESIGN BY: MLK DATE: .
CHECKED BY: . DATE: .

GUY WEST BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROJECT
STAGING DETAILS

PN: RR16

SHEET 5 OF X

CAD FILE S:\Client\Sac City\S49-700 Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation\CAD\S49-700-rga-001.dwg

DATE PLOTTED: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 TIME PLOTTED: 10:28:01 AM, Craig Polglase



PLAN
1" = 40'

RETROFIT MEASURES

1. Wrap main cable
2. Relocate back stay cable clamp
3. Install new back stay cable clamps
4. Repair suspender connections
5. Repair bottom strut
6. Replace deck seals
7. Repair deck spalls
8. Repair handrail hardwood
9. Replace bearing pad



ELEVATION
1" = 40'

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
No.
Exp. CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

65% SUBMITTAL

CAD FILE S:\Client\Sac City\S49-700 Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation\CAD\S49-700-a-GP01.dwg

REVISIONS NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY

FIELD BOOK

SCALE
HORIZ. 1" = 40'
VERT. N/A

QUINCY ENGINEERING
3247 RAMOS CIRCLE SACRAMENTO, CA 95827-2501

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

DRAWN BY: DCP DATE: 8/15/13
DESIGN BY: MLK DATE: .
CHECKED BY: . DATE: .

GUY WEST BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROJECT
GENERAL PLAN

PN: RR16

SHEET 11 OF X

DATE PLOTTED: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 TIME PLOTTED: 10:28:06 AM, Craig Polglase

GUY WEST BRIDGE RESTORATION PROJECT

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Anticipated Subsequent Projects Under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

Prepared for
City of Sacramento

November 2013

Prepared by ESA



GUY WEST BRIDGE RESTORATION PROJECT

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Anticipated Subsequent Projects Under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

Prepared for
City of Sacramento

November 2013

Prepared by ESA

2600 Capitol Avenue
Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95816
916.564.4500
www.esassoc.com

Los Angeles

Oakland

Orlando

Palm Springs

Petaluma

Portland

San Diego

San Francisco

Santa Cruz

Seattle

Tampa

Woodland Hills

120851

City of
SACRAMENTO

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
SERVICES

300 Richards Boulevard
Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

Guy West Bridge Restoration Project (K15105000)(SCH#: 2013102021) - The project consists of maintenance and restoration of the Guy West Bridge over the American River, one of the few replicas of the Golden Gate Bridge.

The Guy West Bridge Restoration Project spans and is located on both the western and eastern sides of the American River Parkway within the City of Sacramento. The existing Guy West Bridge is a suspension bridge that provides a primary access route for pedestrians and bicyclists travelling from the Campus Commons residential area (east of the existing bridge) to the Sacramento State University Campus (west of the bridge). The bridge also provides an important connection point for a variety of recreation users along American River Parkway

The purpose of the proposed project is to restore two suspender rope connections; repair one truss strut member; replace all deck seals and repair dell spalls; full removal and replacement of paint system; replace handrail hardware; repair loose utility conduit; and replace approach truss bearing pads to ensure the continued safe performance of this suspension bridge. Additional objectives include the following:

- Complete the restoration work in a manner that minimizes environmental impacts to the American River Parkway;
- Implement restoration/maintenance activities in a manner that maintains pedestrian/recreation access, circulation, and connectivity to the surrounding Campus Commons area, the Sacramento State University Campus, and for users of the Jedediah Smith Recreation Trail as much as possible; and
- Incorporate restoration/maintenance activities (e.g., paint coatings, materials) that maintain the unique aesthetic and design features of the existing suspension bridge.

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

This Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.), CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq. of the California Code of Regulations), the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento, and the Sacramento City Code.

A copy of this document and all supportive documentation may be reviewed or obtained at the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (or 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with prior arrangement). The document is also available on the CDD website at: http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports.aspx

Environmental Services Manager, City of Sacramento,
California, a municipal corporation

By: _____

Date: November 15, 2013

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
GUY WEST BRIDGE RESTORATION PROJECT
(PROJECT NUMBER: K15105000)
INITIAL STUDY/ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR ANTICIPATED SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR

This Initial Study has been prepared for the City of Sacramento Department of Public Works located at 915 I Street, Room 200, Sacramento CA 95814, pursuant to Title 14, Section 15070 of the California Code of Regulations; the City of Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento.

ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study is organized into the following sections:

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A – COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES: Identifies the comment letters received during the review period and responses prepared.

SECTION I - BACKGROUND

Project Name and File Number:	Guy West Bridge Restoration Project (CIP-K15105000)
Project Location:	Located east of the California State University, Sacramento campus, the Guy West Bridge Restoration Project spans and is located on both the western and eastern sides of the American River Parkway within the City of Sacramento.
Project Manager:	Ricky Chuck, Project Manager City of Sacramento Department of Public Works 915 I Street, Room 200 Sacramento CA 95814
Environmental Planner:	Scott Johnson, Associate Planner Community Development Department Environmental Planning Services 300 Richards Blvd., 3rd Floor Sacramento, CA 95835
Date Initial Study Completed:	October 9, 2013

This Initial Study was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 *et seq*.). The Lead Agency is the City of Sacramento.

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

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

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

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

http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports.aspx

The City is soliciting views of interested persons and agencies on the content of the environmental information presented in this document. Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than the 30-day review period ending November 13, 2013.

Please send written responses to:

Scott Johnson
Community Development Department
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
Direct Line: (916) 808-5842
FAX (916) 808-5786
SRJohnson@cityofsacramento.org

SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The Guy West Bridge Restoration Project (proposed project) spans and is located on both the western and eastern sides of the American River Parkway within the City of Sacramento (City). The existing Guy West Bridge is a suspension bridge that provides a primary access route for pedestrians and bicyclists travelling from the Campus Commons residential area (east of the existing bridge) to the Sacramento State University Campus (west of the bridge). The bridge also provides an important connection point for a variety of recreation users along American River Parkway (in particular both the southern and northern segments of the Jedediah Smith Recreation Trail). **Figure 1** shows the project site and surrounding vicinity.

Project Background

Description of Existing Bridge

The Guy West Bridge was constructed in 1966 and has been in service since then. This structure has a main suspended span of 600 feet, and two simply supported truss approach spans of 72 feet each. The pedestrian walkway is approximately 15 feet wide over the full length of the bridge. The suspension structure consists of two steel box frame towers approximately 87 feet in height, a pair of suspension cables each consisting of four 2 1/16 inch diameter galvanized steel bridge strands, a steel truss stiffening system suspended by ninety-eight 3/4 inch diameter galvanized steel bridge rope suspenders, and a 6 inch thick lightweight reinforced concrete walkway slab. Deck joints in the walkway slab are positioned to provide slab sections that are three-span continuous over the floor beams. An aluminum handrail system is used to protect pedestrians at both edges of the deck. A lighting system is integrated with the handrail. Additional design details regarding the existing bridge can be found in the Guy West Bridge Condition Assessment Report (Quincy Engineering Inc., 2011).

Previous Bridge Inspections and Maintenance

The Guy West Bridge is a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over the American River, and as such is not listed in the National Bridge Inventory (NBI). This means that bridge inspections and maintenance are undertaken by the City for the Guy West Bridge as necessary. Studies were commissioned by the City between 2000 and 2001, which recommended replacement of vertical suspender cotter pins, repainting of main suspension cable end anchorage plates, improving western anchorage area drainage, repairing concrete deck spalls, and replacing missing railing hardware. This work was completed shortly thereafter. During that same time period, a paint condition assessment report (July 2001) determined that repainting the entire bridge could be deferred five to ten years without further deterioration.

Current (2011) Bridge Inspection Report and Recommendations

During the spring of 2011, the City of Sacramento engaged a consultant whom conducted a hands-on visual inspection of the Guy West Bridge and performed non-destructive tests (NDT) to assess the condition of the bridge. Detailed results of this inspection are identified in the Guy West Bridge Condition Assessment Report (Quincy Engineering Inc., 2011) and are summarized in the following paragraphs.



SOURCE: USGS Topographic Quadrangle (Sacramento East, 1967; Photorevised, 1980); DeLorme Street Atlas, 2000; ESA, 2013

Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project . 120851

Figure 1
Project Site and Surrounding Vicinity

Overall, many of the inspected components were found to be in good condition and required no restoration work including the steel towers, concrete piers, concrete abutments, embankments, suspender ropes and sockets, and the main cable anchorage plates and pins. The majority of the bridge deck was found to be in fair condition, requiring only minor repairs, and the majority of steel truss members, in both the approach and suspension portions, were found to be in good condition with the exception of two members with minor damage. Some less critical elements requiring maintenance or replacement included a bulging truss bearing pads, loose utility conduit, and corroded handrail hardware.

The 2011 report found that the existing paint is considered to be in very poor condition. The exterior is comprised of a red lead-type primer that typically contains greater than 40% lead with alkyd topcoat that also contains other heavy metals. This type of paint coating becomes brittle over time and there is widespread fading, cracking, chipping throughout the paint surfaces. The report determined that the exterior paint has reached the end of its useful life and no longer provides protection to the steel surfaces. This has allowed the formation of surface corrosion in many places. Partial removal or overcoating of the existing paint is not practical; it must be completely removed and replaced in order to provide the best corrosion protection going forward.

The most important finding during the most recent inspection was the discovery of eleven fractured wires in three of the four strands that make up the southern main suspension cable. The report recommended, as a high priority, that wire samples should be taken from the bridge for laboratory examination to verify the fatigue nature of the fractures. The report also recommended that the number and position of fractured wires should be noted during this work to determine if continued fracturing is occurring.

Based on the findings of the Guy West Bridge Condition Assessment Report, a restoration work plan was developed, summarized below in **Table 1**, to prioritize repair work into three primary categories, with Priority One work representing the highest priority tasks. Between February and October of 2012, the Priority One work was completed and included: sampling and testing fractured wire samples, applying banding to the cables to prevent further strand unraveling, and relocating the out of position back stay cable clamp. Metallurgical analysis confirmed fatigue as the failure mode of the wire strands and relocation of the back stay cable clamp eliminated observation cable oscillations.

The current proposed project will complete the recommended repair work including Priority Two and Priority Three items. These items represent the vast majority of recommended and remaining restoration work for the bridge.

Table 1. Proposed Restoration Work Plan

Priority	Description	Status
One (highest)	• Sample broken wires & test to verify fatigue failure • Wrap damaged cables to prevent unraveling • Relocate out of position main cable spacer	Complete
Two (moderate)	• Restore two suspender rope connections • Repair one truss strut member • Replace all deck seals and repair deck spalls • Full removal and replacement of paint system	In Process
Three (lowest)	• Replace handrail hardware • Repair loose utility conduit • Replace approach truss bearing pads	In Process

Project Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the proposed project is to implement a restoration work plan that completes the Priority Task Two and Three recommendations identified in the Guy West Bridge Condition Assessment Report (as summarized in Table 1, above) to ensure the continued safe performance of this suspension bridge. Additional objectives include the following:

- Given the bridge's location within the environmentally sensitive American River Parkway, the City proposes to complete the restoration work in a manner that minimizes environmental impacts to the American River Parkway;

- Implement restoration/maintenance activities in a manner that maintains pedestrian/recreation access, circulation, and connectivity to the surrounding Campus Commons area, the Sacramento State University Campus, and for users of the Jedediah Smith Recreation Trail as much as possible; and

- Incorporate restoration/maintenance activities (i.e., paint coatings, materials, etc.) that maintain the unique aesthetic and design features of the existing suspension bridge.

Project Description

Project Features

The restoration work plan for the proposed project is comprised of the following features:

Bridge Deck. While the lightweight reinforced concrete deck was observed to be in satisfactory-to-good condition, the inspection conducted as part of the Guy West Bridge Condition Assessment Report identified hairline cracking on the bottom surface and some scattered, minor spalling (<3% total deck area) as shown in **Figure 2a**. The repair of minor concrete spalls and failed joint seals are included as part of the proposed project.

Suspended Span Stiffening Trusses and Floor System. Spotty conditions of paint failure and light surface corrosion along with a few areas exhibiting larger areas of paint failure were observed as part of the last inspection. One indication of damage to the structure that is unrelated to normal use was located on the lower strut at L53´ (on the north tower) shown in **Figure 2a** and **2b**. The flanges of this strut have been cut through and the strut section has been greatly reduced. This structural steel member will be repaired with field drilled bolts and cover plates to restore the steel section to its original area and stiffness as part of the proposed project.

Bearings. The approach span trusses each have a fixed end bearing at the towers and a free end bearing at the abutments. The free end (expansion) bearings were observed to be in satisfactory-to-good condition. However, the elastomeric bearing pad at each of the four fixed bearing locations was observed to have failed and is bulging out around the lower chord bottom flange as shown in Figure 2a and 2b. Replacement of these fixed bearing pads is included as part of the proposed project.

Vertical Suspender Ropes and Sockets. The main vertical load carrying elements of the bridge were found to be in fair condition due to noted deterioration of the galvanized coating and some minor surface corrosion. The wire suspender ropes were observed to exhibit varying degrees of galvanized coating failure and surface corrosion at the point of entry into the sockets at locations throughout the structure. Additionally, it was noted that a cotter pin was determined to be

PHOTOGRAPH 1 – Spalling of the deck panel edge beyond the handrail. Note the exposed reinforcing bar.

PHOTOGRAPH 2 – Typical staining on the bottom of a deck panel at the location of a joint seal.

PHOTOGRAPH 3 – Damage to the stiffening truss lower strut at L53'.

SOURCE: Quincy Engineering, Inc., 2011

Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project . 120851

Figure 2a
Bridge Features Requiring Maintenance

PHOTOGRAPH 4 – Impact damage to the north approach truss lower chord bottom flange between L4' and L5'.



PHOTOGRAPH 5 – Fixed bearing detail and bulging elastomeric bearing pad.

PHOTOGRAPH 6 – Wire suspender rope at top socket connection in good condition.

SOURCE: Quincy Engineering, Inc., 2011

Figure 2b
Bridge Features Requiring Maintenance

missing at some past inspection point and was replaced by a piece of wire in place of the pin joining the vertical suspender rope anchorage to the cable clamp on the north cable. A pin at one of the vertical suspender anchorages on the north truss is moderately corroded, indicating that the pin was not galvanized as specified. Replacement of these items is included as part of the proposed project.

Suspension Cables. The suspension cables are in fair to satisfactory condition due to fracture of several wires in three of the four strands that make up the southern main cable. The fractures were found at the south saddle of the tower on the approach span side (see Figures 2a and 2b). In addition, the galvanized coating has begun to show signs of weathering and is absent or thin in small areas over the full length of the cables. Tree foliage was observed to encroach both the north and south cables at the east anchorage and the north cables at the west anchorage. Restoration of these items through galvanized paint coating is included as part of the proposed project.

Handrail System. In general, the handrail system was observed to be in fair to satisfactory condition. However, several of the anchor nuts (approximately 29) were found to be loose. In addition, 14 anchor nuts were observed not having the correct engagement of the U-bolt, and 3 anchor bolts were observed to be broken off. In addition, many grout pads below the handrail post base plates were observed to be cracked as shown in Figures 2a and 2b. Minor repairs of the handrail system are included as part of the proposed project.

Utilities. Two utility conduits run from abutment to abutment and are hung from the upper strut of each floor beam. These conduits appear to carry electric cables, but they are not marked for contents. The conduits were observed to be separated or broken at their expansion joint in three locations. Restoration of the utility conduit integrity is included as part of the proposed project.

Paint. The existing paint system consists of a red lead-type primer that typically contains greater than 40% lead with alkyd topcoat that contains lead and other heavy metals. This existing system shows signs of widespread failure and is no longer providing adequate protection. Widespread areas of paint flaking and incipient corrosion can be observed throughout the structure. The paint system is extremely brittle and is exhibiting blistering. The top coat shows extensive chalking and color change and is easily separated from the base primer. As part of the proposed project, the existing paint system will be removed and replaced as soon as possible to prevent further corrosion of exposed steel surfaces. The same paint color—“International Orange”; which matches the Golden Gate Bridge—will be used for the proposed project and will restore the bridge to its original color.

Restoration Details

Site Access Routes and Equipment Staging Areas

Access routes and equipment staging areas are identified in **Figures 3** and **4**. To minimize a variety of environmental impacts and facilitate construction operations, the proposed project will be divided up into two phases. One phase will consist of restoration of the eastern side of the bridge. A separate phase will consist of similar restoration work for the western side of the bridge. It is possible that work may be performed on both sides of the river concurrently, but within allowable construction schedule windows as defined by environmental and public user considerations, as well as the allowable load limits of the bridge.

On the eastside, the Contractor will be allowed to set up a staging area for parking, equipment, stockpiles, and site access within a private parking lot near the bridge between University Ave and the levee. This staging area will be fenced and secured by a temporary fence. This staging

LEGEND:

TFESA — TEMPORARY FENCE ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA (ESA)

—x—x—x—x—x— TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION FENCE CHAIN LINK

#X ELDERBERRY SHRUB

NOTES:

1. FOR SECTION "A–A", SECTION B–B AND SECTION "C–C", SEE "ACCESS DETAILS" SHEET.
2. FOR UTILITY INFORMATION, SEE "UTILITY PLAN".

Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
3	SAC	N/A	N/A	3	X

REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER DATE

PLANS APPROVAL DATE

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER — XXX X. XXXXXXX — No. C12345 — Exp. XX/XX/XX — CIVIL — STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.

QUINCY ENGINEERING
3247 RAMOS CIRCLE
SACRAMENTO, CA 95827–2501
P: 916.368.9181



SOURCE: Quincy Engineering, Inc., 2010

Figure 3
Eastern Side – Staging and Access Layout

Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
3	SAC	N/A	N/A	4	X

REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER DATE

PLANS APPROVAL DATE

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER — XXX X. XXXXXXX — No. C12345 — Exp. XX/XX/XX — CIVIL — STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.

QUINCY ENGINEERING
3247 RAMOS CIRCLE
SACRAMENTO, CA 95827-2501
P: 916.368.9181

LEGEND:

TFESA — TEMPORARY FENCE ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA (ESA)

—x—x—x—x—x— TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION FENCE CHAIN LINK

#X ELDERBERRY SHRUB

NOTES:

1. FOR SECTION "A–A" AND SECTION "D–D", SEE "ACCESS DETAILS" SHEET.
2. FOR UTILITY INFORMATION, SEE "UTILITY PLAN" SHEET.

SOURCE: Quincy Engineering, Inc., 2010

Figure 4
Western Side – Staging and Access Layout

area will have a dedicated driveway into the parking lot from University Ave, and a gate will be used to restrict public access for safety. An earthen ramp will be built with the staging area from the private parking lot grade to the top of the existing levee in order to provide access for construction equipment. An area immediately adjacent to the bridge on top of the levee will be used for construction activities. A temporary earthwork ramp will be required from the top of the levee to the grade of the American River Parkway (Sacramento County Parks) in order to provide access to the base of the tower. **Figure 5** includes a photo of a similar earthen ramp developed for a previous levee project within roughly the same location.

On the westside, the Contractor will gain access to the bridge work area from State University Drive East within the California State University Sacramento (CSUS) Campus. The access route will proceed from State University Drive East up an existing paved levee access ramp, back down an existing levee ramp on the waterside, and along a flat area at the toe of the levee within CSUS property. The staging and construction activity work area for parking, equipment, supplies will be near the existing bridge tower. This staging area will be fenced and protected from public access.

Construction Activity Areas

Most of the restoration work will be performed from the bridge itself, above the ground (see Figure 5). Work occurring on the deck level will include work on the bridge deck, main cables, suspender cables, and handrail system. Work occurring below the deck level, within the truss structure of the bridge, will include work on the truss, bearing, and the utility conduit. The vast majority of paint removal and restoration work (which accounts for over 90% of the total restoration effort) will occur at the bridge truss level, below the bridge deck. While the proposed project is located within the American River Parkway, restoration activities (including construction access routes and staging areas) do not include in-water work or would involve ground disturbing activities.

Minor work will be performed at both abutments on the bearing system and minor paint work will be performed at all cable anchorage locations. In order to access and build paint containment systems around each tower, construction of temporary scaffolding will be required around each tower. Scaffolding will be the full height of each tower, braced off each tower, and will be supported on temporary pads at the base of each tower. The contractor may elect to design a containment structure that will provide a protected opening for bikes and pedestrians crossing underneath the towers during this work activity.

Required Equipment and Workers

Equipment used for the project will include typical pieces of general construction equipment and also specialized painting equipment. Specialized paint equipment will include a paint blaster/recycling machine, dust collector, and air compressors. The recycling machine stores, sorts and transports inbound and outbound blasting material streams. The dust collector filters and controls atmosphere within the paint containment tent. Air compressors provide air pressure to drive the recycling and collecting machines. A water containment system will be established to ensure that contaminated water used to wash and clean paint surfaces is fully captured without affecting the environment. All these machines come on wheeled trailers or carriages that spread out load below legal limits for operating on local streets, access ramps, and would be parked as close to the bridge as possible.

In addition to these pieces of specialized equipment, smaller more typical construction equipment will also be utilized. This includes equipment such as heavy duty pick-ups and loaders for moving materials, forklifts, and manlifts for accessing areas of the bridge. There would also be some light trailers for decontamination showers as well as stockpiles of ancillary hosing and grit stockpiles that could be staged further from the immediate area of the bridge. One or two office trailers may also be required for the Contractor and City's construction management staff.

PHOTOGRAPH 1. Access to upper portions of most vertical suspender ropes using a manlift.



PHOTOGRAPH 2. Access to towers and upper portions of the suspension cables and vertical suspender ropes gained using an 86-foot aerial boom lift.

PHOTOGRAPH 3. Example of temporary earthwork ramp from previous project.

SOURCE: Quincy Engineering, Inc., 2011; EAS, 2013

Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project . 120851

Figure 5
Bridge and Project Site Access

An estimated 10 to 20 workers, which could vary based on specific restoration/maintenance activity, would be onsite each day during restoration activities. Workers travelling to the eastern side of the project site would likely travel along Fair Oaks Boulevard to University Avenue and park their vehicles near the equipment staging area within the private parking lot (see Figures 3 and 4). Workers accessing the western side of the project site would likely enter the CSUS campus through either Hornet Drive or Folsom Boulevard and proceed to the levee access location on State University Drive East and the western staging area. Restoration/maintenance activities would be limited to daylight hours, typically the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and possibly Saturday and Sunday.

Restoration Schedule

One of the primary objectives of the proposed project is to minimize access and circulation impacts to the Sacramento State University Campus and for users of the Jedediah Smith Recreation Trail. Impacts will be minimized as part of the proposed project schedule during the April to November 2014 construction season. Additionally, implementation of the project in two stages will also minimize impacts to participants of the Eppies Great Race (occurring in mid to late July). The contractor will select which side of the bridge to restore first and will complete construction in a timely matter so as to not interfere with the Eppies Great Race. Therefore, one phase will occur during the April through June timeframe. Completion of this phase will coincide to ensure that adequate time is made available for removal of equipment and restoration of staging areas located along the eastern side of the bridge, which is an important part of the Eppies Great Race. Following the completion of work on this phase, work will commence on the remaining side.

Site Preparation

Preparation of the site will include setting up the staging areas and securing them with construction fencing to limit public access for safety. Additional measures such as silt fencing, fiber rolls, and signage may also be installed with the staging and construction areas. Temporary earthen construction ramps will be constructed adjacent to the levee on the east side for access. A chain link fence will also need to be removed in order to build this ramp. Minor temporary earth fill may also be required on the west side to level the access route near the adjacent levee ramp. Minor fill, steel plating, timber blocking, or other temporary pads may be placed under equipment to protect existing features such as levee paving and slopes. Temporary pad foundations will also be required below the access and containment scaffolding required for paint activities at each existing tower. Vegetation trimming will be required both for restoration/maintenance access and to trim vegetation growing into the bridge that interferes with painting activities.

Site Restoration and Cleanup

The project will require the contractor to preserve and restore property upon completion of the project. All restoration/maintenance materials will be required to be removed and all surfaces restored to their pre-project condition including replacing fences, repairing AC surfaces, restoring existing slopes and grades, and restoring vegetated surfaces through means such as hydroseeding. All hard surfaces, such as the private parking lot, will be cleaned of dirt, dust, or other construction materials. Resurfacing and re-striping may be performed, if required, to restore the hard surfaces back to their original condition.

Utilities

Although relocation of utilities is not anticipated for this project, the limits of the project will contain various easements and underground utilities. Some of the utility companies may elect to rehabilitate some of their lines or connections to the bridge during this project. Utility companies would temporarily disconnect affected utility lines to the bridge for repairs, and then would reconnect them during the painting operations. On the eastside, the temporary ramp will be built over a SMUD easement and electrical line (see Figure 3). Portions of the work on the eastside will also be

performed over an easement for the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District which contains a sanitary sewer. On the eastside, a portion of the construction area will be over a series of drainage culverts serving the CSUS campus. Work on the bridge will include restoration of a utility conduit carrying SMUD electrical lines. Utility coordination will be performed with all utility owners.

Public Engagement Process

A public workshop was conducted by the City on September 25, 2013 at the Sierra Oaks Elementary School Multipurpose Room (171 Mills Road, Sacramento, CA 95864) from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

Comments raised specific to environmental issues included questions regarding the extent of closures to the Guy West Bridge and the resultant effects to pedestrian circulation to and from the campus. Additional comments were provided regarding the possible effects to recreation use along trails adjacent to the project site and coordination with various planned recreation events in the Parkway.

Project Permits and Approvals

The following agencies (includes responsible agencies) have permitting or approval authority over the proposed project:

- U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) for a Navigability Assessment;
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for work conducted above a Navigable Water as defined under section 10 of the federal Clean Water (CWA);
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for impacts to elderberry shrubs, the host plant for the federally threatened valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB) per section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act;
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to address impacts within the banks of the river and associated riparian habitat per Section 1602 of State Fish and Game Code; To Be Determined.
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to address potential impacts to water quality that may result from discharges from the project site to the river or from diffused sources (e.g., erosion from soil disturbance or waste discharges to land) per Section 401 of the CWA; TO Be Determined.
- Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) for work within a designated floodway;
- American River Flood Control District (ARFCD) for an endorsement of the project
- County of Sacramento, Regional Parks, Recreation and Open Space for work conducted on County Park land, or within a County designated Parkway, requires an encroachment permit;
- California State University Sacramento (CSUS) for site access and temporary construction easement approval; and
- State Lands Commission (SLC), while not an actual permit, the City will be coordinating with the SLC to acquire additional easement rights.

SECTION III – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

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

Introduction

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

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

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

This section of the initial study identifies the applicable land use designations of the project study area. Because the proposed project is a bridge restoration/maintenance project (with a limited study area located with the American River Parkway) that would not involve the development of new or additional housing units or employment centers, detailed descriptions of community plans, policies, and permissible land use densities and intensities are not considered necessary and are not described further.

Discussion

Land Use and Planning

As shown in **Figure 6**, a majority of the project site is located within the American River Parkway and is designated as Parks and Recreation under the City's current 2030 General Plan. The dominate land use to the west is the CSUS campus, which is designated Public/Quasi-Public. Land use designations to the east include Employment Center Mid Rise, Suburban Neighborhood Medium and Suburban Neighborhood Low (see Figure 6).

While a majority of the project site is located within the American River Parkway, the project site is surrounded by an urbanized portion of the community. As shown in Figure 6, the predominant surrounding land uses include CSUS, residential areas, commercial/office uses, and public land maintained by the County of Sacramento. As described above under Section II "Project Description", the project is a temporary bridge restoration/maintenance project that would not involve new development or permanent land use changes within the City. Upon project completion, all

SOURCE: City of Sacramento, 2011; Microsoft, 2012; ESA, 2013

Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project . 120851

Figure 6
Land Uses Within the Study Area

project areas (staging/access areas) would be returned to pre-project conditions after maintenance activities are completed. Consequently, project activities would not result in permanent changes to the existing landscape, and the proposed project is consistent with planning designations in the 2030 General Plan and Zoning Code.

Population and Housing

The proposed project does not involve construction of residential land uses that would generate new residents in the city or region. Temporary construction workers (estimated at 10 to 20 workers) serving the proposed project would reasonably be expected to come from the existing labor pool of residents in Sacramento and nearby communities. Additionally, the proposed bridge restoration/maintenance project does not include the provision of additional infrastructure with the capacity to serve other un-served properties, or stimulate additional economic activity not currently planned for in the vicinity or region. Therefore, the project would not induce direct or indirect population growth. Consequently, the proposed project will not have an impact on population and housing and these issues are not described further in this initial study.

Agricultural Resources

The Master EIR discussed the potential impact of development under the 2030 General Plan on agricultural resources. See Master EIR, Chapter 6.2. The Master EIR concluded that the impact of the 2030 General Plan on agricultural resources within the City was less than significant.

The project site is primarily located within the American River Parkway and does not contain soils designated as Important Farmland (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance). The site is not zoned for agricultural uses, and there are no lands with Williamson Act contracts that would be affected by project activities. No existing agricultural or timber-harvest uses are located on or in the vicinity of the project site. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts to agricultural resources and this issue is not discussed further in this initial study.

Energy

Chapter 6.11, "Public Utilities," of the Master EIR evaluates the potential effects of the 2030 General Plan to result in the construction of new energy production facilities (Impact 6.11-9) and the potential cumulative effects associated with the continued use of electricity and natural gas in the region (Impact 6.11-10). Policies included in the 2030 General Plan were identified to reduce impacts associated with energy consumption to a less-than-significant level.

The proposed project focuses on bridge restoration/maintenance activities to the Guy West Bridge and would not result in the construction of additional development that would result in the permanent increased use of electricity and natural gas in the region. As part of the project, the two utility conduits running from abutment to abutment (which appear to carry electric cables) will be repaired and utility conduit integrity will be restored. Overall, the proposed project would not result in any impacts not identified and evaluated in the Master EIR.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Federal Clean Air Act establishes National Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) and delegates enforcement to the states, with direct oversight by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In California, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) is the responsible agency for air quality regulation. The California Clean Air Act established California AAQS. These standards are more stringent than Federal standards and include pollutants not listed in Federal standards.

The Sacramento area (including the project site) is included in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. The air quality in the area is managed by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD).

Ozone. The project site is located in the Sacramento Federal Ozone Nonattainment Area (SFNA). The SFNA is also subject to regulations, attainment goals, and standards of the U.S. and California EPAs. On February 14, 2008, CARB, on behalf of the air districts in the Sacramento region, submitted a letter to EPA requesting a voluntary reclassification (bump-up) of the Sacramento

Federal Nonattainment Area from a “serious” to a “severe” 8-hour ozone nonattainment area with an extended attainment deadline of June 15, 2019, and additional mandatory requirements. On May 5, 2010 EPA approved the request effective June 4, 2010 (SMAQMD, 2011). The SFNA is thus designated a “severe” nonattainment area for the National 8-hour AAQS for ozone. The EPA General Conformity Regulation requires that “severe” designated nonattainment areas further reduce Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) and Reactive Organic Gas (ROG) thresholds to 25 tons/year rather than 100 tons/year.

Particulate Matter. Particulate matter is a term used for solid or liquid particles emitted into the air. Particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM10) is small enough to be inhaled and can cause health problems in the respiratory system. According to the State and Federal 24-Hour AAQS, Sacramento County is designated as a nonattainment area for PM10. Additionally, on October 16, 2006, the EPA promulgated a new 24-Hour standard for particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM2.5). This change lowered the daily standard from 65µg/m3 to 35µg/m3 to protect the general public from short term exposure of the fine particulate matter. Sacramento does not meet the new standards (EPA, 2007). The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires nonattainment areas to achieve and maintain the State AAQS by the earliest practicable date and local air districts to develop plans for attaining State ozone standards.

Toxic Air Contaminants. Under the Clean Air Act, toxic air contaminants (TACs) are airborne pollutants that may be expected to result in an increase in mortality, serious illness, or may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. A chemical becomes a regulated TAC after it is assessed for its potential for human exposure, and evaluated for its health effects on humans by CARB’s California Air Toxics Program or the EPA’s National Air Toxics Assessment. TACs are not classified as criteria air pollutants (CAPs) and no ambient air quality standards have been established for them. The effects of various TACs are very diverse and their health impacts tend to be local rather than regional; consequently, uniform standards for these pollutants have not been established.

Currently, the estimated risk from particulate matter emissions from diesel exhaust (diesel PM) is higher than the risk from all other TACs combined. In September 2000, CARB adopted the Diesel Risk Reduction Plan (Diesel RRP), which recommends many control measures to reduce the risks associated with diesel PM and achieve a goal of 75% diesel PM reduction by 2010 and 85% by 2020. The key elements of the DRR Plan are to clean up existing engines through engine retrofit emission control devices, to adopt stringent standards for new diesel engines, to lower the sulfur content of diesel fuel, and implement advanced technology emission control devices on diesel engines (CARB, 2010).

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR

The Master EIR addressed the potential effects of the 2030 General Plan on ambient air quality and the potential for exposure of people, especially sensitive receptors such as children or the elderly, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. See Master EIR, Chapter 6.1. Policies in the 2030 General Plan in Environmental Resources were identified as mitigating potential effects of development that could occur under the 2030 General Plan. For example, Policy ER 6.1.1 calls for the City to work with the California Air Resources Board and the SMAQMD to meet state and federal air quality standards; Policy ER 6.1.12 requires the City to review proposed development projects to ensure that the projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions; Policy ER 6.1.11 calls for coordination of City efforts with SMAQMD; and Policy ER 6.1.15 requires the City to give preference to contractors using reduced-emission equipment.

The Master EIR identified exposure to sources of toxic air contaminants (TAC) as a potential effect. Policies in the 2030 general Plan would reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. The

policies include ER 6.1.5, requiring consideration of current guidance provided by the Air Resources Board and SMAQMD; as well as Policies ER 6.11.1 and ER 6.11.15, referred to above.

The Master EIR found that greenhouse gas emissions that would be generated by development consistent with the 2030 General Plan would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. The discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR are incorporated by reference in this Initial Study. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150) As the proposed project does not include the development of additional housing units or result in land uses that would generate additional sources of permanent or long-term greenhouse gas emissions, this impact is not discussed further.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

- Construction emissions of NOx above 85 pounds per day;
- Operational emissions of NOx or ROG above 65 pounds per day;
- Violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- PM10 concentrations equal to or greater than five percent of the State ambient air quality standard (i.e., 50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) in areas where there is evidence of existing or projected violations of this standard. However, if project emissions of NOx and ROG are below the emission thresholds given above, then the project would not result in violations of the PM10 ambient air quality standards;
- CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm); or
- Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

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

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTION A

The proposed project would only generate short-term, temporary air quality emissions as a result of bridge restoration/maintenance activities such as bridge paint application and removal (i.e., from air compressors, paint equipment, etc.). Consequently, standard air quality emission modeling conducted for typical construction-related projects involving a variety of earthmoving activities was not conducted for the proposed project, as ground disturbing activities are not proposed. Other activities resulting in some minor amounts of construction-related exhaust emissions would be generated by heavy-duty maintenance equipment, material delivery/haul trucks, and a small number of construction worker vehicles (between 10 to 20 average daily trips). As the proposed project is limited to bridge restoration/maintenance activities, no ground-disturbance or building

demolition activities would generate fugitive particulate matter (PM) dust emissions, which typically account for a majority of construction-related air quality emissions. Some site restoration/clean-up activities (i.e., repairing AC surfaces, restoring existing slopes and grades, and restoring vegetated surfaces/hydro-seeding, etc.) would also generate very small amounts of reactive organic gas (ROG) emissions. As these emissions would be temporary in nature, and would cease following the restoration/maintenance work, project-related activities would not constitute a significant source of air quality emissions that would exceed the SMAQMD threshold of significance. However, the proposed project will include applicable SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (including low vehicle speeds, limited equipment idling, etc.) to ensure that maintenance activity emissions are low. These measures are outlined in SMAQMD's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices. Consequently, with implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** the proposed project would fulfill all the SMAQMD-required construction control practices and generate NOX emissions less than the 85 lbs/day threshold. Therefore, the impact would be ***less-than-significant*** with incorporation of mitigation.

QUESTION B

As previously described, the proposed project is a bridge restoration/maintenance project that would not involve extensive ground disturbing activities or result in the construction of additional development that would result in additional permanent or long-term air quality emissions As the proposed project would not result in operational emissions of NOx or ROG above 65 pounds per day, ***no impact*** is expected.

QUESTIONS C, D, AND E

The SMAQMD has developed construction activity screening criteria and cumulative construction significance criteria for PM10 and PM2.5. (SMAQMD CEQA Guide, Chapter 3). If a project would implement all SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (as set forth in Mitigation Measure AQ-1 below) and the maximum daily disturbed area (i.e., grading, excavation, cut and fill) of the project site would not exceed 15 acres (the proposed project involves no ground excavation), then the project does not have the potential to exceed or contribute to the SMAQMD's concentration-based thresholds of significance for PM10 and PM 2.5 at an off-site location. Consequently, with implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1,** the proposed project would fulfill all the SMAQMD's criteria for construction activities to not exceed the concentration-based threshold of significance for PM10 and PM2.5. Finally, the proposed project's maintenance vehicle trips and material deliveries are not anticipated to be so great as to substantially change (i.e., more than 5%) the mix of vehicles at affected intersections along travel routes to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would meet all of the SMAQMD's CO hotspot second tier screening criteria and would not generate traffic volumes that could cause CO hotspots at local intersections or adversely affect sensitive receptors. Therefore, the impact would be ***less-than-significant*** with incorporation of mitigation.

QUESTIONS F AND G

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the short-term generation of diesel PM emissions from the use of painting equipment and off-road diesel equipment required for moving materials, forklifts, and manlifts for accessing areas of the bridge. Diesel PM has been classified as a TAC by the ARB and therefore even acute exposure could have potential health impacts. Multi-family residences are located along the southeast side of the eastern staging area (roughly 180 feet from the nearest edge of the staging area), which are considered sensitive receptors. Maintenance emissions would occur intermittently during a 24-week work period. Diesel PM emissions would vary depending on the types of activities occurring each day.

The dose to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk and is a function of both the concentration and duration of receptor exposure. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), health risk assessments that determine the health risks associated with exposure of residential receptors to TAC emissions should be based on a 70-year exposure period and health risk assessments that address the health risk associated with exposure of children to TAC emissions should be based on a 9-year exposure period (OEHHA 2003). TAC exposure to children is of special concern because children typically metabolize more air per unit of body weight in comparison to adults and can be more sensitive to toxics during development. As described above, maintenance activities would occur over a short term period (approximately 24 weeks). Therefore, the total exposure time where some level of maintenance activities and subsequent diesel PM emissions are occurring would be less than the minimum number of years recommended for a health risk assessment and less than 1% of the total exposure time for a typical health risk assessment.

Consequently, because the potential generation of TACs would be temporary and intermittent in nature and the relatively low exposure period in combination with the dispersive properties of diesel PM (Zhu and Hinds 2002), short-term maintenance activities would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC concentrations that would exceed 10 in a million cancer risks. However, the proposed project will include applicable SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (including low vehicle speeds, limited equipment idling, etc.) to ensure that maintenance activity emissions are low. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** would fulfill SMAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures and reduce diesel PM emissions from heavy-duty construction equipment by limiting idling time, limiting construction vehicle speeds, and properly maintaining construction equipment. Therefore, the impact would be ***less-than-significant*** with incorporation of mitigation.

The proposed project also includes the use of painting compounds and other hazardous materials. These potential impacts associated with the use of hazardous materials are described below in "Hazards".

QUESTION H

As previously described above, the proposed bridge restoration/maintenance project does not include the development of additional housing units or result in land uses that would generate additional sources of permanent or long-term greenhouse gas emissions. Consequently, ***no impact*** is expected.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure AQ-1 Implement Construction-related Emission Control Practices. The project applicant shall implement all SMAQMD basic construction emission control practices and requirements of SMAQMD Rule 403 during bridge maintenance activities, including the following:

- Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads.

- Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered.

- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible track-out mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

- Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).

- All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, parking lots to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

- Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes [required by California Code of Regulations, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485]. Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.

- Maintain all equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determine to be running in proper condition before it is operated.

FINDINGS

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
2. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the proposal: A) Create a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected		X	
B) Result in substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal		X	
C) Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands)?		X	

Environmental Setting

The project site is located in the Sacramento Valley floristic province of the Great Central Valley. Historically, this region supported extensive marshes, riparian woodlands intermixed with oak woodland, vernal pools, and grasslands. Intensive agricultural and urban development has resulted in substantial changes and conversions of these habitats. The project site is located within the American River Parkway, which is a greenbelt that extends from Folsom Dam southwest to the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers. The project study area encompasses both sides (eastern and western side) of the Guy West Bridge which spans the American River, access routes along the levees of the American River, and associated staging areas (**Figures 7** and **8**). Habitats present in and adjacent to the study area include annual grassland, Valley foothill riparian, riverine, barren, and urban or developed areas (see also Figures 7 and 8).

The east side of the study area is characterized by open space along the levee consisting of paved and compacted trails and roadways with annual grassland growing along the levee slopes and benches. The Campus Commons (residential complexes) is located east of the levee. Dense riparian habitat occurs along the riverside of the levee; this area is dominated by large cottonwoods (*Populus fremontii*), valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*), and dense shrubs. The west side of the study area is characterized by dense riparian habitat below the levee on the riverside and open space between the CSUS campus and the riparian habitat. Annual grassland, mature cottonwoods, and black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*) trees occur in association with paved trails.

Biological Data and Surveys

Biological resources within the study area were identified by ESA biologist LeChi Huynh through field reconnaissance, a review of pertinent literature, and database queries. The primary sources of data referenced for this report included the following:

- Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that may be Affected by Projects in the Sacramento East, California 7.5-Minute Topographic Quadrangles (United States Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS], 2013a);
- USFWS Critical Habitat for Threatened and Endangered Species (online mapping program) (USFWS, 2013b);

SOURCE: Microsoft, 2012; Quincy Engineering 2013; ESA, 2013

Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project . 120851

Figure 7

Eastern Side – Habitats within the Project Site

Guy West Bridge Rehabilitation Project . 120851

SOURCE: Microsoft, 2012; Quincy Engineering, 2013; ESA, 2013

Figure 8

Western Side – Habitats within the Project Site

- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), Rarefind 4 computer program (California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW], 2013a);
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS, 2013)
- Special Vascular Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List (CDFW, 2013b);
- Special Animals List (CDFW, 2013c); and
- Ecological Subregions of California (Miles and Goudey, 1997).

ESA biologist LeChi Huynh conducted biological surveys of the study area on March 19 and June 4, 2013. The surveys were conducted on foot and existing habitat types, plants, and wildlife species within and adjacent to the study area were recorded. The biological surveys focused on identifying and delineating habitat for special-status plant and wildlife species, although general habitat conditions were noted and incidental species observations were recorded.

Plant Communities and Wildlife Habitats

Plant communities are assemblages of plant species that occur together in the same area. They are defined by species composition and relative abundance. The plant community and wildlife habitat descriptions and nomenclature used in this section generally follows the classification system of A Guide to Wildlife Habitats of California or CWHR (CDFG, 1988). The CWHR habitat classification scheme has been developed to support the CWHR System, a wildlife information system and predictive model for California's regularly occurring birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians. **Table 2** provides a summary of the habitat acreage within both project sites as shown in Figures 7 (eastern side) and 8 (western side). Additional detail regarding these habitat types is provided in the Biological Resources Technical Report (ESA, 2013).

Table 2. Habitat Types within the Study Area

Habitat Type	**Area (acres)**
Annual Grassland	0.90
Valley Foothill Riparian	0.34
Riverine*	0.22
Urban	0.76
Barren	0.20
Total	**2.42**

*Wetlands and other waters of the U.S. have not been formally delineated and the jurisdictional status of features has not been verified by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
SOURCE: ESA, 2013

Special-Status Species

Special-status species are legally protected under the State and federal Endangered Species Acts or other regulations or are species that are considered sufficiently rare by the scientific community to qualify for such listing. These species are classified under the following categories:

1. Species listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (50 Code of Federal regulations [CFR] 17.12 [listed plants], 17.11 [listed animals] and various notices in the Federal Register [FR] [proposed species]).
2. Species that are candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (61 FR 40, February 28, 1996);

3. Species listed or proposed for listing by the State of California as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 670.5);
4. Plants listed as rare or endangered under the California Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code, Section 1900 et seq.);
5. Species that meet the definitions of rare and endangered under CEQA. CEQA Section 15380 provides that a plant or animal species may be treated as "rare or endangered" even if not on one of the official lists (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15380); and
6. Plants considered under the CNPS to be "rare, threatened or endangered in California" (Rank 1A, 1B, and 2 in CNPS, 2013) as well as CNPS Rank 3 and 4[a] plant species.

A list of special-status species that have the potential to occur within the vicinity of the project study area was compiled based on data contained in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) (CDFW, 2013a), the United States Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) list of Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that Occur in or may be Affected by the proposed project (USFWS, 2013a), and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS, 2013). Special-status species with a high potential to occur within the study area are described below. A complete list (and description) of all special-status species with potential to occur within the study area is provided in the Biological Resource Technical Report (ESA, 2013).

Special-Status Wildlife

Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle

The valley elderberry longhorn beetle is completely dependent on its host plant, elderberry (*Sambucus sp.*), which is a common component of the riparian forests and adjacent upland habitats of California's Central Valley and foothills (USFWS, 1999a). Females lay eggs within the bark, where larvae hatch and bore into the stems. Larvae remain within the stems for one to two years and emerge as adults in early spring (March). Mating usually occurs in June. Often the only indicators of their presence are the distinctive small oval openings that are left after larvae pupate and emerge (UC Berkeley, 2005). For this reason, suitable habitat for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle is typically defined as live elderberry stems measuring at least one inch in diameter at ground level in habitats below 3,000 feet in elevation. They are generally found along waterways and in floodplains that support remnant stands of riparian vegetation. Elderberry shrubs with valley elderberry longhorn beetle populations occur in a variety of habitats and plant communities, but most often are found in riparian areas.

Suitable elderberry shrubs are present within the project sites in several locations (see Figures 7 and 8) and species occurrences have been recorded in the CNDDB along the American River Parkway within five miles of the project site (CDFW, 2013a). Additionally, critical habitat has been designated for valley elderberry longhorn beetle adjacent to or along the American River four miles northwest and five miles northeast of the project site (USFWS, 2013b).

Cooper's Hawk

Cooper's hawk is a breeding resident raptor species throughout most of the wooded portion of California from sea level to above 9,000 feet. It generally breeds in southern Sierra Nevada foothills,

[a] List 3 plants may be analyzed under CEQA §15380 if sufficient information is available to assess potential impacts to such plants. Factors such as regional rarity vs. statewide rarity should be considered in determining whether cumulative impacts to a List 4 plant are significant even if individual project impacts are not. CNPS List 3 and 4 may be considered regionally significant if, e.g., the occurrence is located at the periphery of the species' range, or exhibits unusual morphology, or occurs in an unusual habitat/substrate. For these reasons, CNPS List 3 and 4 plants should be included in the special-status species analysis. List 3 and 4 plants are also included in the California Natural Diversity Database's (CNDDB) Special Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List. [Refer to the current online published list available at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata.].

New York Mountains, Owens Valley, and other local areas in southern California. The most frequently used habitats include dense stands of live oak, riparian deciduous or other forest habitats near water. Cooper's hawk hunts in broken woodland and habitat edges; thus, the species is seldom found in areas without dense tree stands or patchy woodland habitat. Nests are often found in deciduous riparian trees, but it also nests in second-growth conifer stands near streams (Zeiner et al., 1988).

Suitable habitat for Cooper's hawk is present in the vicinity of the project sites. The nearest CNDDB record of Cooper's hawk is located approximately three miles northwest of the project site (CDFW, 2013a).

Swainson's Hawk

Swainson's hawks were historically found throughout California except in the mountainous regions of the state, including the Central Valley, all of the Coast Ranges south of Marin County, the Tehachapi Range, the Colorado River area, the Mojave Desert, the Great Basin, and the Modoc Plateau. Today, Swainson's hawk occurrences are mainly limited to a few areas of the Central Valley and the Great Basin. Migrating individuals move south through the southern and central interior of California in September and October and north in March through May. Breeding occurs late March to late August, with peak activity late May through July (Zeiner et al., 1988).

The Swainson's hawk preferred habitat is concentrated along permanent waterways with a more or less continuous canopy of trees, with grassland, irrigated pasture, alfalfa or grain fields nearby to forage. Vineyards, orchards, rice and cotton crops are unsuitable foraging habitat for this species. Nests are composed of sticks, bark, and fresh leaves and are placed in tall trees or on utility poles. Swainson's hawks typically nest in open riparian habitat, in scattered trees or small groves in sparsely vegetated flatlands (Zeiner et al., 1988).

Suitable Swainson's hawk nesting and foraging habitat is present in the vicinity of the project site. Additionally, Swainson's hawk nests have been observed within five miles of the project site, primarily to the northwest of the study area. An occurrence was noted approximately one mile east of the project site along the American River Parkway (CDFW, 2013a).

White-tailed Kite

White-tailed kites are a yearlong resident in coastal and valley lowlands of California; they are rarely found away from agricultural areas. The species generally inhabit low-elevation grassland, savannah, oak woodland, wetland, agricultural, and riparian habitats. White-tailed kites forage in undisturbed, open grasslands, meadows, farmlands, and emergent wetlands. Some large shrubs or trees are required for nesting and for communal roosting sites. Nest trees range from small, isolated shrubs and trees to trees in relatively large stands. The breeding season lasts from February to October, with peak from May to August (Zeiner et al., 1988).

Suitable foraging and nesting habitat is present in the vicinity of the project site. Additionally, several white-tailed kite nests have been observed along the American River Parkway ranging from one to four miles away from the project site (CDFW, 2013a).

Central Valley Steelhead

Information on migration and spawning tendencies of Central Valley steelhead is difficult to determine due to the low abundance of spawners and the high flows and turbid waters occurring during winter spawning periods. Central Valley steelhead are reported to begin upstream migration into the American, Feather, Yuba, and Mokelumne rivers in August through October depending upon water temperature, weather conditions, and flow. Peak migration occurs in November through December (CALFED, 2001) with spawning peaks occurring from January through February.

Emergence occurs from January through May. Juvenile steelhead may rear in their natal streams for one to two years prior to emigrating from the river, with emigration of one- to two-year-old fish primarily occurring from April to June.

Adult steelhead migration within the Sacramento and American Rivers begins in November through January, and spawning begins December through April (Hanson, 2002). Fry emergence from the gravel generally occurs in March and may extend through June (Hanson, 2002).

Naturally spawning stocks of Central Valley steelhead are known to occur in the Sacramento River, the American River, and tributaries. Additionally, the American River is designated as critical habitat for steelhead salmon (USFWS, 2013b).

Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook and Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook

Chinook salmon runs (spring-run and winter-run) are named for the time of season that upstream spawning migration occurs, and are defined by the combined timing of adult migration, the amount of time juveniles reside in a stream, and the time of year the smolts migrate out to sea. Timing of adult upstream migration varies within individual runs depending upon the region (Yoshiyama, 1998). Central Valley spring-run Chinook enter the Sacramento River system from March to July, and spawning occurs from late August through early October (Yoshiyama, 1998). Due to the longer period of time between upstream migration and spawning, spring-run Chinook must hold out in the cold temperatures of mountain headwaters to avoid excessive summertime temperatures of the valley and foothills. Spring-run ascent to mountain elevations can only be accomplished if there are no obstructions within the drainage system preventing passage. Winter-run Chinook generally begin migrating upstream from December through February and hold-over in the river system (Sacramento River) for a couple of months before peak spawning occurs between May and July (Healey, 1998). Temperatures must be suitable for the winter-run to hold over.

Life histories (migration, holding, spawning, rearing, and juvenile emigration) of Chinook salmon varies within the separate runs, but essential habitat requirements including substrate, temperature, dissolved oxygen, stream flow, and water quality are consistent throughout the runs. Chinook salmon require a water temperature from 43 to 56 degrees F to successfully spawn (Boles, 1988). Spawning can occur in habitats ranging from small tributaries to large river beds, and generally requires coarse gravel riffles. Chinook salmon eggs incubate in the gravel for approximately 35 to 50 days, depending on the temperature. The newly emerged fry remain in the gravel until most of the yolk sac is absorbed (CALFED, 2001). Successful rearing of juvenile Chinook requires cool streams/rivers with significant vegetative cover providing shade for protection from predation.

The American River supports a mixed run of hatchery and naturally produced winter-run Chinook salmon and smaller numbers of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon. The American River is also designated as critical habitat for Chinook salmon by the USFWS (2013b).

Sensitive Natural Community

A sensitive natural community is a biological community that is regionally rare, provides important habitat opportunities for wildlife, is structurally complex, or is in other ways of special concern to local, State, or federal agencies. CEQA identifies the elimination of such communities as a significant impact. The CDFW tracks sensitive natural communities in the CNDDB. Most sensitive natural communities are given special consideration because they perform important ecological functions, such as maintaining water quality and providing essential habitat for plants and wildlife. Some plant communities support a unique or diverse assemblage of plant species and therefore are considered sensitive from a botanical standpoint. Regionally occurring sensitive natural communities identified by the CNDDB (2013a) that occur within the study area include limited areas of Great Valley Cottonwood Riparian Forest and Great Valley Valley Oak Riparian Forest. Sensitive

natural communities that were identified by the CNDDB (2013a) that are not present within the study area include Elderberry Savanna, Northern Claypan Vernal Pool, Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool, and Northern Volcanic Mud Flow Vernal Pool.

Critical Habitat

Critical habitats are areas considered essential for the conservation of a special-status species listed as endangered or threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act. Critical habitats are specific geographic areas that contain features essential for conservation of special-status species and may require special management and protection. Critical habitat may include an area not currently used by an endangered or threatened species, but that will be needed for species recovery. Projects involving a federal agency or federal funding are required to consult with the USFWS to ensure that project actions will not destroy or adversely modify critical habitat.

A review of GIS-based habitat data for *USFWS Critical Habitat for Threatened and Endangered Species* shows that the study area is currently located within designated critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead, Central Valley spring-run Chinook, and Sacramento River winter-run Chinook (USFWS, 2013b). Additionally, critical habitat for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle is located four miles northeast and five miles northwest of the project site (USFWS, 2013b).

Heritage Trees

Heritage trees promote scenic beauty, enhance property values, reduce soil erosion, improve air quality, abate noise and provide shade to reduce energy consumption. City Code 12.64 provides provisions to protect significant specimen trees existing in the city known as “heritage trees.” The City Code defines “heritage trees” as follows:

1. Any tree of any species with a trunk circumference of one hundred (100) inches or more, which is of good quality in terms of health, vigor of growth and conformity to generally accepted horticultural standards of shape and location for its species.
2. Any native *Quercus* species, *Aesculus california* or *Platanus racemosa*, having a circumference of thirty-six (36) inches or greater when a single trunk, or a cumulative circumference of thirty-six (36) inches or greater when a multi-trunk, which is of good quality in terms of health, vigor of growth and conformity to generally accepted horticultural standards of shape and location for its species.
3. Any tree thirty-six (36) inches in circumference or greater in a riparian zone. The riparian zone is measured from the centerline of the water course to thirty (30) feet beyond the high water line.
4. Any tree, grove of trees or woodland trees designated by resolution of the city council to be of special historical or environmental value or of significant community benefit.

Although a formal arborist survey has not been conducted for the project site, biological surveys indicate that there are several tree species (e.g., Fremont cottonwood, black locust, and oaks) located in riparian habitat within the study area that qualify for designation of “heritage” per the City Code. However, no heritage trees along the riverside of the levee are expected to be removed or significantly impacted as a result of bridge maintenance activities resulting from the proposed project. Heritage trees located along the access path on the west side of the Guy West Bridge will be protected by standard tree protection measures during project implementation. Vegetation trimming may be required for both restoration and maintenance activities; however, all trimming will be conducted by a qualified arborist to minimize the extent of impacts to existing heritage trees. Prior to the trimming of heritage trees on the project site, the contractor will be required to submit a permit to the City’s Department of Transportation’s Urban Forestry Services (City Code 12.64.050).

Waters of the United States

The Clean Water Act (CWA) regulates the discharge of pollutants into waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Section 404 of the CWA regulates the discharge of dredged and fill material into wetlands and other waters of the U.S. The federal government defines "waters of the United States" in 33 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 328.3 as:

1. All waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible to use in interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide;
2. All interstate waters including interstate wetlands;
3. All other waters such as intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds, the use, degradation or destruction of which could affect interstate or foreign commerce including any such waters:
    A. Which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes; or
    B. From which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce; or
    C. Which are used or could be used for industrial purpose by industries in interstate commerce;
4. All impoundments of waters otherwise defined as waters of the United States under the definition;
5. Tributaries of the above waters;
6. The territorial seas;
7. Wetlands adjacent to the above waters (other than waters that are themselves wetlands). Waste treatment systems, including treatment ponds or lagoons designed to meet the requirements of CWA (other than cooling ponds as defined in 40 CFR 123.11(m) which also meet the criteria of this definition) are not waters of the United States.
8. Waters of the United States do not include prior converted cropland. Notwithstanding the determination of an area's status as prior converted cropland by any other federal agency, for the purposes of the CWA, the final authority regarding CWA jurisdiction remains with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

The term "wetlands" refers to those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Under normal circumstances, the definition of wetlands requires three wetland identification parameters be present: wetland hydrology, hydric soils, and hydrophytic vegetation. Typical examples of wetlands include freshwater marsh, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pool complexes that have a significant ecological nexus to a traditional navigable waterway.

"Other waters of the U.S." refers to those hydric features that are regulated by the Act but are not wetlands (33 CFR 328.4). To be considered jurisdictional, these features must exhibit a defined bed and bank and an ordinary high water mark. The term "ordinary high water mark" refers to that line on the shore established by the fluctuations of water and indicated by physical characteristics such as clear, natural line impressed on the bank, shelving, changes in the character of soil, destruction of terrestrial vegetation, the presence of litter and debris, or other appropriate means that consider

the characteristics of the surrounding areas. Examples of other waters of the U.S. include rivers, creeks, ponds, and lakes.

On June 5, 2007 the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) released guidance on the definitions of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. in response to *Rapanos v. United States* and *Carabell v. United States*. According to this guidance, the ACOE and the EPA will take jurisdiction over the following waters:

1. Traditional navigable waters, which are defined as all waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible to use in interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide;
2. Wetlands adjacent to traditional navigable waters; including adjacent wetlands that do not have a continuous surface connection to traditional navigable waters;
3. Non-navigable tributaries of traditional navigable waters that are relatively permanent where the tributaries typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically three months);
4. Wetlands adjacent to non-navigable tributaries as defined above; that have a continuous surface connection to such tributaries (e.g. they are not separated by uplands, a berm, dike, or similar feature).

The EPA and the ACOE decide jurisdiction over the following waters based on a fact-specific analysis to determine if there is a significant nexus, as defined below, to a traditional navigable water:

1. Non-navigable tributaries that are not relatively permanent;
2. Wetlands adjacent to non-navigable tributaries that are not relatively permanent;
3. Wetlands adjacent to but that do not directly abut a relatively permanent non-navigable tributary.

The EPA and the ACOE generally do not assert jurisdiction over the following features:

1. Swales or erosional features (e.g., gullies, small washes characterized by low volume, infrequent, or short duration flow);
2. Ditches (including roadside ditches) excavated wholly in and draining only uplands and that do not carry a relatively permanent flow of water.

The EPA and the ACOE have defined the significant nexus standard as follows:

1. A significant nexus analysis assesses the flow characteristics and functions of the tributary itself and the functions performed by all wetlands adjacent to the tributary to determine if they significantly affect the chemical, physical and biological integrity of downstream traditional navigable waters;
2. Significant nexus includes consideration of hydrologic and ecologic factors including:
    A. Volume, duration, and frequency of flow, including consideration of certain physical characteristics of the tributary,
    B. Proximity to the traditional navigable water,
    C. Size of the watershed,
    D. Average annual rainfall,
    E. Average annual winter snow pack,

F. Potential of tributaries to carry pollutants and flood waters to traditional navigable waters,

G. Provision of aquatic habitat that supports a traditional navigable water,

H. Potential of wetlands to trap and filter pollutants or store flood waters, and

I. Maintenance of water quality in traditional navigable waters.

The American River is the only potentially jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. identified during preliminary biological surveys of the project study area. No potential wetlands or other waters of the U.S. were observed directly adjacent to or within construction access ramps, pathways, or staging areas.

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

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

Policies in the 2030 General Plan were identified as mitigating the effects of development that could occur under the provisions of the 2030 General Plan. Policy 2.1.5 calls for the City to preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors and other riparian resources; Policy ER 2.1.10 requires the City to consider the potential impact on sensitive plants for each project and to require pre-construction surveys when appropriate; and Policy 2.1.11 requires the City to coordinate its actions with those of the California Department Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and other agencies in the protection of resources.

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

The project shall comply with the General Plan policies outlined above.

Standards of Significance

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

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

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

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

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

Habitats and special-status species that may be affected either directly or indirectly through implementation of the proposed bridge restoration/maintenance project include valley elderberry longhorn beetle, Cooper's hawk, Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, Central Valley steelhead, Central Valley spring-run Chinook, and Sacramento River winter-run Chinook. Each of these potentially affected species is described below.

Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle: Project-related activities which could affect the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle include vegetation removal and trimming within the project sites along with a variety of indirect impacts (vehicle dust, etc.). At least two shrubs will be removed as a result of the proposed project. One shrub will be removed due to its proximity to the construction access pathway (western project site), while the other requires removal as it is growing into the bridge tower (eastern project site), and would otherwise interfere with restoration/maintenance activities. At least nine (9) elderberry shrubs occur within the project impact area or within 20 feet of bridge restoration/maintenance activities, and one shrub occurs within 100 feet of the project impact footprint (see Figures 7 and 8). Implementation of avoidance measures consistent with **Mitigation Measures BR-1 and BR-2** would minimize or avoid potential impacts to elderberry shrubs and valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Therefore, the impact would be ***less-than-significant*** with incorporation of mitigation.

Raptors and Migratory Birds: Most bird species, especially those that are breeding, migrating, or of limited distribution, are protected under federal and state regulations. Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), migratory bird species and their nests and eggs are protected from injury or death. Project related disturbances must be reduced or eliminated during the nesting cycle. California Fish and Game Code Subsections 3503, 3503.5, and 3800 prohibit the possession, incidental take, or needless destruction of birds, their nests, and eggs. California Fish and Game Code Section 3511 lists birds that are "fully protected" (those species that may not be taken or possessed except under specific permit).

Birds that may forage in the vicinity of the project study area include Cooper's hawk, tricolored blackbird, great egret, great blue heron, burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, merlin, double-crested cormorant, purple martin and bank swallow. Suitable nest trees occur along the American River and the species with the greatest potential for nesting in the vicinity of the proposed project include Cooper's hawk, Swainson's hawk, and white-tailed kite. Implementation of pre-construction surveys consistent with **Mitigation Measure BR-3** will mitigate potential impacts to

species protected by the MBTA and other raptors (including Swainson's hawk). Therefore, the impact would be ***less-than-significant*** with incorporation of mitigation.

Special-Status Fish: The American River is considered critical habitat and essential fish habitat for the Central Valley steelhead, Central Valley spring-run Chinook, and Sacramento River winter-run Chinook. Restoration activities associated with the bridge and the use of construction access routes and staging areas do not include in-water work or would involve ground disturbing activities (i.e., generate erosion, etc.) that would directly impact fish species within the American River. Although no in-water work is proposed, there is potential for fugitive dust and construction runoff to enter the American River. As more fully described in sections Air Quality and Hydrology and Water Quality, a variety of water quality, sediment/erosion control, and dust abatement measures are proposed as part of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** "**Implement Construction-related Emission Control Practices**" and **Mitigation Measure HWQ-1** "**Implement Water Quality Best Management Practices**" that would also serve to minimize impacts to fish species and the water quality of the American River. Therefore, the impact would be ***less-than-significant*** with incorporation of mitigation.

Question B

Several heritage trees (as defined by the City of Sacramento) are located along the riverside of the levees, including cottonwood, black locust, and oaks. The bridge maintenance activities will not require the removal of heritage trees along the riverside of the levee. However, the proposed project will likely include some removal or branch trimming of heritage trees to provide clearance for maintenance activities directly adjacent to the bridge. Compliance with avoidance measure as outlined under City Code (Section 12.64.040) specific to heritage trees will ensure that this impact remains ***less-than significant***.

As required by Section 12.64.040 of the City Code, a permit will be submitted by the contractor to the Director of the Department of Public Works or the Director's authorized representative for trimming of heritage trees in the City right of way. All trimming will be conducted by a qualified arborist to minimize structural damage to the trees and reduce potential for long-term health impacts. Retained heritage trees adjacent to construction activities may require additional protection. Where feasible, buffer zones should include a minimum one-foot-wide buffer zone outside the dripline for oaks and heritage trees. The locations of these resources would be clearly identified on the construction drawings and marked in the field. Fencing or other barriers would remain in place until all construction and restoration work that involves heavy equipment is complete. Construction vehicles, equipment, or materials would not be parked or stored within the fenced area. No signs, ropes, cables, or other items would be attached to the protected trees. Grading, filling, trenching, paving, irrigation, and landscaping within the driplines of oak trees and heritage trees should be limited. Grading within the driplines of oak and heritage trees is not permitted unless specifically authorized by a Certified Arborist or the Director of the Department of Public Works or the Director's authorized representative.

Question C

Aside from the American River, there are no other waters of the U.S. located within or directly adjacent to the project site. As more fully described in sections Air Quality and Hydrology and Water Quality, a variety of water quality, sediment/erosion control, and dust abatement measures are proposed as part of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** "**Implement Construction-related Emission Control Practices**" and **Mitigation Measure HWQ-1** "**Implement Water Quality Best Management Practices**" that would also serve to minimize impacts to fish species and the water quality of the American River. Therefore, the impact would be ***less-than-significant*** with incorporation of mitigation.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BR-1 Coordination with USFWS. Based on field surveys conducted at the project sites, at least nine (9) elderberry shrubs occur within 20 feet of the project impact area, and would require formal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act with the USFWS. The City shall coordinate with the USFWS to determine an appropriate avoidance plan for all elderberry shrubs located within 20 feet of the construction disturbance zone.

Mitigation Measure BR-2 Implement Avoidance Measures for Valley Elderberry Shrubs. The construction contractor shall maintain a setback of 100 feet from all elderberry shrubs to avoid impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle. If the 100 foot setback is not feasible, the construction contractor shall implement a number of avoidance measures (in consultation and approval by the City and the USFWS). Such measures may include installing fencing around the shrubs, providing construction worker awareness training, transplanting of shrubs, and requiring biological monitoring during construction. The 1999 *Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle* (USFWS, 1999) provides applicable avoidance and minimization measures. No construction shall occur within 100 feet of all elderberry shrubs identified onsite until final approvals are received from the USFWS (Biological Opinion or concurrence letter). Upon City and USFWS approvals, the construction contractor shall create a 20-foot buffer around each potentially affected shrub. Work crews shall be briefed on the status of the beetle, the need to protect its host plant (elderberries), requirements to avoid damaging elderberry shrubs, and possible penalties for not complying with identified avoidance and minimization measures. In addition, construction workers should be made aware of the habitat needs of VELB and the location of protection areas on the site.

Mitigation Measure BR-3 Conduct Pre-Construction Nesting Surveys. For construction activities expected to occur during the nesting season (February-August), a pre-construction survey shall be conducted to determine if active nests are present on or within 500 feet of the project site. The survey should be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to the onset of construction. If active nests are found on or within 500 feet of the project site during pre-construction surveys, then CDFW should be consulted for additional mitigation measures that may be required. Typically CDFW will recommend that no construction activities occur within 500 feet of the nests, until the young have fledged or until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. Additionally, depending on the conditions specific to each nest, and the relative location and rate of construction activities, it may be feasible for construction to occur as planned within the buffer without impacting the breeding effort. In this case (to be determined on an individual basis by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW), the nest(s) shall be monitored by a qualified biologist during construction within the buffer. Construction activities may be halted at any time if, in the professional opinion of the biological monitor, construction activities are negatively impacting the breeding effort. Implementation of the pre-construction surveys should also be consistent with the protocol standards devised by the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and endorsed by the CDFW (Swainson's Hawk TAC, 2000).

If no active nests are identified during the pre-construction survey, no further mitigation is necessary. If construction activities are proposed to occur during the non-breeding season (September-January), a pre-construction survey is not required and no further studies are necessary.

Findings

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
3. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project: A) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in § 15064.5?			X
B) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource?			X

Environmental Setting

The project site consists of the 1966 Guy West Bridge and adjacent access roads and staging areas on the east and west sides of the American River. The Cultural Resources Technical Report completed by ESA for the proposed project includes additional information regarding the historic context of the Guy West Bridge, Sacramento State University, and the Campus Commons neighborhood, as well as a detailed evaluation of the Guy West Bridge under local, state, and federal register criteria (ESA, 2013).

As part of the analysis conducted for the technical report, ESA completed archival review of records maintained at the North Central Information Center (NCIC), a pedestrian field survey in January and March of 2013, and contact with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as well as interested Native American tribes and individuals.

The NCIC records search conducted on January 22, 2013 (File No. SAC-13-08) indicated that fourteen cultural resource studies had been previously conducted within the ½-mile records search study radius. Additionally, the records search identified four cultural resources previously recorded within the records search radius, including two mid-twentieth century historic period levees in the project area itself (P-34-508 [CA-SAC-481H], and P-34-509 [CA-SAC-482H]). Previous evaluations had determined the levee segments ineligible for listing in the National or California Registers due to a lack of physical integrity resulting from extensive alterations and maintenance. No prehistoric period resources were identified during the archival review.

The field surveys in January and March 2013 identified the two levee segments, as well as the 1966 Guy West Bridge, which was recorded and evaluated for listing in the National, California, and Sacramento Registers. No additional historic or prehistoric period resources were identified during the field survey.

The evaluation of the Guy West Bridge recommended it as eligible for listing (consistent with established Criterion) in the Sacramento Register and California Register (at the local level), due to its associations with the development of Sacramento State University and the surrounding community (Criterion A/a), associations with the life and work of University President Guy West (Criterion B/b), and its high artistic value as a community landmark structure (Criterion C/e). As such, the Guy West Bridge is considered a historic resource at the state and local level, and is considered a resource for CEQA purposes.

The NAHC was contacted on February 1, 2013 to request a database search for sacred lands or other cultural properties of significance within or adjacent to the project area. A response was received on March 18, 2013. The sacred lands survey did not identify the presence of cultural

resources in the project area. The NAHC provided a list of Native American contacts that might have further knowledge of the project area with respect to cultural resources. Each person or organization identified by the NAHC was contacted by letter on March 19, 2013. On April 8, 2013, the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria responded, noting concern regarding development within their aboriginal territory, and noted the presence of identified cultural resources within and in close proximity to the project area. Archaeologist Scott Baxter contacted the UAIC on April 25, 2013, detailing the results of the records search and survey, and stating that the project description involved no ground disturbing activities. The Shingle Springs Rancheria responded via letter on April 9, 2013, stating that they were unaware of any known cultural resources on the site, but would like to remain updated as the project progressed. To date, no additional responses have been received.

Standards of Significance

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

- Cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or

- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.

Summary of Analysis Under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

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

General plan policies identified as reducing such effects call for identification of resources on project sites (Policy HCR 2.1.1), implementation of applicable laws and regulations (Policy HCR 2.1.2 and HCR 2.1.15), early consultation with owners and land developers to minimize effects (Policy HCR 2.1.10) and encouragement of maintenance and upkeep of historic resources (Policy HCR 2.1.7), especially City-owned resources (Policy HCR 2.1.9).

The project shall comply with the General Plan policies outlined above.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

As described above, no prehistoric or historic period archaeological resources were identified during archival review or field survey. Additionally, the proposed project does not include any proposed earth moving or ground disturbing activities that would inadvertently disturb currently undiscovered archaeological resources. Therefore, no impacts to archaeological resources are anticipated through construction of the proposed project.

The archival review and field survey did, however, identify the 1966 Guy West Bridge as eligible for listing in the Sacramento Register and California Register at the local level, and would therefore be considered a historic resource at the state and local level, and a resource for CEQA purposes. The proposed project includes repair and restoration of the Guy West Bridge, including removal of existing lead-based paint, and repainting of the Guy West Bridge in its original “international orange” color. The decision to repaint the Guy West Bridge “international orange” will comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards (SOI) Guidelines for Rehabilitation (replacement in-kind**).** The new paint will preserve the distinctive original aesthetic of the Guy West Bridge, and will not result in a

significant impact to the bridge. For historic resources, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (b) (3) indicates that a project that follows the *U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*, or the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995*), shall mitigate impacts to a less than significant level. Consequently ***no impacts*** to the bridge as a historic resource are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Question B

As discussed in Section 6.5, Geology, of the General Plan Master EIR, the City of Sacramento is not considered sensitive to paleontological resources and the likelihood for finding a significant paleontological resource is considered low (page 6.5-25). As described under impacts to archaeological resources, the proposed project does not include any proposed ground disturbing activities with the potential to disturb currently undiscovered subsurface resources, and subsequently ***no impacts*** to paleontological resources are anticipated through implementation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

Findings

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

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

Environmental Setting

The lower American River area is part of the Great Valley Geomorphic province of California, and consists of low rolling foothills and flood plain areas near the confluence with the Sacramento River. The floor of the Sacramento Valley is generally flat and open with little natural relief, and the broad valley is filled with erosion debris that originates from the surrounding mountains. Flood control levees provide the only significant topographic relief in or near the project site.

Geologic formations underlying the Sacramento Valley include igneous, metamorphic, and sedimentary rock types, which range in age from pre-cretaceous to recent. The valley is situated on vast alluvial deposits that have slowly accumulated over the last 100 million years. The materials have been derived from the surrounding uplands; transported by major streams; and deposited in successive clay, silt, sand, and gravel layers on the valley floor. Soils in the area are predominately recent alluvial flood plain soils consisting of unconsolidated deposits of clay, silt, and sand. Sedimentation rates in the American River Basin are relatively low due to limited development, shallow soils, a low rate of upstream erosion, and numerous containment basins.

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

Chapter 6.5 of the Master EIR evaluated the potential effects related to seismic hazards, underlying soil characteristics, slope stability, erosion, existing mineral resources and paleontological resources in the general plan policy area. Goals include the protection of water quality (Goal ER 1.1) through implementation of practices designed to minimize construction site impacts (ER 1.1.7). Implementation of identified policies in the 2030 General Plan reduced all effects to a less-than-significant level.

Standards of Significance

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

- Allow a project to be built that will either introduce geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on such a site without protection against those hazards.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

Implementation of the proposed project would not include ground disturbance activities or involve the construction of new structures or facilities. Consequently, the proposed project would not involve any activities that would result in new geologic/seismic hazards or increase the severity of an existing geologic/seismic hazard. The proposed project includes a variety of Best Management

Practices (BMPs) (see Hydrology and Water Quality, below) to reduce water quality impacts that may result from project-related erosion effects. These BMPs include a range of erosion control measures, sediment retention measures, and erosion protection practices. Consequently, no impact would result.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

Findings

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
5. HAZARDS Would the project: A) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities?			X
B) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials?			X
C) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities?			X

Environmental Setting

The proposed project site is located within and adjacent to the American River Parkway, with a majority of the project area not associated with hazardous/toxic wastes, materials, or uses.

Standards of Significance

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

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

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

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

The project shall comply with the General Plan policies outlined above.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

Implementation of the proposed project would occur primarily within the American River Parkway. Additionally, maintenance-related activities would not result in large-scale ground disturbing or earth moving activities. As the proposed project would involve maintenance activities focused on the existing bridge structure, ***no impact*** is associated with the potential to expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during implementation of the proposed project.

Question B

Implementation of the proposed project would not include ground disturbance or building demolition activities that would expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials. However, as described above under the project description, the exterior paint of the Guy West Bridge is currently comprised of a red lead-type primer that typically contains greater than 40% lead with a topcoat that also contains other heavy metals. Removal of the current paint has the potential to expose workers and the environment to stray lead slivers. To address this concern, restoration activities will include the use of specialized paint equipment that will remove the existing paint coat. Specialized equipment (see Required Equipment and Workers section on page 15) includes a paint blaster/recycling machine, dust collector, and air compressors. The recycling machine stores, sorts and transports inbound and outbound blasting material streams, while the dust collector filters and controls atmosphere within the paint containment tent. Use of this equipment will ensure that no lead slivers from the removed paint will be introduced into the environment.

While typical maintenance activities (including paint application and recycling, etc.) will include the use of a variety of hazardous materials, the construction contractor is obligated to store and handle these materials (and associated wastes) in compliance with all Federal, State, and local regulations, as well as in adherence to Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) worker safety standards, which includes worker training related to onsite personal safety, hazardous materials storage and handling procedures (including container labeling, completion of material safety data sheets, employee training, and emergency response procedures. Additionally, the construction contractor would be responsible for developing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) (see Hydrology and Water Quality, below). Consequently, ***no impact*** would result.

Question C

Implementation of the proposed project would not involve any ground disturbing, earth moving, or dewatering activities. As the proposed project would involve maintenance activities focused on the existing bridge structure, ***no impact*** is associated with the potential to expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater through implementation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

Findings

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
6. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project: A) Substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the project?		X	
B) Substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood?			X

Environmental Setting

The proposed project site is located within and adjacent to the American River Parkway. The American River is a major waterway within the region and its flow is influenced by several factors including upstream dams, spring snow melt, and upstream tributaries. Local water quality conditions of the American River are affected by storm water runoff, water diversion, and surrounding land uses.

Standards of Significance

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

- Substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by project-related maintenance activities or

- Substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

The Master EIR Chapter 6.7, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” of the Master EIR evaluates the potential effects of development that could occur under the 2030 General Plan related to potential water quality degradation due to construction activities (Impacts 6.7-1 and 6.7-2) and exposure of people to flood risks (Impacts 6.7-3 and 6.7-4). Policies included in the 2030 General Plan were identified to reduced impacts related to hydrology and water quality to a less-than-significant level.

Policies ER 1.1.3 through ER 1.1.8 requires measures to reduce post-construction increases in runoff rates, maintains agreements for selected on-site stormwater quality facilities through the development permit process, reduces use of chemicals applied for landscape use, provides recycling programs and facilities to prevent unauthorized dumping, and provides watershed education to City staff.

The project shall comply with the General Plan policies outlined above.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

The proposed project would occur primarily within the American River Parkway. However, restoration/maintenance-related activities would not result in large-scale ground disturbing or earth moving activities. Additionally, no in-water maintenance activities are proposed that would directly affect water quality or aquatic life. While a variety of project design measures (including, use of a wash water containment system; limiting the size and location of project staging areas away from the river channel; and the use of specialized equipment, including paint blaster/recycling machine, dust collector, and air compressors, that will prevent the release of hazardous materials into the river below) and compliance with federal, state, and local regulations regarding the storage, handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials will significantly minimize these impacts, inadvertent spills of oil or fuels from maintenance equipment could be a source of contamination to the river parkway. However, with implementation of **Mitigation Measure HWQ-1**, the proposed project would ensure that no project-related water quality impacts would occur. Therefore, the impact would be ***less-than-significant*** with incorporation of mitigation.

Question B

Implementation of the proposed project would occur within the American River Parkway, which is also designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as a flood zone. However, the proposed bridge maintenance project will not affect the structural integrity of the surrounding levee nor will it result in additional development or exposure of people to additional flood risk resulting in injury or property damage. Consequently, **no impact** would result.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 Implement Water Quality Best Management Practices. The project contractor would be required to obtain a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Central Valley Region. As part of the permit, the contractor would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP into their construction plans, prior to initiating construction activities, identifying BMPs to be used to avoid or minimize any adverse effects before, during, and after construction to surface waters. The following BMPs will be incorporated into the project as part of the construction specifications:

- Implement appropriate measures to prevent debris, soil, rock, or other material from entering the water. Use a water truck or other appropriate measures to control dust on applicable access roads, construction areas, and stockpiles.
- Properly dispose of oil or other liquids.
- Fuel and maintain vehicles in a specified area that is designed to capture spills. This area cannot be near any ditch, stream, or other body of water or feature that may convey water to a nearby body of water.
- Fuels and hazardous materials would not be stored on site.
- Inspect and maintain vehicles and equipment to prevent the dripping of oil or other fluids.
- Schedule construction to avoid the rainy season as much as possible. Ground disturbance activities are expected to begin in the spring/summer of 2014. If rains are forecasted during construction, additional erosion and sedimentation control measures would be implemented.

- Maintain sediment and erosion control measures during construction. Inspect the control measures before, during, and after a rain event.
- Train construction workers in storm water pollution prevention practices.
- Revegetate disturbed areas in a timely manner to control erosion.

Findings

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to Hydrology and Water Quality can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
7. LIGHT AND GLARE Would the proposal: A) Create a source of glare that would cause a public hazard or annoyance?			X
B) Create a new source of light that would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses?			X

Environmental Setting

The project site and area surrounding the Guy West Bridge possesses high visual sensitivity due to its open space character (experiencing a high degree of visual quality) and the areas use by a large number of sensitive viewers. Surrounding areas include residential development, businesses, levees, the American River Parkway Trail, American River access points and parking lots, bridges, and Sacramento State University. While the surrounding land uses include a variety of light and glare sources (glass windows, outdoor lighting, etc.) typical of a developed environment, the American River Parkway is relative free of similar light and glare sources.

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

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

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

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

Standards of Significance

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

- Create glare in such a way as to cause public hazard or annoyance for a sustained period of time or
- Create a new source of light that would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A and B

The Guy West Bridge currently includes a lighting system integrated into the handrail. The proposed bridge maintenance project would not enhance the existing lighting system or add additional sources of light or glare as part of bridge maintenance/restoration activities. Painting of the existing

structure would use similar materials and color schemes (International Orange) as those currently associated with the bridge structure. Under the proposed project, restoration/maintenance activities would be limited to daylight hours, resulting in no temporary light impacts. Guy West Bridge will remain consistent with the existing lighting of surrounding development and would not adversely affect day or nighttime views. *No impacts* to light and glare would result under the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Light and Glare.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
8. NOISE Would the project: A) Result in exterior noise levels in the project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the project's noise level increases?			X
B) Result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA L_{dn} or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project?			X
C) Result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance?			X
D) Permit existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction?			X
E) Permit adjacent residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations?			X
F) Permit historic buildings and archaeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inches per second due to project construction and highway traffic?			X

Environmental Setting

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that evokes a subjective reaction to the physical characteristics of a physical phenomenon. Ambient noise in the project area is generated primarily by traffic along adjacent surface streets and by land uses adjacent to the project site (i.e., CSUS, businesses, and residential land uses). A limited amount of noise is generated by a variety of recreational uses along the American River and the American River Parkway. Existing noise levels in the project area are in the range of 60 to 70 decibels (dB) day-night sound level (Ldn), with ambient noise generated by surrounding land uses and traffic on adjacent streets (i.e., J Street and University Avenue) (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2013).

The City of Sacramento has established policies and regulations concerning the generation and control of noise that could adversely affect their citizens and noise-sensitive land uses. The Noise Element of the City's General Plan contains planning guidelines relating to noise. The Sacramento Municipal Code, Title 8 (Health and Safety) establishes the Noise Ordinance for the City.

Although bridge maintenance equipment may cause a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels near the project site and construction staging areas, all project-related noise increases are considered to be temporary and short-term in nature. Project-related noise would fluctuate, depending on maintenance/restoration activity, equipment type, and duration of use, distance

between noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of barriers between noise source and receptor. The nearest residences to the project site are located approximately 120 feet from the project site and traffic access routes (see Figures 3 and 6) on the eastern side of the project site. A variety of commercial (mostly office-related) uses are also located adjacent to the project site. Trees, shrubbery, and the levee would provide for some attenuation of the noise.

On the western side, classrooms in Sequoia Hall and Riverside Hall on the Sacramento State University campus would be within approximately 300 and 375 feet of construction activities, respectively. However, as shown in Figure 4 (above), the staging area is proposed for an area within the Parkway near the bridge tower. Classrooms on the Sacramento State University campus would be buffered by a variety of features including trees and the western levee.

Summary of Analysis Under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

The Master EIR evaluated the potential for development under the 2030 General Plan to increase noise levels in the community. New noise sources include vehicular traffic, aircraft, railways, light rail and stationary sources. Traffic increases associated with implementation of the General Plan were modeled, including roadways affected by project traffic, with maps depicting both existing and future forecast noise levels. Stationary source noise impacts were also addressed in the Master EIR, along with vibration-related effects on both people and structures.

The General Plan policies establish exterior (Policy EC 3.1.1) and interior (EC 3.1.3) noise standards. A variety of policies provide standards for the types of development envisioned in the general plan. See Policy EC 3.1.8, which requires new mixed-use, commercial and industrial development to mitigate the effects of noise from operations on adjoining sensitive land use, and Policy 3.1.9, which calls for the City to limit hours of operations for parks and active recreation areas to minimize disturbance to nearby residences. Notwithstanding application of the general plan policies, noise impacts for exterior noise levels (Impact 6.8-1) and interior noise levels (Impact 6.8-2), and vibration impacts (Impact 6.8-4) attributable to implementation of the City's General Plan were found to be significant and unavoidable.

The project shall comply with the General Plan policies outlined above.

Standards of Significance

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

- Exceedance of the City's standards for incremental noise impacts, as provided in General Plan Table EC 2;
- Residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project;
- Construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance;
- Existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction;
- Adjacent residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations; or
- Historic buildings and archaeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inches per second due to project construction and highway traffic.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A Through C

Activities associated with the proposed project would generate temporary restoration-related noise primarily through the use of paint removal/application equipment and daily vehicle trips from construction employees (10 to 20 average daily vehicle trips) and deliveries. Activities (and noise levels) such as pile driving, demolition, or large numbers of daily haul/heavy truck trips would not occur as part of the proposed project. The primary noise sources would result from both on-site restoration activities, especially during site preparation (establish fencing, vegetation trimming) and equipment staging. Noise would be generated by equipment such as air compressors, paint recyclers/applicators, water trucks, cranes, manlifts, and other miscellaneous equipment. The exact type and number of construction equipment will be based on the contractor's judgment and what equipment is reasonably necessary to complete the project, using industry standard means and methods.

Construction noise is a temporary impact. The City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance (City Code Title 8, Chapter 8.68 et seq.) exempts construction-related noise if the construction takes place between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., on Monday through Saturday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday.

While a detailed inventory of maintenance equipment that would be used for the proposed project is not available; this analysis estimates project-related maintenance noise assuming that typical construction equipment would be used during restoration activities. **Table 2** presents a list of noise generation levels for typical equipment types similar to those anticipated for the restoration project. A conservative but reasonable assumption is that some of the pieces of equipment (paint applicators, air compressors, etc.) would operate simultaneously and continuously over at least a 1-hour period. If all of these pieces of equipment were to operate simultaneously, the combined-source noise level would be 86 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. The multi-family residences located near the eastern side of the project site are all roughly 120 feet away from the nearest project site boundary (see Figures 3 and 6, above). The combined noise levels would be 78.4 dBA (assuming 6 dBA attenuation) at 120 feet.

Table 2. Noise Emission Levels from Construction Equipment

Equipment Type (1)	Typical Noise Level (dB) at 50 feet
Air Compressor	78
Crane Mobile, Generator, Water Pump	81
Pneumatic Tools	85
Trucks	74-81
Paint Recycler	83 (dBA) at 120 feet

Source: (1) Paint Recycler, (Reed, personal communication). All other equipment types, Federal Transit Administration, 2006)

Restoration activities for the proposed project, including hours of operation, would comply with the requirements set forth in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance. While the proposed project would not exceed City of Sacramento noise standards, implementation of **Mitigation Measure N-1**, which would require the applicant to implement a series of noise-reducing measures, will further ensure that project site noise levels are maintained at acceptable standards. Because project maintenance activities would comply with the City's Noise Ordinance, and the applicant would be

required to adhere to the measures set forth in **Mitigation Measure N-1**, the impact from maintenance noise would be ***less-than-significant***.

Questions D Through F

Some maintenance activities associated with the proposed project may result in varying degrees of temporary ground vibration, depending on the specific maintenance equipment used and operations involved. While the Federal Transit Administration (FTA, 2006) identifies typical or representative vibration source levels for a variety of construction equipment, the proposed project does not involve the use of heavy equipment such as large bulldozers, pile driving, or drilling. Equipment anticipated for use includes cranes or manlifts, air compressors, haul/delivery trucks and vehicles. The proposed project also involves the use of a variety of specialized paint application/recycling equipment not typically associated with a construction project.

Maintenance activities associated with the project may result in some minor amount of ground vibration. Typical ground-borne vibration for trucks is less than 65 VdB at 50 feet (Federal Transit Administration, 2006:7-5). The closest residences to the construction activities would be just beyond this 50-foot limit; however, most residences would be 120 feet away or greater from the initial staging area/access route. Vibration from these activities would be short term and would end after completion of the maintenance activities.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure N-1 Implement Construction-related Noise Reduction Measures. The project applicant shall implement the following noise reducing measures:

- Maintenance equipment and vehicle noise would be minimized during project construction by muffling and shielding intakes and exhaust on maintenance/construction equipment (per the manufacturer's specifications) and by shrouding or shielding paint application/recycling equipment.

- All equipment, haul trucks, and worker vehicles would be turned off when not in use for more than 10 minutes.

- Residences and businesses would be notified about the type and schedule of maintenance activities at least two weeks prior to mobilization.

Findings

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

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

Environmental Setting

The proposed project is within the jurisdiction of the City of Sacramento which provides a variety of public services to the surrounding area. The City of Sacramento Police Department would provide police protection services to the proposed project site. The project site is approximately 4.9 miles southeast of the Richards Police Facility. Additional law enforcements services are also provided by Sacramento County Park Rangers, who help control traffic along the Jedidiah Smith Memorial Trail to ensure safety during peak usage times. The Sacramento Fire Department would provide fire protection services to the proposed project, with Fire Station 8 located .5 miles northwest of the project site.

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

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

The 2030 General Plan provides that adequate staffing levels for police and fire are important for the long-term health, safety and well-being of the community (Goal PHS 1.1, PHS 2.1). The Master EIR concluded that effects would be less than significant.

Standards of Significance

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

- Result in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, roadway maintenance, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

The proposed bridge maintenance project will not include the construction of new residential land uses or include a project feature (i.e. new utility infrastructure or access route to current undeveloped land) that would generate the need for additional public services (including schools, libraries, or other community facilities). The proposed project would not create any new public roadways or create the need for additional roadway maintenance (see Traffic Management Plan, under Transportation and Circulation, below) Bridge lighting would remain operational throughout the construction period for safety and security. Access for emergency personnel will be maintained within the project site and surrounding American River Parkway (see Traffic Management Plan, under Transportation and Circulation, below). Because the proposed project would not result in the

need for new or additional public services (including police and fire protection services) beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan, ***no impacts*** to public services would result under the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

Findings

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

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

Environmental Setting

The proposed project site is located along the banks of the lower American River within the American River Parkway. The American River Parkway consists of a 5,000 acre regional park along the riparian corridor of the American River stretching from its confluence with the Sacramento River upstream to Folsom Lake. While a number of agencies have jurisdiction over aspects or resources within the parkway, the Sacramento County Department of Regional Parks (County Parks) has primary responsibility over the American River Parkway.

The Jedediah Smith Recreation Trail is the primary trail traversing the entire parkway and provides bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian trail connectivity from Discovery Park to Folsom Lake. The trail also connects with the Folsom Lake Trail, the Sacramento River Trail, Old Sacramento State Historic Park, and provides a number of access points to residential neighborhoods along the parkway and portions of downtown Sacramento. Consequently, the trail serves both recreational users and provides a daily commute route for many users.

The project site is located along small portions of both the northern and southern alignments of the recreation trail. Project-related activities would also affect the Guy West Bridge which serves as a connection point for both northern and southern alignments of the trail. The Guy West Bridge also serves as an important bicycle/pedestrian connector between CSUS and the Campus Commons neighborhood.

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

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

Standards of Significance

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

- Cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities; or

- Create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

The proposed bridge maintenance project will not include the construction of new residential land uses or include a project feature (i.e. new utility infrastructure or access route to current undeveloped land) that would generate the need for additional recreational facilities or result in the accelerated physical deterioration of existing area parks. Consequently, ***no impacts*** to recreation facilities or parks (associated with increased demand for facilities or accelerated physical deterioration) would result under the proposed project.

While one of the primary objectives of the proposed project is to minimize access and circulation impacts to the CSUS Campus and users of the Jedediah Smith Recreation Trail, project-related maintenance activities and vehicle traffic may result in short-term pedestrian and bicycle circulation conflicts near the project sites. The reader is directed to the "Transportation and Circulation" section (below) for additional details regarding these potential impacts and for a description of mitigation necessary to ensure these impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

Findings

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

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

Environmental Setting

Roadways accessing the project site consist primarily of minor residential streets maintained by the City of Sacramento and Sacramento County. The primary access routes to the project site include University Avenue to the eastern side of the project site and Jed Smith Drive (through CSUS) to the western side of the project site. Larger arterial roadways leading to these access routes include Howe Avenue, Fair Oaks Boulevard, and Folsom Boulevard. As previously described above under the "Recreation" section, a number of paved and unpaved multiuse trails provide circulation routes through the American River Parkway and access points to surrounding business and residential areas surrounding the parkway.

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

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

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

Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to transportation or circulation issues are considered significant if the proposed project would do either of the following:

Roadway Segments

A) the traffic generated by a project degrades peak period Level of Service (LOS) from A,B,C or D (without the project) to E or F (with project) or

B) the LOS (without project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C ratio) by 0.02 or more.

Intersections

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

Freeway Facilities

Caltrans considers the following to be significant impacts.

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

Transit

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

Bicycle Facilities

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

Pedestrian Circulation

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

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A, B, C, and D

As previously described above in Section II (Project Description) and Section III (Land Use and Population and Housing), the proposed project does not involve the construction of residential land uses that would generate additional vehicle trips in the city or region. Temporary construction workers (estimated at 10 to 20 workers) associated with the proposed project are assumed to come from the existing labor pool of residents in Sacramento and would not generate a large number of vehicle trips (10 to 20 average daily trips) that would degrade peak hour roadway/intersection level of service or increase the roadway Volume to Capacity Ratio under current City standards. Additionally, once the bridge maintenance activities are complete, project-related vehicle traffic would cease. The proposed bridge maintenance project is located some distance from the nearest Sacramento Regional Transit stop (CSUS main campus) and would not directly or indirectly affect transit operations.

Project-related traffic would include a small number of equipment/material deliveries (by heavy trucks) to the project sites that may result in minor and temporary roadway access conflicts along University Avenue and Jed Smith Drive, in particular near the project site access points (see Figures 3 and 4). While these effects are anticipated to be minor, implementation of **Mitigation Measure TC-1** would ensure that these roadway/access conflicts would be further reduced through the implementation of traffic control measures as outlined in a traffic control plan. Therefore, the impact would be ***less-than-significant***.

Questions E and F

One of the primary objectives of the proposed project is to minimize access and circulation impacts to the CSUS Campus and for users of the Jedediah Smith Recreation Trail. As an example, the proposed project will include the use of signs, security fencing, and traffic controls (see Mitigation Measure TC-1, below) to advise recreation users/bicycle commuters on possible detour routes near the bridge site (see Figures 3 and 4). Additionally, the proposed project will be accomplished during a single season and will be divided up into two distinct stages to minimize impacts to participants of the Eppies Great Race (occurring in mid to late July).

Informational and detour signage would be posted a minimum of two weeks prior to project commencement. To ensure public safety, warning and restricted access signs would be posted before and during maintenance activities. Public outreach would be conducted prior to construction through mailings, a public workshop, and Internet sites (including the City's website). Coordination with local bicycle groups, residents, businesses, and other interested groups would keep the public informed of the upcoming construction.

Work performed on the bridge structure will require a narrowing of the bridge width available for bicyclists and pedestrians during distinct phases of the project. As such, cyclists may be required to dismount and walk their bike when utilizing the reduced access path. Additionally, during the establishment of tower scaffolding above the bridge deck and other operations, it will be necessary to shut down the bridge entirely to bicycle and pedestrian traffic in order to protect public safety. During these times, bicycle and pedestrian traffic will be temporarily detoured to the H Street Bridge, located downstream along the American River. Proper public notice including signage will be provided in advance to these required detours. With the implementation of **Mitigation Measure TC-1** and the public outreach planned, impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be ***less-than-significant***.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure TC-1 Implement Traffic Control Plan. The project contractor would be required to develop a Traffic Control Plan, which would be reviewed and approved by the City of Sacramento prior to construction. This plan would include the following measures:

- Do not permit construction vehicles to block any roadways or private driveways.
- Provide access for emergency vehicles at all times.
- Select travel routes to avoid schools, parks, and high pedestrian use areas when possible. Crossing guards provided by the contractor would be used when truck trips coincide with schools hours and when travel routes cross student travel path.
- Obey all speed limits, traffic laws, and transportation regulations during construction. If speed limits are not posted, construction vehicles would not exceed 15 miles per hour on unpaved levee roads.
- Use signs and flagmen, as needed, to alert motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians to avoid conflict with construction vehicles or equipment.
- Construction employee parking would be restricted to the designated staging areas.
- No road closures are anticipated; however, in the event that road closures are necessary, local agencies and affected organizations would be notified prior to construction.
- Closure of levee roads, construction sites, and public access areas for construction use would be clearly fenced and delineated with appropriate closure signage.
- Require cyclists to dismount and walk bikes when bike/pedestrian path is narrowed to eight feet.

Findings

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to transportation and circulation can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

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

Environmental Setting

Service systems and utilities located in or near the project site include potable water supply, electricity, natural gas supply, storm water discharge, and sanitary sewage. These utility services are implemented by local utility districts including the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, the California Department of Transportation, the California State University of Sacramento, Cable Vision, Comcast, the Pacific Bell Telephone Company, the Sacramento Metropolitan Utility District, Pacific Gas & Electric, and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District.

Summary of Analysis under the 2030 General Plan Master EIR

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

The Master EIR evaluated the impacts of increased demand for water that would occur with development under the 2030 General Plan. Policies in the general plan would reduce the impact generally to a less-than-significant level (see Impact 6.11-1) but the need for new water supply facilities results in a significant and unavoidable effect (Impact 6.11-2). The potential need for expansion of wastewater treatment facilities was identified as having a significant and unavoidable effect (Impacts 6.11-4, 6.11-5Impacts on solid waste facilities were less than significant (Impacts 6.11-7, 6.11-8). Implementation of energy efficient standards as set forth in Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations for residential and non-residential buildings, would reduce effects for energy to a less-than-significant level.

Standards of Significance

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

- Result in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the project's demand in addition to existing commitments or

- Require or result in either the construction of new utilities or the expansion of existing utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A and B

As described above under the project description (see Section II, above), the two broken utility conduits running from abutment to abutment along the bridge will be restored as part of the proposed project. While relocation of utilities is not anticipated for this project, the limits of the project may contain various easements and underground utilities. On the eastside, the temporary ramp will be built over a SMUD easement and electrical line. Portions of the work on the eastside will also be performed over an easement for the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District which contains a sanitary sewer. On the western project site, a portion of the project area will occur over a series of drainage culverts serving the CSUS campus. Work on the bridge will include restoration of a utility conduit carrying SMUD electrical lines. Utility coordination will be performed with all utility owners.

Overall, the proposed bridge maintenance project will not include the construction of new residential land uses or include a project feature (i.e. new access route to current undeveloped land) that would generate the need for additional utility services (including water supply, wastewater, or drainage). Because the proposed project would not result in the need for new or additional utility services beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan, ***no impacts*** to public services would result under the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to utilities and service systems.

Issues:	Effect remains significant with all identified mitigation	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
13. 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 history or prehistory?		X	
B.) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X
C.) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

As discussed above, the project would not 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, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure that the project would not impact rare or endangered wildlife species. The proposed project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Question B and C

When project impacts are considered along with or in combination with impacts from other projects, the project related impacts are less than significant. The proposed project would not add substantially to any cumulative effects. Project related impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. The project does not have environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings,

SECTION IV - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

	Agriculture		Land Use and Planning
X	Air Quality		Light and Glare
X	Biological Resources	X	Noise
	Cultural Resources		Public Services
	Energy and Mineral Resources		Recreation
	Geology and Soils	X	Transportation/Circulation
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Utilities and Service Systems
	Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Population and Housing
X	Hydrology and Water Quality		Mandatory Findings of Significance

SECTION V - DETERMINATION

On the basis of the initial study:

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

Scott Johnson
Signature

Oct. 9, 2013
Date

Scott Johnson
Printed Name

References Cited

Boles, G. L., S. M. Turek, C. C. Maxwell, and D. M. McGill. 1988. Water Temperature Effects on Chinook Salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) With Emphasis on the Sacramento River: A Literature Review. California Department of Water Resources.

California Air Resources Board. 2010. Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-fueled Engines and Vehicles. http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/documents/rrpFinal.pdf.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2000. Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in the California's Central Valley. Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2013a. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) Rarefind 4 computer program. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Biogeographic Data Branch. Sacramento, CA. Data dated March 5, 2013.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2013b. Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants List. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Biogeographic Data Branch, Sacramento, CA. Data dated July 2013.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2013c. Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Animals List. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Biogeographic Data Branch, Sacramento, CA. Data dated January 2013.

CALFED. 2001. CALFED's Comprehensive Monitoring, Assessment, and Research Program for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Central Valley Rivers. Online publication: http://calfed.ca.gov/programs/cmarp/a7a9.html

California Native Plant Society. 2013. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition, version 7-13). California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, CA. Accessed March 15, 2013. Available at: www.rareplants.cnps.org

Calflora. 2013. The Calflora Database [web application]. Berkeley, California. Available: http://www.calflora.org/ (Accessed: August-September, 2013).

Federal Transit Administration. 2006 (May). Office of Planning and Environment. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. FTA-VA-90-1003-06.

Hanson, C.H. 2002. Preliminary Assessment of Potential Fishery and Aquatic Resource Issues Associated with a Proposed Surface Water Diversion from the Sacramento River to Provide Water Suppliers to the City of Davis and University of California, Davis. Prepared for Environmental Science Associates by Hanson Environmental. May 2002.

Healey, M. C. 1998. Life history of chinook salmon. Pages 313-393 in C. Groot and L. Margolis (eds.), Pacific salmon life histories. UBC Press. Vancouver, B.C. Copyright 1991, reprinted 1998.

Mayer, Kenneth E., and W.F. Laudenslayer, Jr. 1988. A Guide to Wildlife Habitats of California. State of California Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game. Sacramento, CA. Accessed online August-September, 2013:

http://www.dfg.ca.gov/whdab/html/wildlife_habitats.html.

Miles, S,R. and C.B. Goudey. 1997. Ecological Subregions of California: Section and Subsection Descriptions. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region Publication R5-EM-TP-005. San Francisco, CA.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2003 (August). Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines. Available: at http://oehha.ca.gov/air/hot_spots/pdf/HRAguidefinal.pdf. Accessed March 21, 2012.

Quincy Engineering, Inc. 2011. Guy West Bridge Condition Assessment Report. Prepared for the City of Sacramento.

Reed, Doug. 2013. Personal communication (email dated October 4, 2013) with Doug Reed at ARS Recycling.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, 2011. Revision - Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan. http://www.airquality.org/plans/federal/ozone/8hr1997/2011SIPrev/index.shtml

United States Army Corps of Engineers. 2013. American River Common Features, WRDA 96 Remaining Sites, Sites L7, L10, R3A, and R7. Environmental Assessment/Initial Study. Sacramento CA.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2007. Area Designations for 1997 Fine Particle (PM2.5) Standards. http://www.epa.gov/pmdesignations/1997standards/final/statemaps/California.htm.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999. Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. Sacramento, CA. July 9, 1999.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2013a. Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that Occur in or may be Affected by Projects in the 'Sacramento East' USGS 7.5-minute Quad. Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Service, Endangered Species Division. Accessed online March 15, 2013 at: http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/spp_list.htm

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2013b. FWS Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species online mapper program. Accessed August-September, 2013. Available at: http://criticalhabitat.fws.gov/crithab/

University of California, Berkeley. 2005. Essig Museum of Entomology, California's Endangered Insects – Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. Available at: http://essig.berkeley.edu/endins/desmocer.htm

Yoshiyama, R, F. Fisher, and P. Moyle, 1998. Historical Abundance and Decline of Chinook Salmon in the Central Valley. North American Journal of Fisheries Management. Vol. 18.

Zeiner, D.C., W.F. Laudenslayer, and K.E. Mayer. 1988-1990. California's Wildlife. Vols I, II, and III. California Statewide Wildlife Habitat Relationships System. California Department of Fish and Game. Sacramento, California.

Zhu, Y., W. C. Hinds, S. Kim, and S. Shen. 2002. Study of Ultrafine Particles Near a Major Highway with Heavy-duty Diesel Traffic. Atmospheric Environment. 36:4323–4335.

APPENDIX A – COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES

Follows

City of SACRAMENTO
Community Development

APPENDIX A:

Guy West Bridge Restoration Project (K15105000) (SCH#: 2013102021)
Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Comment Letters & Responses

This appendix includes the comment letters received during the agency/public review period for the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (from October 14, 2013 to November 13, 2013). A summary of the comment letters received is provided below in **Table 1** and the responses in **Table 2,** following the comment letters.

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS

Letter #	Letter Type	Commenter (Letter Date)
#1	Agency	Central Valley Flood Protection Board (November 6, 2013)
#2	Agency	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (November 8, 2013)
#3	Agency	California State Lands Commission (November 12, 2013)
#4	Agency	County of Sacramento (November 13, 2013)
#5	Organization	Breathe California of Sacramento-Emigrant Trails (November 12, 2013)
#6	Organization	Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (November 13, 2013)
#7	Organization	Walk Sacramento (November 13, 2013)
#8	Individual	Barbara Bravos (October 15, 2013)

CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION BOARD
3310 El Camino Ave., Rm. 151
SACRAMENTO, CA 95821
(916) 574-0609 FAX: (916) 574-0682
PERMITS: (916) 574-2380 FAX: (916) 574-0682

November 6, 2013

Mr. Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, California 95811

Subject: The Guy West Bridge Restoration Project
SCH Number: 2013102021
Document Type: Negative Declaration

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Staff of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) has reviewed the subject document and provides the following comments:

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

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

- The placement, construction, reconstruction, removal, or abandonment of any landscaping, culvert, bridge, conduit, fence, projection, fill, embankment, building, structure, obstruction, encroachment, excavation, the planting, or removal of vegetation, and any repair or maintenance that involves cutting into the levee (CCR Section 6);

- Existing structures that predate permitting, or where it is necessary to establish the conditions normally imposed by permitting. The circumstances include those where responsibility for the encroachment has not been clearly established or ownership and use have been revised (CCR Section 6);

- Vegetation plantings will require the submission of detailed design drawings; identification of vegetation type; plant and tree names (i.e. common name and scientific name); total number of each type of plant and tree; planting spacing and irrigation method that will be utilized within the project area; a complete vegetative management plan for maintenance to prevent the interference with flood control, levee maintenance, inspection, and flood fight procedures (CCR Section 131).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

James Herota
Senior Environmental Scientist
Projects and Environmental Branch

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

Scott Johnson

From: Kennedy, Amy@Wildlife <Amy.Kennedy@wildlife.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 1:16 PM
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Guy West Bridge ISMND

Hi Scott;

I just finished reading through the Guy West Bridge ISMND SCH # 200131102021. The only small comment I have is, that in the section regarding waters of the U.S there is no subsequent mention of F & G Code 1600, or that these are also state jurisdictional waters (not just federal).

Fish and Game Code (FGC) §1602 requires any entity (defined as any person, State or local governmental agency, or public utility) to notify the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) before beginning any activity that will do one or more of the following:

1) substantially obstruct or divert the natural flow of any river, stream, or lake;

2) substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake;

3) deposit or dispose of debris, waste, or other material containing crumbled, flaked, or ground pavement where it may pass into any river, stream, or lake.

FGC §1602 applies to any river, lake, or stream, including those that are perennial, ephemeral, or intermittent.

Let me know if you have any questions, and thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Amy Kennedy
California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
1701 Nimbus Road
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
916-358-2842

CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825-8202

Our 75th Year

1938 - 2013

JENNIFER LUCCHESI, *Executive Officer*
(916) 574-1800 *Fax* **(916) 574-1810**
California Relay Service TDD Phone **1-800-735-2929**
from Voice Phone **1-800-735-2922**

Contact Phone: **(916) 574-1900**
Contact Fax: **(916) 574-1885**

November 12, 2013

File Ref: SCH # 2013102021

Scott Johnson, Associate Planner
City of Sacramento, Community Development Department
Environmental Planning Services
300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Subject: Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Guy West Bridge Restoration Project, Sacramento County

Dear Mr. Johnson:

The California State Lands Commission (CSLC) staff has reviewed the subject MND for the Guy West Bridge Restoration Project (Project), which is being prepared by the City of Sacramento (City). The City, as a public agency proposing to carry out a project, is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.). The CSLC is a trustee agency because of its trust responsibility for projects that could directly or indirectly affect sovereign lands, their accompanying Public Trust resources or uses, and the public easement in navigable waters.

CSLC Jurisdiction and Public Trust Lands

The CSLC has jurisdiction and management authority over all ungranted tidelands, submerged lands, and the beds of navigable lakes and waterways. The CSLC also has certain residual and review authority for tidelands and submerged lands legislatively granted in trust to local jurisdictions (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 6301, 6306). All tidelands and submerged lands, granted or ungranted, as well as navigable lakes and waterways, are subject to the protections of the Common Law Public Trust.

As general background, the State of California acquired sovereign ownership of all tidelands and submerged lands and beds of navigable lakes and waterways upon its admission to the United States in 1850. The State holds these lands for the benefit of all people of the State for statewide Public Trust purposes, which include but are not limited to waterborne commerce, navigation, fisheries, water-related recreation, habitat preservation, and open space. On navigable non-tidal waterways, including lakes, the State holds fee ownership of the bed of the waterway landward to the ordinary low

water mark and a Public Trust easement landward to the ordinary high water mark, except where the boundary has been fixed by agreement or a court. Such boundaries may not be readily apparent from present day site inspections.

The bed of the American River at the project site is State-owned sovereign land under the jurisdiction of the CSLC. The City has a Right-of-Way Easement, No. PRC 3402, for the use and maintenance of a pedestrian foot-bridge known as the Guy West Bridge. The easement expires on November 2, 2014. The proposed Project falls within the "use and maintenance" of the current easement terms. Although the Project, therefore, will not require an approval from the CSLC, the CSLC is providing the comments below as a trustee agency.

Project Description

The City proposes to complete the Guy West Bridge Restoration Work Plan to meet its objectives and needs as follows:

- Implement a restoration work plan that ensures the continued safe performance of the Guy West Suspension Bridge;
- Complete the restoration work in a manner that minimizes environmental impacts to the American River Parkway;
- Implement the restoration activities in a way that maintains public access, circulation, and connectivity to the surrounding area; and
- Incorporate restoration activities that maintain the unique aesthetic and design features of the existing suspension bridge.

From the Project Description, CSLC staff understands that the Project would include the following components:

- Replace existing paint system, which contains lead primer and other heavy metals, and is currently experiencing widespread failure;
- Restore suspender cables and connections, including replacing corroded cotter pins and restoring the galvanized paint coating on the suspension cables;
- Repair suspended span, including repair of the damage on a lower strut of the bridge with drilled bolts and cover plates to restore the section to its original area and stiffness;
- Repair deck, including repair of minor concrete spalls and failed joint seals; and
- Complete other replacements and repairs, including replacement of handrail hardware, a loose utility conduit, and truss bearing pads.

Environmental Review

CSLC staff requests that the City consider the following comments on the Project MND.

Hydrology and Water Quality

1. Contingency Measures: The MND states that specialized construction equipment will be used to remove the existing lead-based paint system. This equipment includes a paint blaster/recycler and a water containment system. Using this specialized

equipment will prevent paint flakes, and associated heavy metals, from entering the American River. However, the MND does not assess or plan for any failure of these specialized paint-removal systems and potential release of paint into the American River, therefore, the impacts of this project may not be fully disclosed. The MND should assess the potential impacts of an accidental release of paint, from the paint blaster/recycler or contaminated water from the water containment system. The analysis should identify a threshold of significance for the release of the heavy metals in the paint and contaminated water, calculate the worst-case-scenario of paint/contaminated water release, and determine if impacts will be significant. If impacts are found to be significant, mitigation measures should be developed such as having spill-containment and cleanup equipment available on-site, providing appropriate worker training, and preparing and implementing a spill contingency plan, if necessary.

Recreation

2. Water-Based Recreation: The MND should include whether any limitations to river-based recreation are necessary during the Project, and if so, whether restrictions on recreational activity would give rise to a potentially significant impact. The public uses the American River for boating, fishing, and other recreational activities. If significant impacts are determined, mitigation could include posting signs announcing the project and any restrictions on boating or fishing in the area.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the MND for the Project. As a trustee agency, we request that you consider our comments prior to adoption of the MND.

Please send copies of future Project-related documents, including electronic copies of the Final MND, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), and Notice of Determination (NOD), when they become available, and refer questions concerning environmental review to Holly Wyer, Environmental Scientist, at (916) 574-2399 or via e-mail at Holly.Wyer@slc.ca.gov. For questions concerning CSLC leasing jurisdiction, please contact Mary Hays, Public Land Manager, at (916) 574-1812, or via email at Mary.Hays@slc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Cy R. Oggins, Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
and Management

cc: Office of Planning and Research
Mary Hays, LMD, CSLC
Holly Wyer, DEPM, CSLC
Eric Milstein, Legal, CSLC

Regional Parks Department
Jeffrey R. Leatherman, Director

County of Sacramento

Divisions
Administration
Golf
Leisure Services
Maintenance
Rangers
Therapeutic Recreation Services

Scott Johnson
Community Development Department
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
SRJohnson@cityofsacramento.org

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Guy West Bridge Restoration Project.

We are pleased to see that the environmental document acknowledges Eppie's Great Race and that the document describes implementing the project in two stages to minimize impacts to Eppie's Great Race. The document states that phasing will strategized to allow adequate time for removal of project equipment and for the restoration of project staging areas located along the eastern side of the bridge.

The Eastern Staging Layout shows a fenced area to protect an "environmentally sensitive area" just upstream of the bridge. This proposed fenced area is also an important staging area for the Eppie's Great Race, and is mowed by Regional Parks staff several weeks in advance of the event. If project fencing is used around this area, it will need to be removed to allow a mid-June pre-race mowing, for other race preparations, and for use during Eppie's Great Race.

Thanks you for the opportunity to comment on this document, and we look forward to continuing to work with the City on coordinating needs of Regional Parks with the Guy West Bridge Restoration Project.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey R. Leatherman
Director

4040 Bradshaw Road • Sacramento, California 95827 • phone (916) 875-6961 • fax (916) 875-6632 • www.saccounty.net

909 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 444-5900
Fax: (916) 444-6661
staff@sacbreathe.org

www.sacbreathe.org
www.SceneSmoking.org
www.sacSTAND.org

Breathe California of Sacramento-Emigrant Trails is dedicated to healthy air and preventing lung and other air-pollution related diseases by partnering with youth, advocating public policy, supporting air pollution research, and educating the public.

BREATHE® CALIFORNIA
of Sacramento-Emigrant Trails
The Clean Air and Healthy Lungs People
Since 1917

November 12, 2013

Breathe California of Sacramento-Emigrant Trails
909 12th Street Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mr. Scott Johnson
Community Development Department
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: SUPPORT – Notice of Availability/Intent to Adopt – Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Guy West Bridge Restoration Project

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I am writing on behalf of Breathe California of Sacramento-Emigrant Trails in support of the Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Guy West Bridge Restoration project. The Guy West suspension bridge is one of the few replicas of the Golden Gate Bridge, and it provides an important primary access route and connection point for pedestrians, bicyclists and recreation users along American River Parkway.

Having reviewed the Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, the proposed project demonstrates restoration and maintenance activities to ensure the continued safe performance of the Guy West Bridge. The proposed project minimizes environmental impacts, maintains pedestrian/recreation access, and maintains the bridge's unique aesthetic and design features. Because the proposed project is short-term, temporary air quality emissions can be mitigated to a less than significant level. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** would fulfill SMAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures. This is necessary to ensure that the proposed project would generate less than significant environmental health impacts with regard to ozone, particulate matter and toxic air contaminants.

As public health advocates we believe the proposed project with identified mitigation measures will not have a significant effect on the environment, and will continue to foster pedestrian and bicyclist connectivity, benefiting community health. We encourage adoption of the Guy West Bridge Restoration Project, and look forward to its success.

Sincerely,

Kori Titus

Kori Titus
CEO

SACRAMENTO AREA
BICYCLE ADVOCATES

909 12th St, Ste. 116
Sacramento, CA 95814

sacbike.org
saba@sacbike.org
916 444-6600

November 13, 2013

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
Community Development Dept.
Environmental Planning Services
300 Richards Blvd., 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95835
SRJohnson@cityofsacramento.org

Subject: Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Guy West Bridge Restoration Project.

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I'm writing on behalf of the Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates in response to the Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Guy West Bridge Restoration Project.

SABA is dedicated to making the Sacramento region more livable by ensuring that residents can choose bicycling as a comfortable, convenient method of everyday travel. Our work includes reviewing proposals for public works projects to ensure that they do not impede bicycle circulation or connectivity or create conditions that endanger people riding bikes.

The initial study's "Project Purpose and Objectives" includes this objective:

> "Implement restoration/maintenance activities in a manner that maintains pedestrian/recreation access, circulation, and connectivity to the surrounding Campus Commons area, the Sacramento State University Campus, and for users of the Jedediah Smith Recreation Trail as much as possible...."

We believe the project will fail to meet this objective, as the study fails to adequately address significant impacts on bicycle travel and bicycle paths and adequately provide for access by bicycle, as required by the Master EIR for the 2030 General Plan.

The study indicates that the proposed mitigation for the impacts of periodic closures of the Guy West Bridge – detouring bike and pedestrian traffic onto the nearby H Street Bridge for up to two days at a time – can be mitigated to less than significant. However, the study fails to adequately address the impacts in these ways:

1. The study fails to account for the high volume of bike traffic currently carried by the Guy West Bridge and the importance of the bridge as a primary connector for bike traffic between the American River Parkway and the neighborhoods south of the American River.

On Wednesday, April 4, 2012, civil engineering students at Sacramento State University counted 597 bike trips entering campus from across the Guy West Bridge between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., which suggests that the bridge carries at least 1,200 bike trips in both directions on most weekdays when classes are in session. This traffic also includes commute and recreational bike trips unrelated to classes or campus operations.

These results correlate with SABA's own bike traffic counts conducted quarterly at the Guy West Bridge as part of the National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project. On a weekday afternoon between 4 and 6 p.m. in the first full week of September 2011, for example, we counted 337 bike trips crossing the bridge in both directions. Our quarterly

citywide counts consistently indicate that bike traffic at the Guy West Bridge is about 50% higher than bike traffic at any of the 20+ other count locations, including three other bridges crossing the Sacramento and American rivers.

2. The study fails to account for the size of the H Street Bridge sidewalk as an alternate route to the Guy West Bridge.

The H Street Bridge has a single sidewalk on the south side that is 5 feet wide, whereas the Guy West Bridge is 13 feet wide. Due to the high volume and speed of vehicle traffic on the H Street Bridge and the approaches at both ends, virtually all bike traffic crossing the bridge in both directions uses this one sidewalk. Delays are common as the narrow width forces traffic to move slowly in single file; it is generally not possible for bikes to pass other bikes or pedestrians from behind or in the opposite direction. The current width of the sidewalk falls well below the City of Sacramento's standard of 8 feet for paths that carry two-way bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

3. The study fails to account for impacts to bicycle circulation and connectivity due to the detours required for bikes and pedestrians by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers levee project.

The concurrent U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) levee project involves closing the levee approaches to the H Street Bridge on both sides of the river for up to 7 months. Bike and pedestrian traffic will be rerouted from the levee approaches onto the west end of the bridge from the shoulder of eastbound J Street starting at the toe of the levee and onto the east end of the bridge through Campus Commons via University Drive, Campus Commons Drive and the sidewalk on the south side of Fair Oaks Blvd.

When the Guy West Bridge is closed, substantially higher volumes of bike and pedestrian traffic from the bridge will be routed onto the J Street shoulder, which does not have a sidewalk and is not currently used for pedestrian traffic. The USACE project calls for adding a protective barricade of K-rail along eastbound J Street from the toe of the levee to the bridge, although this remedy does nothing to improve accommodation for bikes on the bridge itself. Indeed, the USACE project also calls for placing a slurry pipe on the H Street Bridge sidewalk, which will narrow it from 5 feet to 4 feet throughout the Guy West Bridge restoration project.

Similarly, the USACE project reroutes bike and pedestrian traffic from the east end of the Guy West Bridge through Campus Commons to the sidewalk on the south side of Fair Oaks Blvd. west of Campus Commons Drive. The 5-foot-wide sidewalk narrows to 43 inches at one point, at the east end of the guardrail that extends beyond the east end of the bridge. The width of this entire sidewalk segment falls well below the City of Sacramento's standard of 8 feet for paths that carry two-way bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

Finally, the Campus Commons Drive/Cadillac Drive intersection with Fair Oaks Blvd. is closed to through traffic in both directions. During the Guy West Bridge closures, bike traffic to and from the neighborhood along Cadillac Drive north of Fair Oaks Blvd. will be forced into the crosswalk on the west side of the Cadillac/Fair Oaks intersection (there is no pedestrian crosswalk on the east side of the intersection), leaving northbound bike traffic positioned facing into oncoming southbound vehicle traffic.

Due to the high volume of bike and pedestrian traffic rerouted across the H Street Bridge and the inadequacy of those facilities, we foresee the following impacts from closing the Guy West Bridge:

- Significant delays for bike and pedestrian traffic crossing the river in both directions
- Serious conflicts between bike and pedestrian traffic and between eastbound and westbound traffic attempting to share the single narrow sidewalk
- Serious conflicts between bike and car traffic, should bike-riders attempt to ride in traffic lanes on the bridge in both directions in order to avoid the congested sidewalk.
- Many people will choose to drive rather than bike or walk across the bridge.

Furthermore, there are no alternatives to the H Street Bridge. The Howe Avenue and Watt Avenue bridges and the Sacramento Northern Bikeway bridge are 1-3 miles from the H Street Bridge, too far to be useful for most people who ride across the Guy West Bridge. Additionally, the Howe Avenue Bridge does not have bike lanes or direct access to the adjacent American River Parkway, and its pedestrian paths are very narrow.

For these reasons, we request that the initial study be revised to address high bike traffic volumes on Guy West Bridge and the adequacy of the detour routes across the H Street Bridge and along Fair Oaks Blvd.

We also propose that the initial study address these possible solutions for easing the impacts of closing the Guy West Bridge:

- Expand the capacity of the H Street Bridge and approaches for the duration of the project to accommodate the additional bike traffic during Guy West Bridge closures. For the duration of the Guy West Bridge project, the K-rail to be placed by the USACE could be extended across the H Street bridge and along eastbound Fair Oaks Blvd., ideally to Campus Commons Drive, to create a fully protected path for two-way bike traffic in the roadway and thus reduce congestion and potential bike-pedestrian and bike-car conflicts on the H Street bridge and approaches. This would require temporarily restriping narrower traffic lanes across the bridge, implementing construction zone speed limits across the bridge, and adding signs and signals to advise drivers, among other precautions.

- Reduce the number of bridge closures by consolidating them into a single week or less, to minimize the logistics and impacts of reconfiguring traffic lanes on the H Street Bridge.

- Reduce the duration and frequency of closures to no more than 6 hours at a time and no more than one closure per week, and schedule them to coincide with the periods of lowest bike traffic, i.e., late on weekday nights or early on Sunday mornings.

- Avoid some or all closures by installing protective overhead barriers across the bridge so it can remain open during periods when overhead work is being performed.

We appreciate having this opportunity to comment on the Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration. Please feel welcome to contact me anytime if you have questions or need more information from us.

Sincerely,



Jim Brown
Executive Director
916-444-6600
jim@sacbike.org

CC Ricky Chuck, RChuck@cityofsacramento.org
Max Katt, maxk@quincyeng.com

11/13/2013 VIA EMAIL

Scott Johnson, Associate Planner
City of Sacramento, Community Development Department
Environmental Planning Services
300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Guy West Bridge Restoration Project (K15105000)

Dear Mr. Johnson:

WALKSacramento has reviewed the Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Guy West Bridge Restoration project. WALKSacramento was founded in 1998 as a nonprofit community organization "dedicated to achieving safe, walkable communities — for personal health and recreation, for livable neighborhoods, for traffic safety, and for clean air." We appreciate the opportunity to review the IS/MND and offer the following comments.

1. **The IS/MND did not fully analyze pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation.**

The Guy West Bridge provides a crossing of the American River for pedestrians and bicyclists that is a major access route to Sac State for students, faculty and staff, and is heavily used by bicycle commuters and recreational users of the American River Parkway. The H Street Bridge and the Howe Avenue Bridge, each about a half-mile away, are the closest river crossings for pedestrians.

It is our understanding the restoration and repair work will require temporary full closures of the bridge twice during the project work. The proposed detour would route pedestrians and bicyclists to the five-foot wide sidewalk on the south side of the H Street Bridge.

If the Guy West Bridge was used only by pedestrians, the 1.1-mile detour during the two Guy West Bridge closures would be inconvenient due to the added distance. However, bicyclists currently use the Guy West Bridge in great numbers, with peak usage occurring during typical morning and afternoon commute hours and at mid-day. Adding hundreds of pedestrians and bicyclists during several weekday hours to the narrow sidewalk on the H Street Bridge doesn't seem feasible.

The standard of significance for pedestrian circulation considered by the IS/MND is stated as being impacts that "adversely affect pedestrian travel, pedestrian paths or fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians."

In order to determine the significance of the project impacts to pedestrian, we believe it is necessary to consider the numbers of pedestrian and bicyclists that currently use the Guy West Bridge and the ability of the H Street Bridge sidewalk to accommodate the detoured traffic.

2. The IS/MND did not adequately mitigate for the impacts to pedestrians.

The document contends that with public outreach and implementation of **Mitigation Measure TC-1**, impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be *less-than-significant*. However, the only item in TC-1 that is related to pedestrians is to "Require cyclists to dismount and walk bikes when bike/pedestrian path is narrowed to eight feet." This doesn't address the impacts during the times when the Guy West Bridge is closed to pedestrians and bicyclists. Since the adequacy of the H Street Bridge sidewalk to accommodate the potential volume of bicycle and pedestrian traffic was not considered, it is unreasonable to assume the affected facilities would not be impacted.

3. The IS/MND did not consider the impacts to pedestrians from the US Army Corp of Engineers WRDA 96 R7 and L7 levee work that is scheduled for the same time frame as the Guy West Bridge Restoration project.

The US Army Corps of Engineers work on the levees at both ends of the H Street Bridge will compound the challenges of the Guy West Bridge Restoration project detour. The levee work will have several major impacts. First, the detour route on the east side of the river will need to go through the Campus Commons area, increasing the detour length to 1.6 miles. Second, the USACE will install pipes with a plywood-sheet cover on the H Street Bridge sidewalk, temporarily reducing the sidewalk width to four feet. The IS/MND should be revised to consider and mitigate the increased impacts to pedestrian and bicycle circulation as a result of the USACE levee work.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and recommendations. If you have questions, please contact me by phone at (916) 446-9255.

Sincerely,

Chris Holm
Project Analyst

Scott Johnson

From: Barbara Bravos <bbravos@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:45 PM
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Guy West Bridge

Thank you for the information we received today in the mail regarding the restoration project for the Guy West Bridge. We are happy to know that work will be done, as the bridge is sorely in need of care. We live in Campus Commons and use the bridge frequently to get around. Good luck with the project.

Barbara Bravos
720 Hartnell Place
Sacramento, CA 95825

City of SACRAMENTO Community Development

APPENDIX A:

Guy West Bridge Restoration Project (K15105000) (SCH#: 2013102021)
Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Comment Letters & Responses

TABLE 2. RESPONSES TO COMMENT LETTERS	
Letter	
1	Central Valley Flood Protection Board, November 6, 2013
	Response: The commenter summarizes the Central Valley Flood Protection Board's jurisdictional authority over the designated flood plain in the project. As described in the IS/MND, the proposed project will focus on restoring the existing Guy West Bridge and will not involve activities (e.g., increase fill materials or place additional structures) that affect the capacity of the flood channel in the study area. The Initial Study discusses the project's mitigation measures (see Mitigation Measures BR-1 and BR-2) that minimize vegetation impacts and provide for off-site mitigation opportunities. No addition analysis is required.
2	California Department of Fish and Wildlife, November 8, 2013
	Response: The commenter summarizes the intent of Fish and Game Code (FGC) §1602. The City will comply with the intent and requirements of this section of the Fish and Game Code as appropriate.
3	California State Lands Commission, November 12, 2013
	Response: The commenter summarizes the California State Lands Commission's jurisdictional authority over the resources in the project area and provides comments regarding the potential impacts to hydrologic/water quality and water-based recreation resources. Project measures designed to address water quality impacts are described on pages 45-49 of the IS/MND and include Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 "Implement Water Quality Best Management Practices. Consistent with standard practice, lead paint removal, containment and disposal requirements will be included in the construction specifications and will be responsive to the specific design and site features of the project. Prior to starting construction, the contractor will submit a paint removal plan to the Engineer for acceptance, along with a monitoring plan and an emergency repair, remediation and notification plan in the event of lead paint leakage. No fishing piers or boat access ramps/facilities are located in the project study area and implementation of the proposed bridge restoration project will not affect the ability of water-based recreation activities from continuing to occur within this portion of the American River.
4	County of Sacramento, November 13, 2013
	Response: The commenter provides a letter of support regarding the proposed project. No further comment is necessary.
5	Breathe California of Sacramento-Emigrant Trails, November 12, 2013
	Response: The commenter provides a letter of support regarding the proposed project. No further comment is necessary.
6	Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates, November 13, 2013

APPENDIX A:

Guy West Bridge Restoration Project (K15105000) (SCH#: 2013102021)
Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Comment Letters & Responses

	Response: The comment addresses issues relating to the need to close the bridge during the project work, and the timing of activities by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers work in the project vicinity. The bridge closures are temporary and the document identifies alternative routes that would be available during these closures. Those who use the bridge would, during the closures, have various route and mode choices available to them, and the Initial Study analyzes the impacts to the extent it is reasonable to do so, correctly concluding that the impacts would be less than significant as mitigated. Coordination with the federal agency, university, and outreach to the public will continue throughout the project, and efforts to minimize disruption to paths and times of travel sought by the City and its contractor. The Initial Study has adequately identified and evaluated impacts and no additional analysis is required.
7	Walk Sacramento, November 13, 2013
	Response: The commenter identifies issues similar to those set forth by the Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (Letter 6). See response to that letter, above. The City has acknowledged the importance of the bridge to the university community and the public. Periodic maintenance of the bridge is required for safety reasons and the temporary closure of the bridge for this purpose, requiring temporary adjustments to travel routes and schedules, would not result in significant impacts due to conditions on local streets and bridges. The Initial Study has adequately identified and evaluated impacts and no additional analysis is required.
8	Barbara Bravos, October 15, 2013
	Response: The commenter provides a letter of support regarding the proposed project. No further comment is necessary.