# INITIAL STUDY/ ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

# SR-99 CORRIDOR BIKEWAY FACILITY PHASE 5 $20^{TH}$ STREET OVERCROSSING (BIKEWAY 99 PHASE 5)

# MAJGC/50347-300-4110 PIN: 0319000145



#### Lead Agency:

City of Chico 411 Main Street Chico, CA 95928

September 2019

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

# **General Information about this Document**

#### What's in this document:

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was completed for the entire State Route 99 (SR-99) Corridor Bikeway Project in September 2009. This focused Bikeway 99 Phase 5 CEQA document is being prepared because an East 20th Street overcrossing was not previously considered or evaluated in the original document as an at-grade alternative was originally proposed. Due to the change from an at-grade crossing to a bridge structure, the City of Chico has prepared this Initial Study to examine the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Bikeway 99 Phase 5 project located in the City of Chico, Butte County, California. The document describes the project being proposed, the existing environment that could be affected by the project, the potential impacts from the project, and the proposed avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures.

#### What you should do:

Please read this Initial Study. A hard copy of this document is available for review at the City of Chico Municipal Building, 411 Main Street Chico, CA 95928 on the second floor. An electronic copy of the Initial Study, as well as listed appendicies may be viewed online at the following website: <a href="http://www.chico.ca.us/capital\_project\_services/StateRoute99CorridorBikewayProject.asp">http://www.chico.ca.us/capital\_project\_services/StateRoute99CorridorBikewayProject.asp</a> or <a href="http://bikeway99.com/">https://bikeway99.com/</a>. The public circulation period begins Monday, September 30, 2019 and ends at 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, Ocotber 30, 2019.

We welcome your input . If you have any comments regarding the proposed project, please send your written comments to the City of Chico no later than Wednesday, Ocotber 30, 2019.

Submit comments via postal mail to the City of Chico at the following address so they are received no later than Wednesday, October 30, 2019 to:

Tracy R. Bettencourt, MPA - AICP Regulatory and Grants Manager City of Chico Public Works – Engineering PO Box 3420 Chico, CA 95927

#### What happens next:

After comments are received from the public and reviewing agencies, the City of Chico may: (1) give environmental approval to the proposed project, (2) undertake additional environmental studies, (3) abandon the project, or (4) decide to modify the proposed project under consideration based on comments received. If the project is given environmental approval and funding is appropriated, the City could design and construct all or part of the project.

## THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Ι.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	. 1
II.	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	. 8
III.	DETERMINATION	. 8
IV.	EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	. 9
	A. AESTHETICS	10
	B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	13
	C. AIR OUALITY	14
	D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	18
	E. CULTURAL RESOURCES	25
	F. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	30
	G. ENERGY	32
	H. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	33
	I. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	35
	J. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	39
	K. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	42
	L. LAND USE AND PLANNING.	45
	M. MINERAL RESOURCES	46
	N. NOISE	47
	O. OPEN SPACE / RECREATION	51
	P. POPULATION AND HOUSING	52
	Q. PUBLIC SERVICES	53
	R. TRANSPORTATION	54
	S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	56
	T. WILDFIRE	58
	U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	60
V.	REFERENCES	63

#### LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1.	VICINITY MAP	4
FIGURE 2.	PROJECT LOCATION	5
FIGURE 3.	PROJECT FEATURES	6
FIGURE 4.	BIOLOGICAL STUDY AREA	23
FIGURE 5.	CULTURAL PROJECT AREA LIMITS	29
FIGURE 6.	CALIFORNIA GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORY	37
FIGURE 7.	NOISE LEVELS OF COMMON ACTIVITIES	48

#### LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. BCAQMD THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE	14
TABLE 2. ROAD CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS AND THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE	16
TABLE 3. CONSTRUCTION CO2 EMISSIONS COMPARED TO THRESHOLD OF SIGNIFICANCE	38
TABLE 4. POPULATION DENSITY AND ASSOCIATED AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS	48
TABLE 5. CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NOISE EMISSION LEVELS	49

#### LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A	MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN
ATTACHMENT B	ANTICIPATED TREE REMOVAL IMPACTS

# LIST OF APPENDICES (Note: All Appendices are available for review on the City's Website

http://www.chico.ca.us/capital\_project\_services/StateRoute99CorridorBikewayProject.asp)

APPENDIX AAIR QUALITY ROAD CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS MODELAPPENDIX BCNDDB, USFWS, CNPS, AND CDFW SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES TABLEAPPENDIX CNATIVE AMERICAN CORRESPONDENCE LOG

APPENDIX DFEMA FIRMETTE MAPAPPENDIX EENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL STUDIES

# ACRONMYS

AB	Assembly Bill				
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act				
BCAQMD	Butte County Air Quality Management District				
Bgs	Below ground surface				
BMPs	Best Management Practices				
BSA	Biological Study Area				
BRCP	Butte Regional Conservation Plan				
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation				
CAA	Clean Air Act				
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards				
CARB	California Air Resources Board				
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife				
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act				
CERFA	Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act of 1992				
CESA	California Endangered Species Act				
CH <sub>4</sub>	methane				
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database				
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level				
CNPS	California Native Plant Society				
СО	carbon monoxide				
CO <sub>2</sub>	carbon dioxide				
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources				
dBA	Decibel A-weighted				
E.O.	Executive Order				

EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environmentally Sensitive Area
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
GHG	greenhouse gases
HFC	Hydrofluorocarbons
Lb	pound
Ldn	day-night average sound level
Leq	equivalent continuous sound level
LED	Light-emitting diode
Lmax	maximum sound level
LOS	Level of Service
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
Mph	miles per hour
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NEPA	National Environmental Protection Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NO <sub>2</sub>	nitrogen dioxide
NO <sub>X</sub>	nitrogen oxides
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
03	ozone
PAL	Project Area Limits
Pb	lead

PFC	Perfluorocarbons
PM	particulate matter
ppb	parts per billion
ppm	parts per million
ROG	Reactive organic compounds
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
SR	State Route
SWMP	Storm Water Management Plan
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
TCRs	Tribal Cultural Resources
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VOCs	Volatile Organic Compounds

# THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

# I. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

- A. <u>Project Title:</u> SR-99 Corridor Bikeway Facility Phase 5; 20<sup>th</sup> Street Overcrossing (Bikeway 99 Phase 5)
- B. Project Location: The project is located adjacent to SR-99 from 1,000 feet north of the East 20<sup>th</sup> Street interchange to approximately 1,600 feet south of the interchange. The closest approximate address is the Chico Mall located at 1950 East 20<sup>th</sup> St, Chico, CA 95928, Township 22 North, Range 1. The total length of the bikeway segment will be approximately 0.6 miles. The north and south ends of this project (from PM R31.1 to R31.7) will tie into Phases 1 and 4 of the overall 7-mile bikeway corridor from Eaton Road to Skyway (see Figure 1 Vicinity Map and Figure 2 Location Map).

#### <u>City Contact:</u> Tracy Bettencourt, Regulatory and Grants Manager, City of Chico, 411 Main Street, Chico, CA 95928 (mailing address: PO Box 3420, Chico, CA 95927) Phone: (530) 879-6903 Email: <u>tracy.bettencourt@chicoca.gov</u>

- D. Project Area: 48.9 acres
- E. <u>General Plan Designation</u>: Regional Commercial (RC)
- F. Zoning: CR Regional Commercial (RC)
- **<u>G.</u> <u>Environmental Setting:</u>** The project site is an urbanized/commercial area in southeast Chico, parallel with SR-99. The site fronts SR-99 and extends from 1,000 feet north of the East 20<sup>th</sup> Street interchange to approximately 1,600 feet south of the interchange. Phase 5 of the SR-99 Bikeway will connect the existing Phase 2 bikeway to the north, which ends in the Chico Mall parking lot, to the end of Phase 4 bikeway to the South. Phase 4 is currently in design and construction began in 2018.

Urban areas within the project area include parking lots, commercial businesses including restaurants, and the Chico Mall. The main roadways in the area include East 20<sup>th</sup> Street, Business Lane, Baney Lane, SR-99 and on and off ramps to SR-99. Landscaping within the project area consists of ornamental grass, shrubs and trees that are scattered throughout the Chico Mall parking lot and along East 20<sup>th</sup> Street and Business Lane.

**H. Project Description:** The project design offers a direct route, following SR-99. The total length of the bikeway segment will be approximately 0.6 miles. The north and south ends of this Project (from PM R31.1 to R31.7) will tie into Phases 2 and 4 of the overall 7-mile bikeway corridor from Eaton Road to Skyway.

The project will be a Class I multi-use trail that will consist of an approximately 8 to 10-footwide paved path with approximately 2-foot wide shoulders (see Figure 3 – Project Features). The project will contain an overcrossing that runs parallel with SR-99, between the northbound East 20<sup>th</sup> Street on and off ramps. The overcrossing would provide a link to both sides of East 20<sup>th</sup> Street and Business Lane, offering access to local restaurants and businesses. A set of stairs will allow access on the north side of East 20<sup>th</sup> Street and a ramp will provide access to the south side of East 20<sup>th</sup> Street. The overcrossing abutments, as well as the stair and ramp structures will be placed within the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) right-of-way. Bikeway users would be separated from congestion of vehicular traffic on East 20<sup>th</sup> Street. The overcrossing bridge will have architectural features that will provide the City of Chico with a unique, context sensitive structure.

The project will require vegetation and tree removal, utility relocations, sign relocations, rightof-way acquisition, temporary construction easements and the removal of parking spaces associated with commercial businesses adjacent to the project. The project will impact approximately nine parcels on the east side of SR-99 on/off ramps. The total construction cost of the project is estimated to be approximately \$11 million. Construction is anticipated to begin in the spring of 2022.

- **<u>I.</u> <u>Project Purpose and Need:</u>** The purpose of the project is to:
  - Build a Class I pedestrian/bike multiuse path that closes the gap between Phases 2 and 4 of the SR-99 Corridor Bikeway;
  - Build a bikeway that is consistent with the goals outlined in the City's 2030 General Plan and Chico Bicycle Plan 2019 Update;
  - Build a safe and more direct route for pedestrians and cyclists to cross East 20<sup>th</sup> Street;
  - Provide a bikeway that will improve pedestrian and bicycle access throughout the City of Chico and will help provide multi-modal connectivity to public services, employment centers, business districts, commercial centers, health facilities, adjacent neighborhoods, and local schools; and,
  - Design and construct a bikeway that meets Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

The project is needed to:

- Close the gap (between Phases 2 and 4) of SR-99 Corridor Bikeway;
- Achieve the goals of the City of Chico's 2030 General Plan & Chico Bicycle Plan 2019 Update;
- Provide safe and direct access across East 20<sup>th</sup> Street for pedestrians and cyclists. The current crossing at East 20<sup>th</sup> Street is an incomplete sidewalk configuration that exposes pedestrians to vehicular traffic;
- Provide multimodal options within the City to promote recreation and to provide safe connections for pedestrians and cyclists to public services, employment centers, business districts, commercial centers, health facilities, adjacent neighborhoods, and local schools; and,
- Comply with ADA upgrades to ensure the bikeway meets ADA requirements.
- Project Background: The completed Bikeway 99 Corridor will serve as a continuous alternative <u>J.</u> transportation and recreational route from Eaton Road to Skyway, spanning nearly 7 miles. The current lack of a safe and direct pedestrian/bike path discourages residents from walking or biking to local schools, job centers, commercial areas, and public services. A CEQA Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration for the entire State Route 99 Corridor Bikeway Project was prepared in September of 2009. A Notice of Determination was filed with the Butte County Clerk Recorder's Office on October 15, 2009 (SCH # 2009092041). While the first four phases of the project were designed consistent with the original environmental document, that document considered and evaluated an at-grade bicycle/pedestrian crossing at East 20<sup>th</sup> Street on the east side of the SR-99/20<sup>th</sup> Street interchange at the Chico Mall entrance. Due to vehicle congestion and subsequent safety concerns about the bikeway moving forward with the atgrade alternative at this location, an extensive public outreach effort and feasibility study (20<sup>th</sup> Street Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing Feasibility Study/Project Study Report Equivalent for SR-99 Corridor Bikeway Facility Phase 5 (Bikeway 99) (see full document at bikeway99.com)) was conducted. The previously analyzed at-grade bicycle/pedestrian crossing on East 20<sup>th</sup> Street was rejected by the community and an overcrossing at East 20<sup>th</sup> Street was selected.

This focused Bikeway 99 Phase 5 CEQA document is being prepared because the East 20<sup>th</sup> Street overcrossing had not been considered or evaluated as part of the original environmental review process. Of the seven alternatives considered through the Feasibility Study, the overcrossing was selected as the preferred alternative by the community, as well as the Chico City Council as it will result in increased safety of pedestrians and cyclists by separating them from the congested East 20<sup>th</sup> Street/ SR-99 interchange vehicle traffic and it provides a more direct route connecting people to goods and services, including the Chico Mall and Business Lane, offering access to local restaurants and businesses. Additional safety features of the path include lighting, security cameras and the removal of thick vegetation in order to increase visibility on the bikeway. The ramp structure will include the installment of lighting, fencing,

and/or the use of other techniques (i.e., physical barriers) to discourage graffiti and loitering. The context sensitive design of the bridge, as selected through an extensive public outreach effort, is intended to incorporate the history, culture and overall atmosphere of Chico.

The proposed project is consistent with the Land Use, Circulation, and Parks, Public Facilities and Services Elements of the City's 2030 General Plan (adopted in 2011 and amended in 2017), as well as the City's Bike Plan 2019 Update. The Project will be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the City's Best Management Practices and Municipal Code.

The project is funded through the Active Transportation Program grant and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program and requires compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The lead agency for CEQA is the City of Chico.

K. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?: The City of Chico sent a notification and opportunity to consult letter to the Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria on March 12, 2019 and have not received a response or request for consultation (Appendix C).









Project Features EA 03-0J740 PIN 0319000145 SR99 Corridor Bikeway Facility (Bikeway 99) Phase 5 City of Chico, Butte County, California

## THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

# II. 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.

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

# **III. DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ 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, nothing further is required

Development Director

# **IV. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

- Responses to the following questions and related discussion indicate if the proposed project will have or potentially have a significant adverse impact on the environment.
- A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by referenced information sources. A "No Impact' answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors or general standards.
- All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- Once it has been determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there is at least one "Potentially Significant Impact" entry when the determination is made an EIR is required.
- Negative Declaration: "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The initial study will describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 4, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, a program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)].
- Initial studies may incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. the general plan or zoning ordinances, etc.). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted are cited in the discussion.
- The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>A. AESTHETICS</b> Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project or its related activities:				
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, including scenic roadways as defined in the General Plan, or a Federal Wild and Scenic River?				
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
3. Affect lands preserved under a scenic easement or contract?				
4. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality including the scenic quality of the foothills as addressed in the General Plan?				
5. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				

#### Affected Environment / Environmental Consequences

1-3) **No Impact.** The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, scenic resource or scenic easement. The project area is not located immediately adjacent to any state eligible scenic vistas or highways. SR-99 is not a designated scenic highway adjacent to the project boundaries. The proposed project will not have a significant impact upon a scenic highway corridor. No impacts to any state eligible scenic highways or scenic vistas are anticipated. Additionally, the project is not within or immediately adjacent to a Wild or Scenic River. The nearest Wild and Scenic River is the Feather River, approximately 42.3 miles south of the Project location. No lands preserved under a scenic easement or contract are within or adjacent to the project area. It is anticipated that trees will be removed as part of the project;

however, this would not constitute substantial damage to scenic resources and no impact is identified.

4) Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not substantially the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site. The project location and setting provides context for determining potential changes to the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project area is commercially developed, and the bikeway will be parallel to the SR-99 on and off ramps. The overcrossing will alter the current visual conditions; however, the overall character of the area will not be changed. The bridge will contain architectural elements unique to the history and culture of Chico. The truss on the bridge will resemble the "Tree City" concept, found in the East 20<sup>th</sup> Street Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing Feasibility Study/Project Study Report Equivalent for SR-99 Corridor Bikeway Facility Phase 5 (Bikeway 99); this design was highly favored by the public. See rendering of overcrossing below. The bridge will be approximately 20 feet at its highest point with the architectural elements extending up to an additional 25 feet. Other aesthetic features will be incorporated into the bikeway including decorative luminaires, up-lighting, path signage, monuments, emblems and stained and textured concrete. The overcrossing, stair and ramp structures will be placed within Caltrans right-of-way.



Visual Rendering of East 20<sup>th</sup> Street Overcrossing

Resource Change (changes to visual resources as measured by changes in visual character and visual quality) is anticipated to be low. Visual character and quality of the proposed project will be similar to the existing visual character and quality of the project area in its current state. Since the project does not substantially change the existing land uses and adds a minor amount of new paved surfaces, the visual character would not change substantially. The project would not change the surrounding character, because the project would close an existing gap in pedestrian/bicycle facilities. Construction of the proposed project would temporarily change views experienced by drivers, pedestrians, and other people in the project area since construction equipment would be visible from neighboring areas; however, these impacts are temporary, and therefore not considered substantial. Overall visual impacts as a result of the proposed project are anticipated to be low, as the viewer response would be low for residents, businesses and motorists (See Appendix E, Visual Memorandum 2019).

5) **Less Than Significant.** The proposed project would not include addition of light sources that are anticipated to result in substantial light and glare impacts. Lighting that is proposed would be downshielded to limit light pollution. The lighting will improve visibility of the overcrossing at night and enhance the overcrossing. Potential lighting along the bikeway is not anticipated to result in adverse effects to day or nighttime views in the area. There would be a less than significant impact.

# Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

None.

<b>B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST</b> <b>RESOURCES</b> Would the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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?				
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				$\boxtimes$
3. 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))?				
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
5. 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?				

#### Affected Environment / Environmental Consequences

- 1) **No Impact.** The proposed project area is not located within proximity to any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.
- 2) **No Impact.** There are no Williamson Act contract lands within proximity to the project site.
- 3 & 4) **No Impact.** There are no forest lands or timberlands (or lands zoned as such) in the project study area. The project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- 5) **No Impact.** The project would have no impact to conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. No Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance is in the project area as mapped by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. No forest land is in the project area as well.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

None.

<b>C. AIR QUALITY</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans (e.g., Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area 2015 Triennial Air Quality Attainment Plan, Chico Urban Area CO Attainment Plan, and Butte County AQMD Indirect Source Review Guidelines)?				
2. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region ambient air quality standard?				
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
4. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				

#### Affected Environment / Environmental Consequences

1 - 2) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project would not conflict with the implementation of the applicable air quality plans or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant. The City of Chico is in the Butte County Air Quality Management District (BCAQMD) which is in nonattainment for the following state designations: 1-hour ozone, 8-hour ozone, 24-hour PM10, and annual PM2.5 and is also in nonattainment for the federal designation for 8-hour ozone. The completed project does not anticipate to impact air quality. The bikeway path will encourage members of the community to bike or walk to nearby destinations, which may reduce local greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Caltrans' Standard Specifications relating to dust control will be incorporated into the project to reduce potential impacts to air quality. Additional environmental commitments and long-term monitoring, related to air quality, is not anticipated.

The BCAQMD has specified significance thresholds (BCAQMD 2014) to determine whether mitigation is needed for project-related air quality impacts. The BCAQMD's thresholds of significance for construction-related emissions are presented in Table 1.

Thresholds of Significance				
Pollutant	Construction (pounds per day)			
ROG	137 lbs/day			
NO <sub>x</sub>	137 lbs/day			
$PM_{10}$ or smaller	80 lbs/day			
GHGs	No Adopted Threshold			

#### Table 1. BCAQMD Thresholds of Significance

#### Source: BCAQMD 2014

#### <u>Asbestos</u>

Exposure and disturbance of rock and soil that contains asbestos can result in the release of fibers to the air and consequent exposure to the public. Asbestos most commonly occur in ultramafic rock that has undergone partial or complete alteration to serpentine rock (proper rock name serpentinite) and often contain chrysotile asbestos. In addition, another form of asbestos, tremolite, can be found associated with ultramafic rock, particularly near faults. Sources of asbestos emissions include: unpaved roads or driveways surfaced with ultramafic rock, construction activities in ultramafic rock deposits, or rock quarrying activities where ultramafic rock is present. Based on the map of naturally-occurring asbestos locations contained in *Butte County Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, major ultramafic rock formations are not found within proximity to the proposed project site.

#### **Construction Emissions**

Construction and grading would not occur in an area with ultramafic rock that could be a source of emissions of naturally-occurring asbestos.

During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions (airborne dust) generated by excavation, grading, hauling, and various other activities. Emissions from construction equipment are anticipated and would include CO, NOx, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), directly-emitted particulate matter ( $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$ ), and toxic air contaminants such as diesel exhaust particulate matter. Ozone is a regional pollutant that is derived from NOx and VOCs in the presence of sunlight and heat.

Site preparation and roadway construction would involve clearing, cut-and-fill activities, grading, construction of an overcrossing, and paving bikeway surfaces. Construction-related effects on air quality from most bikeway projects would be greatest during the site preparation phase because most engine emissions are associated with the excavation, handling, and transport of soils to and from the site. If not properly controlled, these activities would temporarily generate  $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$ , and small amounts of CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, NOx, and VOCs. Sources of fugitive dust would include disturbed soils at the construction site and trucks carrying uncovered loads of soils. Unless properly controlled, vehicles leaving the site would deposit mud on local streets, which could be an additional source of airborne dust after it dries.  $PM_{10}$  emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the nature and magnitude of construction activity and local weather conditions.  $PM_{10}$  emissions would depend on soil moisture, silt content of soil, wind speed, and the amount of equipment operating. Larger dust particles would settle near the source, while fine particles would be dispersed over greater distances from the construction site.

Construction air quality impacts are short-term in nature and are generally attributable to dust generated by equipment and vehicles. Fugitive dust is emitted both during construction activity and as a result of wind erosion over exposed earth surfaces. Clearing and earth moving activities often generate the majority of construction-related dust emissions, but traffic and other general disturbances of soil surfaces also contribute to dust emissions. Further, dust generation is dependent on soil type and soil moisture.

Adverse effects of construction activities include increased dust-fall and locally elevated levels of total suspended particulate. Dust-fall can be a nuisance to neighboring properties or previously completed developments surrounding or within the project area and may require frequent washing during the construction period. Further, asphalt-paving materials used during construction will present temporary, minor sources of hydrocarbons that are precursors of ozone.

The project's construction is anticipated to take 6 months. The Project's construction emissions were estimated using the Roadway Construction Emissions Model by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD 2014), which is the accepted model for all CEQA roadway projects throughout California (see Appendix A). As summarized in Table 2,

construction activities from the Build Alternative of the Project would not exceed emission thresholds established by the BCAQMD.

Thresholds of Significance							
Pollutant	Road Construction EmissionsBCAQMD ThresholdModel Estimates(pounds per day)						
NO <sub>x</sub>	45.5 lbs/day	137 lbs/day					
VOC	4.34 lbs/day	N/A					
$PM_{10}$	21.94 lbs/day	80 lbs/day					
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	5.91 lbs/day	80 lbs/day					
SO <sub>x</sub>	0.09 lbs/day	N/A					
CO	38.73 lbs/day	N/A					

Table 2. Road Construction Emissions and Thresholds of Significance	e
---	---

Source: Modeling using the Roadway Construction Emissions Model 9.0.0 (Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District 2019).

#### **Operational Emissions**

The completed project does not anticipate impacting air quality. The bikeway path will encourage members of the community to bike or walk to nearby destinations, which may reduce local GHG emissions. Caltrans' Standard Specifications relating to dust control will be incorporated into the project to reduce potential impacts to air quality. Additional environmental commitments and long-term monitoring, related to air quality, is not anticipated.

3 - 4) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project would have less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated, on exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and creating objectionable odors. Some phases of construction, particularly asphalt paving, would result in short-term odors in the immediate area of each paving site(s). Such odors would be quickly dispersed below detectable thresholds as distance from the site(s) increases. Although the closest sensitive receptors are commercial businesses located adjacent to the project area, construction would be temporary in nature and with the inclusion of measures AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3 and AQ-4, these impacts are not considered to be significant.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

All of the construction impacts to air quality are short-term in duration and, therefore, will not result in adverse or long-term impacts. Implementation of the following measures will reduce any air quality impacts resulting from construction activities:

- **AQ-1**: The construction contractor shall comply with Caltrans' Standard Specifications Section 10-5 Dust Control of Caltrans' Standard Specifications (2018).
- **AQ-2**: The construction contractor shall comply with Section 7-1.02 Emissions Reduction and Section 18 Dust Palliative of Caltrans' Standard Specifications (2018).
- **AQ-3**: The project will comply with the following Best Practices from the Butte County Air Quality Management District:
  - All on- and off-road diesel equipment shall not idle for more than five minutes. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and/or job sites to remind drivers and operators of the five-minute idling limit.
  - All construction equipment shall be maintained in proper tune according to the manufacturer's specifications. Equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition before the start of work.
  - Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. And adequate water supply source must be identified. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible.

- All disturbed soil areas not subject to re-vegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advanced by the District.
- **AQ-4**: The Wind Erosion Control BMP (WE-1) from Caltrans' Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual will be implemented.

<b>D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b> Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species as listed and mapped in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.				
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any with established native resident or migratory wildlife native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				

#### **Regulatory Setting**

"Special status species" include any species that has been afforded special recognition by federal, state or local resources agencies (e.g., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS], California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW], etc.), and/or resource conservation organizations (e.g., California Native Plant Society [CNPS]). The term "special-status species" excludes those avian species solely identified under Section 10 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) for federal protection. MBTA Section 10 protected species are afforded avoidance and minimization measures per state and federal requirements.

#### Affected Environment / Environmental Consequences

#### **Biological Study Area**

A Biological Study Area (BSA) is shown in Figure 4. The BSA is located along SR-99 from approximately 1,000 feet north of the East 20<sup>th</sup> Street interchange to approximately 1,600 feet south of the interchange and was delineated with an approximate 50-foot buffer around all anticipated project activities. Land use is a mix of undeveloped ruderal landscaping and commercial.

1) **Less Than Significant.** The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any specialstatus species. Due to the lack of suitable habitat, no special-status wildlife species have the potential to occur within the project area. Furthermore, no critical habitat occurs within or adjacent to the BSA (see Appendix E, Natural Environmental Study (Minimal Impact) 2019).

Databases searches through USFWS National Wetland Inventory and through the EPA's Waters database did not detect any water resources within the project area. The biological surveys conducted on April 10, 2019 identified a wetland feature and jurisdictional drainage feature present within the project area. The remaining of the BSA is highly developed and does not contain any other habitat or natural community of concern.

2) **Less Than Significant.** The project would have less than significant impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. A total of five habitat communities occur within the BSA. The Caltrans right-of-way within the project limits contains all habitat types (see Figure 4: Vegetation Communities within the BSA).

#### Roadways/Urban

Roadways and urban areas are characterized as artificial/man-made, are highly disturbed and contain zero vegetative cover. Urban areas within the BSA include parking lots, restaurants and the Chico Mall. The main roadways in the area include East 20<sup>th</sup> Street, Business Lane, Baney Lane, SR-99 and on and off ramps to SR-99. Roadways and urban areas comprise approximately 33.40 acres (68.3%) of the BSA.

#### Landscaping

Landscaping within the BSA consists of ornamental grass, shrubs and trees that are scattered throughout the Chico Mall parking lot and along East 20<sup>th</sup> Street and Business Lane. There are over 100 trees, both native and non-native, present within the BSA. Vegetation within these areas include valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), silver wattle (*Acacia dealbata*), London plane (*Plantanus hispanica*) and Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*). Landscaping comprises approximately 10.9 acres (22.2%) of the BSA.

#### Disturbed Grassland

Disturbed grassland is found on the west and south side of the BSA. The patch of grassland on the west side of the BSA is regularly maintained, whereas the grassland on the south side of the BSA is in an undeveloped plot of land. The dominant grass species identified in this habitat type include Italian ryegrass (*Festuca perennis*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*) and wild oat (*Avena fatua*). Disturbed grassland comprises approximately 4.58 acres (9.36%) of the BSA.

#### Jurisdictional Drainage

The jurisdictional drainage within the BSA is approximately 190 linear feet in length and is parallel to the SR-99 off ramp. The drainage connects to a City owned culvert within the project area. The drainage collects stormwater runoff during heavy rain events and sheet flow from SR-99. Vegetation found within the drainage includes English plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), wild radish (*Raphanuys sativus*) and bur chervil (*Anthriscus caucalis*). The jurisdictional drainage is approximately 0.03 acres (<1%), of the BSA.

#### Seasonal Wetland Swale

The project area contains approximately 0.04 acres of a seasonal wetland swale and spans approximately 285 linear feet along the SR-99 offramp. On April 10, 2019 a wetland delineation, consistent the USACE Aird West Wetland Delineation Manual, was completed and delineated using a Trimble GeoXT Geoexplorer 6000 series handheld GPS unit. Vegetation within the wetland includes pale spikerush (*Eleocharis macrostachya*), water smartweed (*Persicaria amphibia*) and willow herb (*Epilobium brachycarpum*).

<u>Impacts to Riparian Habitat or other Sensitive Natural Communities</u> The project does not anticipate impacts to the seasonal wetland or jurisdictional drainage.

There are 74 trees within the footprint of the proposed bikeway. The project will require the removal of approximately 50 trees; however, the project has been carefully designed to protect in place or to only trim the remaining 24 trees (Attachment B. Anticipated Tree Removal Impacts). The tree removals are required to allow for construction of the bike path. These removals will also increase visibility and improve safety on the proposed bike path. Although not required as mitigation, the City has been and will continue to incorporate landscaping into the various phases of the Bikeway 99 project. Areas where landscaping could potentially be located along Phase 5 are shown on the figure in Attachment B Anticipated Tree Removal Impacts. The potential Phase 5 landscaping areas are on either side of the East 20<sup>th</sup> Street overcrossing structure, in the median on East 20<sup>th</sup> Street, and at three other locations south of East 20<sup>th</sup> Street and east of the proposed bikeway. The landscaping would occur outside of Caltrans clear recovery zone and would comply with Caltrans landscaping requirements.

The project would have less than significant impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

3) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands. Approximately 285 linear feet of a seasonal wetland swale was identified within the project area during the biological surveys conducted on April 10, 2019 by Dokken Engineering biologist Andrew Dellas. A wetland delineation, consistent with USACE Arid West Wetland Delineation Manual, was completed during the biological survey. The wetland feature occupies approximately 0.04 acres of the BSA. Water within the wetland seems to have collected due to a large tree stump that has blocked water flow to the adjacent jurisdictional drainage. As a result, hydric soils have formed in this area and created ideal conditions for wetland specific plant species. The following plant species are present within the seasonal wetland swale; pale spikerush (*Eleocharis macrostachya*), water smartweed (*Persicaria amphibia*) and willow herb (*Epilobium brachycarpum*).

Additionally, approximately 190 linear feet of a jurisdictional drainage is present within the project area, parallel to the SR-99 off ramp. The drainage connects to a City owned culvert that transports water under SR-99 and then flows south through another drainage channel for approximately 0.70 miles before entering Comanche Creek.

The project does not anticipate impacts to the seasonal wetland swale or the jurisdictional drainage. The project design proposes to avoid all jurisdictional water features present within the project area.

The project has been designed to avoid permanent and temporary impacts to jurisdictional waters. **BIO-1** through **BIO-4** have been implemented as avoidance and minimization measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs) and will be incorporated into project design to ensure avoidance of construction impacts to the seasonal wetland swale and the jurisdictional drainage and reduce the impacts to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

4) **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project would not interfere with the movement of native or migratory wildlife. According to the *CDFW* California Habitat Connectivity Projects, the BSA is not located within any designated migratory corridor or essential habitat connectivity. The project area is designated as Regional Commercial, per the City's General Plan, and lacks natural habitat communities that would allow for habitat connectivity. The project does not anticipate to temporarily or permanently impact any wildlife corridors or areas designated for habitat connectivity.

Regardless, migratory birds could still nest in and adjacent to the project area. The project has been designed to avoid impacts to migratory birds. **BIO-5** through **BIO-6** have been implemented as avoidance and minimization measures to ensure avoidance of construction impacts to any nesting migratory birds and reduce the impacts to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

- 5) **Less than Significant**. The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The project was identified in the City's 2030 General Plan and Chico Bicycle Plan 2019 Update and impacts will be less than significant. There are 74 trees within the footprint of the proposed bikeway. The project will require the removal of approximately 50 trees; however, the project has been carefully designed to protect in place or to only trim the remaining 24 trees (Attachment B. Anticipated Tree Removal Impacts). These removals are required to allow for construction of the bike path which will also increase visibility and improve safety on the proposed bike path. The trees anticipated for removal are not part of any riparian habitat nor do the trees proposed for removal provide a wildlife or habitat corridor. Many are as such, the project is not anticipated to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources within the project area and impacts will be less than significant.
- 6) **Less than Significant.** The project would not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan as no such plans have been adopted. Butte County Association of Governments is currently developing the Butte Regional Conservation Plan (BRCP), the Plan has not yet been adopted. Implementation of the BRCP is anticipated to begin mid-2020.

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY





FIGURE 4 Vegetation Communitites within the BSA EA 03-0J740 PIN 0319000145 SR99 Corridor Bikeway Facility (Bikeway 99) Phase 5 City of Chico, Butte County, California

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

- **BIO-1**: Prior to the start of construction activities, the Project limits in proximity to jurisdictional water features must be marked with Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) high visibility orange fencing, a permanent fence (similar to the chain link fence that is currently present), or staking to ensure construction will not encroach into the wetland or drainage.
- **BIO-2**: Contract specifications will include the following Best Management Practices (BMPs), where applicable, to reduce erosion during construction:
  - The Project specifications will require the contractor to operate under an approved spill prevention and clean-up plan;
  - Raw cement, concrete or concrete washings, asphalt, paint or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances that could be hazardous to aquatic life must be prevented from contaminating the soil or entering surface waters; and,
  - Any concrete rubble, asphalt, or other debris from construction must be taken to an approved disposal site.
- **BIO-3:** To conform to water quality requirements, the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must include the following:
  - Vehicle maintenance, staging and storing equipment, materials, fuels, lubricants, solvents, and other possible contaminants shall be a minimum of 100 ft from wetland habitat. Any necessary equipment washing shall occur where the water cannot flow into the wetland or drainage channel. The Project proponent will prepare a spill prevention and clean-up plan.
- **BIO-4:** Prior to arrival at the Project site and prior to leaving the Project site, construction equipment that may contain invasive plants and/or seeds will be cleaned to reduce the spreading of noxious weeds.
- BIO-5: If possible, vegetation removal should occur outside the nesting bird season (February 1 August 31). If vegetation removal is to take place during the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey must be conducted within 7 days prior to vegetation removal. Within 2 weeks of the nesting bird survey, all vegetation cleared during these surveys must be removed by the contractor.
- **BIO-6:** A minimum 50-foot no-disturbance buffer for songbirds and a 100-foot buffer for raptors must be established around any active nests. The contractor must immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established and is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by the Project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				
2) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				
3) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				

#### **Regulatory Setting**

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a), and the Public Resources Code 5024(a)(b) and (d) require consideration of potential project impacts to "unique" archaeological sites that do not qualify as historical resources. The statutory requirements for unique archaeological sites that do not qualify as historical resources are established in PRC Section 21083.2. These two PRC sections operate independently to ensure that significant potential impacts on historical and archaeological resources are considered as part of a CEQA project's environmental analysis. Historical resources, as defined in the CEQA regulations, include:

- 1) Cultural resources listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register);
- 2) Cultural resources included in a local register of historical resources;
- 3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in one of several historic themes important to California history and development.

Under CEQA, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if the project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, meaning the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource would be materially impaired. This would include any action that would demolish or adversely alter the physical characteristics of a historical resource that conveys its historic significance and qualify it for inclusion in the California Register or in a local register or survey that meets the requirements of PRC Section 5020.1(I) and 5024.1(g). PRC Section 5024 also requires state agencies to identify and protect state-owned resources that meet National Register of Historic Place (National Register) listing criteria. Sections 5024(f) and 5024.5 require state agencies to provide notice to and consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) before altering, transferring, relocating, or demolishing state-owned historical resources that are listed on or are eligible for inclusion in the National Register or are registered or eligible for registration as California Historical Landmarks. Also, CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines also recommend provisions be made for the accidental discovery of archaeological sites, historical resources, or Native American human remains during construction (PRC Section 21083.2(i) CCR Section 15064.5[d and f]).

#### Affected Environment / Environmental Consequences

1) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Efforts to identify
potential historical resources in the Project Area Limits (PAL) include background research, a search of site records and survey reports on file at the Northeast Information Center (NEIC), efforts to coordinate with Native American representatives, and a pedestrian ground surface inventory. The results from the NEIC identified that there are three cultural resources within a one-half-mile radius of the Area of Potential Effect (APE); however, no resources are within the PALs.

The PAL was defined to incorporate all ground disturbing activities required to construct the project (see Figure 5: Cultural Project Area Limits). It includes the proposed staging areas, street closures, vegetation/tree removal, trail realignment, overcrossing bridge, ground disturbance, temporary construction easements, and utility relocations. The PAL extends to the east of the northbound on and off ramps for SR-99 adjacent to the Chico Mall off of East 20<sup>th</sup> Street. The project extends to the west end of Business Lane and approximately 150 feet of the mall parking lot on the northside of East 20<sup>th</sup> Street. The PAL was established as the area of direct and indirect effects and consists of a 21.8-acre area. The vertical PAL for this project extends a maximum of 5 feet of depth below existing ground surface (bgs) to accommodate earthwork for the construction of the trail, vegetation removal, and fill compaction. Bridge abutments will require an excavation depth of 10 feet below existing ground surface, plus an additional 50 feet (for a total of 60 feet) below existing ground surface to accommodate drilled piles into the ground. Underground utilities may require relocation, and all relocation will occur within 5 feet below ground surface.

A survey was conducted by Dr. Brian S. Marks, Ph.D. (archaeologist) on April 10, 2019, for the purpose of identifying and recording historic resources. The field survey did not identify any historic resources within the PAL.

Based on the known geology of the area, consultation with the Native American tribes, and the evidence of disturbance in the area, the project has a low buried archaeological site potential.

With any project requiring ground disturbance, there is always the possibility that cultural resources may be unearthed during construction. This impact is considered potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 and CR-2 would reduce this impact to a less-than significant level.

2) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource. An archaeological field survey was conducted by Dr. Brian S. Marks, Ph.D. (archaeologist) on April 10, 2019, for the purpose of identifying and recording archaeological resources. The field survey did not identify any cultural resources within the PAL.

Based on a review of historic literature, geographic features, previously recorded archaeological resources, and past survey reports, overall archaeological site sensitivity in the project area is considered low due to the construction of the SR99, East 20<sup>th</sup> Street, Chico Mall, and the SR99/20th Street Interchange. This would have removed or destroyed any surface expression of cultural resources, if present. Based on the historic and modern disturbances throughout the area, the probability of buried sites within the PAL is low. The potential for encountering prehistoric buried sites near the bike trail is low due to the disturbances caused by the construction of the existing roadway, the Chico Mall, and the associated infrastructure for the area such as buried utilities, storm water, and sewer.

To help identify any potential archaeological resources within the PAL, Dokken Engineering sent a letter and a map depicting the project vicinity to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in West Sacramento on February 12, 2019, asking the commission to review the sacred land files for any Native American cultural resources that might be affected by the project. The request to the NAHC seeks to identify any Native American cultural resources within or adjacent to the project area. A list of Native American individuals who might have information or concerns about the project was also requested. On February 13, 2019, Dr. Gayle Totton, Associate Government Program Analyst, informed Dokken Engineering via fax that a review of the sacred lands file failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the "immediate project area."

Native American individuals and organizations provided by the NAHC were consulted by Caltrans as mandated by NEPA to meet Section 106 requirements. Caltrans contacted 7 individuals representing 9 Native American groups in July 2019. Letters will be followed up by email and telephone calls. Additional information regarding Native American consultation conducted for CEQA can be found in Section VI. Tribal Cultural Resources.

Based on the known geology of the area, consultation with the Native American tribes, and the evidence of disturbance in the area, the project has a low buried archaeological site potential.

With any project requiring ground disturbance, there is always the possibility that cultural resources be unearthed during construction. This impact is considered potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 and CR-2 would reduce this impact to a less-than significant level.

3) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** With any project requiring ground disturbance, there is always the possibility that unmarked burials may be unearthed during construction. This impact is considered potentially significant. Disturbance to human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries is not anticipated. Measure CR-2 would further avoid effects on human remains.

## Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

- **CR-1**: If a significant archaeological resource(s) or tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). An archaeologist, who meets the Secretory of Interior Standards for an archaeologist, shall assess the discovery, and if the discovery involves Native American resources a representative of the concerned tribe(s) shall be contacted to assess significance. The archaeologist, a representative of the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), and the City of Chico shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). Work shall not resume in the area until mitigation has been completed or it has been determined that the archaeological resource(s) is not significant.
- **CR-2:** If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.



Source: ESRI Maps Online; Dokken Engineering 9/26/2019; Created By: hsheldor



Figure 5 Cultural Project Area Limits PIN 0319000145 EA 03-0J740 SR99 Corridor Bikeway Facility Phase 5; 20th Street Overcrossing City of Chico, Butte County, California

F. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe				

# **Regulatory Background**

Effective July 1, 2015, CEQA was revised to include early consultation with California Native American tribes and consideration of tribal cultural resources (TCRs). These changes were enacted through Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52). By including TCRs early in the CEQA process, AB 52 intends to ensure that local and Tribal governments, public agencies, and project proponents would have information available, early in the project planning process, to identify and address potential adverse impacts to TCRs. CEQA now establishes that a "project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment" (PRC § 21084.2).

To help determine whether a project may have such an adverse effect, the PRC requires a lead agency to consult with any California Native American tribe that requests consultation and is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project. That consultation must take place prior to the determination of whether a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project (PRC § 21080.3.1). Consultation must consist of the lead agency providing formal notification, in writing, to the tribes that have requested notification or proposed projects within their traditionally and culturally affiliated area. AB 52 stipulates that the NAHC shall assist the lead agency in identifying the California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally

affiliated within the project area. If the tribe wishes to engage in consultation on the project, the tribe must respond to the lead agency within 30 days of receipt of the formal notification. Once the lead agency receives the tribe's request to consult, the lead agency must then begin the consultation process within 30 days. If a lead agency determines that a project may cause a substantial adverse change to TCRs, the lead agency must consider measures to mitigate that impact. Consultation concludes when either: 1) the parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a TCR, or 2) a party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached (PRC § 21080.3.2). Under existing law, environmental documents must not include information about the locations of an archaeological site or sacred lands or any other information that is exempt from public disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act. TCRs are also exempt from disclosure. The term "tribal cultural resource" refers to sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:

- Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.
- Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5020.1.
- A resource determined by a California lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the PRC Section 5024.1.

#### Affected Environment / Environmental Consequences

1a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. A cultural resource study area, the PAL was established considering areas of permanent and temporary disturbance, including construction staging and grading.

TCR identification efforts were conducted to determine whether a TCR, as defined by PRC § 21074, would be impacted by the project. These efforts included background research, a search of archaeological site records and cultural survey reports on file at the NEIC, literature and map review, a review of the Sacred Lands File by the NAHC, efforts to coordinate with Native American Tribal Governments, and a pedestrian field survey. No tribes to date have written the City requesting to be consulted under AB 52; however, on March 12, 2019, a letter was sent to Vice Chairperson Sandra Knight of the Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria seeing input for the Bikeway 99 Phase 5 project. The letter provided a summary of the project and requested information regarding comments or concerns the Native American community might have about the project and whether any traditional cultural properties, TCRs, or other resources of significance would be affected by implementation of the project.

At this time, no traditional cultural properties or TCRs have been identified within the project area by the Native American community. See Appendix C for a summary of consultation efforts with the Native American community. Since Native American Consultation resulted in no known Tribal Cultural Resources within the PAL, impacts to TCRs would be unlikely. Nevertheless, with any project requiring ground disturbance, there is always the possibility that unmarked cultural resources may be unearthed during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 and CR-2 would reduce this impact to a less-than significant level.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

See **CR-1** and **CR-2** in Section E. Cultural Resources.

<b>G. ENERGY</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				
2. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				

1) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would result in a potential significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. As discussed in Section I for Greenhouse Gases (GHG), the on-site construction equipment for proposed project is anticipated to emit 419 metric tons of GHG during construction. Construction activities would require minimal electricity consumption which is not anticipated to have any adverse impact on available energy resources. It is not anticipated that the project would result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction.

During operation of the bikeway, the main source of energy consumption will be associated with pathway lighting and security cameras; however, the project would incorporate the use of energy-efficient lighting, such as Light-emitting diode (LED) lights, per Measure CC-1. LED bulbs last five to six years, compared to the one-year average lifespan of the incandescent bulbs previously used. The LED bulbs themselves also consume 10 percent of the electricity of traditional lights, which will also help reduce the project's energy consumption.

2) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project would not conflict with or obstruct any local plans, including the Chico Climate Action Plan, for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The City of Chico is committed to reducing energy consumption to be consistent with statewide goals, which outlines plans for renewable energy and energy efficiency as a means to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As a result, the measure CC-1 will be included in the project to be consistent with the local plan for energy efficiency.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

See Measure CC-1 listed in Section I for Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

H. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
a) 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?				
b) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
c) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
d) Landslides?			$\boxtimes$	
2) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
3) 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?				
4) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?				
5) 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, or is otherwise not consistent with the Chico Nitrate Action Plan or policies for sewer service control?				
6) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				

1(a-d) Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects of risk of loss, injury or death due to a known earthquake fault, seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure or landslides. A Preliminary Geotechnical Report concluded that the alignment would occur on a combination of un-weathered gravel, sand, silt and clay. Additionally, shallow water is expected to be present within 15 to 20 feet below the existing ground surface. Groundwater dewatering and moisture barriers are currently in use by surrounding subsurface structures and may be expected during excavation for the overpass foundations.

The project is located near several faults that could produce regional faulting: Chico Monocline, Cohasset Ridge Fault, Paradise Fault, Magalia Fault, and Cleveland Hill Fault. The most recent seismic activity occurred from the Cleveland Hills Fault. The mapped fault zone is approximately 25 miles south of the project location. The fault is associated with ground rupture during the Oroville earthquakes of 1975. The project location presents a low possibility of seismically induced hazards such as lateral spreading, liquefaction, ground lurching, seismically induced settlement, and surface rupture. Ground shaking is likely due to the surrounding active faults and the bikeway will be designed per Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria. With adherence to design and construction standards according to Caltrans' seismic design criteria, impacts from ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides would be less than significant.

- 2) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Erosion and loss of top soil would be a less than significant impact with mitigation. Grading and earthwork during construction may result in erosion and sedimentation. This impact would be mitigated through implementation of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which would incorporate erosion control methods as detailed in measure WQ-2 listed in Section K.
- 3, 4) Less Than Significant. The project is not on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project. Soils within the project area are predominantly moderately well drained fine-loamy alluvium derived from igneous, metamorphic and sedimentary rock over gravelly alluvium derived from volcanic rock. According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the soil series present within the project area is the Redsluff gravelly loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, and Galt clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes (NRCS 2019). On-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse is not anticipated. Expansive soils contain significant amounts of clay particles that have the ability to give up water (shrink) or take on water (swell). When these soils swell, the change in volume can exert significant pressures on loads that are placed on them and can result in structural distress and/or damage. Soils at the proposed project site are non-expansive.
- 5) **No Impact.** The project does not include septic tanks or an alternative wastewater disposal system on the site.
- 6) No Impact. Due to the extensive disturbances caused by commercial and transportation corridor development within the project area, there is a low potential for paleontological resources at the project site. Additionally, per the University of California Museum of Paleontology NEOMAP database, no paleontological resources have been recorded within the project area (UCMP 2017). No unique paleontological resources, sites, or unique geologic features are anticipated to occur within the project PAL. No impact is anticipated on paleontological resources.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

<b>I. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b> Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				

## **Regulatory Background**

While climate change has been a concern since at least 1988, as evidenced by the establishment of the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the efforts devoted to GHG emissions reduction and climate change research and policy have increased dramatically in recent years. These efforts are primarily concerned with the emissions of GHG related to human activity that include CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, NOX, nitrous oxide, tetrafluoromethane, hexafluoroethane, sulfur hexafluoride, HFC-23 (fluoroform), HFC-134a (s, s, s, 2 –tetrafluoroethane), and HFC-152a (difluoroethane). The City of Chico's 202 Climate Action Plan outlines strategies, organized within a flexible ten-year framework, for a significant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions that are directly and indirectly generated by local activities. The Plan includes actions to reduce energy, water, and fuel consumption and to reduce the amount of waste going into the landfill (City of Chico 2020 Climate Action Plan).

In 2002, with the passage of Assembly Bill 1493 (AB 1493), California launched an innovative and pro-active approach to dealing with GHG emissions and climate change at the state level. AB 1493 requires the California Air Resource Board (CARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck GHG emissions. These stricter emissions standards were designed to apply to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009model year; however, in order to enact the standards California needed a waiver from the EPA. The waiver was denied by the EPA in December 2007 and efforts to overturn the decision had been unsuccessful. See California v. Environmental Protection Agency, 9th Cir. Jul. 25, 2008, No. 08-70011. On January 26, 2009, it was announced that EPA would reconsider their decision regarding the denial of California's waiver. On May 18, 2009, President Obama announced the enactment of a 35.5 mpg fuel economy standard for automobiles and light duty trucks which will take effect in 2012. On June 30, 2009 EPA granted California the waiver. California is expected to enforce its standards for 2009 to 2011 and then look to the federal government to implement equivalent standards for 2012 to 2016. The granting of the waiver will also allow California to implement even stronger standards in the future. The state is expected to start developing new standards for the post-2016 model years later this year.

On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05. The goal of this Executive Order is to reduce California's GHG emissions to: 1) 2000 levels by 2010, 2) 1990 levels by the 2020 and 3) 80 percent below the 1990 levels by the year 2050. In 2006, this goal was further reinforced with the passage of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 sets the same overall GHG emissions reduction goals while further mandating that CARB create a plan, which includes market mechanisms, and implement rules to achieve "real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases." Executive Order S-20-06 further directs state agencies to begin implementing AB 32, including the recommendations made by the state's Climate Action Team.

With Executive Order S-01-07, Governor Schwarzenegger set forth the low carbon fuel standard for California. Under this executive order, the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels is to be reduced by at least 10 percent by 2020.

Climate change and GHG reduction is also a concern at the federal level; however, at this time, no legislation or regulations have been enacted specifically addressing GHG emissions reductions and climate change. California, in conjunction with several environmental organizations and several other states, sued to force the EPA to regulate GHG as a pollutant under the Clean Air Act (Massachusetts vs. [EPA] et al., 549 U.S. 497 (2007). The court ruled that GHG does fit within the Clean Air Act's definition of a pollutant, and that the EPA does have the authority to regulate GHG. Despite the Supreme Court ruling, there are no promulgated federal regulations to date limiting GHG emissions. <sup>1</sup>

On December 7, 2009, the EPA Administrator signed two distinct findings regarding greenhouse gases under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act:

Endangerment Finding: The Administrator finds that the current and projected concentrations of the six key well-mixed greenhouse gases--carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF6)--in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations.
 Cause or Contribute Finding: The Administrator finds that the combined emissions of these well-mixed greenhouse gases from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines contribute to the greenhouse gas pollution which threatens public health and welfare.

These findings do not themselves impose any requirements on industry or other entities. However, this action is a prerequisite to finalizing the EPA's proposed greenhouse gas emission standards for light-duty vehicles, which were jointly proposed by EPA and the Department of Transportation's National Highway Safety Administration on September 15, 2009.<sup>2</sup>

According to Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals on How to Analyze GHG Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents (March 5, 2007), an individual project does not generate enough GHG emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Rather, global climate change is a cumulative impact. This means that a project may participate in a potential impact through its incremental contribution combined with the contributions of all other sources of GHG. In assessing cumulative impacts, it must be determined if a project's incremental effect is "cumulatively considerable." See CEQA Guidelines sections 15064(i)(1) and 15130. To make this determination the incremental impacts of the project must be compared with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. To gather sufficient information on a global scale of all past, current, and future projects in order to make this determination is a difficult if not impossible task.

As part of its supporting documentation for the Draft Climate Change Scoping Plan, CARB recently released an updated version of the GHG inventory for California (June 26, 2008). Figure 6 is a graph from that update that shows the total GHG emissions for California for 1990, 2002-2004 average, and 2020 projected if no action is taken.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> <u>http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment.html</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> ibid





Taken from: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/forecast.htm

On May 13, 2010, the USEPA issued a Final Rule that establishes a common sense approach to addressing GHG emissions from stationary sources under the CAA permitting programs. The rule is in its second phase, which continues through June 2013. In this phase, new construction projects that exceed a CO<sub>2</sub>e threshold of 100,000 tons per year and modifications of existing facilities that increase CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions by at least 75,000 tons per year are subject to permitting requirements. Additionally, operating facilities that emit at least 100,000 tons per year are subject to Title V permitting requirements for GHGs (USEPA 2010a). New and existing industrial facilities that meet or exceed that threshold require a permit under the New Source Review Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Title V Operating Permit programs.

#### Affected Environment / Environmental Consequences

1 & 2) **Less Than Significant.** The project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment.

GHG emissions for projects can be divided into those produced during construction and those produced during operations. Construction GHG emissions include emissions produced as a result of material processing, emissions produced by onsite construction equipment, and emissions arising from traffic delays due to construction. These emissions will be produced at different levels throughout the construction phase; their frequency and occurrence can be reduced through innovations in plans and specifications and by implementing better traffic management during construction phases. In addition, with innovations such as longer pavement lives, improved traffic management plans, and changes in materials, the GHG emissions produced during construction can be mitigated to some degree by longer intervals between maintenance and rehabilitation events. As discussed in Section C, Air Quality, construction of the project would be in compliance with applicable air quality rules.

#### **Construction Emissions**

The on-site construction equipment for proposed project is anticipated to emit 419 metric tons of GHG during construction (see Table 3).

In addition, with innovations such as longer pavement lives, improved traffic management plans, and changes in materials, the GHG emissions produced during construction can be mitigated to some degree by longer intervals between maintenance and rehabilitation events. Per measure

CC-1 and AQ-3 construction activities will be in compliance with the Best Practices to Minimize Air Quality and GHG Impacts from the BCAQMD.

$CO_2$ 419 tops total for the project 75 000 <sup>3</sup>	Greenhouse Gas	Road Construction Emissions Model Estimates (metric tons/year)	U.S. EPA Threshold (metric tons/year)
	CO <sub>2</sub>	419 tons total for the project	75,000 <sup>3</sup>

Table 3. Construction CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Compared to Threshold of Significance

Source: Modeling using the *Roadway Construction Emissions Model* 9.0.0 (Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District 2019).

https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/documents/ghgpermittingguidance.pdf

## **Operational Emissions**

The project is not anticipated to contribute to operational GHG emissions as the project is a bikeway and does not increase traffic volumes or changes in automobile speeds. No impact to GHG emissions or climate change would result from operations.

# **Avoidance and Minimization Measures**

Although the proposed project will not exceed U.S. EPA thresholds, the City of Chico is commited to reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with the Climate Action Plan. As a result, the following measure will be included in the project to reduce the GHG emissions and potential climate change impacts from the project:

- **CC-1:** The contractor must comply with all local Air Quality Management District rules, ordinances, and regulations for air quality restrictions, which include the following relevant measures:
  - *Rule 200 Nuisance*. No person shall discharge from any non-vehicular source such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public or which cause or have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property
  - *Rule 201 Visible Emissions*. No person shall discharge into the atmosphere from any single non-vehicular source of emission whatsoever any air contaminant, other than uncombined water vapor, for a period or periods aggregating more than three (3) minutes in any one hour which is:
    - As dark or darker in shade as that designated as No. 2 on the Ringelmann Chart as published by the U.S. Bureau of Mines; or,
    - 2.2 Of such opacity as to obscure an observer's view to a degree equal to or greater than does smoke described in Section 1 of this Rule.
  - Rule 202 Particulate Matter Concentration. A person shall not discharge into the atmosphere from any source particulate matter in excess of 0.3 grains per cubic foot of gas at standard conditions. When the source involves a combustion process, the concentration must be calculated to 12 percent (12%) carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). In measuring the combustion contaminants from incinerators used to dispose of combustible refuse by burning, the CO<sub>2</sub> produced by combustion of any liquid or gaseous fuels shall be excluded from the calculation of 12 percent (12%) of CO<sub>2</sub>.
  - Rule 205 Fugitive Dust Emissions. The purpose of this Rule is to reduce ambient concentrations and limit fugitive emissions of fine particulate matter (PM10) from construction activities, bulk material handling and storage, carryout and track-out, and similar activities, weed abatement activities, unpaved parking lots, unpaved staging areas, unpaved roads, inactive disturbed land, disturbed open areas, and windblown dust.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Per the U.S. EPA, modifications of existing facilities that increase CO2e emissions by at least 75,000 tons per year are subject to permitting requirements. Additionally, operating facilities that emit at least 100,000 tons per year are subject to Title V permitting requirements for GHGs (USEPA 2010a).

J. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
2. 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?				
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
4. 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?				
5. 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				

## **Regulatory Setting**

Hazardous materials and hazardous wastes are regulated by many state and federal laws. These include not only specific statutes governing hazardous waste, but also a variety of laws regulating air and water quality, human health and land use.

Hazardous waste in California is regulated primarily under the authority of the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, and the California Health and Safety Code. Other California laws that affect hazardous waste are specific to handling, storage, transportation, disposal, treatment, reduction, cleanup and emergency planning.

Worker health and safety and public safety are key issues when dealing with hazardous materials that may affect human health and the environment. Proper disposal of hazardous material is vital if it is disturbed during project construction.

The proposed project area was evaluated for the presence of Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) and/or Activity and Use Limitations (AULs), which are:

REC: "...the presence or the likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum hydrocarbons on the (Subject Property) that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum hydrocarbons into structures or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the subject property."

AUL: "...an explicit recognition by a federal, tribal, state, or local agency that residual levels of hazardous substances or petroleum hydrocarbons may be present on the property, and that unrestricted use of the property may not be acceptable."

#### Affected Environment / Environmental Consequences

- 1) **Less than Significant.** The project would have a less than significant hazard to the public or environment through the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project is designed to provide gap closure for nearby bikeways in the area. No additional transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials is anticipated as a result of the project.
- 2) Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Based on a records review of EPA and state/local regulatory agencies performed by EDR and observations made during the site reconnaissance, the following RECs were identified within the project area:
  - Potential aerially deposited lead (ADL) due to leaded gasoline automobile exhaust near roadsides with exposed soils prior to 1990;
  - The history of agricultural production in the project area likely used organic/inorganic pesticides and herbicides (organochlorines, metals, etc.); and
  - Several adjoining sites along the eastern side of the project area have the potential to affect soil and groundwater based on documented releases to the subsurface.
    - An Arco gas station-am/pm mini-market is present within the central portion of the project alignment, where substantial excavation for the bridge foundation will occur. This area has the potential to contain petroleum hydrocarbons within the subsurface.
    - Other sites including a Walmart Auto Care Center and several other leaking underground fuel tank (LUFT) sites have had releases into the subsurface, with constituents of concern including methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE); benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylenes (BTEX); volatile organic compounds (VOCs); total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) as gasoline (TPHg); TPH as motor oil (TPHmo); TPH as diesel (TPH-d); and hydraulic oil.

Due to the potential hazardous waste on-site, a Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) of shallow soil along the proposed bikeway corridor is proposed to verify the presence/absence of RECs identified above, to evaluate available options for soil disposal and/or reuse, and to provide guidance for waste management and worker safety during construction. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared by WRECO in July 2019 and was approved by Caltrans on August 7, 2019 (see Appendix E), (Initial Site Assessment 2019). Mitigation measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-3 will be implemented to further reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- 3) **Less than Significant.** The project site is located approximately 0.25 miles away from the Chapman Elementary School; however, it is separated from the project site by Highway 99 and a row of commercial businesses. In addition, construction activities would not involve handling or transportation of hazardous materials; therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact in regards to exposure of existing contaminated soil during construction activities.
- 4) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not on a site included in the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, which is also known as the Cortese List. No sites in the Cortese List are in this area of Chico (EnviroStar 2019).
- 5) **No Impact.** The project is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airport is the Ranchaero Airport-Cl56, which is approximately 3.5 miles west of the project area.
- 6) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** The project would have less than significant impact on emergency access. SR-99 and East 20<sup>th</sup> Street would be kept open throughout construction for through traffic. Response times are not anticipated to be affected during construction. In the long-term, it is anticipated that the bikeway would potentially better serve emergency vehicles by providing an additional access route adjacent to SR-99. Measure TRA-1 in Section R would be implemented to further reduce temporary impacts to emergency access as a result of construction activities to a less than significant level.
- 7) **No Impact.** The project would not cause people or structures to be exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

- **HAZ-1:** As is the case for any project that proposes excavation, the potential exists for unknown hazardous contamination to be revealed during project construction. If soil contaminated by hazardous waste is discovered during construction, proper hazardous waste handling and emergency procedures under 40 CFR § 262 and Division 4.5 of Title 22 CA Code of Regulations shall be followed.
- **HAZ-2:** To determine if aerially deposited lead, chlorinated pesticides, herbicides, heavy metals, petroleum hydrocarbons: TPH gasoline, TPH as diesel, TPH motor oil, BTEX, MTBE, or VOCs are present within the project area, a Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) of shallow soil along the proposed bikeway shall be performed.
- **HAZ-3:** Any leaking transformers observed during the course of the project should be considered a potential polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hazard. A detailed inspection of individual electrical transformers was not conducted for this Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by WRECO in July 2019 and approved by Caltrans on August 7, 2019 (see Appendix E), (Initial Site Assessment 2019). However, should leaks from electrical transformers (that will either remain within the construction limits or will require removal and/or relocation) be encountered during construction, the transformer fluid should be sampled and analyzed by qualified personnel for detectable levels of PCB's. Should PCBs be detected, the transformer should be removed and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency. Any stained soil encountered below electrical transformers with detectable levels of PCB's should also be handled and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency.

K. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?				
2. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
<ul> <li>a) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</li> </ul>		$\boxtimes$		
<ul> <li>b) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;</li> </ul>				
c) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				
d) impede or redirect flood flows?				
3. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				
4. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				

# **Regulatory Setting**

Pursuant to Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, for construction projects that will disturb one or more acres, a SWPPP is required for compliance with the State's Construction General Permit (2009-0009-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS 000002). The focus of a SWPPP is to manage soil disturbances, non-stormwater discharges, and construction materials and activities which may impact the quality of runoff from an active construction site. The Construction General Permit requires that applicable sites have a SWPPP submitted prior to the start of construction activities, and also keep the SWPPP on site during grading and construction activities.

- 1) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The proposed project would disturb approximately 48.9 acres of soil. Construction activities would not substantially degrade water quality and would not violate any water quality objectives by the State Water Resources Control Board. Shallow water is expected to be present within 15-20 feet below the existing ground surface, which could potentially be impacted by the discharge of undetected hazardous materials during excavation for the bridge foundations. BMPs will be put in place to prevent sediment and other contaminants generated by construction from impacting any surface or groundwater basin; however, the project does not anticipate substantially depleting groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge and no net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table level is anticipated as a result of the project. With implementation of measures WQ-1 through WQ-2, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to water quality.
- 2(a-d) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. Existing drainage facilities are present within the project vicinity. It is anticipated that the existing facilities will provide adequate drainage for the project and no substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern is anticipated as a result of the bikeway. Due to the additional impervious area, it is anticipated the project will generate additional runoff which can potentially contribute to increased flood potential of natural stream channels, accelerated soil erosion and stream channel scour, and increased transport of pollutants to waterways. This increase in impervious surfaces and potential runoff would be accommodated for with the existing drainage facilities. While the project would introduce additional impervious surfaces, the project would not impede or redirect flood flows. Adherence to WQ-1 and WQ-2 would ensure that substantial erosion or siltation would not occur on or off-site and any increased pollutant runoff caused by the increase in impervious surfaces is mitigated to prevent substantially increasing the rate of surface runoff. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
- 3) **No Impact.** The project location is outside of the 100-year floodplain, as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (see Appendix D). The addition of paved surfaces, from the bikeway, has the potential to alter the hydrology within the Project location. Furthermore, initial field surveys identified a roadside ditch that may be impacted by the alignment. The hydrology and drainage in the Project location will be studied and findings will be reported in a Floodplain Evaluation Report Technical memorandum including the Location Hydraulic Study Form and Floodplain Evaluation Summary Report Form (see Appendix E), (Floodplain Memorandum 2019).
- 4) No Impact. The proposed project does not propose activities requiring permanent increases in groundwater use and therefore would not conflict with a sustainable groundwater management plan. Additionally, no new buildings are proposed that will increase water usage. The project is compliant with Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan and does not conflict or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The following measures would be implemented:

**WQ-1:** To conform to water quality requirements, the SWPPP must include the following:

• Vehicle maintenance, staging and storing equipment, materials, fuels, lubricants, solvents, and other possible contaminants must be a minimum of 100 feet from surface waters. Any necessary equipment washing must occur where the water cannot flow into

surface waters. The project specifications will require the contractor to operate under an approved spill prevention and clean-up plan;

- Construction equipment will not be operated in flowing water;
- Construction work must be conducted according to site-specific construction plans that minimize the potential for sediment input to surface waters;
- Raw cement, concrete or concrete washings, asphalt, paint or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances that could be hazardous to aquatic life shall be prevented from contaminating the soil or entering surface waters;
- Equipment used in and around surface waters must be in good working order and free of dripping or leaking contaminants; and
- Any concrete rubble, asphalt, or other debris from construction must be taken to an approved disposal site.
- **WQ-2:** Contract specifications will include the following Best Management Practices (BMPs), where applicable, to reduce erosion during construction:
  - Implementation of the project will require approval of a site-specific SWPPP that would implement effective measures to protect water quality, which may include a hazardous spill prevention plan and additional erosion prevention techniques;
  - Existing vegetation will be protected in place where feasible to provide an effective form of erosion and sediment control;
  - Stabilizing materials will be applied to the soil surface to prevent the movement of dust from exposed soil surfaces on construction sites as a result of wind, traffic, and grading activities.

<b>L. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community?				
2. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation (including, but not limited to the City of Chico General Plan, Title 19 "Land Use and Development Regulations", or any applicable specific plan) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				

- 1) **No Impact.** The project would not physically divide an established community. The project is a bikeway project and will provide for connectivity to other bikeways in the region. Therefore, the project is anticipated to have no impact.
- 2) No Impact. The project would not conflict with the existing land use plan or regulation. The bikeway will be constructed on land designated as Regional Commercial. The project is consistent with all applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted. The project will adhere to all applicable policies and regulations identified in the City of Chico General Plan to protect environmental resources. The project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to land use policies adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect.

### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

<b>M. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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?				
2. 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?				

1 & 2) **No Impact.** There are no known mineral resources or locally important resources at the project site. The project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or mineral resource recovery site. Mineral resources are not associated with the project or located on the project site and the project would not result in impacts to mineral resources.

# Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

N. NOISE Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the Chico 2030 General Plan or noise ordinance?				
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels??				
3. Exposure of sensitive receptors (residential, parks, hospitals, schools) to exterior noise levels (CNEL) of 65 dBA or higher?				
4. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?				

- 1-3) **Less Than Significant Impact**. The project would not generate substantial temporary or permanent increases in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the Chico 2030 General Plan or noise ordinance. The City of Chico defines noise as an unwanted sound that interferes with an individual's ability to perform a task or enjoy an activity. Temporary construction noise is allowed to exceed typical noise standards as established in the City's Municipal Code (2030 General Plan, Policy N-1.6, Chico Municipal Code Noise Chapter 9.38, Section 9.38.060). The Municipal Code states that construction work of a structure will be allowed between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays and holidays, and 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. on other days and is subject to one of the following limits:
  - No individual device or piece of equipment shall produce a noise level exceeding 83 dBA at a distance of 25 feet from the source.
  - The noise level at any point outside of the property plane of the Project shall not exceed 86 dBA.

Construction noise is also regulated by Caltrans Standard Specifications Sections 7-1.011 "Sound Control Requirements," and 14-8.02 "Noise Control," which states that noise must not exceed 86 dBA at 50 feet from the job site activities from 9 p.m. to 6 a.m. This requirement meets the City's requirements listed above.



#### Figure 7. Noise Levels of Common Activities

Policy N-1.6 (Construction Activity) of the City of Chico General Plan identifies it is permissible for temporary construction activity to exceed the noise standards established, with limits on the time of disturbance to nearby noise-sensitive uses.

The noise environment near the proposed project is dominated by traffic sources. Background noise levels are primarily influenced by SR-99 and East 20<sup>th</sup> Street, as well as the operation of commercial businesses in the vicinity. Traffic remains the dominant noise source at the project site. As a way to characterize noise levels, Table 4 summarizes typical ambient noise levels based on population density.

Population Density	A, Ldn
Rural Suburban	40-50
Quiet suburban residential or small town	45-50
Normal suburban residential urban	50-55
Normal urban residential	60
Noisy urban residential	65
Very noisy urban residential	70
Downtown, major metropolis	75-80
Under flight path at major airport, 0.5 to 1 mile from runway	78-85
Adjoining freeway or near a major airport	80-90
Sources: Cowan 1984, Hoover and Keith 1996	

#### Table 4. Population Density and Associated Ambient Noise Levels

The vicinity of the project area is most similar to that of "very noise urban residential." Very noise urban residential areas have a typical noise level of 65-70 dBA (2015).

Table 5 summarizes noise levels produced by commonly used construction equipment. Individual types of construction equipment are expected to generate noise levels ranging from 74 to 89 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. The construction noise level at a given location depends on the type of construction activity, the noise level generated by that activity, and the distance and shielding between the activity and noise receivers.

Equipment	Typical Noise Level (dBA) 50 feet from Source
Sonic Pile Driver	96
Grader	85
Bulldozers	85
Truck	88
Loader	85
Roller	74
Air Compressor	81
Backhoe	80
Pneumatic Tool	85
Paver	89
Concrete Pump	82

<b>Table 5. Construction</b>	Equi	pment Noise	e Emission	Levels
------------------------------	------	-------------	------------	--------

Source: Federal Transit Administration, 1995

Generally, noise levels at construction sites can vary from 55 dBA to a maximum of nearly 96 dBA when heavy equipment is used. Construction noise of this project would be intermittent, and noise levels would vary depending on the type of construction activity. For this project, lowest construction equipment-related noise levels would be 55 dBA at a distance of 50 ft for sound from a pick-up truck. Highest noise levels would be up to 90 dBA (at a distance of 50 ft) for a concrete saw for pavement removal. A jackhammer, which would be up to 89 dBA at a distance of 50 ft, would also be utilized during the proposed project.

During construction of the project, noise from construction activities may intermittently dominate the noise environment in the immediate area of construction. Construction noise is regulated by the City of Chico. Construction activity could result in noise that exceeds the 55-dBA daytime standard or 50-dBA nighttime standard. Other construction activities associated with the proposed project may cause a small amount of groundborne vibration; however, vibration from these activities would be short-term and intermittent. Although temporary construction noise is exempt from local noise ordinances per Policy N-1.6, the project would include construction methods and structure designs that would reduce the potential noise and vibration impacts to less than significant levels. The project would also comply with NOI-1 which identified the project will include Caltrans Section 14-8.02 of the Standard Specifications and work activities would not exceed 86 dBA LMax at 50 feet between the hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. for the duration of construction.

No significant adverse noise or vibratory impacts from construction are anticipated because construction noise would be short-term and intermittent, and construction would be conducted in accordance with City ordinances as listed in measure NOI-1. A construction noise memorandum has been prepared for the project and was approved by Caltrans on July 25, 2019 (see Appendix E), (Noise Technical Memorandum 2019).

4) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within the City's airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels and the impact is considered to be Less Than Significant.

# Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

**NOI-1**: Construction work of a structure will be allowed between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays and holidays, and 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. on other days and the noise level at any point outside of the property plane of the Project shall not exceed 86 dBA.

<b>O. OPEN SPACE / RECREATION</b> Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Affect lands preserved under an open space contract or easement?				$\boxtimes$
2. Affect an existing or potential community recreation area?				
3. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and substantial physical deterioration of the facility would regional parks or other recreational facilities such that occur or be accelerated?				
4. Does the project include recreational facilities or facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on require the construction or expansion of recreational the environment?				

- 1) No Impact. The project site is located on a combination of public rights-of-way and lands that are currently private commercial properties that are not in an open space contract, nor located within an open space easement. The project is located approximately 0.50 miles south of the Little Chico Creekside Greenway and would beneficially affect public access to a passive recreational corridor. The property will remain public space. Therefore, with respect to open space and potential community recreation areas, the proposed project would have no impact.
- 2) **Less Than Significant.** The project site connects to previously constructed segments of the approximately 7-mile long Bikeway 99 facility; however, the project itself would not permanently affect an existing or potential community recreation area. Temporary impacts to the terminus of adjacent segments are anticipated during construction; however, these impacts will be brief and temporary in nature and would constitute a less than significant impact. A 4(f) memorandum has been prepared for the project and was approved by Caltrans on August 13, 2019 (see Appendix E), (Section 4(f) Memorandum 2019).
- 3 & 4) **Less Than Significant.** The project would not cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities. The project is part of a larger vision for Chico's Bikeway 99 facility to close a gap and complete an approximately 7-mile long multiuse trail. The project does not create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the Chico General Plan or the Chico Bicycle Plan 2019 Update, therefore, the proposed project would not result in additional significant impacts on recreation or cause substantial physical deterioration of recreational facilities.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

<b>P. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial unplanned 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)?				
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

- 1) **No Impact.** The project would have no direct impact on population growth since it does not propose new homes. The project is a bikeway project that would serve existing and planned population growth and would not induce population growth.
- 2) Less than Significant. In order to accommodate the bikeway, the project would result in the relocation of private improvements such as walls and fences. The project would also result in utility relocation and adjustments to power poles, manholes, utility vaults, water valves, pedestals, signs and water meters. While the project may require some temporary construction easements and sliver right-of-way acquisitions from private property, the proposed project would not displace any existing housing or people and impacts would be less than significant.

### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

<b>Q. PUBLIC SERVICES</b> 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection?		$\boxtimes$		
2. Police protection?		$\boxtimes$		
3. Schools?				$\boxtimes$
4. Parks and recreation facilities? (See Section O. Open Space / Recreation)				
5. Other government services?			$\boxtimes$	

- 1-2) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The project proposes to construct a bikeway which would connect to other paths in the region. The project would not directly increase the residential population of the project region and is not expected to induce residential growth that would increase need for services. Additionally, SR-99 and East 20<sup>th</sup> Street would be kept open throughout construction for through traffic. Response times are not anticipated to be affected during construction. Measure TRA-1 in Section R. (Transportation) would be implemented to further reduce temporary impacts to emergency access as a result of construction activities to a less than significant level. No impacts would result from construction of new facilities to accommodate increased demands for services as a result of the proposed bikeway.
- 3) **No Impact.** There are no schools within or adjacent to the project area. It is anticipated there will be no impact to schools as a result of the bikeway project.
- 4-5) Less Than Significant. The project proposes to construct a bikeway which would connect to other paths in the region. The proposed trail would require maintenance consisting of pavement sealing and re-striping; maintenance, repair, and/or replacement of signs, benches, and other trail-side amenities; pavement sweeping; and litter removal. These maintenance requirements would not result in the need to construct new facilities to provide appropriate maintenance to the trail and could be accommodated with existing facilities. All maintenance would be the responsibility of the City of Chico. No impacts would result from construction of new facilities to accommodate increased demands for services as a result of the proposed trail.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

See measure **TRA-1** under Section R. Transportation.

<b>R. TRANSPORTATION</b> Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				
2. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				
3. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
4. Result in inadequate emergency access?				

1-2) Less Than Significant. The project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, nor would the project conflict with CEQA Guidelines. The project is consistent with the City of Chico 2020 General Plan and the 2019 Update to the Chico Bicycle Plan. The proposed bikeway is expected to contribute minimal vehicle trips along local roads for the purpose of accessing the bikeway. Bikeway usage is expected to include residents and visitors biking directly to the bikeway; residents and visitors walking directly to the bikeway; and residents and visitors driving to the bikeway to bike or walk. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in any reduction in Level of Service on area roadways or intersections.

The bikeway would provide an additional link to existing bikeways and other networks identified by the Chico Bicycle Plan 2019 Update. In addition, there is a potential that the bikeway would result in some reduction in vehicle trips on SR-99 and East 20<sup>th</sup> Street, since bicycle trips may replace some motor vehicle trips in the existing condition.

The proposed bikeway would result in less than significant impacts associated with conflicts with applicable planning or regulatory measures for the performance of the circulation system in the project region.

- 3) No Impact. The proposed bikeway would have no effect on roadway hazards associated with roadway geometric design features or user compatibility. The bikeway crosses over the existing East 20<sup>th</sup> Street roadway with an elevated structure that would be designed in accordance with the City of Chico design standards to ensure safety standards are met for roadway crossings. The proposed bikeway would also be designed and constructed to meet ADA accessibility standards.
- 4) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** Emergency vehicle access during construction is addressed in Section J. Impacts associated with emergency access would be less than significant with incorporation of measure **TRA-1**.

## Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

**TRA-1:** Temporary impacts to traffic flow as a result of construction activities would be minimized through construction phasing and signage and a traffic management plan (TMP).

<b>S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b> Will the project or its related activities have an effect upon or result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to the following utilities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
2. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				
3. 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?				
4. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
5. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

1,4) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities. Furthermore, the project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

# 2,3,5) **No Impact.**

The proposed project would construct a bikeway and would require electrical power for lighting along the trail; however, no new utility or service systems would be required or installed as part of the project. The proposed trail would not increase the residential population in the region and would therefore not contribute to an increase in the demand for utilities or service systems. Utilities are available and adequate to serve the proposed development. Additionally, the project would not exceed the capacity of wastewater treatment facilities. It is not anticipated that construction or operation of the bikeway would generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards and any solid waste produced would be managed in compliance with federal, state, and local statues and regulations. The project is expected to have no impact related to provision

of utilities and service in the project region and impacts regarding the provision of utilities and solid waste services are considered less than significant.

# Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

<b>T. WILDFIRE</b> If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
2. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				
3. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				
4. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				

While the project is not located within a state responsibility area and is not within a designated "very high fire hazard severity" area, and will have no impacts to wildfire, see additional discussion below:

- 1) **No Impact.** The project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. All nearby local roads would remain open throughout construction for through traffic. Neither emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans are anticipated to be affected during construction. As the project is not located within a state responsibility area and is not within a designated "very high fire hazard severity" area, it is anticipated there will be no impact.
- 2) **No Impact.** The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks as the project is a bikeway project and does not increase the number of occupants within or adjacent to the project area.
- 3) **No Impact.** The project would require installation and maintenance of the bikeway; however, neither installation or maintenance are anticipated to exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.
- 4) **No Impact.** The project would not expose people or structures to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as the project would not change any of the existing slopes or grades adjacent to the project. The project is not located within a state responsibility area and is not within a designated "very high fire hazard severity" area, it is anticipated there will be no impact.

# Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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?				
2. 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)?				
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				

- 1) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project does not 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. The incorporation of all identified mitigation measures will reduce any potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the project to a less than significant level.
- 2) Less Than Significant: The proposed project would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. This project is the last phase of the SR-99 Corridor Bikeway Facility Project which began design in 2009 and has been completed in phases as funding has become available. The SR-99 Corridor Bikeway Facility Project is included in the Chico Bicycle Plan 2019 Update, adopted November 22, 2012. The completed SR-99 bikeway corridor will provide the safest and most convenient access for pedestrians and bicyclists to commercial and institutional parcels. The entire bikeway along SR-99 spans approximately 7 miles and each segment has been individually environmentally cleared through CEQA and NEPA. Phase 5 will be built in a highly developed area adjacent to the Chico Mall. Phase 5 of the project does not anticipate contributing to cumulative impacts regarding any potential sensitive environmental resources.

3) **Less Than Significant.** No substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, are anticipated. Construction noise would be minimized through timing restrictions, and a traffic control plan would be implemented to manage traffic movements and allow for emergency detour routes.

# Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Please see individual sections for related measures.
#### THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

#### V. REFERENCES

Butte County General Plan 2030.2010. Butte County General Plan Adopted October 26, 2010.

- BCAQMD. 2014. CEQA Air Quality Handbook.<u>http://bcaqmd.shasta.com/wp-content/uploads/CEQA-Handbook-Appendices-2014.pdf</u>.
- Cal Water. 2016. California Water Service Company, 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Chico-Hamilton District, Final Draft. California.
- California Air Resources Board. 2019. Area Designations Maps/State and National, http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm
- California Air Resources Board. 2019. *iADAM: Air Quality Data Statistics*, Palm Springs Fire Station site, <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/index.html</u>
- California Air Resources Board. 2019. *Ambient Air Quality Standards,* <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aags/aags2.pdf</u>
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Butte County Important Farmland 2010 Online resource: <u>ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/but10.pdf</u>
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. 2000. A General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California – Areas More Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos, <u>file:///C:/Users/hsheldon/Downloads/ofr\_2000-002.pdf</u>
- California Department of Transportation. 2003. Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs) Manual.
- City of Chico 2020 Climate Action Plan. 2019. City of Chico. <u>http://www.ci.chico.ca.us/planning\_services/documents/ClimateActionPlan-FINALDRAFT-Web.pdf</u>

Chico General Plan 2030. 2011. City of Chico General Plan, adopted April 12, 2011.

Chico GP EIR. 2011. City of Chico General Plan Environmental Impact Report. State Clearinghouse Number 2008122038. Certified April 12, 2011.

Chico Municipal Code. 2017.

http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/chico\_ca/title19landuseanddevelopmentregu\_ lations1?f=templates\$fn=default.htm\$3.0\$vid=amlegal%3Achico\_ca\$anc=JD\_Title19

Chico Urban Area Bicycle Plan (Chico Bicycle Plan 2019 Update). 2012. http://www.chico.ca.us/building\_development\_services/traffic/documents/2012BIKEPLAN.pdf

Chico Urban Area Nitrate Compliance Plan Environmental Impact Report. 2001. Butte County State Clearinghouse # 1999102080. Certified on September 25, 2001.

Chico Urban Area Nitrate Compliance Program http://www.nitratecompliance.org/

CNDDB. 2019. Rarefind 5. Available at: <u>https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Maps-and-Data</u>

- CNPS. 2019. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants. Available at: <u>http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/advanced.html</u>
- Environmental Protection Agency. 2019a. *Outdoor Air Quality Data, Monitor Values Report,* <u>https://www.epa.gov/outdoor-air-quality-data/monitor-values-report</u>
- Environmental Protection Agency. 2019b. *The Greenbook Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants*, <u>https://www.epa.gov/green-book</u>
- Envirostor and Geotracker. 2019. <u>https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/</u> and <u>https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/</u>
- Federal Highway Administration. 2012. Interim Guidance Update on Mobile Source Air Toxic Analysis in NEPA.
- Floodplain Memorandum. 2019. Floodplain Evaluation Summary Technical Memorandum. Prepared by WRECO.
- Health Effects Institute. 2007. *Mobile-Source Air Toxics: A Critical Review of the Literature on Exposure and Health Effects.*
- Health Effects Institute. 2009. *Traffic-Related Air Pollution: A Critical Review of the Literature on Emissions, Exposure, and Health Effects*.
- Initial Site Assessment. 2019. Initial Site Assessment for the SR 99 Corridor Bikeway Facility Phase 5. Prepared by WRECO.
- NESMI. 2019. Natural Environment Study Minimal Impact for SR 99 Corridor Bikeway Facility (Bikeway 99)- Phase 5. Prepared by Dokken Engineering.
- Noise Memoradum. 2019. Nosie Technical Memorandum for Bikeway 99 Phase 5. Prepared by Dokken Engineering.
- NRCS. 2019. United States Department of Agriculture, Web Soil Survey, California. http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. 2017. Roadway Construction Emissions Model, Version 9.0.0.
- Section 4(f) Memorandum. 2019. Section 4(f) Temporary Occupancy Finding for the SR 99 Corridor Bikeway Facility (Bikeway 99 or Project)- Phase 5. Prepared by Dokken Engineering.
- Stebbins, R. C. 2003 A Field Guide to Western Reptiles and Amphibians. Third Edition. Peterson Field Guide Series Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company
- [UCMP] University of California Museum of Paleontology. 2017. NEOMAP Database. http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/neomap/
- Visual Memorandum. 2019. Scenic Resource Evaluation and Visual Impact Assessment for Bikeway 99 Phase 5. Prepared by Dokken Engineering.

## Attachment A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

Mitigation Measure	Reporting	Reporting / Responsible	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
	Milestone	Party	Initials	Date
AIR QUALITY		-		
<b>AQ-1:</b> The construction contractor shall comply with Caltrans' Standard Specifications Section 10-5 Dust Control of Caltrans' Standard Specifications (2018).	During Construction	Contractor		
<b>AQ-2:</b> The construction contractor shall comply with Section 7-1.02 Emissions Reduction and Section 18 Dust Palliative of Caltrans' Standard Specifications (2018).	During Construction	Contractor		
<b>AQ-3:</b> The project will comply with the following Best Practices from the Butte County Air Quality Management District:	During Construction	Contractor		
<ul> <li>All on- and off-road diesel equipment shall not idle for more than five minutes. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and/or job sites to remind drivers and operators of the five-minute idling limit.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>All construction equipment shall be maintained in proper tune according to the manufacturer's specifications. Equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition before the start of work.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. And adequate water supply source must be identified. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>All disturbed soil areas not subject to re-vegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advanced by the District.</li> </ul>				
AQ-4: The Wind Erosion Control BMP (WE-1) from Caltrans' Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual will be implemented.	During Construction	Contractor		
<ul> <li>Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. And adequate water supply source must be identified. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible.</li> <li>All disturbed soil areas not subject to re-vegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advanced by the District.</li> <li>AQ-4: The Wind Erosion Control BMP (WE-1) from Caltrans' Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual will be implemented.</li> </ul>	During Construction	Contractor		

	Mitigation Measure	Reporting	Reporting / Responsible	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
		Milestone	Party	Initials	Date
BIOLOG	ICAL RESOURCES				
BIO-1:	Prior to the start of construction activities, the Project limits in proximity to jurisdictional water features must be marked with Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) high visibility orange fencing, a permanent fence (similar to the chain link fence that is currently present), or staking to ensure construction will not further encroach into the wetland or drainage.	Prior to and During Construction	Contractor and City of Chico		
BIO-2:	Contract specifications will include the following Best Management Practices (BMPs), where applicable, to reduce erosion during construction:	During Construction	Contractor		
	<ul> <li>The Project specifications will require the contractor to operate under an approved spill prevention and clean-up plan;</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Raw cement, concrete or concrete washings, asphalt, paint or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances that could be hazardous to aquatic life must be prevented from contaminating the soil or entering surface waters; and,</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Any concrete rubble, asphalt, or other debris from construction must be taken to an approved disposal site.</li> </ul>				
BIO-3:	To conform to water quality requirements, the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must include the following:	During Construction	Contractor		
	• Vehicle maintenance, staging and storing equipment, materials, fuels, lubricants, solvents, and other possible contaminants shall be a minimum of 100 ft from wetland habitat. Any necessary equipment washing shall occur where the water cannot flow into the wetland or drainage channel. The Project proponent will prepare a spill prevention and clean-up plan.				
BIO-4:	Prior to arrival at the Project site and prior to leaving the Project site, construction equipment that may contain invasive plants and/or seeds will be cleaned to reduce the spreading of noxious weeds.	During Construction	Contractor		
<b>BIO-5:</b> If possible, vegetation removal should occur outside the nesting bird season (February 1 – August 31). If vegetation removal is to take place during the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey must be conducted within 7 days prior to vegetation removal. Within 2 weeks of the nesting bird survey, all vegetation cleared during these surveys must be removed by the contractor.		Prior to Construction	City of Chico		

	Mitigation Measure	Reporting Milestone	Reporting / Responsible	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
	mugation measure		Party	Initials	Date
BIO-6	A minimum 50-foot no-disturbance buffer for songbirds and a 100-foot buffer for raptors must be established around any active nests. The contractor must immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established and is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by the Project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged.	Prior to Construction	City of Chico		
CULTU	IRAL RESOURCES				
CR-1:	If a significant archaeological resource(s) or tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). An archaeologist, who meets the Secretory of Interior Standards for an archaeologist, shall assess the discovery, and if the discovery involves Native American resources a representative of the concerned tribe(s) shall be contracted to assess significance. The archaeologist, a representative of the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), and the City of Chico shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). Work shall not resume in the area until mitigation has been completed or it has been determined that the archaeological resource(s) is not significant.	During Construction	Contractor and City of Chico		
CR-2:	If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.	During Construction	Contractor and City of Chico		
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS					
CC-1:	The contractor must comply with all local Air Quality Management District rules, ordinances, and regulations for air quality restrictions, which include the following relevant measures from the County of Riverside General Plan Air Quality Element:	During Construction	Contractor		
	• <i>Rule 200 – Nuisance</i> . No person shall discharge from any non-vehicular source such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public or				

Mitigation Measure	Reporting	Reporting / Responsible	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
	Milestone	Party	Initials	Date
which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public or which cause or have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property				
<ul> <li>Rule 201 – Visible Emissions. No person shall discharge into the atmosphere from any single non-vehicular source of emission whatsoever any air contaminant, other than uncombined water vapor, for a period or periods aggregating more than three (3) minutes in any one hour which is:</li> </ul>				
• As dark or darker in shade as that designated as No. 2 on the Ringelmann Chart as published by the U.S. Bureau of Mines; or,				
<ul> <li>2.2 Of such opacity as to obscure an observers view to a degree equal to or greater than does smoke described in Section 1 of this Rule.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Rule 202 – Particulate Matter Concentration. A person shall not discharge into the atmosphere from any source particulate matter in excess of 0.3 grains per cubic foot of gas at standard conditions. When the source involves a combustion process, the concentration must be calculated to 12 percent (12%) carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). In measuring the combustion contaminants from incinerators used to dispose of combustible refuse by burning, the CO<sub>2</sub> produced by combustion of any liquid or gaseous fuels shall be excluded from the calculation of 12 percent (12%) of CO<sub>2</sub>.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Rule 205 – Fugitive Dust Emissions. The purpose of this Rule is to reduce ambient concentrations and limit fugitive emissions of fine particulate matter (PM10) from construction activities, bulk material handling and storage, carryout and track-out, and similar activities, weed abatement activities, unpaved parking lots, unpaved staging areas, unpaved roads, inactive disturbed land, disturbed open areas, and windblown dust.</li> </ul>				
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS WASTE				
<b>HAZ-1</b> : As is the case for any project that proposes excavation, the potential exists for unknown hazardous contamination to be revealed during project construction. If soil contaminated by hazardous waste is discovered during construction, proper hazardous waste handling and emergency procedures under 40 CFR § 262 and Division 4.5 of Title 22 CA Code of Regs shall be followed.	During Construction	Contractor		
<b>HAZ-2</b> : To determine if aerially deposited lead, chlorinated pesticides, herbicides, heavy metals, petroleum hydrocarbons: TPH gasoline, TPH as diesel, TPH motor oil, BTEX, MTBE, or VOCs are present within the project area, a Preliminary Site Investigation	Prior to Construction	City of Chico		

	Mitigation Measure	Reporting	Reporting	Reporting / Responsible	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
		Milestone Party		Initials	Date	
	(PSI) of shallow soil along the proposed bikeway shall be performed.					
<b>HAZ-3</b> : Any leaking transformers observed during the course of the project should be considered a potential polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hazard. A detailed inspection of individual electrical transformers was not conducted for this Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by WRECO in July 2019 and approved by Caltrans on August 7, 2019 (see Appendix E), (Initial Site Assessment 2019). However, should leaks from electrical transformers (that will either remain within the construction limits or will require removal and/or relocation) be encountered during construction, the transformer fluid should be sampled and analyzed by qualified personnel for detectable levels of PCB's. Should PCBs be detected, the transformer should be removed and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency. Any stained soil encountered below electrical transformers with detectable levels of PCB's should also be handled and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency. Any stained soil encountered below electrical transformers with detectable levels of PCB's should also be handled and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency.		During Construction	Contractor			
HYDRO	LOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
WQ-1:	<ul> <li>To conform to water quality requirements, the SWPPP must include the following:</li> <li>Vehicle maintenance, staging and storing equipment, materials, fuels, lubricants, solvents, and other possible contaminants must be a minimum of 100 feet from surface waters. Any necessary equipment washing must occur where the water cannot flow into surface waters. The project specifications will require the contractor to operate under an approved spill prevention and clean-up plan;</li> </ul>	Prior to and Contractor During Construction				
	<ul> <li>Construction equipment will not be operated in flowing water;</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Construction work must be conducted according to site-specific construction plans that minimize the potential for sediment input to surface waters;</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Raw cement, concrete or concrete washings, asphalt, paint or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances that could be hazardous to aquatic life shall be prevented from contaminating the soil or entering surface waters;</li> </ul>					

Mitigation Measure		Reporting	Reporting / Responsible	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE	
	Mil		Party	Initials	Date
	<ul> <li>Equipment used in and around surface waters must be in good working order and free of dripping or leaking contaminants; and</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Any concrete rubble, asphalt, or other debris from construction must be taken to an approved disposal site.</li> </ul>				
<b>WQ-2:</b> Contract specifications will include the following Best Management Practices (BMPs), where applicable, to reduce erosion during construction:		During Construction	Contractor		
	<ul> <li>Implementation of the project will require approval of a site-specific SWPPP that would implement effective measures to protect water quality, which may include a hazardous spill prevention plan and additional erosion prevention techniques;</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Existing vegetation will be protected in place where feasible to provide an effective form of erosion and sediment control;</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Stabilizing materials will be applied to the soil surface to prevent the movement of dust from exposed soil surfaces on construction sites as a result of wind, traffic, and grading activities.</li> </ul>				
NOISE					
NOI-1:	Construction work of a structure will be allowed between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays and holidays, and 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. on other days and the noise level at any point outside of the property plane of the Project shall not exceed 86 dBA.	During Construction	Contractor		
TRANSF	PORTATION				
TRA-1:	Temporary impacts to traffic flow as a result of construction activities would be minimized through construction phasing and signage and a traffic management plan (TMP).	Prior to and During Construction	Contractor and City of Chico		

# Attachment B Anticipated Tree Removal Impacts



B	1 inch = 200	) feet			
	200	400	600	800	1,000
					Feet

0

Attachment B Anticipated Tree Removal Impacts EA 03-0J740 PIN 0319000145 SR99 Corridor Bikeway Facility (Bikeway 99) Phase 5 City of Chico, Butte County, California