

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

GIRVAN ROAD OVER OLNEY CREEK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2025XXXXXX

SUBJECT

Girvan over Olney Creek Bridge Replacement Project

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Redding (City) proposes to replace the Girvan Road Bridge (O6C-0341) over Olney Creek. The purpose of the project is to improve safety conditions for vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic and to improve the hydraulic capacity of Olney Creek at the bridge. The existing bridge, built in 1960, has narrow travel lanes and no shoulders for pedestrian and bicycle use. The existing bridge, which is 32 feet wide and 100 feet long, would be replaced with a 52-foot-wide and 109-foot-long bridge. The new bridge would incorporate two 12-foot lanes, 8-foot shoulders, and 6-foot sidewalks. The roadway will be modified on the east and west sides of the bridge to conform to the new bridge width.

The project includes: sidewalk improvements; ADA compliant curb, gutter, and ramps; and lighting improvements. Construction work will consist of vegetation removal, access ramps, temporary clear water diversion, bridge demolition, earthwork, falsework, drilling, vibratory hammers, trenching, utility relocation, drainage installation and modification, bridge construction, rock slope protection, revegetation, paving, striping, and sign replacement/installation. The improvements will be constructed in the City right of way and within easement areas. The bridge will be constructed over two seasons, with one side of the bridge being removed and reconstructed the first year, and the second side of the bridge being removed and reconstructed the following year. Traffic control will consist of a single lane of alternating traffic, controlled by temporary signals. Construction is anticipated to begin in 2027 and continue through 2028.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

This project is located 0.60 mile east of Eastside Road near State Route 273 in south Redding, Shasta County, California. It is also located within the *Enterprise, California* 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle at a longitude and latitude of -122.36904 and 40.51320 decimal degrees, respectively.

The approximately 1.63-acre project area largely consists single family residences, a community park (Cascade Park), and open space. Olney Creek flows south through the project area to the confluence with the Sacramento River. Riparian vegetation is located along Olney Creek to the north and south of the project area. Elevations in the project area are between approximately 420 and 450 feet above mean sea level and the topography along the Olney Creek terrace is nearly level.

FINDINGS AND DETERMINATION

The City of Redding conducted an Initial Study (attached) that determined that the proposed project could have significant environmental effects on biological resources. Implementation of specific mitigation measures identified below will avoid or mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified, and the preparation of an environmental impact report will not be required. If there are substantial changes that alter the character or impacts of the proposed project, another environmental impact determination will be necessary.

Prior to approval of the project, the lead agency may conclude, at a public hearing, that certain mitigation measures identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration are infeasible or undesirable. In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15074.1, the lead agency may delete those mitigation measures and substitute other measures that it determines are equivalent or more effective. The lead agency would adopt written findings that the new measure(s) is(are) equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and that it would not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment.

- 1) Based on the whole record (including the Initial Study and any supporting documentation) and the mitigation measures incorporated into the project, the City of Redding has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment.
- 2) The Mitigated Negative Declaration, with its supporting documentation, reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the lead agency, which is the City of Redding.

DOCUMENTATION

The attached Initial Study documents the reasons to support the above determination.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project to minimize potential effects on biological resources:

MM-1. The in-stream project construction period will be limited to the dry season (June 1–October 31). If water is present during construction, a temporary stream diversion will be used to divert water away from in-stream construction and maintain flow and fish passage.

MM-2. Prior to any in-stream work, the area will be visually inspected for fish presence. If presence of fish is noted, they will be herded away from the area using seines. If appropriate, seines could be placed upstream and downstream of the project area to prevent fish from entering the area. All translocation or removal of fishes will be conducted by qualified fisheries biologists.

MM-3. Any gravels or materials used for the temporary stream diversion will be rounded fish spawning gravel that is properly disinfected or cleaned prior to installation. The materials will be washed at least once and have a cleanliness value of 85 or higher based on Caltrans Test No. 227.

MM-4. Environmental awareness training for construction personnel will be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to onset of work to brief them on how to recognize foothill yellow-legged frog, western pond turtle, and other special-status animals that may occur in the project area.

MM-5. If foothill yellow-legged frogs or western pond turtles (including nests) are encountered in the project area during construction and could be harmed by construction activities, work will stop in the area and the City will consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

MM-6. If construction or vegetation removal occurs during the nesting season, February 1 through August 31 for birds and November 1 through July 15 for raptors, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey to locate active nests. The pre-construction survey will be performed no more than 7 days prior to the implementation of construction activities. If a lapse in construction activities occurs for 7 days or longer, another pre-construction survey will be performed. If an active nest is found, a qualified biologist (in consultation with the CDFW) will determine the extent of a buffer zone to be established around the nest.

MM-7. To the extent practicable, removal of large trees (greater than 10" dbh) with cavities, crevices, or snags shall occur before bat maternity colonies form (i.e., prior to March 1) or after young are volant (i.e., after August 31). If construction, including the removal of large trees, occurs during the bat non-volant season (March 1 through August 31), a qualified professional shall conduct a pre-construction survey of the study area to locate maternity colonies and identify measures to protect colonies from disturbance. The preconstruction survey will be performed no more than 7 days prior to the implementation of construction activities. If a lapse in construction activities occurs for 7 days or longer, another pre-construction survey will be performed. If a maternity colony is located within or adjacent to the study area, a disturbance free buffer shall be established by a qualified professional, in consultation with CDFW, to ensure the colony is protected from project activities.

PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION

Draft copies or notice of this Mitigated Negative Declaration were distributed to:


- State Clearinghouse
- Shasta County Clerk
- California Department of Transportation District 2
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife Region 1 Inland
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- California Highway Patrol
- Native American Heritage Commission
- State Office of Historic Preservation
- All property owners within 300 feet of the project area boundary

PUBLIC REVIEW

- (X) Draft document referred for comments 7/24/2025–8/22/2025
Date
- () No comments were received during the public review period.

- () Comments were received but did not address the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration findings or the accuracy/completeness of the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.
- () Comments addressing the findings of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and/or accuracy or completeness of the Initial Study were received during the public review period. The letters and responses follow (see Attachment D, Response to Comments).

Copies of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Initial Study, documentation materials, and the Mitigation Monitoring Program may be obtained at the Public Works Department, Engineering Division, City of Redding, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001. Contact: Amber Kelley, Environmental Compliance Manager, (530) 225-4046 or akelley@cityofredding.org.

Date of
Draft Report: 7/23/2025 By: 
Name/Title: Amber Kelley
Environmental Compliance Manager

Date of
Final Report: •

Attachments:

- A. Project Location Map
- B. Initial Study
- C. Mitigation Monitoring and Environmental Commitment Program
- D. Comments and Response to Comments (if any)

ATTACHMENT A

Project Location Map

ATTACHMENT B

Initial Study

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT INITIAL STUDY

Girvan Road Over Olney Creek Bridge Replacement Project



Prepared by:

CITY OF REDDING
Public Works Department
777 Cypress Avenue
Redding, California 96001

July 2025

City of Redding

CEQA Environmental Checklist

1. Project Title: Girvan Road Over Olney Creek Bridge (06C-0341) Replacement Project (proposed project)

2. Lead agency name and address:

City of Redding
777 Cypress Avenue
Redding, CA 96001

3. Contact person and Phone number: Amber Kelley, Environmental Compliance Manager,
(530) 225-4046

4. Applicant's Name and Address:

City of Redding
Public Works Department
777 Cypress Avenue
Redding, CA 96001

5. Project Location:

The proposed project is in the city of Redding, Shasta County, California. The project area extends approximately 600 feet along Girvan Road at Olney Creek, and also includes a staging area along the south side of Girvan Road approximately 500 feet to the east (see Figure 1 and Figure 2).

The project area is located in the Enterprise, California 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle in Township 31N, Range 4W, unsectioned area within San Buenaventura Mexican land grant. The approximate center of the project area at latitude 40.513206°, longitude - 122.369072°.

6. General plan description:

- Greenway (GWY)
- Parkland (PK)
- Residential – 2 to 3.5 Dwelling Units Per Acre (2 to 3.5)

7. Zoning:

- Public Facility (PF)
- Residential Single Family 3 Units Per Acre (RS-3)
- Residential Single Family 2 Units Per Acre (RS-2)
- Open Space (OS)

8. Description of project:

The existing Girvan Road Bridge over Olney Creek was built in 1960. The most recent available Caltrans Bridge Inspection Report performed in June of 2012 lists the bridge as “Functionally Obsolete.” The City of Redding (City) proposes to replace the existing bridge using funding

provided by the Federal Highway Bridge Program as well as local funds. The purpose of the project is to improve safety conditions for vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic on Girvan Road Bridge and to improve the hydraulic capacity of Olney Creek at the bridge. The project is needed as the existing bridge will not reasonably accommodate current and future forecasted traffic as the existing travel lanes are too narrow and there are no shoulders. Additionally, a recent flood studies of Olney Creek confirmed that the existing bridge will obstruct streamflow during a 50- and 100-year flood event and the existing bridge soffit will be inundated under high-flow conditions.

The existing bridge is 32 feet wide by 100 feet long and is a continuous two-span reinforced concrete tee-beam superstructure with a single reinforced concrete column and reinforced concrete diaphragm style abutments, all of which are supported on steel piles. The City would replace the bridge with a 109-foot-long, three-span, 52-foot-wide, continuous concrete slab on intermediate pile bent supports and pile supported diaphragm abutments. The new bridge would incorporate two 12-foot lanes, 8-foot shoulders, and 6-foot sidewalks (total width of 52 feet). The alignment would be essentially the same but at a slightly higher profile grade.

Construction would be completed in two stages, with temporary stop signs controlling one lane to allow bi-directional traffic on Girvan Road (including pedestrian traffic). Each stage would require one summer season. Stage 1 would include construction of the north half (westbound) of the new bridge, and Stage 2 would include construction of the south half (eastbound) of the new bridge. Short-term closures would be required for construction. The general design features of the project are depicted in Figure 2 (Attachment 1).

Construction of access ramps and gravel work pads would be required to remove the existing bridge and construct the new bridge, including abutments, bents, and rock slope protection (RSP). The temporary access ramps, each approximately 20 feet wide, would be constructed upstream and downstream from the bridge alignment leading down both the west and east banks for construction activities required in the channel.

The gravel work pads would be used to support the equipment necessary to construct foundations and the temporary falsework required for bridge construction. Placement of gravel pads is expected to take up to 5 days during each of the two construction stages. Placement of the clean gravel approach pads would be implemented slowly from the top of the banks, working outward into the channel.

Removal of the existing bridge concrete abutments on each bank of the channel may involve standard methods such as saw cutting, jack hammering, and possibly hoe-ram use. The existing steel foundation piles would be cut off below grade. The depth of removal is anticipated to be 13 feet. Removal of the existing concrete pier in the channel would likely include saw cutting and jack hammering. Removal of the existing foundation concrete pile cap may require temporary shoring of excavation using vibratory-driven sheet piles or soldier piles placed in drilled holes, with lagging. The total depth of the shoring piles is anticipated to be 15 feet and the depth of the pile cap removal is anticipated to be 5 feet below the channel bottom. The existing pier

A temporary clear water diversion would be needed to remove the existing bridge abutments and pier, to construct new abutments and new pile bents, and to key the bottom of the new RSP surrounding the new abutments. The final design of the diversion would be determined by the contractor and would be included in a stream diversion/dewatering plan to be approved by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The stream diversion plan would be developed prior

to construction and would be consistent with all environmental commitments and permit requirements. Diverting the stream flow would likely be achieved by diverting stream flow into culverts placed on the bottom of the channel through the work area. Washed rounded gravel or super-sacks filled with gravel would be used to build coffer dams at the upstream and downstream extents of the work area, diverting flow into the culverts. Gravel-fill work pads would be installed over the temporary culverts during construction. Turbidity would be monitored so that any turbidity increase does not exceed threshold limits. The temporary diversion and gravel-fill work pads would be removed from the creek channel prior to the rainy season (rainy season is mid fall through spring).

Some falsework would be required for removal of the old bridge and construction of the new bridge. A temporary support would be needed for the existing structure south (eastbound) half before initiating Stage 1 bridge removal and construction. This temporary support would be located downstream from the existing single column Pier 2 and would be founded on cast-in-drilled-hole (CIDH) piles. This support would remain in the creek over winter if needed until Stage 2 construction can commence. Construction of the temporary support, including its foundation, is expected to require 10 days. Anticipated depth of the CIDH piles for temporary support is 25 feet. This temporary support structure would be removed to at least 1-foot below the surrounding channel bottom when completed.

Permanent pile foundations would consist of twelve 24-inch-diameter CIDH concrete piles (six on each end of the bridge) and 14 piles for the bents (seven on each end of the bridge), for a total of 26 piles. These piles would need to be placed to support the bridge diaphragm abutments and the pile bents. The maximum depth of any drilled-hole excavation is anticipated to be 50 feet.

RSP would be placed along the banks of Olney Creek in front of and surrounding the abutments. Abutment RSP would extend approximately 20 feet upstream and downstream along the banks from the new bridge. Toes of RSP would be keyed into the channel banks approximately 6 feet. Depth of excavation would be about 6 feet.

Diaphragm-type abutments and intermediate pile-bents would be constructed for bridge support. The new abutments would be located slightly farther away from the channel than the existing bridge abutments. Approximate maximum depth of excavation is 10 feet at abutments. The pile bents would be located along the margins of the stream channel. The pile bents would not require excavation other than the installation of each 24-inch CIDH pile to a depth anticipated to be 45 feet. The abutments would likely require vibratory driven sheet piles or soldier piles placed in drilled holes with lagging in order to shore excavations during construction. Depth of these temporary shoring piles is anticipated to be 15 feet.

An existing 12-inch-diameter steel waterline, a 4-inch telecommunication duct, and a 24-inch sanitary sewer jumper pipeline, each on the downstream edge of the existing bridge deck slab, would be relocated to the downstream edge of the new bridge deck slab. A waterline buried in the Girvan Road easement would be relocated to the shoulders of new bridge's west and east approach roadways. The anticipated depth of excavation is 6 feet. The telecommunications line would be relocated just south of the new south sidewalk along the west and east approach roadway. The anticipated depth of excavation is 4 feet. The sanitary sewer jumper would be relocated south of the new south sidewalk along the west and east approach roadway. The anticipated depth of excavation is 8 feet.

The existing 14-inch sanitary sewer pipeline and the four 4-inch-diameter electric conduit lines on the upstream edge of the existing bridge deck slab would be relocated to the new upstream edge of the wider bridge deck slab. The sewer line would be relocated in the west and east approach roadway shoulder. The anticipated depth of excavation would be 20 feet in the east approach to reconnect properly to the existing 22-foot-deep manhole. The anticipated depth of excavation is 12 feet in the west approach. The electric conduits would be relocated north of the approach roadway north sidewalk in the west and east approach. The anticipated depth of excavation is 4 feet.

One joint utility pole would need to be relocated before constructing the project. The pole is currently at the southeast corner of the existing bridge structure. The overhead lines and guys associated with this pole would also be relocated. The depth of excavation to remove and relocate the pole would be approximately 15 feet.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Surrounding land uses include single family residences, a community park (Cascade Park), and open space. Olney Creek flows south through the project area to the confluence with the Sacramento River. Riparian vegetation is located along Olney Creek to the north and south of the project area. Elevations in the project area are between approximately 420 and 450 feet above mean sea level and the topography along the Olney Creek terrace is nearly level.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

The City consulted with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local Native American contacts pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3. This consultation included contacting the local Native American individuals identified by the NAHC via letters, emails, and follow-up phone calls. One local Native American tribe responded, and consultation is ongoing. Additionally, NAHC conducted a review of its Sacred Lands database for culturally significant properties and responded that there are no records for the project area.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

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.

Copies of the Initial Study and related materials and documentation may be obtained at the Engineering Division of the Public Works Department, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001. Contact Amber Kelley at (530) 225-4046 or akelley@cityofredding.org.



Amber Kelley
Environmental Compliance Manager
Public Works Engineering



Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. The environmental analysis in this section is patterned after the Initial Study Checklist recommended by the State of California's *CEQA Guidelines* and used by the City of Redding in its environmental review process. For the preliminary environmental assessment undertaken as part of this Initial Study's preparation, a determination that there is a potential for significant effects indicates the need to analyze the development's impacts more fully and to identify mitigation.

For the evaluation of potential impacts, the questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and an answer is provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. The analysis considers the long-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the development. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- **No Impact.** The development will not have any measurable environmental impact on the environment.
- **Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The development will have the potential for impacting the environment although this impact will be below established thresholds that are significant.
- **Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The development will have the potential to generate impacts which may be considered as a significant effect on the environment; however, mitigation measures or changes to the development's physical or operational characteristics can reduce these impacts to levels that are less than significant.
- **Potentially Significant Impact.** The development will have impacts which are considered significant, and additional analysis is required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Where potential impacts are anticipated to be significant, mitigation measures will be required so that impacts may be avoided or reduced to insignificant levels.

Prior environmental evaluations applicable to all or part of the project area:

- City of Redding General Plan 2045
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, 2024, SCH # 2022050300

List of Attachments/References

- Appendix 1. Figure 1 – Project Location
Figure 2 – Project Design Features
- Appendix 2. Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 9.0.0, (Stantec, 2022)*
- Appendix 3. Natural Environment Study (Stantec, 2024)*
- Appendix 4. Biological Assessment/Essential Fish Habitat Assessment (Stantec, 2022)*
- Appendix 5. Confidential Cultural Reports (Pacific Legacy, 2022)*

*Appendices are on file at the City of Redding, Public Works -Engineering Division.

I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact
c) 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?	Less Than Significant Impact
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion

- a) During the construction period, construction workers, vehicles, and equipment, including heavy machinery, would be present and visible to nearby residents and recreationalists at Cascade Park. Construction activities would include removal of the old bridge and construction of the new bridge over two construction seasons (summer). Following construction, temporarily disturbed areas would be restored to pre-construction conditions. The project would be consistent with the existing aesthetic as experienced from nearby homes and businesses, public recreational sites, and by travelers using the local roadways within the project area. There are no scenic areas or resources within the project area, and the project would have no impact.
- b) The proposed project is not located on or near a state-designated scenic highway. There would be no impacts on scenic resources.
- c) The proposed project would replace the existing 32-foot-wide, 100-foot-long, two-span bridge over Olney Creek with a new 52-foot wide, 109-foot-long, three-span bridge. The proposed project would also involve widening the roadway approaches. Replacing the existing bridge is compatible with the existing visual character of the property and its surroundings. The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, and would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. The impact of the proposed project on the existing visual character and quality of existing views would be less than significant.
- d) Construction of the proposed project may involve the use of temporary safety and security lighting in the construction and staging areas. Temporary construction lighting will comply with the City's Zoning Ordinance light standards that require light shielding (City of Redding 2019). Although there are residences near the project and staging areas, they would not be substantially affected by the use of these types of lights. Construction equipment, machinery, and bright colored traffic control signage may temporarily increase light and glare in the project area during construction.

Operational lighting would not be required for the proposed project. Impacts on day or nighttime views in the area because of project lighting would be less than significant.

Documentation

- California Department of Transportation. 2024. California State Scenic Highway Map. Available at: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>. Accessed June 21, 2024.
- City of Redding. 2024. Municipal Code – Zoning Ordinance Chapter 18.40.090 (Lighting). August 21, 2024.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	No Impact
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact

Discussion

a–e) The project area does not include any designated farmland or timberlands. According to the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, no lands within the project area are under Williamson Act contracts and no lands are mapped as “Important Farmlands.” The proposed project would not convert any farmland to non-agricultural use, or any forestland to non-forest use; therefore, there would be no impact.

Documentation

- California Department of Conservation. 2016. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Shasta County Important Farmland. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed August 9, 2024.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

III. AIR QUALITY

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. Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Choose an item.
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Choose an item.
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Choose an item.
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Choose an item.

Discussion

- a) The project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
- b–c) The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing bridge and would not result in new permanent stationary sources of air pollutants or result in increased indirect air quality impacts due to increased population growth or a permanent increase in motor vehicle emissions. However, construction of the project would result in a temporary increase of air pollutants. Construction activities can produce many types of air pollutants, but dust and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) is the pollutant of greatest concern. PM₁₀ emissions can result from a variety of construction activities, including excavation, grading, demolition, vehicle travel on paved and unpaved surfaces, and vehicle exhaust (SCAQMD 2003).

Shasta County currently exceeds the state's ambient standards for ozone (smog) (CARB 2020). Consequently, this pollutant is a primary focus of local air quality policy, especially when related to land use and transportation planning. Even with application of measures to reduce emissions for individual projects, cumulative impacts are unavoidable when ozone emissions are involved. For example, the primary source of emissions contributing to ozone is from vehicles. Any project that generates vehicle trips has the potential to incrementally contribute to the problem. The Environmental Impact Report for the City's *General Plan* acknowledged this dilemma; and as a result, the City Council adopted *Findings* and a *Statement of Overriding Considerations* for impacts on air quality resulting from growth supported under the General Plan (City of Redding 2000).

Although the proposed project has a relatively small construction footprint (approximately 1.6 acres including staging areas), construction activities would result in limited temporary emissions of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), which are ozone precursors, and inhalable PM₁₀. Thresholds of significance for these pollutants in the City's General Plan Air Quality Element are based on the SCAQMD thresholds as listed in the table below.

City of Redding and SCAQMD Thresholds of Significance

Threshold	Emissions (pounds per day)		
	NO _x	ROG	PM ₁₀
Level A Thresholds	25	25	80
Level B Thresholds	137	137	137
Source: City of Redding General Plan, SCAQMD			

To determine if thresholds of significance would be exceeded, a Road Construction Emission Model (Version 9.0.0) was prepared. The model found that construction emissions from the proposed project would be under the City of Redding/SCAQMD Level “A” thresholds of significance for NO_x, ROG, and PM₁₀. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.

Although the project will have a less than significant impact, City standards implemented through the Grading Ordinance and Uniform Building Code require the implementation of conservation measures and best management practices (BMPs) that contribute to achieving the City’s goal of at least a 20% reduction in emissions or the best reduction otherwise feasible. The following standard conservation measures and BMPs will be used during construction to limit PM₁₀ emissions:

- **AQ-1.** Nontoxic soil stabilizers shall be applied according to manufacturer’s specification to all inactive construction areas.
 - **AQ-2.** All grading operations shall be suspended when winds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 20 miles per hour.
 - **AQ-3.** Water all stockpiles, access roads, and disturbed or exposed areas, as necessary, to prevent airborne dust.
 - **AQ-4.** Pursuant to the California Vehicle Code (Section 23114(e)(4)) (California Legislative Information 2016), all trucks hauling soil and other loose material to and from the construction site shall be covered or shall maintain at least 6 inches of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of load and the trailer).
 - **AQ-5.** All public roadways used by the project contractor shall be maintained free from dust, dirt, and debris caused by construction activities. Streets shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil materials are carried onto adjacent public paved roads.
- d) The project would not create emissions that could generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, the project would result in no impact with regard to odor.

Documentation

- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2023. Area Designation Maps/State and National. Available at: <https://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm>. Accessed August 9, 2024.
- City of Redding. 2045 General Plan, Air Quality Element. 2024.

- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, 2024, SCH # 2022050300.
- Shasta County Air Quality Management District. 2003. Protocol for Review, Land Use Permitting Activities, Procedures for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act. November 2023.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or NOAA Fisheries?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Less Than Significant Impact
c) 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?	Less Than Significant Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Less Than Significant Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No Impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No Impact

Discussion

- a) A Natural Environment Study (Stantec 2022a) was prepared to review special-status species and other sensitive biological resources that occur or have the potential to occur in the project area and vicinity. Following is a summary of special-status species with the potential to occur within the project area.

Special-Status Plants

The project area does not provide suitable habitat for any federal- or state-listed plant species, but does provide suitable habitat for one special-status plant species with a California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) designation of 1B.2 (Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; moderately threatened in California). This plant species is listed below.

- Silky cryptantha (*Cryptantha crinita*), CRPR 1B.2

Botanical surveys of the project area were conducted on April 20 and June 27, 2018; and no special-status plant species were observed (Stantec 2022a). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not impact special-status plant species.

Special-Status Fish

The following federal- and state-listed fish species have the potential to occur in or adjacent to the project area:

- Central Valley steelhead distinct population segment (DPS) (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*), federally listed as threatened, critical habitat
- Central Valley spring-run evolutionary significant unit (ESU) Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), federally listed as threatened, critical habitat, state listed as threatened
- Sacramento River Winter-run ESU Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), federally listed as endangered, state listed as endangered

The following other special-status fish species have the potential to occur in or adjacent to the project area:

- River lamprey (*Lampetra ayresii*), state species of special concern
- Hardhead (*Mylopharodon conocephalus*), state species of special concern
- Central Valley fall/late-fall run Chinook salmon ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), state species of special concern

A Biological Assessment/Essential Fish Habitat Assessment (BA/EFHA) was prepared to assess potential impacts of the proposed project on federally listed salmon and steelhead (Stantec 2022b), and a Natural Environment Study (Stantec 2022a) was prepared to assess potential impacts of the proposed project on other special-status fish species.

The proposed project would adversely impact federally listed and other special-status fish species if it would result in: (1) direct mortality; (2) temporary impacts on habitats such that fish suffer from injury, lowered reproductive success, increased stress, lessened fitness, or mortality; (3) permanent loss of habitat; or (4) a substantial reduction in the quantity or value of fish habitat in which a special-status population occurs.

Potential impacts on special-status fish species and their habitat that were evaluated include those that relate to: (1) sedimentation and turbidity; (2) hazardous materials and chemical spills; (3) re-suspension of contaminants; (4) aquatic habitat modification and shading; (5) entrainment and stranding potential; (6) predation risk; and (7) food resources.

Based on BA/EFHA and the Natural Environment Study, Olney Creek in the project area is only seasonally suitable and accessible for anadromous fishes (i.e., salmon and steelhead) during the winter and spring months due to subsiding and generally intermittent flow and warm water temperatures during the summer months. River lamprey and hardhead are also unlikely to occur in Olney Creek in the project area during the summer months due to the shallow and intermittent flow.

Standard conservation measures and BMPs AQ-1 through AQ-6 (included in Section III Air Quality), GEO/SOIL-1 and GEO/SOIL-2 (included in Section VII Geology and Soils), HAZ-1 through HAZ-5 (included in Section IX Hazards and Hazardous Materials), and BIO-1 through BIO-9 (below) have been incorporated into the proposed project and will reduce the potential for impacts on special-status fish species.

BIO-1. *Turbidity Monitoring.* If there is adequate stream flow during in-stream work, a qualified water quality professional will monitor turbidity and suspended sediment levels at locations 50 feet upstream of and 300 feet downstream of the in-stream work area during construction activities that have the greatest likelihood (i.e., in-water excavation) to adversely affect water quality. Water quality monitoring will occur regularly throughout each day during in-stream excavation. Turbidity and other water quality results will be reported daily to the City construction manager and relayed to NMFS as deemed necessary.

BIO-2. *Limited Vegetation Removal/Exclusionary Fencing.* Areas where vegetation needs to be removed will be identified in advance of ground disturbance and limited to only those areas that have been approved by the City. Areas to be avoided will be clearly identified in the construction drawings and contractor work plans. Exclusionary fencing will be installed around riparian and other areas that are not to be disturbed. All pedestrian and vehicular traffic, into the avoided areas delineated by the fencing, will be prohibited during construction. The exclusionary fencing will be inspected and maintained on a regular basis throughout project construction.

BIO-3. *Equipment Cleanliness.* All equipment and imported fill material will be weed-free prior to entering the project area.

BIO-4. *Use of Native Species.* Any seed mixes or other vegetative material used for revegetation of disturbed areas will consist of locally adapted native plant materials to the extent practicable.

BIO-5. *Pre-Construction Planning.* The width of the construction disturbance zone within the riparian habitat will be minimized through careful pre-construction planning. Riparian vegetation within temporary construction zones will be cleanly cut to ground level and then covered with a layer of clean gravel or topsoil as necessary to protect plant viability and prevent damage to remaining root structures during construction.

BIO-6. *Natural Regrowth/Replacement of Riparian Habitat.* The temporary disturbance areas are anticipated to regrow naturally and passively, as the roots will be protected during construction. Inspections will occur during the second year of construction and one year after construction completion. If these areas do not grow back naturally the disturbed riparian habitat will be replanted using riparian species that have been recorded along Olney Creek in or near the project area, including narrowleaf willow (*Salix exigua*) and Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*).

Because in-stream construction would only occur between June 1 and October 31, the proposed project is anticipated to only have the potential to indirectly impact special-status fish species through the residual or delayed effects of temporary disturbance to the stream channel and adjacent riparian vegetation during construction, which could increase sediment and turbidity in surface runoff from the project area in the following winter months. The potential for, and magnitude of, these impacts is considered low with the implementation of the standard conservation measures and BMPs that have been incorporated into the proposed project; and any potential increase in sediment or turbidity during a storm event would be temporary and insignificant when compared to the natural background turbidity typically associated with early winter runoff and likely to occur only during construction and the following first rains. In addition to the standard conservation measures and BMPs, Mitigation measures MM-1 through MM-3 will be implemented to ensure the project has a less than significant impact on special status fish species.

Special-Status Wildlife

The project area does not provide suitable habitat for any federal- or state-listed wildlife species (i.e., listed as threatened, endangered, or proposed or candidate for listing), but does provide suitable habitat for six other special-status wildlife species. These species are listed below.

- Foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylei*), state species of special concern
- Western pond turtle (*Emys marmorata*), state species of special concern
- Yellow-breasted chat (*Icteria virens*), state species of special concern
- Pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), state species of special concern
- Western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*), state species of special concern
- Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*), state species of special concern

Foothill yellow-legged frog. The rocky channel of Olney Creek within the project area may provide potential foothill yellow-legged frog habitat. The stream could support breeding given that ponded water is likely present into the late summer months. The proposed project could adversely impact the foothill yellow-legged frog if individuals were present in the project area during construction. Potential direct impacts include harassment, injury, and mortality of individuals due to equipment and vehicle traffic. Foothill yellow-legged frog could also be impacted by degradation of aquatic habitat and water quality due to erosion and sedimentation or accidental fuel leaks or spills, or by disturbance of riparian habitat. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-4 and MM-5 will reduce potential impacts on foothill yellow-legged frog to a less-than-significant level.

Western pond turtle. Olney Creek in the project area may contain ponded water during a portion of the year that provides potential aquatic habitat for the western pond turtle. Suitable basking sites (e.g., woody debris and rocks) for the turtle adjacent to Olney Creek are limited in the project area but the adjacent upland habitats may be suitable for nesting. Potential project-related impacts on western pond turtle, if present along Olney Creek, would be similar to those described for foothill yellow-legged frog. Direct impacts could include injury or mortality of individual turtles, temporary impediments to dispersal along the stream channel, or the removal of vegetation areas adjacent to Olney Creek.

Indirect impacts could include potential sedimentation of downstream habitats or the reduction of suitable upland habitat for basking and nesting. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-4 and MM-5 will reduce potential impacts on western pond turtle to a less-than-significant level.

Yellow-breasted chat. The riparian areas along Olney Creek provide potential nesting and foraging habitat for yellow-breasted chat. Project construction would occur during the nesting season (nesting season is generally February through August) and could impact yellow-breasted chat. Construction-related disturbance (e.g., vegetation removal, grubbing and grading, noise) could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings or nest abandonment if the species is nesting in or adjacent to the project area. Impacts on foraging yellow-breasted chat are not anticipated to be significant because of their high mobility and extent of available habitat outside of the project area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-6 will reduce potential impacts on yellow-breasted chat to a less-than-significant level.

Pallid bat, Townsend's big-eared bat, and western red bat. The crevices under the existing bridge and cavities in nearby trees around the project area may provide potential roosting habitat for pallid bat. Additionally, the annual grassland, valley oak woodland, and valley foothill riparian habitats within the project area provide potential foraging habitat. The existing bridge also provides potential roosting and maternity colony habitat (i.e., colony of female bats giving birth and weaning their young) for Townsend's big-eared bat. This species may occur in a wide variety of habitats and the riparian habitat and valley oak woodland adjacent to and within the project area provides potential foraging habitat. The riparian habitat along Olney Creek adjacent to and within the project area provides potential roosting and foraging habitat for western red bat.

Bat species may roost individually or in small groups in tree cavities, in riparian vegetation, or under the existing bridge. Due to the ability of individual bats to move away from disturbance, direct impacts on bats are not expected when the bats are not in a maternity colony. Pallid bats may form maternity colonies under the bridge or in trees near the project area, and Townsend's big-eared bat may also form maternity colonies under the bridge. While unlikely, western red bat could form maternity colonies in the riparian habitat along Olney Creek. If a tree is removed that contains a pallid bat or western red bat colony, the removal could result in mortality or injury of individuals. Mortality or injury could also occur if the bridge contains pallid bat or Townsend's big eared bat maternity colonies when the bridge sections are removed.

Indirect impacts could occur from construction disturbance if a bat maternity colony is present in or adjacent to the project area. Significant noise disturbance could result in adults temporarily or permanently leaving the maternity colony. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-7 will reduce potential impacts on bats to a less-than-significant level.

Migratory Birds and Raptors

The project area and vicinity also provide potential foraging and nesting habitat for migratory birds and raptors (birds of prey). Migratory birds and raptors are protected under California Fish and Game Code and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Migratory birds that may occur in the project area include a variety of warblers and other songbirds. Raptor species that may occur in or near the project area include red-shouldered hawk and red-tailed hawk. Bald eagles and osprey nest along the Sacramento River corridor and may forage near the project area but are unlikely to occur within the project area itself.

Potential impacts on migratory birds and raptors would be the same as those described for yellow-breasted chat. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-6 will reduce impacts on migratory birds and raptors to a less-than-significant level.

- b) Valley foothill riparian habitat and valley oak woodland occur within the project area. Construction of the new bridge and excavation within the floodplain would result in temporary and permanent impacts on valley foothill riparian habitat and valley oak woodland. Construction of the stream channel access routes, excavation for construction of the new bridge abutments, and placement of the temporary gravel pad in the stream channel is estimated to temporarily impact approximately 0.11 acre of valley foothill riparian habitat and 0.11 acre of valley oak woodland. Permanent impacts would occur to an estimated 0.001 acre of valley foothill riparian habitat and an estimated 0.003 acre of valley oak woodland. These permanent impacts would result from new abutments and placement of rock slope protection about 20 feet upstream and downstream from the edge of the abutments. Vegetation removed in temporary access areas is expected to regrow naturally. The permanent impacts are immediately adjacent to the bridge and are minimal given the amount of vegetation throughout the creek corridor. Although the project will not have a significant adverse effect on riparian vegetation, standard conservation measures BIO-5 and BIO-6 have been incorporated into the project.
- c) A delineation of potential waters of the United States and waters of the state (jurisdictional waters) in the project area was conducted on June 20 and 29, 2018 (Stantec 2018). The delineation identified a total of 0.132 acre (182.9 linear feet) of jurisdictional waters. This includes riparian wetland (0.049 acre), intermittent stream (0.081 acre, 111.4 linear feet), and non-vegetated ditch (0.002 acre, 71.5 linear feet). Construction of the proposed project is estimated to result in approximately 0.0623 acre of temporary impacts, including 0.051 acre (111 linear feet) of intermittent stream and 0.0113 acre of riparian wetland. Estimated permanent impacts total 0.025 acre, including 0.017 acre (80 linear feet) of intermittent stream, 0.006 acre of riparian wetland, and 0.002 acre (71.5 linear feet) of non-vegetated ditch.

The temporary impacts would result from in-stream falsework activity and from construction of the temporary water diversion, temporary work pads, and the temporary access ramps on the upstream and downstream sides of the proposed bridge. The permanent impacts would result from the bridge widening; abutment, pier, and pier bent construction; and from placement of the rock slope protection. Standard conservation measures and BMPs BIO-1 through BIO-5, GEO/SOIL-1 and GEO/SOIL-2 (included in Section VII Geology and Soils), and HAZ-1 through HAZ-7 (included in Section IX Hazards and Hazardous Materials), have been incorporated into the project. The project's impact to waters are minimal and qualify for a Nationwide Permit from the Army Corps of Engineers. The Nationwide Permit program provides an expedited permitting path for projects that will not have significant or adverse effect on jurisdictional waters. Prior to any discharge of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional waters the City will also obtain regulatory permits from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project will have a less than significant impact on wetlands.

- d) Olney Creek and adjacent riparian habitat in the project area may serve as a movement corridor for fish and aquatic and terrestrial wildlife. The in-stream construction period of the proposed project would be limited to the dry season (June 1–October 31) when flow within Olney Creek will be absent or nearly absent with little or no potential for fish to be present. If water is present during

construction, a temporary stream diversion will be used to divert water away from in-stream construction and maintain flow and fish passage. Although wildlife may avoid the project area during active construction activities, construction activities would be temporary (two summer construction seasons) and the proposed project would not permanently interfere with the movement of native wildlife. The project will have a less than significant impact on wildlife movement.

- e) The City of Redding has a Tree Management Ordinance (Chapter 18.45 of the Redding Municipal Code) that promotes the conservation of mature, healthy trees in the design of new development. The ordinance also recognizes that the preservation of trees sometimes conflicts with necessary development requirements. There are no conflicts associated with the proposed project that would prevent implementation of the Tree Management Ordinance or other local resource protection ordinances. The proposed project would have no impact.
- f) There is no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan applicable to the project area. The proposed project would have no impact.

Documentation

- City of Redding Municipal Code, Chapter 18.45, Tree Management Ordinance
- Caltrans. 2022a. Girvan Road over Olney Creek Bridge (06C-0341) Replacement Project: Natural Environment Study. Dated August 2022.
- Caltrans. 2022b. Girvan Road at Olney Creek Bridge Replacement Project: Biological Assessment/Essential Fish Habitat Assessment. Dated March 2022.
- Stantec Consulting Services Inc. 2018. Girvan Road over Olney Creek Bridge Replacement Project: Delineation of Potential Waters of the United States. Dated September 2018.

Mitigation

MM-1. The in-stream project construction period will be limited to the dry season (June 1–October 31). If water is present during construction, a temporary stream diversion will be used to divert water away from in-stream construction and maintain flow and fish passage.

MM-2. Prior to any in-stream work, the area will be visually inspected for fish presence. If presence of fish is noted, they will be herded away from the area using seines. If appropriate, seines could be placed upstream and downstream of the project area to prevent fish from entering the area. All translocation or removal of fishes will be conducted by qualified fisheries biologists.

MM-3. Any gravels or materials used for the temporary stream diversion will be rounded fish spawning gravel that is properly disinfected or cleaned prior to installation. The materials will be washed at least once and have a cleanliness value of 85 or higher based on Caltrans Test No. 227.

MM-4. Environmental awareness training for construction personnel will be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to onset of work to brief them on how to recognize foothill yellow-legged frog, western pond turtle, and other special-status animals that may occur in the project area.

MM-5. If foothill yellow-legged frogs or western pond turtles (including nests) are encountered in the project area during construction and could be harmed by construction activities, work will stop in the area and the City will consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

MM-6. If construction or vegetation removal occurs during the nesting season, February 1 through

August 31 for birds and November 1 through July 15 for raptors, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey to locate active nests. The pre-construction survey will be performed no more than 7 days prior to the implementation of construction activities. If a lapse in construction activities occurs for 7 days or longer, another pre-construction survey will be performed. If an active nest is found, a qualified biologist (in consultation with the CDFW) will determine the extent of a buffer zone to be established around the nest.

MM-7. To the extent practicable, removal of large trees (greater than 10" diameter at breast height) with cavities, crevices, or snags shall occur before bat maternity colonies form (i.e., prior to March 1) or after young are volant (i.e., after August 31). If construction, including the removal of large trees, occurs during the bat non-volant season (March 1 through August 31), a qualified professional shall conduct a pre-construction survey of the study area to locate maternity colonies and identify measures to protect colonies from disturbance. The preconstruction survey will be performed no more than 7 days prior to the implementation of construction activities. If a lapse in construction activities occurs for 7 days or longer, another pre-construction survey will be performed. If a maternity colony is located within or adjacent to the study area, a disturbance free buffer shall be established by a qualified professional, in consultation with CDFW, to ensure the colony is protected from project activities.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in §15064.5?	Less Than Significant Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Less Than Significant Impact
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion

a–c) A Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) was prepared for the proposed project (Caltrans 2022c). The archival research, field surveys and investigations, outreach with the Native American community, and outreach with local historical societies are summarized in the HPSR.

Olney Creek Bridge is listed as Category 5 (not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places [NRHP]) in the Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory (Caltrans 2022c). As such, it is not considered a significant historical resource.

There is one recorded archaeological resource identified within the project vicinity, CA-SHA-961. Although the project involves ground disturbance in the existing Girvan Road right of way and Olney Creek project-related impacts on cultural resources are not anticipated. Caltrans and the City have determined that the project would not alter any of the characteristics of the site.

Caltrans, pursuant to the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) Stipulation X.B.2, has determined a Finding of No Adverse Effect (without Standard Conditions) is appropriate for this undertaking. On April 18, 2022, SHPO issued a concurrence letter stating that it agrees with

Caltrans’ finding of no adverse effect pursuant to the Section 106 PA. The project would have a less than significant impact on cultural resources.

The following conservation measures are included in all projects to further protect cultural resources:

CR-1. If cultural materials are discovered during construction, work activity within a 30-foot radius of the discovery will be stopped and the area secured until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find in consultation with SHPO.

CR-2. If human remains and related items are discovered on private or State land, they will be treated in accordance with State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5. Further disturbances and activities will cease in any area or nearby area suspected to overlie remains, and the Shasta County Coroner contacted. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) § 5097.98, if the remains are thought to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who will then notify the Most Likely Descendent (MLD).

Documentation

- Caltrans. 2022c. Girvan Road over Olney Creek Bridge (06C-0341) Replacement Project: Historic Property Survey Report. Dated January 2022. (confidential)

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Less Than Significant Impact
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion

- a) During construction, vehicles including worker commuter vehicles and heavy construction equipment, would require the use of gasoline and diesel fuel for power. Construction is anticipated to be completed in two stages, with each stage requiring one summer construction season. Construction would result in a short-term consumption of energy, representing a small demand on local and regional fuel supplies that would be easily accommodated and would be temporary. The short duration of equipment usage and incorporation of energy efficiencies would not create a wasteful or significant increase in demand for fuel supplies; therefore, impacts on energy resources would be less than significant.

- b) The proposed project is a bridge replacement and would not require the additional use of energy for operations. The proposed project would not prohibit energy conservation or the use of renewable energy (City of Redding 2009) and would not conflict with or obstruct the City’s plan for renewable energy. Because operations would be consistent with existing conditions, there would be no operational impact. Construction of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on state or local plans related to renewable energy.

Documentation

- City of Redding. 2045 General Plan, Natural Resources Element. 2024.
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, 2024, SCH # 2022050300.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	Less Than Significant Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	
iv) Landslides?	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less Than Significant Impact
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Less Than Significant Impact
d) 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?	Less Than Significant Impact

Question	CEQA Determination
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	No Impact
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	No Impact

Discussion

a) CGI Technical Services, Inc. (CGI) completed a geotechnical study for the proposed project that evaluated geological conditions in the project area and provided geotechnical engineering criteria to be used for project design. The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no active faults are known to pass through the project site (Jennings 1994; Hart and Bryant 1997). The mapped fault closest to the project site is the inactive Bear Creek fault, which is about 6 miles to the south (Jennings 1994). The potentially active Battle Creek fault is about 11 miles south of the project site. The closest active fault, as zoned by the State, is the Hat Creek-McArthur Fault System, about 41 miles east of the project site (CGI 2022). The proposed project will be designed in accordance with Caltrans seismic design procedures and the potential impacts of the proposed project related to surface faulting and ground shaking are less than significant.

b) Construction activities associated with the bridge replacement could result in localized erosion or loss of topsoil, but the potential for the proposed project to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be less than significant. The project is subject to certain erosion-control requirements and BMPs, mandated by existing City regulations which include:

GEO/SOIL-1. *City of Redding Grading Ordinance.* This ordinance requires preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan for projects affecting more than one acre (Redding Municipal Code Title 16). The erosion and sediment control plan requires preparation and description of any BMPs that will be used during construction and post-construction, if needed.

GEO/SOIL-2. *City of Redding Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance.* This ordinance requires preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for projects affecting greater than 1 acre (Redding Municipal Code Title 14). The objectives of the SWPPP are to identify the sources of sediment and other pollutants that may affect water quality associated with stormwater discharges and to describe and ensure the implementation of BMPs to reduce those sources of sediment and other pollutants in stormwater discharges.

c) The project area, aside from the stream banks, is on relatively level ground. CGI did not observe any signs of former or incipient landslides or signs of recent or incipient slope instabilities in the vicinity of the project site. It was CGI's opinion that naturally occurring landslides pose a low risk to the proposed project (CGI 2022).

Liquefaction is described as the sudden loss of soil shear strength due to a rapid increase of soil pore water pressures caused by cyclic loading from a seismic event. In simple terms, it means that a liquefied soil acts more like a fluid than a solid when shaken during an earthquake. The adverse effects of liquefaction include local and regional ground settlement, ground cracking and expulsion

of water and sand, the partial or complete loss of bearing and confining forces used to support loads, amplification of seismic shaking, and lateral spreading. Lateral spreading is defined as lateral earth movement of liquefied soils, or soil riding on a liquefied soil layer down slope toward an unsupported slope face, such as a stream bank or an inclined slope face.

The project site appears to be underlain by predominately dense to very dense granular soils that are estimated to have a low potential for liquefaction. A study commissioned by the City of Redding found the project area has a “high” potential for liquefaction (Woodward-Clyde Consultants 1995). However, the performance of the residences in the neighborhood and the results of a liquefaction study performed by CGI for the Olney Creek Levee Evaluation Project (CGI 2017) indicate that the risk is low. As there has been no reported surface fault rupture in the immediate Redding vicinity, the potential for surface faulting within Redding is considered low (CGI 2022). Potential impacts of the proposed project related to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse are less than significant.

- d) There is a direct relationship between plasticity of a soil (ability to undergo deformation without cracking) and the potential for expansive behavior, with expansive soil generally having a high plasticity. Thus, granular soils typically have a low potential to be expansive, whereas clay-rich soils can have a low to high potential to be expansive. Atterberg limit testing performed by CGI on two selected soil samples found plasticity indices (PI) of about 5 and 6 (CGI 2022). A PI value less than 10 is associated with soils having a very low expansion potential (Day 1999). Potential impacts of the proposed project related to expansive soils are less than significant.
- e) The proposed project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- f) A review of published data (Paleobiology Database 2018; UCMP 2019) indicates that there are no reported fossil collections in the project area. The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge within a relatively small area adjacent to Olney Creek that has been previously disturbed from construction of the existing bridge. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in impacts on unique paleontological resources or geological features.

Documentation

- CGI Technical Services Inc. (CGI). 2022. Draft Geotechnical Study: Girvan Road Bridge Over Olney Creek. Unpublished draft technical report prepared for Morrison Structures, Inc. February 2022.
- CGI Technical Services, Inc. 2017. Geotechnical Report: Olney Creek Levee Evaluation Project. Unpublished technical report prepared for City of Redding. January 2017.
- Day, R. 1999. Geotechnical and Foundation Engineering, Design and Construction, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY 10121-2298.
- Hart, E.W. and Bryant, W.A. 1997. Fault-Rupture Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act with Index to Earthquake Fault Zone Maps, California Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
- Jennings, C.W. 1994. Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Area, with Locations and Ages of Recent Volcanic Eruptions, California Division of Mines and Geology, Geologic Data Map No. 6, Scale 1:750,000.

- Woodward-Clyde Consultants. 1995. Seismic Hazards Assessment for the City of Redding. Unpublished technical report prepared for the City of Redding. July 2022.
- Paleobiology Database. 2022. The paleobiology database. Available at: <https://paleobiodb.org/#/>. Accessed August 30, 2022.
- University of California Museum of Paleontology at Berkeley (UCMP). 2022. UCMP Specimen Search Online Database. Available at: <https://ucmpdb.berkeley.edu/>. Accessed August 30, 2022.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less Than Significant Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	No Impact

Discussion

- a) Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are recognized by wide consensus among the scientific community to contribute to global warming/climate change and associated environmental impacts because of their ability to trap heat in the atmosphere and affect climate. The major GHGs that are released from human activity include carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide (Governor’s Office of Planning and Research 2008). The primary sources of GHGs are from transportation (primarily passenger and heavy-duty vehicles), industrial facilities, energy/electricity plants, residential and commercial facilities, and agricultural activities (primarily livestock) (CARB 2021).

GHG emissions for transportation projects can be divided into those produced during construction and those produced during operations. For the proposed project, construction GHG emissions would include emissions produced by onsite construction equipment. As discussed in Section III Air Quality, construction emissions would be below the thresholds established by the City and SCAQMD and would be further reduced through implementation of BMPs AQ-1 through AQ-6.

GHG emissions produced during operations are those that result from potentially increased traffic volumes or changes in automobile speeds. The proposed project consists of replacement of the existing bridge with a new bridge that meets current Caltrans and City design standards. The new bridge and roadway approaches would be wider than the existing conditions to accommodate the current volume of traffic. The project is not anticipated to increase traffic volumes, and thus would not increase local vehicle emissions, but would encourage pedestrian use of the bridge by adding 6-foot sidewalks. The project would not increase capacity or induce growth; therefore, there would be no operational GHG emissions resulting from the project. The temporary construction impacts of the proposed project on GHG emissions and global warming/climate change would be less than significant.

- b) The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions. As noted in impact “a” and in Section III Air Quality, the proposed project is in conformance with the City’s air quality policies and thresholds, follows state guidelines and regulations, and incorporates BMPs AQ-1 through AQ-6. The proposed project would have no impact on applicable plans, policies, or regulations related to GHG emissions.

Documentation

- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2021. Current California GHG Emission Inventory Data. 2000–2019. Report released July 28, 2021. Available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/ghg-inventory-data>. Accessed August 31, 2022.
- Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. 2008. Technical advisory: CEQA and climate change: Addressing climate change through California Environmental Quality Act Review. Sacramento, CA.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less Than Significant Impact
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less Than Significant Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less Than Significant Impact

Question	CEQA Determination
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion

a-b) The proposed project would not present a significant risk due to the use or release of hazardous materials. Operation of the proposed project (i.e., use of the new bridge) would not increase potential impacts related to hazardous materials. Construction of the proposed project would involve the use of heavy equipment and other materials that have hazardous properties (e.g., fuels and lubricants). However, in accordance with the City's Stormwater Management Program (City of Redding 2021) and as a part of the Clean Water Act Section 402, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, a SWPPP is required when obtaining a general construction permit. The existing bridge was constructed in 1960 and could contain asbestos in some of its construction materials.

Lead-based paint and treated wood (wood that has been treated with chemical preservatives) could also be present on the existing bridge. Additionally, aerially deposited lead could be present in the soils along Girvan Road in the project area (e.g., from the historical use of leaded gasoline in vehicles operating on local roads). The City's contract specifications require proper handling and disposal to avoid the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials during project construction.

Compliance under water quality regulations and the SWPPP would require use of the following standard conservation measures and BMPs to avoid or minimize the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials from spills or fuel leaks during project construction:

- **HAZ-1.** Hazardous materials, including fuels, oils, cement, and solvents, will be stored and contained in an area protected from direct runoff and away from areas where they could enter waters of the United States.
- **HAZ-2.** Construction equipment will be inspected daily for leaks. Leaking fluids will be contained upon detection and equipment repairs will be made as soon as practicable or the leaking equipment will be moved off site.
- **HAZ-3.** Secondary containment such as drip pans or absorbent materials shall be used to catch spills or leaks when removing or changing fluids. Secondary containment will be used for storage of all hazardous materials.
- **HAZ-4.** Spill containment and clean-up materials shall be kept on site at all times for use in the event of an accidental spills.
- **HAZ-5.** Absorbent materials shall be used on small spills rather than hosing down or burying the spill. The absorbent material shall be promptly removed and properly disposed.

The potential for project construction and operation to create a hazard to the public or the environment through the use or release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

c) There are no schools within 0.25 mile of the project area. There would be no impacts on schools.

- d) The project area is not on any lists of properties known to contain hazardous materials. A review of known hazardous materials sites databases identified two nearby leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites and one cleanup site within approximately 0.5 mile of project area (California State Water Resources Control Board 2019; California Department of Toxic Substances Control 2019). These sites include:
- Morgan Emultech Inc. 7200 Pit Road (RB Case No. 450272): LUST cleanup site located about 0.4 mile southwest of the project area, case closed.
 - Shorts Scrap Iron & Metal Inc. 2041 Girvan Road (RB Case No. 450013): LUST cleanup site located about 0.5 mile west of the project area, case closed.
 - Northstate Recycling, 2041 Girvan Road (RB Case No. SLT5R1078): Cleanup program site located about 0.5 mile west of the project area, case open – remediation.

The two LUST cases are now closed and do not pose a threat to the proposed project in the form of hazardous material leaks or spills. The Northstate Recycling site has been under evaluation since June 2012. The proposed project would not involve any use or disturbance of this site. As such, the proposed project would have no impact.

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of an airport. There would be no impacts on airport land uses.

- f) Although temporary, short-duration disruptions to normal traffic operations would occur during project construction. Construction would be completed in two stages, with temporary stop signs controlling one lane to allow bi-directional traffic on Girvan Road (including pedestrian traffic). Each stage would require one summer season to construct. Stage 1 would include construction of the north half (westbound) of the new bridge, and Stage 2 would include construction of the south half (eastbound) of the new bridge. Emergency response vehicles would be given priority access during traffic control through the project area. Short-term road closures could be required during some phases of construction. In these cases, temporary signage would be used to alert motorists and non-motorists of the closure and detour route(s). The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans during construction.
- g) The use of construction equipment in and around vegetated areas increases the potential for wildfire ignition. Portions of the project site consist of vegetated areas that could be susceptible to wildfires. However, the proposed project would be constructed in compliance with applicable local, state, and federal requirements, including the California Fire Code, which would minimize the potential for construction equipment to spark a wildland fire. Operation of the proposed project (i.e., use of the new bridge) would not increase the existing wildfire potential. The potential for wildfire ignition from construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Documentation

- California Department of Conservation. 2000. A General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California - Areas Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos. Open-File Report 2000-19. Available at: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/minerals/mineral-hazards/asbestos>. Accessed September 9, 2022.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2019. EnviroStor – Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese) available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/>. Accessed August 29, 2022.

- California State Water Resources Control Board. 2019. Geotracker available at: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Accessed August 29, 2022.
- City of Redding. 2021. Storm Water Management Program available at: <https://www.cityofredding.org/departments/public-works/environmental-management/storm-water-management>. Accessed September 1, 2022.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Less Than Significant Impact
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	No Impact
c) 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:	Less Than Significant Impact
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	No Impact
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	
(iii) 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	
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	No Impact
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	No Impact

Discussion

- a) Construction of the proposed project would disturb greater than one acre, therefore a Construction Storm Water General Permit (CGP) would be required to address storm water runoff. The CGP would address clearing, grading, grubbing, and disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling or excavation. The CGP would also require that a SWPPP be implemented to protect water quality. The objectives of the SWPPP are to identify the sources of sediment and other pollutants that may

affect water quality associated with stormwater discharges and to describe and ensure the implementation of BMPs to reduce those sources of sediment and other pollutants in stormwater discharges. Additionally, standard conservation measures and BMPs GEO/SOIL-1 and GEO/SOIL-2 (included in Section VII Geology and Soils) and HAZ-1 through HAZ-7 (included in Section IX Hazards and Hazardous Materials), and BIO-1 through BIO-9 (below) have been incorporated into the proposed project and would reduce the potential for impacts on water quality. As such, potential impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.

- b) The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge. The new bridge and road approaches would be wider than the existing conditions, but this would not alter drainage patterns in a manner that would affect groundwater recharge or groundwater supplies. No impact would occur.
- c) A draft Design Hydraulic Study was prepared for the proposed project (Pacific Hydrologic Incorporated 2019). The study determined that the proposed project is not expected to have any impact on flood risk, would not change hydraulic conditions responsible for sediment transport, and is not expected to have any impact on the Olney Creek channel. The new bridge and road approaches would be wider than the existing conditions, but this would not alter drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation, flooding, exceeding the capacity of planned stormwater drainage systems. The impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.
- d) The project area is along Girvan Road at Olney Creek. Most of the project area is designated as Special Flood Hazard Areas (Zone A and Zone AE) on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Federal Emergency Management Agency 2011). The proposed project (i.e., new bridge) has been designed to pass the 100-year flood event without overtopping and the draft Design Hydraulic Study determined that the proposed project is not expected to have any impact on flood risk (Pacific Hydrologic Incorporated 2019) and there is no risk of release of hazardous materials due to inundation. No impact would occur.

A tsunami is a series of waves caused by earthquakes or undersea volcanic eruptions that send surges of water and flood areas along the coast. The threat of a tsunami is not applicable to inland, Central Valley communities such as Redding. A seiche is a standing wave oscillating in a semi-enclosed or fully enclosed body of water. Seiches could potentially be generated in either Shasta or Whiskeytown lakes during an earthquake. However, any overspill would likely be released through the dam spillways and does not present a risk of inundation in the project area (City of Redding 2000). No impact would occur.

- e) The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. No impact would occur.

Documentation

- Pacific Hydrologic Incorporated. 2019. Design Hydraulic Study Girvan Road over Olney Creek, Bridge 06C0341. Draft report dated February 6, 2019.
- City of Redding. 2045. 2045 General Plan Health and Safety Element.

- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Floodplain regulations, FIRM Map 06089C1563G, March 17, 2011.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Physically divide an established community?	No Impact
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	No Impact

Discussion

a-b) The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge and would not divide an established community. The proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan. The proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environment effect. The proposed project would have no impact on land use or planning.

Documentation

- City of Redding. 2045. 2045 General Plan.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	No Impact
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	No Impact

Discussion

a-b) The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge. This would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource or the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impact would occur.

Documentation

- City of Redding. 2045. 2045 General Plan, Natural Resources Element.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less Than Significant Impact
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less Than Significant Impact
c) 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?	No Impact

Discussion

a–b) The project area is located in proximity to residences along Girvan Road, Minnow Court, and Platinum Way, as well as recreational users at Cascade Park. Existing sources of noise and minor vibrations in the area include vehicles traveling on the local roadways, typical sounds from residential land use, and recreational use of a community park.

Construction noise/vibration generated by the proposed project would be intermittent and noise/vibration levels would vary depending on the type of construction activity. The most noticeable construction noise/vibration would be related to the temporary use of grading and excavation equipment, pile-driving equipment, and other heavy equipment.

Heavy construction equipment that may be used for this project can generate noise levels as high as 88 decibels at a distance of 50 feet. The City’s General Plan Noise Element specifies goals to protect residents from exposure to excessive transportation-related noise (greater than 65 decibels), including considerations of the significance of noise level increases associated with roadway improvement projects needed to accommodate buildout of the General Plan (Goal N2D). Noise from construction between equipment and receptors generally reduces more quickly over longer distances. Construction activities would be temporary in nature and are anticipated to occur during normal daytime working hours. Noise would also be generated during the construction phase by increased truck traffic on area roadways. A project-generated noise source would be truck traffic associated with transport of heavy materials and equipment to and from the construction site. This

noise increase would be of short duration. The City of Redding Noise Ordinance (RMC Chapter 18.40.100.A) limits the acceptable hours of construction and demolition activity.

Operation of any tools or equipment used in construction, drilling, repair, alteration or demolition work in or within five hundred feet of a residential district such that the sound creates a noise disturbance across a property line during the following times:

May 15 through September 15: Between the weekday hours of seven p.m. and six a.m. and weekends and holidays between eight p.m. and nine a.m.

September 16 through May 14: Between the weekday hours of seven p.m. and seven a.m. and weekends and holidays between eight p.m. and nine a.m.

However, the Ordinance also includes exemptions for specific activities, including Public Works Construction Projects. Construction of the proposed project would be under contract to the City of Redding Public Works Department; therefore, the Exterior Noise Standards are not applicable. Temporary construction noise impacts would be less than significant. Ambient noise associated with project operation would be consistent with existing conditions. While the impact has been determined to be less than significant, nighttime work is not anticipated, and work would generally occur between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m.

- c) The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or near any airports. No impact would occur.

Documentation

- California Department of Transportation. 2018. Standard Specifications. Available at: http://ppmoe.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/construction_contract_standards/std_specs/2018_StdSpecs/2018_StdSpecs.pdf. Accessed September 1, 2022.
- City of Redding. 2045. 2045 General Plan, Noise Element.
- City of Redding. 2018. Title 18. Development and Site Regulations: 18.40.100 – Noise. Dated August 21, 2018.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) 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)?	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact

Discussion

- a) The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing bridge. The proposed project does not include the construction of new homes or businesses, nor does it include extension or construction of new roadways. As such, the proposed project would have neither a direct nor an indirect effect on unplanned population growth. No impact would occur.
- b) The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge. The proposed project would not displace people or housing. No impact would occur.

Documentation

N/A.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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 following public services:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Fire protection?	No Impact
b) Police protection?	No Impact
c) Schools?	No Impact
d) Parks?	No Impact
e) Other public facilities?	No Impact

Discussion

- a–e) The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge. Replacement of the existing bridge would not result in an increased demand for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public services. No impact would occur.

Documentation

N/A.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

XVI. RECREATION

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Less Than Significant Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	No Impact

Discussion

- a) The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing bridge. Cascade Park, which is approximately 28 acres and includes four acres of developed areas, is adjacent to the project area. Cascade Park includes various recreation amenities including a basketball court, parking lot, picnic area, playground area, trail, turf grass, and fishing access. The City's General Plan classifies Cascade Park as a community park which can range from 15 to 50 acres in size and provide opportunities for organized and informal recreation to the local community.

Cascade Park would remain open during construction of the proposed project, which would occur over two summer construction seasons. However, given potential traffic delays, noise, presence of construction equipment, and other temporary disturbance associated with construction activities; some park users could decide not to use the park or to use an alternate park during some phases of project construction. This could temporarily increase the use of other existing parks and recreational facilities available to the community. However, this potential increased use would not be expected to result in or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of the facilities. The impact would be less than significant.

- b) The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing bridge. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

Documentation

- City of Redding. 2045. 2045 General Plan, Recreation Element.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	No Impact
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Less Than Significant Impact
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less Than Significant Impact
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion

- a) The proposed project would not conflict with any program, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. The impact would be less than significant.
- b) Section 15064.3(b) of the current CEQA Guidelines shifts transportation impact analysis from a level of service (LOS) standard to a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) standard that refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project.

The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing bridge and does not involve the construction of new roadways or the addition of travel lanes. The CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 provides criteria for the analysis of transportation impacts. Pursuant to the Guidelines Transportation projects that reduce, or have no impact on, vehicle miles traveled should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact.

- c) The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing bridge. The new bridge design would be consistent with current Caltrans and City design standards and guidelines. The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible uses. No impact would occur.
- d) The proposed project would be constructed over two summer construction seasons. During construction, one lane would remain open with temporary stop signs to allow for bi-directional traffic. Short-term road closures could be required during some phases of construction. In these cases, temporary signage would be used to alert motorists and non-motorists of the closure and detour route(s). Following completion of construction, the new bridge would provide for improved vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on emergency access.

Documentation

- City of Redding. 2045. 2044 General Plan, Transportation Element.
- California Office of Planning and Research (OPR). 2018. Technical Advisory On Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA. Available at: https://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf. Accessed August 30, 2022.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project 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:

Question	CEQA Determination
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	Less Than Significant Impact
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.	Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion

a–b) The City and Caltrans consulted with the NAHC and local Native American contacts during environmental review and plan to continue Native American consultation through the completion of the proposed project.

As discussed in Section V Cultural Resources, a portion of a sensitive cultural site extends into the project area. For purposes of the proposed project, Caltrans assumed the cultural site to be eligible for listing in the NRHP and the Caltrans CSO approved the assumption of eligibility on January 16, 2022.

Archaeological test excavations and coordination with Native American representatives conducted for the proposed project documented that the portions of the cultural site in the project area are extremely limited in their ability to address any important research issues under any of the four criteria for listing in the NRHP or the CRRHR (Caltrans 2022c).

Caltrans determined that the proposed project would not adversely affect the cultural site because impacts: (1) would be minor; (2) impacts would not diminish the characteristics that contribute to the assumed eligibility for listing in the NRHP; and (3) impacts outside of the project area would be avoided.

On April 18, 2022, the SHPO responded that there was no objection to the finding of no adverse effect. The project would have a less than significant impact on a site that is listed or eligible for listing on the NHRP.

Standard conservation measures and BMPs CR-1 and CR-2 (included in Section V Cultural Resources) have been incorporated.

Documentation

- Caltrans. 2022c. Girvan Road over Olney Creek Bridge (06C-0341) Replacement Project: Historic Property Survey Report. Dated January 2022. (confidential)

Mitigation

None necessary.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) 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?	No Impact
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	No Impact
c) 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?	No Impact
d) 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?	No Impact
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	No Impact

Discussion

- a) The proposed project would involve the relocation of utilities within the project area necessary to replace the existing bridge. These utilities include waterline, sanitary sewer pipeline, electric line, and telecommunications line. All of these relocations would be within the project area and completed as part of construction of the proposed project. The proposed project would not require new or expanded utility facilities outside of the project area. No impact would occur.

- b) The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge and would not result in additional water supply demands. Construction of the project may involve limited use of water (e.g., dust control). No impact would occur.
- c) The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge and would not require wastewater treatment. No impact would occur.
- d–e) The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge. Operation of the proposed project (i.e., use of the new bridge) would not generate solid waste. Solid waste generated during construction of the proposed project would be transported to the West Central Landfill or other approved solid waste facility.

The City’s standard contract specifications would require recycling of some materials (e.g., concrete) to reduce landfill waste; potentially hazardous materials be disposed of at an appropriate facility; and compliance with applicable federal, state, and local requirements related to solid waste. No impact would occur.

Documentation

- City of Redding. 2022. Solid Waste Utility Department Website. Available at: <https://www.cityofredding.org/departments/solid-waste>. Accessed September 1, 2022.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact
b) 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?	No Impact
c) 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?	No Impact
d) 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?	No Impact

Discussion

a–d) The proposed project consists of replacement of an existing bridge. The project area is within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) and not within a State Responsibility Area (SRA); and is not classified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). No impact would occur.

Documentation

- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2025. Office of the State Fire Marshall. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. Available at: <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/03beab8511814e79a0e4eabf0d3e7247/>. Accessed July 16, 2025.

Mitigation

No mitigation required.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Question	CEQA Determination
a) 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?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	Less Than Significant Impact
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion

a) The proposed project would have minimal potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce fish or wildlife populations or their habitats, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plant and animal species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Although special-status fish and wildlife species and sensitive habitats may be impacted by implementation of the proposed project, standard conservation measures and BMPs, as well as mitigation measures, will be implemented to avoid the potential for significant impacts.

- b) As described in Section III Air Quality, the proposed project could temporarily contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. However, these impacts would be considered less than significant and under policy of the City's General Plan, application of standard conservation measures and BMPs would avoid significant air quality impacts during project construction. Upon project completion, the proposed project would not result in an increase in emissions and would therefore not be cumulatively considerable. The potential cumulative traffic impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.
- c) As discussed in this document, the proposed project does not include any activities that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level or that could otherwise cause substantial adverse impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Documentation

Determinations for Section XXI Mandatory Findings of Significance are based on all review and documentation provided in the Initial Study Checklist sections above.

Mitigation

MM-1. The in-stream project construction period will be limited to the dry season (June 1–October 31). If water is present during construction, a temporary stream diversion will be used to divert water away from in-stream construction and maintain flow and fish passage.

MM-2. Prior to any in-stream work, the area will be visually inspected for fish presence. If presence of fish is noted, they will be herded away from the area using seines. If appropriate, seines could be placed upstream and downstream of the project area to prevent fish from entering the area. All translocation or removal of fishes will be conducted by qualified fisheries biologists.

MM-3. Any gravels or materials used for the temporary stream diversion will be rounded fish spawning gravel that is properly disinfected or cleaned prior to installation. The materials will be washed at least once and have a cleanliness value of 85 or higher based on Caltrans Test No. 227.

MM-4. Environmental awareness training for construction personnel will be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to onset of work to brief them on how to recognize foothill yellow-legged frog, western pond turtle, and other special-status animals that may occur in the project area.

MM-5. If foothill yellow-legged frogs or western pond turtles (including nests) are encountered in the project area during construction and could be harmed by construction activities, work will stop in the area and the City will consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

MM-6. If construction or vegetation removal occurs during the nesting season, February 1 through August 31 for birds and November 1 through July 15 for raptors, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey to locate active nests. The pre-construction survey will be performed no more than 7 days prior to the implementation of construction activities. If a lapse in construction activities occurs for 7 days or longer, another pre-construction survey will be performed. If an active nest is found, a qualified

biologist (in consultation with the CDFW) will determine the extent of a buffer zone to be established around the nest.

MM-7. To the extent practicable, removal of large trees (greater than 10" dbh) with cavities, crevices, or snags shall occur before bat maternity colonies form (i.e., prior to March 1) or after young are volant (i.e., after August 31). If construction, including the removal of large trees, occurs during the bat non-volant season (March 1 through August 31), a qualified professional shall conduct a pre-construction survey of the study area to locate maternity colonies and identify measures to protect colonies from disturbance. The preconstruction survey will be performed no more than 7 days prior to the implementation of construction activities. If a lapse in construction activities occurs for 7 days or longer, another pre-construction survey will be performed. If a maternity colony is located within or adjacent to the study area, a disturbance free buffer shall be established by a qualified professional, in consultation with CDFW, to ensure the colony is protected from project activities.

Appendix 1: Figures



Project Location

Staging Area



Biological Study Area (1.63 acres)

2,000 1,000 0 2,000 Feet



Project Location: Shasta County, California
 185704585
 Prepared by DP on 2019-07-16
 Technical Review by ST on 2019-7-30

Client/Project:
 Girvan Road at Olney Creek Bridge
 [06C-0341] Replacement Project








Figure No.
 1

Title
 Project Location

- Notes
1. Coordinate System: NAD 1983 StatePlane California I FIPS 0401 Feet
 2. Base map: ESRI USA Topo Maps web mapping service
 3. Public Land Survey: T31N 04W Sec. 17 18
 4. USGS 7.5 Quad Enterprise

Disclaimer: Stantec assumes no responsibility for data supplied in electronic format. The recipient accepts full responsibility for verifying the accuracy and completeness of the data. The recipient releases Stantec, its officers, employees, consultants and agents from any and all claims arising in any way from the content or provision of the data.



-  Biological Study Area (1.63 acres)
-  Channel Access Routes and Gravel Pad Areas
-  Pavement Extent
-  Curb or Gutter Extent
-  Replacement Bridge Structure
-  Pile Bent Supports
-  Ordinary High Water Mark

- Notes**
1. Coordinate System: NAD 1983 StatePlane California I FIPS 0401 Feet
 2. Base map: ESRI USA Topo Maps web mapping service
 3. Public Land Survey: T31N 04W Sec. 17 18
 4. USGS 7.5 Quad: Enterprise



Project Location
Shasta County, California
Prepared by DP on 2019-07-24
Technical Review by ST on 2019-07-30

Client/Project
Girvan Road at Olney Creek Bridge (06C-0341)
Replacement Project

Figure No.
2

Title
Project Design Features

V:\222\stntec\222\0201\103_dsl\sl\06_cad\shasta\06c0341\01_01_01.dwg, Figure 2, 2019-07-24, by: dch/rlh, Revised: 2019-08-27, by: dch/rlh

Disclaimer: Stantec assumes no responsibility for data supplied in electronic format. The recipient accepts full responsibility for verifying the accuracy and completeness of the data. The recipient releases Stantec, its officers, employees, consultants and agents, from any and all claims arising in any way from the content or provision of the data.

ATTACHMENT C

Mitigation Monitoring and Environmental Commitment Program

MITIGATION MONITORING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENT PROGRAM

GIRVAN ROAD OVER OLNEY CREEK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2025XXXXXX)

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM CONTENTS

This document is the Mitigation Monitoring and Environmental Commitment Program (MMP/ECP) for the Girvan over Olney Creek Bridge Replacement Project (project). The MMP/ECP includes a brief discussion of the legal basis for, and the purpose of, the program, discussion, and direction regarding complaints about noncompliance; a key to understanding the monitoring matrix; and the monitoring matrix.

LEGAL BASIS OF AND PURPOSE FOR THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

California Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires public agencies to adopt mitigation monitoring or reporting programs whenever certifying an environmental impact report (EIR) or a mitigated negative declaration (MND). This requirement facilitates implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.

The MMP contained herein is intended to satisfy the requirements of CEQA as they relate to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the project. It is intended to be used by City of Redding (City) staff, participating agencies, project contractors, and mitigation monitoring personnel during implementation of the project.

Mitigation is defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15370 as a measure that does any of the following:

- Avoids impacts altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
- Minimizes impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.
- Rectifies impacts by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.
- Reduces or eliminates impacts over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the project.
- Compensates for impacts by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

The intent of the MMP is to ensure the effective implementation and enforcement of adopted mitigation measures and permit conditions. The MMP will provide for monitoring of construction activities as necessary, onsite identification and resolution of environmental problems, and proper reporting to City staff.

In addition to meeting the CEQA MMP requirements, this document incorporates environmental commitments, standard practices, conservation measures, and best management practices (BMPs). The environmental commitments may be part of the project design, standard contract specifications, City requirements, or conservation measures. These commitments are part of the project, but they do not constitute mitigation under CEQA as they have not been incorporated to reduce a potentially significant impact.

MITIGATION MONITORING/ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENT PROGRAM TABLE

The MMP/ECP Table identifies the mitigation measures and commitments proposed for the project. The tables have the following columns:

- **Mitigation Measure:** Lists the mitigation measures identified within the Initial Study for a specific potentially significant impact, along with the number for each measure as enumerated in the Initial Study.
- **Environmental Commitment:** Lists the commitments identified within the project that are not related to a potentially significant CEQA impact, but further ensure environmental resource protection.
- **Timing:** Identifies at what point in time, review process, or phase the mitigation measure will be completed.
- **Agency/Department Consultation:** References the City department or any other public agency with which coordination is required to satisfy the identified mitigation measure.
- **Verification:** Spaces to be initialed and dated by the individual designated to verify adherence to a specific mitigation measure.

NONCOMPLIANCE COMPLAINTS

Any person or agency may file a complaint asserting noncompliance with the mitigation measures and commitments associated with the project. The complaint shall be directed to the City in written form, providing specific information on the asserted violation. The City shall investigate and determine the validity of the complaint. If noncompliance with a mitigation measure has occurred, the City shall take appropriate action to remedy any violation. The complainant shall receive written confirmation indicating the results of the investigation or the final action corresponding to the particular noncompliance issue.

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENT PROGRAM TABLE
FOR THE GIRVAN ROAD OVER OLNEY CREEK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT
MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2025XXXXXX)**

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

The following environmental commitments will be incorporated into the project to further protect environmental and biological resources:

Best Management Practices	Timing/ Implementation	Enforcement/ Monitoring	Verification (Date and Initials)
Air Quality (AQ)			
AQ-1. Nontoxic soil stabilizers shall be applied according to manufacturer’s specification to all inactive construction areas.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
AQ-2. All grading operations shall be suspended when winds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 20 miles per hour.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
AQ-3. Water all stockpiles, access roads, and disturbed or exposed areas, as necessary, to prevent airborne dust.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
AQ-4. Pursuant to the California Vehicle Code (Section 23114(e)(4)) (California Legislative Information 2016), all trucks hauling soil and other loose material to and from the construction site shall be covered or shall maintain at least 6 inches of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of load and the trailer).	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
AQ-5. All public roadways used by the project contractor shall be maintained free from dust, dirt, and debris caused by construction activities. Streets shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil materials are carried onto adjacent public paved roads.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
Biological Resources (BIO)			

Best Management Practices	Timing/ Implementation	Enforcement/ Monitoring	Verification (Date and Initials)
<p>BIO-1. Turbidity Monitoring. If there is adequate stream flow during in-stream work, a qualified water quality professional will monitor turbidity and suspended sediment levels at locations 50 feet upstream of and 300 feet downstream of the in-stream work area during construction activities that have the greatest likelihood (i.e., in-water excavation) to adversely affect water quality. Water quality monitoring will occur regularly throughout each day during in-stream excavation. Turbidity and other water quality results will be reported daily to the City construction manager and relayed to NMFS as deemed necessary.</p>	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
<p>BIO-2. Limited Vegetation Removal/Exclusionary Fencing. Areas where vegetation needs to be removed will be identified in advance of ground disturbance and limited to only those areas that have been approved by the City. Areas to be avoided will be clearly identified in the construction drawings and contractor work plans. Exclusionary fencing will be installed around riparian and other areas that are not to be disturbed. All pedestrian and vehicular traffic, into the avoided areas delineated by the fencing, will be prohibited during construction. The exclusionary fencing will be inspected and maintained on a regular basis throughout project construction</p>	Preconstruction/ Construction	City/ Construction Management	
<p>BIO-3. Equipment Cleanliness. All equipment and imported fill material will be weed-free prior to entering the project area.</p>	Preconstruction/ Construction	City/ Construction Management	
<p>BIO-4. Use of Native Species. Any seed mixes or other vegetative material used for revegetation of disturbed areas will consist of locally adapted native plant materials to the extent practicable.</p>	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
<p>BIO-5. Pre-Construction Planning. The width of the construction disturbance zone within the riparian habitat will be minimized through careful pre-construction planning. Riparian vegetation within temporary construction zones will be cleanly cut to ground level and then covered with a layer of clean gravel or topsoil as necessary to protect plant viability and prevent damage to remaining root structures during construction.</p>	Preconstruction	City/ Construction Management	

Best Management Practices	Timing/ Implementation	Enforcement/ Monitoring	Verification (Date and Initials)
<p>BIO-6. Natural Regrowth/Replacement of Riparian Habitat. The temporary disturbance areas are anticipated to regrow naturally and passively, as the roots will be protected during construction. Inspections will occur during the second year of construction and one year after construction completion. If these areas do not grow back naturally the disturbed riparian habitat will be replanted using riparian species that have been recorded along Olney Creek in or near the project area, including narrowleaf willow (<i>Salix exigua</i>) and Fremont cottonwood (<i>Populus fremontii</i>).</p>	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
Cultural Resources (CR)			
<p>CR-1. If cultural materials are discovered during construction, work activity within a 30-foot radius of the discovery will be stopped and the area secured until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find in consultation with SHPO.</p>	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
<p>CR-2. If human remains are discovered during project activities, all activities near the find will be stopped, and the Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner’s Office will be notified. If the coroner determines that the remains may be those of a Native American, the City will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Treatment of the remains will be conducted in accordance with further direction of the County Coroner or NAHC, as appropriate.</p>	Construction	City/NAHC/ County Coroner	
Geology and Soils (GEO/SOIL)			
<p>GEO/SOIL-1. <i>City of Redding Grading Ordinance.</i> This ordinance requires preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan for projects affecting more than one acre (Redding Municipal Code Title 16). The erosion and sediment control plan requires preparation and description of any BMPs that will be used during construction and post-construction, if needed.</p>	Preconstruction/ Construction	City/ Construction Management	
<p>GEO/SOIL-2. <i>City of Redding Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance.</i> This ordinance requires preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for projects affecting greater than 1 acre (Redding Municipal Code Title 14). The objectives of the SWPPP are to identify the sources of sediment and other pollutants that may affect water quality associated with stormwater discharges and to describe and ensure the implementation of BMPs to reduce those sources of sediment and other pollutants in stormwater discharges.</p>	Preconstruction/ Construction	City/ Construction Management	
Hazards and Hazardous Material (HAZ)			
<p>HAZ-1. Hazardous materials, including fuels, oils, cement, and solvents will be stored and contained in an area protected from direct runoff and away from areas where they could enter waters of the United States.</p>	Construction	City/ Construction Management	

Best Management Practices	Timing/ Implementation	Enforcement/ Monitoring	Verification (Date and Initials)
HAZ-2. Construction equipment will be inspected daily for leaks. Leaking fluids will be contained upon detection, and equipment repairs will be made as soon as practicable, or the leaking equipment will be moved offsite.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
HAZ-3. Secondary containment such as drip pans or absorbent materials will be used to catch spills or leaks when removing or changing fluids. Secondary containment will be used for storage of all hazardous materials.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
HAZ-4. Spill containment and clean-up materials will be kept onsite at all times for use in the event of an accidental spill.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
HAZ-5. Absorbent materials will be used on small spills rather than hosing down or burying the spill. The absorbent material will be promptly removed and disposed of properly.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT MITIGATION MEASURES

Resource-specific mitigation measures that will be used during project implementation include the following:

Mitigation Measure (MM)	Timing/ Implementation	Enforcement/ Monitoring	Verification (Date and Initials)
Biological Resources (BIO)			
MM-1. The in-stream project construction period will be limited to the dry season (June 1–October 31). If water is present during construction, a temporary stream diversion will be used to divert water away from in-stream construction and maintain flow and fish passage.	Preconstruction/ Construction	City/ Construction Management	
MM-2. Prior to any in-stream work, the area will be visually inspected for fish presence. If presence of fish is noted, they will be herded away from the area using seines. If appropriate, seines could be placed upstream and downstream of the project area to prevent fish from entering the area. All translocation or removal of fishes will be conducted by qualified fisheries biologists.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
MM-3. Any gravels or materials used for the temporary stream diversion will be rounded fish spawning gravel that is properly disinfected or cleaned prior to installation. The materials will be washed at least once and have a cleanliness value of 85 or higher based on Caltrans Test No. 227.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
MM-4. Environmental awareness training for construction personnel will be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to onset of work to brief them on how to recognize foothill yellow-legged frog, western pond turtle, and other special-status animals that may occur in the project area.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	
MM-5. If foothill yellow-legged frogs or western pond turtles (including nests) are encountered in the project area during construction and could be harmed by construction activities, work will stop in the area and the City will consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).	Preconstruction/ Construction	City/ Construction Management	
MM-6. If construction or vegetation removal occurs during the nesting season, February 1 through August 31 for birds and November 1 through July 15 for raptors, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey to locate active nests. The pre-construction survey will be performed no more than 7 days prior to the implementation of construction activities. If a lapse in construction activities occurs for 7 days or longer, another pre-construction survey will be performed. If an active nest is found, a qualified biologist (in consultation with the CDFW) will determine the extent of a buffer zone to be established around the nest.	Construction	City/ Construction Management	

Mitigation Measure (MM)	Timing/ Implementation	Enforcement/ Monitoring	Verification (Date and Initials)
<p>MM-7. To the extent practicable, removal of large trees (greater than 10” dbh) with cavities, crevices, or snags shall occur before bat maternity colonies form (i.e., prior to March 1) or after young are volant (i.e., after August 31). If construction, including the removal of large trees, occurs during the bat non-volant season (March 1 through August 31), a qualified professional shall conduct a pre-construction survey of the study area to locate maternity colonies and identify measures to protect colonies from disturbance. The preconstruction survey will be performed no more than 7 days prior to the implementation of construction activities. If a lapse in construction activities occurs for 7 days or longer, another pre-construction survey will be performed. If a maternity colony is located within or adjacent to the study area, a disturbance free buffer shall be established by a qualified professional, in consultation with CDFW, to ensure the colony is protected from project activities.</p>	<p>Construction</p>	<p>City/ Construction Management</p>	

ATTACHMENT D

Comments and Response to Comments (if any)