

State Route 128 Roadway Retaining System

On State Route 128 in Napa County, near Rutherford and 1.1 miles west of

Knoxville Road

04-NAP-128-PM 17.94

Project ID:0400021254 (04-2G940)

Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration



Prepared by the
State of California Department of Transportation

October 2013



General Information About This Document

What's in this document?

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has prepared this Initial Study, which examines the potential environmental impacts of alternatives being considered for the proposed project in Napa County, California. The document describes the project, the existing environment that could be affected by the project, potential impacts from the project, and proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.

What should you do?

- Please read this Initial Study. Additional copies of this document as well as the technical studies are available for review at the Caltrans district office at Caltrans District Office, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, CA 94612 and St. Helena Public Library, 1492 Library Lane, St. Helena, CA 94574.

- We welcome your comments. If you have any concerns about the project, please send your written comments to Caltrans by the deadline. Submit comments via U.S. mail to Caltrans at the following address:

Kelly J. Hobbs, Senior Environmental Planner
Sierra Pacific Environmental Analysis Branch
California Department of Transportation
855 M Street, Suite 200
Fresno, CA 93721

Submit comments via email to: kelly_hobbs@dot.ca.gov.

Submit comments by the deadline: November 15, 2013 (circulation is October 15, 2013 to November 15, 2013).

What happens next?

After comments are received from the public and reviewing agencies, Caltrans may

- 1) give environmental approval to the proposed project, 2) do additional environmental studies, or 3) abandon the project. If the project is given environmental approval and funding is appropriated, Caltrans could design and build all or part of the project.

Printing this document: To save paper, this document has been set up for two-sided printing (to print the front and back of a page). Blank pages occur where needed throughout the document to maintain proper layout of the sections.

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in Braille, in large print, on audiocassette, or on computer disk. To obtain a copy in one of these alternate formats, please call or write to Caltrans, Attn: Kelly J. Hobbs, Senior Environmental Planner, Sierra Pacific Environmental Analysis Branch, 855 M Street, Fresno, CA 93721; (559) 445-5286 Voice, or 711.

CEQA Environmental Checklist

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Project Title:	SR 128 Roadway Retaining System
Lead agency name and address:	Caltrans, District Office 4, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, CA 94612
Contact person and telephone number:	Kelly J. Hobbs, 559-445-5286
Project Location:	Napa 128 PM 17.94
General plan description:	The project is located in an unincorporated area of Napa County. The County will seek to work cooperatively with the municipalities, special districts, and Local Agency Formation Commission to define and establish the limits of current and future urban expansion and development. (Napa County General Plan 2009).
Zoning:	Transportation corridor in Napa County
Description of project:	The project proposes to construct a 90 foot long and 27-foot deep Cast in Drilled Hole soldier pile wall. The wall will be constructed outside of the northbound shoulder of State Route 128. Project activities include replacing the corrugated metal pipe culvert that is crossing under the roadway. The drainage structure at the upstream end of the culvert will be removed and replaced with a flared end section. The existing headwall at the bottom of slope will remain in place. A drainage inlet, dike replacement and a guard railing system are proposed along the northbound shoulder. Two existing down drains will be replaced on the slope outside of the northbound shoulder.
Surrounding land uses and setting:	The project is located on State Route 128 in Napa County at Post Mile 17.94, near Rutherford and 1.1 miles west of Knoxville Road and approximately 2 miles southwest of Lake Berryessa. The existing environment consists primarily of oak forest along the downhill slope of the roadway which levels off into grassland at the toe of the slope. The surrounding landscape primarily consists of grazing land. Soda Creek is approximately 600 feet from the roadway. Soda Creek is a perennial creek that flows southeast and connects with Capell Creek.
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):	United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the checklist beginning on page 9 for additional information. Any boxes not checked represent issues that were considered as part of the scoping and environmental analysis for the project, but for which no adverse impacts were identified. Regarding boxes not checked, no further discussion of these issues is in this document.

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

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation,

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect; in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION , including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature: 	Date: 10/14/2013
Printed Name: Kelly J. Hobbs, Senior Environmental Planner	

Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

Pursuant to: Division 13, Public Resources Code

Project Description

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes to construct a 90 foot long and 27 foot deep Cast in Drilled Hole soldier pile wall. The wall will be constructed outside of the northbound shoulder. The project activities include replacing the corrugated metal pipe that is crossing under the roadway. The drainage structure at the upstream end of the culvert will be removed and replaced with a flared end section. The existing headwall at the bottom of slope will remain in place. A drainage inlet, dike and pipe replacement, and a guardrail system are proposed along the northbound shoulder. Two existing down drains will be replaced on the slope outside of the northbound shoulder.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration is included to give notice to interested agencies and the public that it is Caltrans' intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. This does not mean that Caltrans' decision on the project is final. This Mitigated Negative Declaration is subject to change based on comments received by interested agencies and the public.

Caltrans has prepared an Initial Study for this project and, pending public review, expects to determine from this study that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons.

The proposed project would have no effect on: aesthetics; agricultural resources, air quality; cultural resources; geology/soils, hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology/water quality; land use/planning; mineral resources; noise; population/housing; public services; recreation; transportation/traffic; and utilities/service systems.

In addition, the proposed project would have no significantly adverse effect on biological resources because the following mitigation measures would reduce potential effects to insignificance; impacts to the California red-legged frog would be mitigated by purchase of credits from a mitigation bank.

Kelly J. Hobbs

Senior Environmental Planner

District 06

California Department of Transportation

Date _____

Figure 1 Project Vicinity Map



Section 1 Impacts Checklist

CEQA Environmental Checklist
04-NAP-128

17.9

04-2G940

Dist.-Co.-Rte.

P.M/P.M.

E.A.

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where a clarifying discussion is needed, the discussion either follows the applicable section in the checklist or is placed within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA—not NEPA—impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

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

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
 - b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?
- While Caltrans has included this good faith effort in order to provide the public and decision-makers as much information as possible about the project, it is Caltrans determination that in the absence of further regulatory or scientific information related to GHG emissions and CEQA significance, it is too speculative to make a significance determination regarding the project's direct and indirect impact with respect to climate change. Caltrans does remain firmly committed to implementing measures to help reduce the potential effects of the project.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------
- j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?
- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

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

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

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

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
- Fire protection?
 - Police protection?
 - Schools?
 - Parks?
 - Other public facilities?

XV. RECREATION:

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

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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)?

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

Additional Explanations for Questions in the Impacts Checklist

IV. Biological Resources (checklist questions a and f)

Threatened and Endangered Species

Affected Environment

The biological study area consists of the existing Caltrans right-of-way in addition to portion of the adjacent private property. Vegetation in the biological study area contains oak forest along the downhill slope of the roadway which levels off into grassland at the toe of the slope. The biological study area encompasses 1.56 acres.

The Federally and State-listed Species that could be present in the study area include:

California Red-legged Frog (*Rana draytonii*) – Federal Threatened, State Species of Special Concern.

The California red-legged frogs predominantly inhabit permanent water sources such as streams, lakes, marshes, natural and manmade ponds, as well as drainages in valley bottoms and foothills. Protocol surveys were not performed for the California red-legged frog, as presence is presumed due to species' range, habitat suitability, California Natural Diversity Database occurrences nearby, and correspondence with agency and consultant biologists with expertise and experience with California red-legged frog in this area. According to the California Natural Diversity Database the closest occurrence is within approximately 5.5 miles southeast from the project location, in Capell Creek.

Environmental Consequences

The biological study area includes upland habitat for California red-legged frog that would be impacted as a result of the proposed project. The project would permanently affect 0.14 acre of California red-legged frog habitat.

Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Caltrans proposes to avoid and minimize effects to the California red-legged frog by implementing the following measures:

- A United States Fish and Wildlife Service- approved biologist would be on-site during all activities that may result in the take of the California red-legged frog. The biologist qualifications would be presented United States Fish and Wildlife Service for review and written approval prior to ground-breaking at the project site.

- California red-legged frogs that enter the construction zone would need to be relocated no more than 300 feet from their capture location at an appropriate cover site. The biological monitor would inform the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the capture and relocation within one working day.
- No more than twenty working days prior to any ground disturbance, pre-construction California red-legged frog surveys would be conducted by a United States Fish and Wildlife Service- biologist. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service-approved biologist would investigate all potential California red-legged frog cover sites within the action area. This includes full investigation of mammal burrows. Burrow entrances would be collapsed in areas that would be subject to ground disturbance following investigation.
- A United States Fish and Wildlife Service-approved biologist would be onsite to monitor the initial ground disturbance activities. The biologist would perform a California red-legged frog clearance survey immediately prior to the initial ground disturbance. The biological monitor would also investigate areas of disturbed soil for signs of California red-legged frogs within 30 minutes following the initial disturbance of that given area.
- Within and adjacent to California red-legged frog habitat, all investigation equipment or debris left overnight within the action area would be inspected for California red-legged frogs by the United States Fish and Wildlife – approved biologist prior to the beginning of each day’s activities and prior to being moved.
- The Resident Engineer or their designee would be responsible for implementing the conservation measures and Terms and Conditions of the Biological Opinion issued by United States Fish and Wildlife Services and would be the point of contact for the project. The Resident Engineer or their designee would maintain a copy of the Biological Opinion issued by United States Fish and Wildlife Service and would be the point of contact for the project. The Resident Engineer or their designee would maintain a copy of the Biological Opinion onsite whenever construction is taking place. Their name and telephone number would be provided to the Service at least thirty calendar days prior to ground-breaking.

- The Resident Engineer would stop work at the request of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service-approved biologist if activities are identified that may result in the take of a California red-legged frog. Should the biologist or the Resident Engineer exercise this authority, United States Fish and Wildlife Service would be notified by telephone and electronic mail within one working day. The Service's contact would be the Coast Bay/Forest Foothills Division Chief in the Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office at (916) 414-6600.
- A United States Fish and Wildlife Service-approved biologist would conduct environmental education training for all construction employees. The program would include the following: a description of the California red-legged frog and its habitat needs; photographs of the species; and explanation of its legal status and protection under Federal Endangered Species Act; and a list of the measures that would be implemented to minimize and avoid effects to the listed frog. Upon completion of the training program, personnel would sign a form stating that they attended the program and understand the avoidance and minimization measures relevant to their activities on the project. These sign-in sheets would be kept on file and would be made available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on request.
- Project employees would be provided with written guidance governing vehicle use, speed limits on unpaved roads, fire prevention, and other hazards.
- Except for vegetation clearing (necessary to minimize effects to nesting birds), work within the creek channel would be limited to between June 1 and October 15.
- To prevent inadvertent entrapment of California red-legged frogs during construction, all excavated, steep-walled holes or trenches more than 1-foot deep would be covered at the close of each working day with plywood or similar materials, or provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earthen fill or wooden planks. Holes and trenches would be thoroughly inspected for trapped animals before being filled. If at any time a trapped listed animal is discovered, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service-approved biologist would immediately place escape ramps or other appropriate structures to allow the animal to escape, or the Service would be contacted by telephone guidance. United States Fish and Wildlife Service

would be notified of the incident by telephone and electronic mail within one working day.

- Plastic mono-filament netting (erosion control matting) or similar material would not be used at the project site because California red-legged frog may become entangled or trapped in it. Acceptable substitutes include coconut coir matting or tackified hydro seeding compounds.
- If pumping is used for dewatering, intakes would be completely screened with wire mesh no larger than 0.2 inch to prevent frogs from entering the pump.
- Vegetation would be cleared only where necessary and would be cut above soil level in areas that would be restored following construction. Clearing and grubbing would be completed with hand tools when possible. If clearing and grubbing occurs between February 1 and August 31, a qualified biologist would survey for nesting birds within the area to be disturbed, including a perimeter buffer of 50 feet for passerines and 250 feet for raptors, before clearing activities begin. All nest avoidance requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Department of Fish and Wildlife codes would be observed. Cleared vegetation would be removed from the action area. The contractor would be responsible for obtaining all permits, licenses and environmental clearances for properly disposing of such materials.
- Caltrans would restore temporarily disturbed areas to baseline conditions or better to the maximum extent practicable. Exposed slopes and bare ground would be reseeded with native grasses and shrubs to stabilize and prevent erosion. Where disturbance includes the removal of trees and woody shrubs, native species would be replanted, based on the local species composition.
- All grindings and asphaltic concrete waste would be temporarily stored within previously disturbed areas absent of habitat and at a minimum of 50 feet from any culvert, drainage, or aquatic feature and removed from the action area after construction is complete.
- Hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, etc. would be stored in sealable containers in a designated location that is at least 50 feet from wetlands and aquatic habitats.

- Equipment would be maintained to prevent the leakage of vehicle fluids such as gasoline, oils or solvents and a Spill Response Plan would be prepared and implemented.
- A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and erosion control best management practices would be developed and implemented to minimize any wind or water related erosion. These plans would also be in compliance with the Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements. Caltrans Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual would provide guidance for design staff to include provisions in construction contracts for measures to protect sensitive areas and prevent and minimize storm water and non-storm water discharges. At a minimum, protective measures would include:
 - No discharge of pollutants from vehicle equipment cleaning into any storm drains or watercourses;
 - Keeping vehicle and equipment fueling and maintenance operations at least 50 feet away from watercourses, except at established commercial gas stations or established vehicle maintenance facility;
 - Collecting and disposing of concrete wastes in washouts and water from curing operations;
 - Maintaining spill containment kits onsite at all times during construction operations and/or staging or fueling of equipment;
 - Using water trucks and dust palliatives to control dust in excavation and fill areas, covering temporary access road entrances and exits with rock, and covering temporary stockpiles during rain events;
 - Installing coir rolls or straw wattles along or at the base of slopes during construction to capture sediment;
 - Protecting graded areas from erosion with a combination of silt fences and fiber rolls along toes of slopes or along edges of staging areas, and erosion control netting (such as jute or coir) as appropriate on sloped areas; and

- Establishing permanent erosion control measures such as bio-filtration strips and swales to receive storm water discharges from the highway, or other impervious surfaces would be incorporated to the maximum extent practicable.

Because the presence of California red-legged frog is inferred throughout habitats located in the Biological Site Assessment, all temporary and permanent impacts to suitable habitat would be mitigated. Compensatory mitigation to affected listed species and regulated habitats would be determined upon consultation with appropriate state and federal agencies. In accordance with the Federal Endangered Species Act, Caltrans proposes to mitigate for California red-legged frog habitat impacted by the project. The 0.13 acre of permanent impacts to California red-legged frog habitat would be mitigated at an offsite mitigation source at a 3:1 ratio. The total mitigation for permanent impacts at a 3:1 ratio is 0.39 acres. Temporary impacts to habitat would be mitigated at a 1.1:1 ratio. Caltrans would purchase single or multiple species acreage from an agency approved mitigation source.

