

# Scour Repair and Bridge Deck Rehabilitation at Mill Creek Bridge (Bridge No. 08-0133)

TEHAMA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA  
02-TEH-36-PM 91.46  
2C223

## Draft Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration / Environmental Assessment



Prepared by the  
California Department of Transportation

The environmental review, consultation, and any other action required in accordance with applicable Federal laws for this project is being, or has been, carried out by Caltrans under its assumption of responsibility pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327.



**January 2010**

## **General Information About This Document**

### ***What's in this document?***

This Draft Initial Study with proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) examines potential environmental effects of the proposed Mill Creek Bridge scour repair and bridge deck rehabilitation project on State Route 36 in Tehama County, California. The IS/EA was prepared to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. It describes the purpose and need for the project, project alternatives, the existing environment, and potential effects from each of the project alternatives. Final selection of a project alternative will not be made until after the full evaluation of environmental impacts, consideration of public comments, and approval of the final IS/EA.

### ***What should you do?***

- Please read this IS/EA.
- We welcome your comments. If you have any information or concerns regarding the project, please send your written comments to Caltrans by the deadline. Submit comments via regular mail to:

California Department of Transportation  
Attention: Christopher Quiney  
Office of Environmental Management, MS-30  
P.O. Box 496073  
Redding, CA 96049-6073

- You may also submit comments via e-mail to [chris.quiney@dot.ca.gov](mailto:chris.quiney@dot.ca.gov).
- Submit comments by the deadline: February 25, 2010

### ***What happens after this?***

After comments are received from the public and reviewing agencies, Caltrans may (1) give environmental approval to the proposed project, (2) undertake additional environmental studies, or (3) abandon the project. If the project were given environmental approval and funding were appropriated, Caltrans could design and construct all or part of the project.

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in Braille, large print, on audiocassette, or computer disk. To obtain a copy in one of these alternate formats, please call or write to Caltrans, Attn: Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, 1657 Riverside Drive, CA 96001; (530) 225-3055 Voice, or use the California Relay Service TTY number, (530) 225-2019.

**Mill Creek Bridge (Bridge No. 08-0133) Scour Repair and Deck  
Rehabilitation Project on State Route 36 in Tehama County, near Childs  
Meadow, approximately 0.24 mile east of the Junction of State Route 172**

**DRAFT INITIAL STUDY WITH PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE  
DECLARATION / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

Submitted Pursuant to: (State) Division 13, Public Resources Code  
(Federal) 42USC 4332(2)(C)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Department of Transportation

12-31-09  
Date of Approval

  
CINDY ANDERSON  
Office Chief  
North Region Environmental Services, North  
California Department of Transportation

---

*Mill Creek Bridge, 02-TEH-36-PM 91.46, EA 2C223*



## **Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration**

Pursuant to: Division 13, Public Resources Code

### ***Project Description***

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is proposing a project at Mill Creek Bridge (Bridge No. 08-0133) on State Route 36 in Tehama County, near Childs Meadow, approximately 0.24 mile east of the junction of State Route 172. The project includes rehabilitation of the bridge deck and placement of large rocks at the bridge foundations to prevent scour damage. The Mill Creek Bridge has a history of hydraulic scour at the foundations and is classified as scour critical, which means the bridge is susceptible to severe scour damage. Severe scour could result in traffic restrictions or closure of the bridge. To reduce the potential for scour damage, two-ton rock would be strategically placed around the foundations of the bridge abutments and pier. In addition to the scour protection work, the bridge deck would be rehabilitated. Rehabilitation of the deck would entail removal of the existing bridge deck joint seals and asphalt concrete deck surface. New deck joint seals would be installed and a polyester overlay would be placed. The pavement approaches would be adjusted to the new deck elevation. Metal beam guardrail at the bridge approaches would be upgraded to current standards as necessary and new traffic striping would be applied to the deck surface.

### ***Determination***

This proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is included to give notice to interested agencies and the public that it is Caltrans' intent to adopt a MND for this project. This does not mean that Caltrans' decision regarding the project is final. This draft MND is subject to modification 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, cultural resources, geology or soils, mineral resources, air quality, noise, land use and planning, population and housing, community resources, public services, recreation, transportation, or emergency services.

The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on water quality, wetlands, floodplain, hazardous waste, traffic, and utilities.

*Mitigated Negative Declaration*

---

Potential adverse impacts to sensitive species would be reduced to a level of less than significant with the implementation of conservation measures specified in the Natural Environment Study, the Biological Assessment and Essential Fish Habitat Assessment dated December 2009, and any additional measures included in the Biological Opinion issued by NOAA Fisheries.

---

John Bulinski  
District Director, District 2  
California Department of Transportation

---

Date

## Table of Contents

Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration.....	i
Table of Contents.....	iii
<b>Chapter 1.</b> Proposed Project.....	1
1.1. Introduction.....	1
1.2. Purpose and Need .....	1
1.3. Project Description .....	2
1.4. Project Alternatives .....	2
1.4.1. Alternative A (No Build).....	2
1.4.2. Alternative B (Place RSP at Foundations and Rehabilitate Bridge Deck) .....	2
1.5. Permits and Approvals .....	5
<b>Chapter 2.</b> Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.....	7
2.1. Plant Species .....	7
2.1.1. Regulatory Setting.....	7
2.1.2. Affected Environment.....	8
2.1.3. Environmental Consequences .....	9
2.1.4. Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.....	10
2.2. Animal Species .....	10
2.2.1. Regulatory Setting.....	10
2.2.2. Affected Environment.....	11
2.2.3. Environmental Consequences .....	11
2.2.4. Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.....	12
2.3. Threatened and Endangered Species .....	12
2.3.1. Regulatory Setting.....	12
2.3.2. Affected Environment.....	13
2.3.3. Environmental Consequences .....	14
2.3.4. Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.....	15
2.4. Wetlands and Other Waters.....	19
2.4.1. Regulatory Setting.....	19
2.4.2. Affected Environment.....	20
2.4.3. Environmental Consequences .....	21
2.4.4. Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.....	22
2.5. Invasive Plant Species .....	23
2.5.1. Regulatory Setting.....	23
2.5.2. Affected Environment.....	23
2.5.3. Environmental Consequences .....	24
2.5.4. Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.....	24
2.6. Hydrology and Floodplain .....	24
2.6.1. Regulatory Setting.....	24
2.6.2. Affected Environment.....	25
2.6.3. Environmental Consequences .....	25
2.6.4. Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.....	25
2.7. Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff .....	26
2.7.1. Regulatory Setting.....	26
2.7.2. Affected Environment.....	27
2.7.3. Environmental Consequences .....	27
2.7.4. Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.....	28
2.8. Air Quality.....	29
2.8.1. Regulatory Setting.....	29
2.8.2. Affected Environment.....	30
2.8.3. Environmental Consequences .....	31
2.8.4. Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.....	31
2.9. Utilities.....	31

2.9.1.	Affected Environment .....	31
2.9.2.	Environmental Consequences.....	32
2.9.3.	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures .....	32
2.10.	Hazardous Waste .....	32
2.10.1.	Affected Environment .....	33
2.10.2.	Environmental Consequences.....	34
2.10.3.	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures .....	35
2.11.	Climate Change (CEQA) .....	36
2.12.	Cumulative Impacts .....	46
2.12.1.	Regulatory Setting .....	46
2.12.2.	Affected Environment .....	47
2.12.3.	Environmental Consequences.....	47
2.12.4.	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures .....	48
<b>Chapter 3.</b>	Comments and Coordination .....	49
<b>Chapter 4.</b>	List of Preparers .....	51
<b>Chapter 5.</b>	References .....	53
Exhibit 1	Project Vicinity Map .....	55
Exhibit 2	Project Location Map.....	57
Exhibit 3	Environmental Study Limits .....	59
<b>Appendix A</b>	California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation .....	61
<b>Appendix B</b>	Preliminary Construction Staging Plans .....	73
<b>Appendix C</b>	Threatened and Endangered Species Consultation Documents .....	83
<b>Appendix D</b>	Summary of Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.....	85
<b>Appendix E</b>	Title VI Policy Statement.....	93