

# RECLAMATION

*Managing Water in the West*

Environmental Assessment/Initial Study and  
Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

## Lower American River Anadromous Fish Habitat Restoration Project



**U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Mid Pacific Region**



**City of Sacramento  
June 2019**

## **Mission Statements**

The mission of the Department of the Interior is to protect and provide access to our Nation's natural and cultural heritage and honor our trust responsibilities to Indian Tribes and our commitments to island communities.

The mission of the Bureau of Reclamation is to manage, develop, and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner in the interest of the American public.

# Table of Contents

<b>List of Acronyms and Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Section 1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Project Purpose, Need, and Objectives .....	6
<b>Section 2. Alternatives Including the Proposed Action .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 No Action Alternative .....	8
2.2 Proposed Action .....	8
<b>Section 3. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences .....</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1 Aesthetics.....	25
3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	26
3.3 Air Quality.....	26
3.4 Biological Resources .....	29
3.5 Cultural Resources .....	33
3.6 Geology and Soils.....	35
3.7 Hazardous Materials .....	37
3.8 Water Resources (Hydrology and Water Quality).....	37
3.9 Noise .....	43
3.10 Recreation.....	45
3.11 Transportation .....	47
3.12 Environmental Commitments.....	48
3.13 Cumulative Effects .....	60
<b>Section 4. Consultation and Coordination .....</b>	<b>63</b>
4.1 Public Review Period .....	63
4.2 State Historic Preservation Officer.....	63
4.3 Endangered Species Act (16 USC Section 1531 et seq.) ...	63
4.4 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.....	64
4.5 Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.....	64
4.6 Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.....	64
4.7 Section 408 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.....	64
4.8 State and Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies .....	64
<b>Section 5. Report Preparers.....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Section 6. References.....</b>	<b>67</b>

## Tables

Table 1-1. Past Spawning Gravel Placement and Habitat Creation/Enhancement - 2008 to Present .....	2
Table 2-1. Proposed Restoration Site Summary .....	10
Table 2-2. Construction Equipment.....	18
Table 2-3. Potential Federal Actions, Permissions, Permits, Authorizations, and Approvals .....	21
Table 2-4. Potential State, Regional, and Local Actions, Permits, and Approvals .....	22
Table 3-1. Proposed Action Construction Emissions .....	29
Table 3-2. Construction Equipment and Typical Equipment Noise Levels .....	43

## **Figures**

Figure 1-1.	Overview of Restoration Sites, Borrow Sites, and Haul Routes .....	3
Figure 2-1.	Example Floodplain and Side Channel Creation at River Bend (top photos) and Nimbus Basin (bottom photos) .....	12
Figure 2-2.	Example of Woody Material Placement - Nimbus Basin, 2014 .....	17
Figure 2-3.	Woody Material Placement from Sacramento Bar, 2016 .....	17

## **Project Design Detail Plates**

Plate C-1.	Cover Sheet
Plate C-2.	Project Overview
Plate C-3.	Site Plan
Plate C-4.	Profiles
Plate C-5.	Sections
Plate C-6.	Staking Plan

## **List of Appendices**

Appendix A - Public Notices
Appendix B - CEQA Environmental Checklist (City of Sacramento)
Appendix C - Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration
Appendix D - Hydraulics Analysis Technical Report (Water Surface Elevations)
Appendix E - Hydraulics Analysis Technical Report (Sediment Transport)
Appendix F - Air Quality Model Results
Appendix G - Biological Resources Technical Memorandum

## **List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**

BA	Biological Assessment
BMP	Best Management Practices
BO	Biological Opinion
CAA	Clean Air Act
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	Cubic feet per second
City	City of Sacramento
CMP	Sacramento Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	Carbon monoxide
Corps	US Army Corps of Engineers
CRF	California red-legged frog
CVFPB	Central Valley Flood Protection Board

CVPIA	Central Valley Project Improvement Act
CWA	Clean Water Act
dBA	A-weighted Decibel
DOI	Department of the Interior
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
EA	Environmental Assessment
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
FISH Group	Fisheries and In-Stream Habitat Working Group
FMS	Flow Management Standard
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
GGS	Giant garter snake
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IPaC	Information for Planning and Conservation
LAR	Lower American River
L <sub>eq</sub>	Equivalent sound level
L <sub>max</sub>	Maximum sound level
LOS	Level of Service
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MDM	Mount Diablo Meridian
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen dioxide
NPPA	Native Plant Protection Act
O <sub>3</sub>	Ozone
OHWM	Ordinary High Water Mark
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PCE	Primary Constituent Elements
PM	Particulate matter
Quad	Quadrangle
Reclamation	Bureau of Reclamation
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RM	River mile
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur dioxide
SPCCP	Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan
SRA	State Recreation Area
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
USFWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	US Geological Survey

VELB	Valley elderberry longhorn beetle
VOC	Volatile organic compound
Water Forum	Sacramento Area Water Forum
WYBC	Western yellow-billed cuckoo

# **Section 1. Introduction**

In conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U. S. C. Section 4431 et seq. (NEPA), as amended, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the City of Sacramento (City) have prepared this Environmental Assessment/Initial Study (EA/IS), in association with the Sacramento Area Water Forum (Water Forum), to evaluate and disclose potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the Lower American River (LAR) Anadromous Fish Habitat Restoration Project (Proposed Action or proposed project) over a 16-year period from 2019 through 2034. The City has also prepared a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), a CEQA Environmental Checklist, and a proposed MND, as required by the CEQA Guidelines. Reclamation is the NEPA lead agency and the City is the CEQA lead agency for the Proposed Action. CEQA review is required because the 16-year long Proposed Action will be physically implemented by the City, using City equipment and employee labor, in association with the Water Forum, and may result in a potentially significant impact on the environment that must be analyzed.

This EA/IS describes the existing environmental resources in the project area; evaluates the impacts of the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action on the resources; and proposes measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any significant adverse impacts. This EA/IS was prepared in accordance with NEPA, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508), Department of the Interior Regulations (43 CFR Part 46), and State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Section 15000 et seq. of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Reclamation's 2016 EA (Reclamation 2016) is incorporated by reference in its entirety, as well as Reclamation's 2008 EA (Reclamation 2008), 2010 Supplemental EA (SEA) (Reclamation 2010), 2011 SEA (Reclamation 2011), and 2014 SEA (Reclamation 2014).

## **1.1 Background**

The Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA), Section 3406 (b)(13) directs the Department of the Interior to develop and implement a continuing program for the purpose of restoring and replenishing, as needed, salmonid spawning gravel lost due to the construction and operation of Central Valley Project dams and other actions that have reduced the availability of spawning gravel and rearing habitat in the LAR from Nimbus Dam to the confluence with the Sacramento River. The CVPIA Program Environmental Impact Statement (DOI 1999) included habitat restoration projects that are now being analyzed in more detail in this SEA/IS.

The Water Forum, Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the City have collaborated with stakeholders to implement the recommendations

of the River Corridor Management Plan. In a natural system, sediment is constantly entering a river and moving downstream. Thus, one of the principal needs for fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead is replacement of spawning gravel of an appropriate size and creation of appropriate water depths and velocities at the flows that typically occur during the spawning season. This is currently accomplished by relocating gravel deposits from higher floodplain areas downstream of Folsom Dam and placing it strategically within the river. The City, in association with the Water Forum, currently manages and implements this restoration work with demonstrated success; juvenile fish densities have increased from only 0.1 fish per square meter to 3.25 fish per square meter in some reaches. Additionally, spawning increased approximately 500% from a restoration action. This ongoing gravel augmentation is integral to maintaining legal operation of the federal Central Valley Project (CVP), and to supporting salmonid persistence in the LAR.

Figure 1-1 shows the project area and locations of proposed restoration sites, borrow sites, and haul routes associated with the Proposed Action, many of which have been used by Reclamation for past restoration activities. Although many appropriate sites in the LAR have been identified for gravel augmentation, placement has generally been limited to one site per year due to funding constraints, as detailed in Table 1-1. Despite these constraints, Reclamation with assistance from the Water Forum has placed approximately 92,000 cubic yards (cy) of spawning gravel in the LAR since 2008. Side channel modifications and habitat structure (e.g., trees, trunks, rootwads, and willows) placement have also been implemented for additional habitat enhancement where appropriate, at select sites identified in Table 1-1. There has been no gravel placement or other habitat enhancements in the LAR since 2016.

**Table 1-1. Past Spawning Gravel Placement and Habitat Creation/Enhancement - 2008 to Present**

Year	Site Name	River Mile	Gravel Volume (cubic yards)	Floodplain and Side Channel Creation/Enhancement	Instream Habitat Structure Placement
2008	Upper Sailor Bar	22.5	4,666		
2009	Upper Sailor Bar	22.5	7,066		
2010	Lower Sailor Bar	21.3	11,066		X
2011	Lower Sailor Bar	21.1	13,846		X
2012	Lower Sailor Bar	21.8	16,340	X	X
2013	River Bend Area	13.5	4,750	X	X
2014	Nimbus Basin	23.1	8,500	X	X
2016	Sacramento Bar	19	25,800	X	X
<b>Approximate Total to Date</b>			<b>92,034</b>		

Source: Water Forum 2019



Figure 1-1. Overview of Restoration Sites, Borrow Sites, and Haul Routes




Figure Source: GEI Consultants, Inc. 2019.

17May2019 RS/SI Z:\Projects\1804694\_SAFCA\1804694\_G003\_ProjectLocation\_20190517.mxd



This page intentionally left blank.

### **1.1.1 Previous Environmental Review**

In 2008, Reclamation prepared an EA for the LAR Salmonid Spawning Gravel Augmentation and Side-Channel Habitat Establishment Program (2008 EA) (Reclamation 2008). The Proposed Action evaluated in the 2008 EA was permitted through 2013 for several locations. A Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was signed on August 4, 2008. Reclamation began the gravel and channel habitat work in September 2008 and continued in 2009.

In 2010, Reclamation completed an SEA and signed a FONSI to modify its Proposed Action to meet the 2008 EA objectives by including the gravel acquisition site at Sailor Bar which was identified and analyzed as an alternative in the 2008 EA.

In 2011, Reclamation completed an SEA and signed a FONSI to incorporate woody material into other main channel features to improve Chinook salmon and steelhead spawning and rearing habitat.

In 2014, Reclamation completed an SEA and FONSI as an informational update of the proposed activities for the Nimbus Basin project site that were not completed within the 2008 EA timeframe.

In 2016, Reclamation completed an EA and FONSI to cover 11 sites for habitat restoration, with up to 15 gravel augmentation and 15 side channel restoration sites to be designated in the future. The EA covered restoration of up to three sites per year through 2030.

### **1.1.2 Current Environmental Review**

As the federal and state lead agencies respectively, Reclamation and the City have prepared this EA/IS and associated public notices, and the City has additionally prepared the CEQA Environmental Checklist and proposed MND, to comply with NEPA and CEQA and fully disclose and evaluate the potentially significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Action.

The need for this EA/IS is three-fold:

- The 2019 EA provides information to comply with Section 408 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and facilitate the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) consideration to grant permission to the Requestor (City) to modify or alter a locally or federally maintained Corps project requiring the Chief of Engineers approval under 33 USC 408.
- The 2019 IS and CEQA Environmental Checklist provide the substantial evidence required under the CEQA Guidelines to evaluate the Proposed Action's potential for significant environmental impacts during the 2019-2034 time period and support the City's adoption of the MND and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board's (CVFPB's) issuance of an encroachment permit to the City for project implementation.

- The Proposed Action’s time frame is not a single year but would extend through 2034 and therefore requires additional environmental analysis.

Reclamation is the NEPA lead agency for the Proposed Action because it provides project funding, is required to implement Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) Section 3406(b)(13), and is responsible for implementing the project in partnership with the City and the Water Forum.

The City is the CEQA lead agency for the Proposed Action because it is responsible for physically implementing the construction of LAR habitat improvements, is a signatory to the Sacramento Water Forum Agreement and has served as the local partner on past LAR habitat improvements associated with the CVPIA, in coordination with Reclamation. Note: The Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) is a Responsible Agency under CEQA for this project because it must meet a gravel augmentation requirement in the LAR due to SAFCA’s past participation as a local partner to the Corps in the Folsom Dam Joint Federal Project.

After the required public review of this document is complete, the City Council will consider adopting the proposed MND, adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), and deciding whether to approve the Proposed Action.

### **1.1.3 Document Organization**

This document includes the following:

- EA/IS in compliance with NEPA and CEQA requirements, respectively;
- Notice of Availability and Intent to Adopt an MND for the proposed project in compliance with CEQA Guidelines (Appendix A);
- CEQA Environmental Checklist to provide substantial evidence to support the City’s conclusions (Appendix B); and
- Proposed MND, in compliance with CEQA Guidelines (Appendix C).

## **1.2 Project Purpose, Need, and Objectives**

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to increase and improve Chinook Salmon and steelhead spawning and rearing habitat by replenishing spawning gravel and establishing additional side-channel habitat.

The need for the Proposed Action derives from (1) the declines of naturally spawned salmonid stocks due in part to loss of spawning and rearing habitat through curtailment of gravel recruitment due to blockage of the river channel by dams and the alteration in flow patterns, and (2) CVPIA Section 3406 (b)(13) requirements that direct the Department of the Interior to develop and implement a continuing program for the purpose of restoring and replenishing, as needed,

*Lower American River Anadromous Fish Habitat Restoration Project*

salmonid spawning gravel lost due to the construction and operation of CVP dams and other actions that have reduced the availability of spawning gravel and rearing habitat in the LAR.

The objectives of the Proposed Action as required under the CEQA Guidelines are as follows:

- Replenish spawning gravel and create/enhance side channel and floodplain habitat and in-stream habitat structures, as needed, in the LAR, and
- Facilitate continued operation of Folsom and Nimbus dams in compliance with CVPIA Section 3406(b)(13) and ESA Section 7 requirements.

## **Section 2. Alternatives Including the Proposed Action**

This EA/IS considers two possible alternatives: the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action. The No Action Alternative reflects future conditions without the Proposed Action and serves as a basis of comparison for determining potential impacts to the human environment that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action.

Identification of the reasonable range of alternatives for this EA/IS was based upon consideration of the need to increase and improve salmon and steelhead spawning and rearing habitat in the LAR. As of 2015, the Lower American River Fisheries and In-Stream Habitat Working Group (FISH Group) has identified 10 restoration sites (four new future restoration sites and six previously restored sites [Figure 1]) that are intended to maintain flexibility for providing salmonid spawning and rearing habitat enhancement through gravel placements and side channel and floodplain enhancements to meet the goals of the CVPIA 3406 (b)(13) Habitat Restoration Program. Additional feasible alternatives, including varied amounts of gravel, were considered but eliminated as they were all substantially similar in design and effects as the Proposed Action (40 CFR Section 1502.14(a)). Moreover, Section 408 requirements recommend limiting the NEPA evaluation to the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action (RHA Section 14 [i.e., USC, Title 33, Section 408]). The process and criteria for restoration site selection is addressed in detail on pages 11-12 in Reclamation's 2016 EA (Reclamation 2016), which is incorporated by reference. Restoration sites were selected based on several criteria including site suitability and access, engineering and design, environmental compliance and permitting, gravel availability and transportation, and cost-benefit.

### **2.1 No Action Alternative**

Under the No Action Alternative, gravel would not be placed in the LAR below Nimbus Dam, nor would side-channels be developed. Spawning and rearing habitat restoration would not occur in this reach of the river, leaving the LAR in a deteriorated condition as spawning and rearing habitat for salmonids. Further declines in habitat quality would be likely.

### **2.2 Proposed Action**

#### **2.2.1 Location**

The Proposed Action is located at various sites within restoration reaches on the LAR below Lake Natoma and above the confluence with the Sacramento River, from approximately River Mile (RM) 23 to RM 13 in Sacramento County, California (Figure 1-1). All project sites are located upstream of the leveed portion of the river. The restoration sites are accessible by Gold Country Boulevard, Nimbus Road, Illinois Avenue, Olive Avenue, South Bridge Street, El

Manto Drive, and Rod Beaudry Drive and are located on lands held by Sacramento County.

## **2.2.2 Description**

In accordance with requirements of the CVPIA Spawning and Rearing Habitat Restoration Program, the Proposed Action would entail three primary activities in the LAR:

- spawning gravel replenishment,
- floodplain and side channel creation/enhancement, and
- instream habitat structure placement.

These methods have been developed and refined successfully during gravel augmentation and habitat restoration activities by Reclamation and the Water Forum in previous years. Additionally, ongoing hydraulic and sediment transport studies would inform the specific extent and location of future gravel placement (see Appendix D - Hydraulics Analysis Technical Report (Water Surface Elevations) and Appendix E - Hydraulics Analysis Technical Report (Sediment Transport)).

### **Spawning Gravel Augmentation**

Annual gravel relocation from artificially high floodplains downstream of Folsom Dam (or purchased from an off-site quarry) and in-river placement would occur at the sites listed in Table 2-1 and shown on Figure 1-1, and other sites identified as appropriate by the Water Forum from approximately RM 23 to RM 13, as needed. Due to funding constraints, gravel would only be placed at up to three sites annually, and in some years, it is likely that no gravel would be placed. In-river gravel placement along the entire project reach would not exceed approximately 30,000 tons annually and would not exceed approximately 450,000 tons total over the 16-year (2019-2034) duration of the Proposed Action (Table 2-1). Spawning gravel augmentation consists of three primary activities:

- gravel borrow,
- gravel processing and stockpiling, and
- in-river gravel placement.

### **Gravel Borrow**

Gravel borrow would occur at two sites, previously used as borrow areas for restoration actions implemented by Reclamation and the Water Forum. These areas are characterized by old riverbed and floodplain deposits of generally cobble and gravel-sized material.

### **Sailor Bar**

The Sailor Bar gravel borrow site is a large feature composed primarily of gravel. The borrow site is located within the American River Parkway, which is owned by Sacramento County and managed by the Sacramento County Department of Regional Parks (Figure 1-1).

**Table 2-1. Proposed Restoration Site Summary**

Reach Name	River Mile Extent of Reach	Restored Spawning Gravel Area (acre)	Restored Spawning Gravel Channel Extent (linear feet)	Estimated Maximum Gravel Volume (tons)	Estimated Maximum Gravel Volume (cubic yards)	Side Channel Restoration Length (feet)	Habitat Structure Placement
Nimbus Basin	22.75-23	3.5	400	4,000	2,817	1,350	Placement occurs at locations identified as appropriate in the field during gravel augmentation and floodplain/ side channel creation/ enhancement activities.
Upper Sailor Bar	22.5-22.75	6	600	14,000	9,859	1,450	
Lower Sailor Bar	20.75-22	6.5	2,000	19,000	13,415	350	
Sunrise	19.75-20.5	4	300	13,500	9,507	1,700	
Lower Sunrise	19.25-19.75	2.5	600	3,000	2,113	1,200	
Sacramento Bar	18.5-19	13	900	6,000	4,225	1,750	
El Manto	18-18.5	7.5	700	13,500	9,507	1,150	
Ancil Hoffman	16-16.75	7	700	11,500	8,099	1,850	
Upper River Bend	14.5-15.5	14	4,000	24,000	16,900	5,000	
River Bend	13.25-13.75	4.5	250	4,500	3,169	1,450	
<b>Approximate Annual Maximum Fill Total</b>				<b>~ 30,000</b>	<b>~ 21,000</b>		
<b>Approximate Maximum Fill Total (Years 2019-2034)</b>				<b>~ 80,000</b>	<b>~ 450,000</b>		

Note: Restoration activities may occur at any point along the river mileage extent shown for each restoration reach, based on adaptive management and monitoring.

Several gravel augmentation sites are adjacent to Sailor Bar. The primary gravel source is located within the designated floodway at lower Sailor Bar near the Olive Avenue access; however, other dredger tailings occur throughout the area and might be used if the gravel size is appropriate. Gravel from Sailor Bar would be processed (sorted and cleaned) and stockpiled at the borrow site before being delivered via dump truck to short-term areas adjacent to gravel augmentation sites within the Sailor Bar portion of the American River Parkway and would not be transported outside the parkway.

Gravel sorting and cleaning would occur at borrow sites and adjacent to restoration sites, where appropriately sized material is available, and consists of scooping gravel into a mobile incline screener to separate gravel of an unsuitable size and transport via conveyor where the gravel is shaken and washed, if needed, to dislodge small particles, then stockpiled. River water is used when needed and is obtained via small pump, equipped with a fish screen, that is used to fill water trucks and/or the wash conveyor. The water drains into a settling pond which we clean up later.



The conveyor would be located over a shallow sump to catch the wash water. The sump would be filled with excess gravel and restored to the original grade once borrow activities are complete. All areas cleared of gravel, including processing areas, at Sailor Bar, would be restored in accordance with a restoration plan to be developed and implemented by the Sacramento County Regional Parks and Reclamation prior to obtaining gravel at borrow sites. Transportation routes for borrow material are detailed on Figure 2-1.

### **Mississippi Bar**

The Mississippi Bar gravel borrow site is located within the Folsom Lake State Recreational Area (SRA). The Folsom Lake SRA is administered by the California Department of Parks and Recreation through a contract with Reclamation and the land is owned by the federal government. Major gravel extraction and processing operation was underway into the 1990s on adjacent State lands.

Gravel was extracted for use in habitat restoration on the federal lands in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The proposed area for gravel extraction is shown in Figure 1-1. If an additional gravel source is needed beyond the supply at Sailor Bar, gravel would be obtained, processed (sorted and cleaned), and stockpiled at the Mississippi Bar site on federal lands and then transported by dump truck to short-term stockpile areas adjacent to the river at the spawning gravel augmentation sites in the same manner as described above (see Figure 2-1). Trucks transporting gravel from this borrow site would use an existing gravel road to access Sunset Avenue. Areas cleared of gravel at Mississippi Bar, including processing areas, would be planted using native vegetation in consultation with California Department of Parks and Recreation and/or Reclamation.

### **Gravel Processing and Stockpiling**

The gravel would be uncrushed, rounded "natural river rock" with no sharp edges. Gravel would be sized based on general criteria recommended by the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program and studies designed to specify optimum size for LAR salmon and steelhead. The gravel would be obtained at borrow sites using front-end loaders and dump trucks. Gravels would be sieved/sorted to the appropriate size and cleaned prior to delivery to the restoration sites to minimize the introduction of fine sediments into the river. The gravel would also be free of oils, clay, debris, and organic material. The larger gravel and cobble resulting from sorting operations would be used as needed to enhance stability of habitat features. Gravel sizing could vary, based on monitoring results, to meet specific project goals such as to stabilize material in the river and to provide better habitat for spawning of smaller-sized fish such as steelhead or to encourage or discourage spawning in specific areas.

Short-term stockpile areas would be located within restoration site boundaries and located as directed by Sacramento County Parks. These short-term stockpile areas adjacent to the river generally would be about 0.5 acre or less and would be

placed in existing clearings where ground disturbance would be minimized by using existing dredger tailings or similar materials. Gravel would be generally transported from the borrow site, dumped onto the short-term stockpile, and placed in-river within the same project period. Thus, there would be no long-term storage of gravel at the various restoration sites. For purposes of this analysis, tandem transfer trucks (trucks pulling a trailer that can be telescoped into the truck bed) capable of carrying 24 tons per load would be used for transporting gravel from the gravel borrow sites to the restoration sites. Single-bed off road trucks capable of carrying 12 to 50 tons would be used for transporting gravel within restoration sites off of major, public roads.

**Figure 2-1. Example Floodplain and Side Channel Creation at River Bend (top photos) and Nimbus Basin (bottom photos)**



Reclamation proposes to create new side channels, modify existing side channels, and place gravel and instream habitat structures in the LAR below Nimbus Dam. The Proposed Action area encompasses an approximately 21-mile reach of the LAR and adjacent land between Nimbus Dam (RM 23) and the State Route 160 Bridge (RM 2). The Proposed Action area may include Mississippi Bar, above Nimbus Dam, as a gravel source. This area of evaluation is large enough to encompass potential direct impacts on listed species and potential indirect impacts, such as elevated turbidity that may extend beyond individual project sites.

The project area presents several opportunities for improving and restoring salmonid spawning and rearing habitats. The criteria used to select sites and develop conceptual designs include: biological need, site suitability and access, engineering feasibility, environmental compliance and permitting, gravel availability and transportation, and cost-benefit. The Proposed Action includes activities applicable to these 10 sites as well as possible unknown sites as described in the following sections.

The proposed activities are designed to minimize potential direct and indirect impacts to listed fish species during construction and installation, while meeting long-term restoration goals established by the FISH Group. Because the anadromous fish species inhabiting the LAR range throughout the Central Valley, Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, San Francisco Bay Estuary, and portions of the Pacific Ocean during their various life stages, meeting these goals would have ecosystem and fisheries benefits that extend well beyond the action area.

Reclamation proposes to create new side channels, modify existing side channels, enhance existing floodplain habitat, and place gravel and woody material in the LAR below Nimbus Dam. Gravel would be placed to improve spawning at project locations and to replenish spawning gravel downstream that is not replaced by upstream sources. Side channel and floodplain work would be completed to improve juvenile rearing habitat. In the future, the FISH Group may identify additional sites where similar restoration activities (i.e., similar types, size, and construction methods) would be beneficial.

Instream work would be conducted at time periods to minimize effects on Chinook salmon and steelhead as specified in permits. Work mobilizing gravel and equipment to the sites could occur outside of fish timing windows, but all work in the water would be confined to timing windows and suitable flows.

Restoration activities are anticipated to be completed at up to three sites per year through 2034. In addition to the 10 sites already identified, restoration activities at approximately 15 additional gravel augmentation sites (including riffle supplementation) and 15 additional side channel sites could be completed by 2034. Detailed information on the 10 sites currently identified for restoration is presented on pages 13-15 of Reclamation's 2016 EA (Reclamation 2016) and incorporated by reference.

Designs would be prepared as needed for site-specific work. Gravel augmentation would be completed without formal designs at some sites, while sites that incorporate side channel work would include more formal designs. The specific design for each site would be prepared as funding becomes available to conduct the work each year. In the future, the FISH Group may identify additional sites where similar restoration activities (i.e., similar types, size, and construction methods) would be beneficial.

### **Gravel Placement**

Gravel placement would occur using the "Spawning Habitat Integrated Rehabilitation Approach" (SHIRA) developed by the University of California, Davis. SHIRA integrates widely accepted concepts from hydrology, civil engineering, aquatic biology, riparian ecology, and geomorphology to design alternative river configurations for a degraded section of river and then uses predictive computer models to evaluate the relative performance of the different configurations in their specific details *before* implementing a final design (Pasternack 2004). Under SHIRA, gravel would be placed in the river using dump trucks and front-end loaders. At some sites, the existing river substrate would be graded with a bulldozer prior to gravel additions to remove armoring (surface layer of larger rock) or to meet topographic design specifications. A bulldozer would be used to distribute the existing materials in areas unworkable for loaders.

For the gravel placement, front-end loaders and/or haul trucks would pick up gravel from the adjacent stockpile, drive from the stockpile into the river margins, and carefully dump the gravel in a manner that distributes the gravels across the river bottom according to design parameters. Adaptive construction techniques, such as placement of gravel berms in shallow areas of the channel to reduce turbidity during gravel placement, would be used to minimize turbidity. In-river bulldozers would help grade the surface as needed to reach design specifications. Placement would proceed starting from the river access site closest to the bank and work progressively farther out into the river. This would allow the loaders to drive on the newly placed gravel, thereby avoiding driving in overly deep water and distributing fines from the existing substrate. Off-road dump trucks would haul the material into the river in areas where the travel distance to an onshore stockpile is excessively long for multiple loader trips. The loaders would then distribute the gravel along the river bottom to create the hydraulic conditions desired for salmonid spawning. This work would use two or three front-end loaders for 4 - 6 weeks at a location, dependent on conditions at each restoration site. A tracked bulldozer or excavator would be used for grading the existing substrate prior to spawning gravel placement and larger placed rock as needed.

Using SHIRA, the riffles are expected to be used for spawning and rearing almost immediately after the gravel is placed. Spawning habitat would be designed to function optimally under flows within the main channel of 800 - 2,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) with a target flow of 1,750 cfs. Turbidity would be monitored at the downstream end of each restoration site during in-river work and other applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented in

accordance with Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards and provisions of a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification to be obtained for the project.

### **Floodplain and Side Channel Creation and Enhancement**

Floodplain and side channel habitats serve as important refuge and rearing areas for juvenile salmonids. However, the number and quality of these habitats have been reduced in the LAR due to channel modifications and levee construction (Lindley et al. 2009). The proposed project includes potential implementation of floodplain and side channel creation/enhancement at locations from approximately RM 23 to RM 13, as identified in Table 2-1, where feasible and appropriate.

Floodplain and side channel habitat creation/enhancements would consist of created side channels, reconnected existing side channels and floodplain modifications (see Figure 2-1). These enhancements consist of physical modifications to the river channel rather than instream habitat structure placement (see “Instream Habitat Structure Placement”), but both are typically, but not always, used in conjunction with one another to provide the best possible salmonid habitats. Floodplain and side channel habitat would be designed to inundate incrementally at higher flows. Physical characteristics would be variable with water velocities typically 0 - 5 feet per second (fps), water depths averaging 1 - 3 feet deep, and channel widths of 12 - 50 feet. Water velocities would be designed to be variable and range up to about 5 fps at design flows. All floodplain and side channels are designed to allow egress as flows recede to avoid stranding.

Floodplain and side channel habitats would be reconnected or enhanced by excavation and channel modifications using heavy equipment (i.e., bulldozer, front-end loader, and excavator). Where the excavated material is of the appropriate size distribution, it would be sorted and placed into side channel or main channel areas as spawning gravel. If excavated gravel is not needed for gravel augmentation, it would be placed on the nearby bar or bank and would be graded to approximate the existing topography. Where appropriate, fine sediment resulting from excavation activities would be incorporated into existing surface sediment on the floodplain, along with a native seed mix, to assist in revegetating the area. Low elevation and gently sloping benches would be created along channels in appropriate locations to provide optimal floodplain juvenile rearing habitat through a range of flows. Up to 20 trees per site may be removed, if necessary, from areas where side channel excavation may occur. Removed trees, of an appropriate size, would be reused and incorporated into instream habitat structures.

### **Instream Habitat Structure Placement**

Woody material is a natural part of healthy rivers and provides important habitat for aquatic species, including cover from high flows and predators, a mosaic of favorable and complex hydraulic conditions for juvenile fish, collection of suitable spawning materials, and a food source for aquatic insects. Woody

material functions to provide rearing habitat by creating diverse cover for emerging fry, rearing and out-migrating juveniles, and migrating and spawning adults. Instream woody material is also used to change instream flow dynamics to cause channel scour, creating or expanding pool habitat.

Woody material can be placed below or above the low-flow water line up to the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) (see Figures 2-2 and 2-3). Material can be trees or bush-type material, including willow, cottonwood, alder, oak, ash, walnut, conifer, or other suitable tree species with a single, intact root ball and at least one trunk and crown, where possible. Woody material would be incorporated into the main channel and/or side channels to enhance habitat quality, as appropriate. Woody material would be sourced from within the watershed and may include willow cuttings and/or tree trunks available for use as a result of Sacramento County Parks maintenance activities. If suitable woody material is not available from within the parkway, it may be sourced from offsite.

Woody material would be tagged for identification as part of this project before it is placed by excavator or front-end loader from the banks; no barges would be used. To create features more like naturally occurring woody material, woody material would not be secured to the banks using artificial materials, such as steel cable. The woody material would be partially buried in existing soil and rock. Logs with rootwads intact would be positioned with the rootwad end extending down into the pool to create complexity for increasing rearing habitat and maximizing scour. All woody material would be confined to side channel creation/enhancement sites and/or the downstream end of main channel spawning areas that are away from heavily used recreation areas. Tagged woody material that County Park personnel identify as being a safety hazard would be removed, or moved to a safe location, by existing contractors used by County Parks for removing in-river hazards.

## **General Construction Details**

### ***Construction and Operational Safety***

In-river work would occur during flows of less than 4,000 cfs. To ensure boater safety during restoration work, in-river safety personnel would be posted upstream of each site when boater traffic is heavy, typically Fridays and would implement the following safety measures: 1) verbally communicate with recreational boaters to warn them of ongoing downstream in-river work, and 2) communicate via radio with downstream construction equipment operators to temporarily stop in-river work until boater traffic has safely passed the restoration site. Additionally, signs would be posted upstream of construction areas to warn boaters of the location and schedule of upcoming in-river work.



**Figure 2-2. Example of Woody Material Placement - Nimbus Basin, 2014**



**Figure 2-3. Woody Material Placement from Sacramento Bar, 2016**



Designs for gravel augmentation would ensure that restoration and enhancement activities do not impede navigation within the main channel and a navigable area at least 2 feet deep and up to 30 feet wide would be present at all restoration sites. Habitat structures would be placed at the stream margins or within side channels and outside of the main channel flow. A Health and Safety Plan would be prepared prior to construction activities and implemented during construction activities. A first aid kit would be kept on site.

### **Construction Equipment**

All construction equipment would use Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and implement dust control Best Management Practices (BMPs) in accordance with current Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) guidance. Expected construction equipment and duration of use for each activity occurring in any given restoration reach is presented in Table 2-2. In any given year, one, two, or all three restoration activities may be conducted.

**Table 2-2. Construction Equipment**

<b>Activity</b>		<b>Number of Units Annually</b>	<b>Estimated Duration of Use Annually (weeks)</b>
Spawning Gravel	Bulldozer <sup>1</sup>	4	4
Augmentation, Floodplain and Side Channel	Excavator <sup>1</sup>	2	4
	Front-end loader <sup>1</sup>	4	4
Creation/Enhancement, and Instream Habitat Structure Placement	Dump truck (40-yard) <sup>1</sup>	4	4
	Off-Road water truck	2	4
	Mobile Incline Screen (gravel sorting)	2	4
Site Restoration	Haul truck	4	4
	Water truck	2	4
	Motor grader	1	1
	Hydroseeding truck	1	1

Source: Water Forum 2019

Note:

<sup>1</sup> Denotes river-friendly equipment. River-friendly equipment is pressure washed daily and uses food-grade vegetable oil in lieu of traditional hydraulic fluid for protection of water quality during in-river work.

### **Construction Personnel**

Construction-related traffic would occur from daily commutes by construction workers and the delivery of gravel from gravel borrow sites to restoration sites. Up to 15 construction workers would be present at any given time, including:

- Gravel borrow sites: up to a nine-person crew for gravel processing, loading, and transporting.
- Restoration sites: up to a 15-person crew for spawning gravel placement, floodplain and side channel creation/enhancement, and instream habitat structure placement.



### **Construction Haul Routes**

Construction traffic (including truck traffic) accessing the restoration sites would follow the haul routes as specified on Figure 2-1. Existing improved and unimproved roads would be used by transport trucks to deliver gravel and woody material to the restoration sites for placement in the river (see Figure 2-1). Use of haul routes within the American River Parkway boundary may require tree trimming to facilitate passage of construction vehicles. A Certified Arborist would be consulted regarding appropriate trimming techniques. Any tree trimming or minor road modifications or repairs that are needed to facilitate site access or material transport would be conducted in consultation with County Parks staff.

### **Monitoring and Maintenance**

Biological and physical monitoring would be conducted pre- and post-project as a continuing program under the CVPIA. The goal of monitoring is to evaluate the effectiveness of the restoration activities at meeting the needs of the targeted species and to validate the design parameters. Monitoring could include spawning surveys, juvenile habitat use surveys, benthic macroinvertebrate surveys, gravel movement surveys, and gravel quality surveys at project sites and at suitable control sites to compare species response before and after completion of each year's restoration activities. Monitoring would be conducted throughout the duration of the project. Monitoring objectives would be refined annually through coordination with the interagency group. Annual monitoring reports are developed by Reclamation and as part of the CVPIA with reports being published periodically on the results.

Sites will be monitored, but once spawning gravels are placed, floodplains and side channels created/enhanced, and/or instream habitat structures placed, no routine or scheduled operations and maintenance activities are proposed. Since this reach of the LAR is an erosional reach and sediment transport within a river is an ongoing and dynamic process, the enhanced habitats would function without interference until modified by high flows and any gravel transported by natural fluvial processes could continue to function at downstream locations from where habitat enhancements initially occurred. The project team would monitor sediment transport after restoration sites are enhanced to further validate baseline modeling and channel capacity over the project duration. In the event that monitoring indicates a need to adjust or further replenish gravels once they have been placed, this would be conducted within the scope of the 30,000 tons per year of material to be placed at up to three sites annually.

### **2.2.3 Adaptive Management**

As mentioned previously, spawning gravel augmentation and other habitat enhancements would generally be implemented once at each restoration site; however, depending on evaluation of topographic, sediment, and biological monitoring data by the Fisheries and Instream Habitat Working Group, guided by the Restoration Team (both groups facilitated by Water Forum), some restoration

sites may not receive enhancements at all; some types of enhancement may be moved to new sites in order to ensure ease of maintenance access and avoid effects to other agencies goals (like County Parks); and some sites may need periodic re-treatment to maintain quality spawning and rearing habitats. Following an adaptive management approach, the Restoration Team would select specific restoration sites for a given year based on the results of ongoing monitoring directed by the Water Forum within the LAR.

#### **2.2.4 Schedule**

The project duration is expected to be the 16-year period between summer 2019 and fall 2034. Although equipment staging and gravel processing may occur at any time after project approval, all spawning gravel augmentation, floodplain and side channel creation/enhancement, and instream habitat structure placement would occur over a 4- to 6-week period during July through September to ensure in-river work is complete prior to annual fall-run Chinook salmon spawning activity. All construction work would occur between 7:00 am and 6:00 pm on weekdays and exclude weekends and holidays.

#### **2.2.5 2019 Project Activities**

Based on available funding, the Upper Sailor Bar site is targeted for summer 2019 gravel placement, side channel improvement, and large woody material placement, if appropriate (see Plates C1-C6 for draft site designs).

- Two spawning riffles consisting of approximately 14,000 cubic yards of gravel (approximately 8,000 cubic yards in the upstream riffle and 6,000 cubic yards in the downstream riffle). The finished grade of the spawning riffles will be 0.1-0.3%. Riffles will be approximately 300 feet wide and 150 linear feet in length.
- 1,500 linear feet of side channel on the north side of the LAR. Creation of the side channel would require excavating approximately 11,500 cubic yards of material. The side channel would extend from upstream of the spawning riffles and rejoin the main channel downstream of the spawning riffles. Side channel bank slopes would be 2:1 to 4:1, depending on site conditions assessed during final design. Portions of the side channel would be backfilled with scour-resistant cobble-sized material, where appropriate. Material excavated from the side channel would be reused onsite as described above in Section 2.2.2 or returned to the source material site.
- Large woody material would be field fit if its inclusion is deemed appropriate and practicable, based on final design and assessment of on-site conditions during construction of the side channel at this site. Trees would be sourced from within the American River Parkway as appropriate and would reuse trees removed during park maintenance activities in coordination with County Parks.

The Sailor Bar borrow site would be used for 2019 restoration activities. The preferred access between the borrow site and the restoration site would be via parkway roads. Alternately, the site could be accessed via Illinois Avenue. Construction of restoration elements at Upper Sailor Bar would take place over approximately 4 weeks during July-September.

### 2.2.6 Regulatory Requirements, Permissions, Permits, Authorizations, and Approvals

The proposed project may need permissions, permits, authorizations, and approvals both from federal agencies (Table 2-3) and state, regional, and local agencies (Table 2-4).

**Table 2-3. Potential Federal Actions, Permissions, Permits, Authorizations, and Approvals**

Permit/Authorization/Permission	Agency
Request permission under RHA Section 14 (i.e., USC, Title 33, Section 408) — Division Review for the alteration of federal levees on the Lower American River	Corps
CWA Section 404 Permit for discharge of dredge and fill material into waters of the United States also ensuring compliance with CWA Section 401 through receipt of the City's Section 401 Water Quality Certification	Corps
ESA Section 7 — Consultation and Biological Opinions for possible effects on federally listed species pursuant to Section 7 of the federal ESA	Corps, NMFS, USFWS
NHPA Section 106 — Consultation and PA or MOA regarding effects on cultural resources pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA	Corps, SHPO/Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Review comments on CWA Section 404 permit application and Section 408 permission	NMFS, USFWS, CDFW

Notes: CDFW = California Department of Fish and Wildlife; CWA = Clean Water Act; DWR = California Department of Water Resources; ESA = Endangered Species Act; MOA = Memorandum of Agreement; NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act; PA = Programmatic Agreement; NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service; RHA = Rivers and Harbors Act; SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer; SRFCP = Sacramento River Flood Control Project; Corps = U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;

Source: Compiled by GEI Consultants, Inc. in 2019

**Table 2-4. Potential State, Regional, and Local Actions, Permits, and Approvals**

Permit/Authorization	Agency
CWA Section 401 — Water Quality Certification for a Permit for discharge of dredge and fill materials into waters of the United States or waters of the State	CVRWQCB
CWA Section 402 — NPDES for Construction General Permit	CVRWQCB
LSAA (California Fish and Game Code Section 1602) or similar agreement	CDFW
CCR, Title 23, Section 6 — Encroachment Permit (required for City implementation of project)	CVFPB
Sacramento County Department of Parks and Recreation Encroachment Permit	County Parks

Notes: AB = Assembly Bill; AQMD = Air Quality Management District; CBC = California Building Code; CCR = California Code of Regulations; CDFW = California Department of Fish and Wildlife; CESA = California Endangered Species Act; CSLC = California State Lands Commission; CVFPB = Central Valley Flood Protection Board; CVRWQCB = Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board; CWA = Clean Water Act; DWR = California Department of Water Resources; LSAA = Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement; NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System; PRC = Public Resources Code; SMARA = Surface Mining and Reclamation Act;  
 Source: Compiled by GEI Consultants, Inc. in 2019

This page intentionally left blank.

## Section 3. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

This section describes the affected environment and evaluates the environmental consequences that may occur with implementation of the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative. Information on the affected environment and environmental consequences for water resources (including hydrology and water quality, biological resources, hazardous materials, air quality, traffic, noise, recreation, and cultural resources) was previously provided in Reclamation's 2016 EA (Reclamation 2016), which this document supplements (see pages 17-55 of the 2016 EA). This EA/IS includes only updates to the information that was previously provided for these resource areas. The City has also prepared an Environmental Checklist under CEQA, which is provided in Appendix C, "CEQA Environmental Checklist." The CEQA Environmental Checklist provides additional, more specific detail on the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines.

Effects on several environmental resources were examined and found to be minimal or nonexistent. These resources include agriculture, energy, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, seismicity, socioeconomics, utilities and service systems, and wildfire. Please refer to Appendix C, "CEQA Environmental Checklist," for additional documentation.

For CEQA purposes only, a significance conclusion is presented for each issue area. These conclusions are not part of the analysis of the project effects under NEPA.

Indian Trust Assets: Indian Trust Assets are legal interests in assets that are held in trust by the United States for federally recognized Indian tribes or individuals. There are no Indian reservations, Rancherias or allotments in the project area. The nearest Indian Trust Asset is the Shingle Springs Rancheria about 17 miles away. The Proposed Action does not have a potential to affect Indian Trust Assets.

Indian Sacred Sites: Sacred sites are defined in Executive Order 13007 (May 24, 1996) as "any specific, discrete, narrowly delineated location on federal land that is identified by an Indian tribe, or Indian individual determined to be an appropriately authoritative representative of an Indian religion, as sacred by virtue of its established religious significance to, or ceremonial use by, and Indian religion; provided that the tribe or appropriately authoritative representative of an Indian religion has informed the agency of the existence of such a site." There are no identified Indian Sacred Sites within the project area of the Proposed Action and therefore the Proposed Action would not inhibit use or access to any Indian Sacred Sites.

Environmental Justice: Executive Order 12898 requires each federal agency to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or

environmental effects, including social and economic effects of its program, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. The Proposed Action would not result in any adverse human health or environmental effects to minority or low-income populations.

### **3.1 Aesthetics**

#### **3.1.1 Affected Environment**

The American River Parkway (Parkway) is a 23-mile-long open space greenbelt which extends from Nimbus Dam to the American River's confluence with the Sacramento River. Many areas along the north and south sides of the river have been affected by past gold mining and/or gravel borrow activities and these areas exhibit extensive dredge piles of gravel and cobble-sized material with riparian, wetland, woodland, and upland vegetation of various densities occupying floodplain, bank, and instream gravel bar areas. Topography in the Parkway varies from steep banks to wide, more broadly-sloping or flat meander areas.

The Parkway's open spaces and natural resources provide visitors with a highly-valued natural setting in the midst of a developed urban area. The American River Parkway Plan (Parkway Plan) specifies management for many uses, including: viewing the clean, transparent waters of the LAR at various flow levels; fish, wildlife and associated habitat; river recreation such as rafting, fishing, hiking, and biking; viewing geology and landforms; and many other uses with minimal urban or ambient noise and light (Sacramento County 2008).

The LAR is designated as a "Recreational" river by the Secretary of the Interior under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (designated 1981) and is given the same designation by the State under the California Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (designated 1972).

#### **3.1.2 Environmental Consequences**

##### *No Action Alternative*

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts on aesthetic resources since no construction would take place.

##### *Proposed Action*

In-river spawning gravel placement, side channel excavation, and habitat structure placement would require the use of large construction equipment within and adjacent to the river but would be limited to a maximum of three restoration sites per year which represent a small portion of the total Parkway area. Furthermore, construction and equipment use would be only 4-6 weeks at each location. After work is completed at the various restoration sites, the visual character of these reaches would be consistent with existing conditions along the Parkway and LAR, where visitors see a meandering main channel, side channels, gravel bars, vegetated and unvegetated banks, upland and riparian vegetation at various life stages (including downed logs and rootwads), and the fish and wildlife species

that use the Parkway and LAR as habitat. At borrow sites, the visual character would be similar before and after removal of material; the visual environment in these locations is characterized by large piles or mounds of gravel, and vegetation typical of disturbed areas. The National Park Service (NPS) has twice concurred that the project described in the 2008 EA and conducted in 2008 through 2013 would not have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which the river was federally designated as a Wild and Scenic River (NPS 2008, 2018). A similar conclusion from NPS is expected for the proposed action for 2019 through 2034 since the Proposed Action is very similar to the previous LAR restoration efforts. This impact would be less than significant.

## **3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources**

### **3.2.1 Affected Environment**

Portions of the Parkway qualify as forestlands for CEQA purposes since these areas support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. There are no lands designated as Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance nor are there any Williamson Act contracted lands within the project area

### **3.2.2 Environmental Consequences**

#### No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts on forestry resources since no construction would take place.

#### Proposed Action

During construction of the side channels, up to 20 trees may need to be removed at each site, although all trees would be avoided to the extent feasible. The Parkway is a dynamic riverine environment, and continual recruitment and disposition of riparian and floodplain trees and other vegetation is a part of the natural cycle as the river meanders throughout the Parkway. The removal of up to 20 trees per site over the 16 years of the Proposed Action would not convert forest land to a non-forest use and would be a less-than-significant impact.

## **3.3 Air Quality**

Section 176 (c) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) (42 USC 7506 (c)) requires that any entity of the federal government that engages in, supports, or in any way provided financial support for, licenses or permits, or approves any activity to demonstrate that the action conforms to the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP) required under Section 110 (a) of the CAA (42 USC 7401 (a)) before the action is otherwise approved. In this context, conformity means that such federal actions must be consistent with a SIP's purpose of eliminating or reducing the severity and number of violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and achieving expeditious attainment of those standards. Each federal agency must



determine that any action that is proposed by the agency and that is subject to the regulations implementing the conformity requirements would, in fact conform to the applicable SIP before the action is taken.

### **3.3.1 Affected Environment**

The Proposed Action is located within the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), which is part of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). Air basins share a common “air shed,” the boundaries of which are typically defined by surrounding topography.

Criteria air pollutants are prevalent pollutants in the air that are known to be deleterious to human health. Concentrations are monitored to designate as nonattainment, attainment, and unclassified for criteria air pollutants. Criteria air pollutants include ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), respirable and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and lead.

As specified in the California Clean Air Act of 1988, Chapters 1568-1588, it is the responsibility of each district within the state to attain and maintain California’s ambient air quality standards. The SMAQMD is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws. Management districts issue air quality permits and Best Available Control Technology to be implemented if trigger levels are exceeded.

On November 30, 1993, EPA promulgated final general conformity regulations at 40 CFR 93 Subpart B for all federal activities except those covered under transportation conformity. The general conformity regulations apply to a proposed federal action in a non-attainment or maintenance area if the total of direct and indirect emissions of the relevant criteria pollutants and precursor pollutant caused by a Proposed Action equal or exceed certain emissions thresholds, thus requiring the federal agency to make a conformity determination.

Sacramento County is currently designated as nonattainment for the state and federal ambient air quality standards for ground-level ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), as well as for the federal standards for PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

Construction-related emissions are described as “short-term” or temporary in duration and have the potential to represent a significant impact with respect to air quality, especially fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> dust emissions. Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> dust emissions are primarily associated with site preparation and vary as a function of such parameters as soil silt content, soil moisture, wind speed, acreage of disturbance area, and vehicle miles traveled by construction vehicles on- and off-site.

Ozone precursor emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) are primarily associated with gas and diesel equipment exhaust and the application of architectural coatings.

### 3.3.2 Environmental Consequences

#### No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts to air quality since no construction would take place.

#### Proposed Action

Construction emissions would vary from day to day and by activity, timing and intensity, and wind speed and direction. Generally, air quality impacts from the Proposed Action would be localized in nature.

Short-term air quality impacts would be associated with construction and would generally arise from dust generation (fugitive dust) and operation of construction equipment. Fugitive dust results from land clearing, grading, excavation, concrete work, and vehicle traffic on paved and unpaved roads. Fugitive dust is a source of airborne particulates, including PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

Large earth-moving equipment, trucks, and other mobile sources powered by diesel or gasoline are also sources of combustion emissions, including nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, sulfur dioxide, and small amounts of air toxics.

SMAQMD has adopted a CEQA threshold of 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2e</sub>) per year for construction-related GHG emissions related to land development and construction, and stationary source construction and operation. Air quality modeling results for the Proposed Action show that the Proposed Action's total construction-related GHG emissions would be 279 metric tons in the maximum modeled year.

For the purposes of the air quality analysis, it was assumed that gravel additions would be completed at up to three sites per year using a total of approximately 30,000 tons. Work would be conducted for approximately 4 weeks (20 working days) per site for a total of 60 working days per year. Using a 24-ton truck, gravel transport would require approximately 59 one-way trips per day. Additional traffic would occur from daily worker trips to the site. Delivery of gravel to any site would not be done at the same time as delivery to another site. Equipment used in air quality modeling is presented in Table 2-2 in Chapter 2, "Proposed Action and Alternatives." Project-generated construction-related emissions were modeled using CalEEMod version 2016.3.2 for daily and annual vehicle emissions between 2019 and 2034. Modeling results are presented in Table 3-1.

The Proposed Action would involve temporary emissions from construction activities and worker trips made to the site and back. Implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in a substantial increase of long-term emissions from mobile, stationary, or area sources. Total emissions would be temporary, would not exceed the federal general conformity or state *de minimis* thresholds, and would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase. This impact would be less than significant.

**Table 3-1. Proposed Action Construction Emissions**

Construction Year(s)	Emissions					
	pounds/day (unmitigated)				tons/year (unmitigated)	
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
2019-2023	7.86	84.77	22.46	8.39	0.63	0.24
2024-2028	5.11	51.02	20.61	6.69	0.58	0.19
2029-2033	4.76	46.74	20.37	6.47	0.57	0.18
2034	4.87	26.69	19.30	5.53	0.54	0.16
SMAQMD Threshold of Significance	--	85	82	80	14.6	15
Exceeds Project Threshold?	--	No	No	No	No	No

Notes: ROG = reactive organic gases; NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides; PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 10 micrometers; PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 micrometers

Source: Emissions modeled by GEI Consultants, Inc., in 2019 (Model results in Appendix F)

### 3.4 Biological Resources

#### 3.4.1 Affected Environment

The project study area is located in the riverine, riparian, and woodland corridor of the LAR. Elevation of the study area ranges from approximately 50 feet above mean sea level at the downstream end of the River Bend restoration site to approximately 200 feet at the upstream end of the Mississippi Bar borrow site. Water depth in this portion of the river fluctuates during summer because it is downstream of Nimbus Dam and subject to regulated flows. Vegetation on the restoration sites includes valley oak woodland, mixed riparian forest, and willow scrub (Reclamation 2015). The borrow sites are primarily barren and composed of dredge tailings, though seasonal wetlands are present in concave portions of the tailings (Water Forum 2008). These habitats have potential to support one special-status plant and several special-status wildlife species. The LAR also supports a variety of native and nonnative fishes, including game fish and special-status species. The study area includes designated critical habitat for two federally listed species and Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*).

Please refer to Reclamation’s 2016 EA and the Biological Resources Technical Memorandum in Appendix F for a detailed discussion of the affected environment with respect to biological resources, including habitat types and federal and state special-status species potentially in the project area (Conservancy fairy shrimp, Vernal Pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, delta smelt, green sturgeon, Central Valley steelhead, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, western yellow-billed cuckoo, Least Bell’s vireo, golden eagle, bald eagle, burrowing owl, Swainson’s hawk, white-tailed kite, bank swallow, and purple martin).

### 3.4.2 Environmental Consequences

#### No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Reclamation would not place gravel in the LAR below Nimbus Dam, nor would side-channels be developed. The reach would remain in a deteriorated condition as spawning and rearing habitat for salmonids. Further declines in aquatic habitat quality over time would be likely as in-river gravel sources diminish and cannot be replenished naturally by upstream sources.

#### Proposed Action

##### **Plants**

Sanford's arrowhead (*Sagittaria sanfordii*) is the only special-status plant (California Rare Plant Rank 1B.2) that has potential to occur on the restoration sites. This plant has three occurrences mapped along the LAR, including one occurrence in a concrete-lined drainage channel, near the restoration site approximately 0.8 mile downstream of the Rossmoor Drive access point. The other nearby occurrences are along the river, within 3 miles of restoration sites. Ground disturbance at the restoration sites would primarily occur below the OHWM in areas where waters are generally fast moving and well oxygenated. Because Sanford's arrowhead occurs in slow-moving waters, it is very unlikely to occur in areas of project-related disturbance, and unlikely to be adversely affected by project implementation. Therefore, impacts to plants are less than significant.

##### **Invertebrates**

Vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*) is known to occur within 3 miles of the restoration and borrow sites, including one occurrence near the Sailor Bar borrow site. This occurrence is from seasonal wetland habitat on the high floodplain terrace (CDFW 2019), outside the area of dredge tailings that would be used as borrow material. Vernal pool tadpole shrimp (*Lepidurus packardii*) has not been documented in this wetland, but it also could occur if habitat conditions are suitable. Implementing Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and BIO-2 (described in Section 3.12, "Environmental Commitments") would reduce the impact associated with direct and indirect disturbance of seasonal wetlands potentially occupied by vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp to a less-than-significant level because a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would be prepared and implemented, as needed, and measures would be implemented to avoid and minimize extracting borrow from and staging near seasonal wetlands.

There are a number of known occurrences of valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB) on or near the restoration and borrow sites, and two areas of designated critical habitat for the species are located on or adjacent to several of the restoration sites, between approximately RM 18 and RM 19 and from RM 14.5 to RM 17. Project activities would not require removal or trimming of elderberry shrubs, but elderberry shrubs adjacent to the restoration and borrow sites could be indirectly affected. Implementing Mitigation Measure BIO-3 (described in Section 3.12, "Environmental Commitments") would reduce potential project-

related adverse effects to valley elderberry longhorn beetle to a less-than-significant level, because agency staff and contractors would receive training, and measures would be implemented to avoid and minimize potential disturbance of elderberry shrubs. Therefore, impacts to invertebrates including VELB are less than significant.

## **Fisheries**

The Proposed Action includes a suite of habitat modification/restoration activities with the expressed intent to improve conditions for anadromous salmonids in the LAR. Activities to augment spawning gravel, enhance floodplain and side channel habitats, and place instream habitat structures are expected to improve aquatic habitats and increase spawning and rearing success. Operation of construction equipment in or adjacent to the river presents the risk of a spill of hazardous materials into the river (e.g., construction equipment leaking fluids). Additionally, on-site refueling of construction equipment can result in minor fuel and oil spills. Without rapid containment and clean up, these materials could have deleterious effects on special-status fish within the exposure area. Although juvenile salmonids and other fish are highly mobile and thus have the ability to avoid potentially hazardous materials, exposure to such materials could result in mortality of large numbers of special-status fishes and have a substantial adverse effect on local populations. Project activities could result in short-term increases in suspended sediment and turbidity levels and impact fish populations through reduced food availability and feeding efficiency. Implementing Mitigation Measure GEO-1 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”) would reduce the impact of pollutant discharge on special-status fish from accidental spill of or exposure to hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level, because a SWPPP would be prepared and implemented when required.

Placing material in the active channel would generally occur along non-vegetated channel margins where juvenile salmonid presence is expected to be minimal due to the lack of vegetation cover and timing of in-river construction. However, using heavy equipment in areas that are accessible by fish and/or installing temporary water crossings could result in injury or mortality and have a substantial adverse effect on local populations. Implementing Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”) would reduce the impact associated with project-related injury or mortality of special-status fish to a less-than-significant level, because restrictions related to in-water work would be implemented, agency staff and contractors would receive training, and biological monitoring would be conducted.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) also provided EFH conservation recommendations for Pacific salmon as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act for the previous restoration projects (see pages 32-38 in the 2016 EA).

Effects to habitat areas of particular concern under EFH are similar to ESA-listed critical habitat. Based on this, and the EFH conservation measures recommended by NMFS and that Reclamation is committed to implement, the Proposed Action

is not likely to eliminate or significantly diminish or disrupt, EFH for species of concern such as the Central Valley fall/late-fall Chinook Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU). Therefore, impacts to fish are less than significant.

### **Reptiles**

Western pond turtle (*Emys marmorata*), a California species of special concern, is known to occur along the LAR and could be present on-site during project activities. Natural basking sites, such as partially submerged logs or rocks, vary in abundance along the river, including at the restoration sites. However, habitat on the restoration and borrow sites is unlikely to be used for nesting, due to unsuitable substrate conditions. Therefore, impacts to reptiles including Western pond turtle are less than significant.

### **Birds**

Eight special-status bird species—golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), western yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), bank swallow (*Riparia riparia*), and purple martin (*Progne subis*) have potential to occur on or adjacent to the restoration and/or borrow sites. Project activities are anticipated to require limited tree removal where side-channels are created and the use of haul routes in the American River Parkway could require tree trimming to facilitate passage of large project vehicles and equipment. Tree removal is limited to areas where side-channels would be created and is not likely to result in the removal of large diameter trees, since these areas are subject to high-velocity flows during periods of flooding. If tree trimming is required, it would not reduce the overall amount of suitable nesting habitat available and is very unlikely to remove active nests of special-status birds. However, if active nests of special-status birds are present on or near the restoration or borrow sites, they could be disturbed. Implementing Mitigation Measure BIO-4 (described in Section 3.12, "Environmental Commitments") would reduce the impact associated with project-related failure of active nests of special-status birds to a less-than-significant level, because agency staff and contractors would receive training and buffers would be implemented around active nests to minimize potential for nest failure. Therefore, impacts to birds are less than significant.

### **Wetlands and Waters of the United States**

The LAR is a water of the United States subject to regulation under CWA Sections 404 and 401 and California Fish and Game Code (FGC) Section 1602. Implementing the Proposed Action would result in direct modification and placement of fill within the jurisdictional river channel but would not result in the loss of channel capacity. However, project activities could temporarily degrade water quality in the river. Seasonal wetlands are known to occur at the borrow sites and could be directly modified, if borrow material is removed from tailings that support wetlands. Degradation of river water quality and loss of seasonal wetlands that are considered sensitive aquatic sites could have a substantial

adverse effect on state and federally protected wetlands. Implementing Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and BIO-2 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”) would reduce the potentially significant impact associated with fill and modification of waters of the United States and waters of the State to a less-than-significant level because a SWPPP would be implemented, if needed, to protect water quality, impacts to seasonal wetlands would be avoided to the extent feasible, and biological monitoring would be conducted. Therefore, impacts to wetlands and waters of the United States are less than significant.

### **Nursery Sites**

The LAR serves as a nursery site for colonial-nesting bird species. In addition to the potential for bank swallow and purple martin nest colonies in the project area (as described above), three great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*) and great egret (*Ardea alba*) nest colonies are known to occur near the restoration /borrow sites. If nest colonies on or near the restoration or borrow sites are active during project implementation, they could be disturbed. Implementing Mitigation Measures GEO-1, BIO-1, and BIO-4 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”) would reduce the potentially significant impact associated with direct and indirect effects on rearing juvenile fish and colonial nesting birds to a less-than-significant level, because a SWPPP would be implemented, if needed, to protect water quality, measures would be implemented to minimize turbidity during in-water activities and project-related injury or mortality of juvenile fish, and buffers would be implemented around active nest colonies to minimize potential for nest failure. Therefore, impacts to nursery sites are less than significant.

## **3.5 Cultural Resources**

Cultural resource is a broad term that includes prehistoric, historic, architectural, and traditional cultural properties. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (Title 54 U. S. C.300101 et. seq.) is the primary federal legislation that outlines the federal government’s responsibility related to cultural resources. Title 54 USC Section 306108, formerly and commonly known as Section 106 of the NHPA, requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties and to provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation an opportunity to comment. The 36 CFR Part 800 regulations that implement Section 106 of the NHPA describe how federal agencies address these effects. The regulations follow a series of steps that are designed to identify interested parties; determine the area of potential effects (APE); identify historic properties (defined as cultural resources that are eligible for inclusion in or listed in the National Register of Historic Places [National Register]); to assess the effects of the action on historic properties; and to resolve adverse effects, if any, on historic properties. The Section 106 process must be conducted in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Indian tribes, and other interested parties, as applicable.

### 3.5.1 Affected Environment

Dredge tailings at both Sailor Bar and Mississippi Bar have been determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register as contributing to P-34-335. To resolve adverse effects, pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.6(c), a Memorandum of Agreement was executed by Reclamation and SHPO in 2010: Memorandum of Agreement Between the Bureau of Reclamation and the California State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the Resolution of Adverse Effects to Historic Properties from the Acquisition of Gravel from Sailor Bar on the LAR, Sacramento County, California. The mitigation stipulations were met and concurred with by SHPO in 2012.

The project site is situated within an extremely modified landscape along the American River. Historic dredge mining and gravel acquisition resulted in a severe reworking of the natural channel and surrounding vicinity. In addition, historic hydraulic mining in the foothills resulted in the deposition of countless tons of sand and silt during flood events. Construction of Nimbus Dam stopped the historic flooding, and as a result, the numerous resultant silt and sand bars have developed soils which support current lacustrine vegetation. In regard to cultural resources, the aforementioned processes create an environment which shows a negligible sensitivity for the presence of historic properties.

### 3.5.2 Environmental Consequences

#### No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, existing conditions would persist into the future and the Proposed Action would not be implemented. As a result, the No Action Alternative would result in no impacts to cultural resources.

#### Proposed Action

Both the Sailor Bar dredge tailings and Mississippi Bar dredge tailings have been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP as contributors to P-34-000335 (a historic mining district). In 2009, the SHPO determined that other ongoing rock crushing and quarrying activities at Mississippi Bar had affected the integrity of the tailings at the site and therefore proposed gravel extraction and processing activities at Mississippi Bar would have no adverse effect to the contributing elements of the mining site (P-34-000335) (SHPO 2009). Based on analysis of the previous determination, the Mississippi Bar site has lost integrity and is no longer considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, a finding of no impact is recommended.

In 2010, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was executed between Reclamation and SHPO to resolve any adverse effects to Sailor Bar. The mitigation outlined in the MOA was concurred with by SHPO in 2012 (SHPO 2010; Reclamation 2015). Because SHPO determined Mississippi Bar dredge tailings have lost integrity and because consultation resulted in mitigation of impacts to Sailor Bar, a finding of no impact for the proposed project is recommended.



Two segments of the proposed project have not undergone complete pedestrian survey; these include the segment spanned by Sunrise Boulevard at which only the northeastern portion underwent pedestrian survey by Reclamation; and the segment immediately to the southwest of the Sunrise Boulevard segment, which has not been the subject of an archaeological pedestrian survey. These two segments are similar to the rest of the area of potential effect (APE) in that they comprise portions of the American River and modern sediments and sand bars. Because of the recently deposited material and dynamic environment along the river, these areas have extremely low archaeological sensitivity for prehistoric resources. Further, aerial photography of the two segments do not show any features that might be associated with historic-era resources such as tailings piles.

No archaeological resources have been identified on the project site. Further, given the physical context of the site, situated in the river and modern sand bars and sediment, archaeological sensitivity is extremely low. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

No burials including remains interred out of formal cemeteries were identified on the project site. The project site is situated in modern sediments, sand bars, and portions of the American River giving the area very low potential for human remains. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

## **3.6 Geology and Soils**

### **3.6.1 Affected Environment**

The project area lies within the Sacramento Valley, which is part of the Great Valley Geomorphic Province. In the project area, 7Holocene (i.e., 11,700 years B.P. [Present Day]) and Pleistocene (1.8 million–11,700 years B.P.) alluvial deposits lie atop the thick sequence of sedimentary rock units that form the deeply buried bedrock units in the mid-basin areas of the valley. The youngest geomorphic features in the project area are low floodplains, which are found primarily along the Sacramento and American rivers. These major drainage ways were originally confined within broad natural levees sloping away from the rivers or streams. The natural levees formed through the deposition of coarser materials that settled out of suspension nearest the rivers and streams, forming the natural levees and sand bars in the vicinity of the river channel. The finer material was carried in suspension farther from the rivers or streams and settled out in quiet water areas such as swales, abandoned meander channels, and lakes. However, because the streams have meandered and reworked the previously deposited sediments, extreme variations in material types may be found over a limited distance or depth.

The Mississippi Bar and Sailor Bar borrow areas have been highly disturbed as a consequence of historic gold mining operations. A large portion of the project area outside of the borrow areas, extending as far downstream as the El Manto site, has been altered by mining activities. In these areas, dredger tailings are prevalent, and in some areas, they have been partially, or largely, removed to

provide gravel for construction projects. Where gravel remains, it is poorly graded with sand, cobble, and boulders in upper portion of the dredge piles. Where gravel has been mined, silty sand or silty sand with gravel is present at the surface, which in turn lies atop sandy materials and a basal layer of fines deposited over bedrock or undredged deposits. In between windrows of dredge materials occasionally are parallel rows of slickens deposits, which are fined-grained materials (silts or clays) that settled out of standing water during the dredging process. Due to past gravel mining and associated excavation activities, large deep areas have been created within the riverbed from approximately RM 14-12. Modeling shows that these areas catch sediment as it moves downstream (see discussion in Section 3.8, “Water Resources: Hydrology and Water Quality,” and Appendices D and E).

The local bedrock is the Mehrten Formation which is usually well indurated and slightly to well cemented silty sands or mud-stones. In some locations in the project area, the Mehrten Formation is exposed along the river bank (Sherer 2008). The main channel of the LAR and side channel areas are primarily gravel bars with some boulders and outcropping of the Mehrten Formation.

### **3.6.2 Environmental Consequences**

#### *No Action Alternative*

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts related to geology and soils since no construction would take place.

#### *Proposed Action*

Gravel placement, side channel excavation, and habitat structure placement would take place within the river and would thus not impact surface soil erosion or contribute to loss of topsoil. Gravel borrow and processing would occur in areas previously used for and disturbed by gravel borrow and past gold mining activities and all work would be conducted during the dry season. However, construction could result in the temporary and short-term disturbance of soil and could expose disturbed areas if a storm event were to occur during project implementation. Rainfall of sufficient intensity could dislodge soil particles from the soil surface. Once particles are dislodged and the storm is large enough to generate runoff, substantial localized erosion could occur. In addition, soil disturbance during summer could result in substantial loss of topsoil because of wind erosion. Implementing Mitigation Measure GEO-1 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because a SWPPP or SWMP would be prepared and implemented consistent with permit requirements that would prevent and control pollution and minimize and control runoff and erosion. Therefore, impacts to geology and soils are less than significant.

The borrow and restoration sites lie within Holocene-aged stream channel and alluvial fan deposits. The bedrock at the restoration sites (the Mehrten Formation) is paleontologically sensitive, and inadvertent penetration of the Mehrten

Formation is a possibility during construction. Impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementing Mitigation Measure GEO-2 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”), because construction personnel would be trained before work commences, work would stop if paleontological resources are discovered, and a qualified paleontologist would assess the resource and prepare a recovery plan, if needed. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources are less than significant.

### **3.7 Hazardous Materials**

Potential impacts of construction-related hazardous materials to fish are addressed in Section 3.6, “Biological Resources.” A discussion of water quality and potential hazards to water quality associated with the project is presented in Section 3.8, “Water Resources.”

## **3.8 Water Resources (Hydrology and Water Quality)**

### **3.8.1 Affected Environment**

#### **Surface Water**

The project site is immediately adjacent to, and within, the LAR. Within Sacramento County, the American River is impounded at Folsom Dam and Nimbus Dam. Folsom Dam, at RM 29.4, was completed in 1955. Releases from Folsom Dam are re-regulated approximately 7 miles downstream by Nimbus Dam (RM 23). Both dams are part of the federal CVP. Releases from Nimbus Dam to the LAR pass through the Nimbus Power plant, or, at flows in excess of 5,000 cfs, the spillway gates.

Water that is stored in upstream reservoirs (primarily Folsom Reservoir) during winter and spring is released in summer and fall for municipal and industrial supply, irrigation, water quality, power generation, recreation, and fish and wildlife purposes. Consequently, the flows in the LAR are generally lower in winter and spring and higher in summer and fall than they were prior to the building of the dams. The dams regulate LAR flows throughout the project site (excepting stormwater flows from the adjacent levee slopes and floodplain and small local drainages such as Carmichael Creek [near Ancil Hoffman Park]), downstream to its confluence with the Sacramento River. Local runoff in the project area flows by gravity overland during storm events, and also through culverts and vegetated or lined intermittent drainages.

Releases from Folsom and Nimbus dams are operated under State water rights permit and fish protection requirements. SWRCB Decision D-893 in 1958 required minimum flows of 250 cfs from January through mid-September and 500 cfs between mid-September through December 31. The Water Forum, in cooperation with Reclamation, NMFS, USFWS, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), subsequently developed the Flow Management Standard (FMS) for the LAR. The FMS regulates flows in the LAR below Nimbus Dam, establishing Minimum Release Requirements from 800 to 2,000

cfs. The FMS also included these agencies to coordinate fishery and operational requirements. The FMS was included in the NMFS 2009 Biological Opinion on the Long-Term Operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project Reasonable and Prudent Alternative action. The proposed action would not affect the FMS and is designed to meet the target fishery needs of the FMS.

### **Water Quality**

The project site is in the Sacramento Hydrologic Basin Planning Area and the Lower American Hydrologic Subarea, as designated by the Central Valley RWQCB. In accordance with CWA Section 303, water quality standards for this basin are contained in the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River Basin and the San Joaquin River Basin (Basin Plan). Stormwater runoff from the project site is received by the LAR which is listed on the 303(d) list as an impaired water for several constituents of concern, including fecal indicator bacteria, bifenthrin, pyrethroids, toxicity, mercury, and polychlorinated biphenyls (RWQCB 2016).

In 1991, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, the County of Sacramento Department of Water Resources and the City of Sacramento jointly established the Sacramento Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program (CMP) to conduct water quality monitoring in the Sacramento and American rivers. The CMP has routinely monitored the LAR for heavy metals content and for compliance with conventional water-quality parameters. Monitoring has shown that water quality generally meets ambient water-quality criteria for aquatic life protection. Specifically, CMP data for the 1992–1995 monitoring period indicate a mean total suspended solids content of less than 1 milligram per liter (mg/L), mean electrical conductivity of 52 micro Siemens per centimeter ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ), and a  $\text{CaCO}_3$  hardness of 25 mg/L (Sacramento County Water Agency 1995). Nevertheless, through its Resolution No. 98-055 (1998) and its CWA Section 303(d) efforts, SWRCB named the LAR as impaired because of group “A” pesticides, mercury, and unknown toxicity and assigned low, medium, and high priority rankings, respectively, for developing the corresponding total maximum daily load programs (RWQCB 2002).

Water temperature in the LAR is controlled by releases from Folsom and Nimbus dams. On June 4, 2009, NMFS issued a biological opinion (BO) for listed anadromous fishes and their critical habitats governing the coordinated long-term operation of the CVP and State Water Project that included water temperature requirements from May 15 through October 31 for juvenile steelhead rearing.

### **Groundwater**

The project site is in the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin and abuts the North and South American Subbasins; the LAR serves as the boundary between these two basins (DWR 2003). According to the Groundwater Information Center Interactive Map Application, both subbasins are designated as “High Priority” and groundwater levels in the project area are approximately 30-40 feet from ground surface (DWR 2018).

## **Flood Management**

The majority of the project area is mapped as Zone AE on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map Zone. AE areas are designated as a Regulatory Floodway and are within the 100-year floodplain for the LAR. The area near the Nimbus Hatchery is mapped as AO (flood depths 1-3 feet expected due to sheetflow) and the Mississippi Bar borrow site is not mapped in a flood zone.

### **3.8.2 Environmental Consequences**

#### No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts to water resources since no construction would take place. The existing conditions would continue into the future as modified by any future activities or regulations.

#### Proposed Action

##### **Water Quality**

Reclamation would implement the project in accordance with the following permits that are protective of water quality: a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification issued by the Central Valley RWQCB; and a CWA Section 404 Permit issued by the Corps.

Both direct and indirect discharges associated with ground-disturbing construction activities for the proposed project could cause surface or groundwater to become contaminated by soil or construction-related substances. The proposed activities include removing and processing gravel borrow, transporting material to restoration sites, earthmoving and placing gravel and woody material in-river, excavating side channels, and revegetating gravel borrow and channel-adjacent floodplain areas.

All side channel excavation areas would be isolated from the main channel during excavation and only after excavating and grading the side channel is complete, would the inlet/outlet of the side channel be opened to introduce flows. Bladder dams may also be used, where appropriate, to allow construction to take place isolated from the river. Gravel sorting and cleaning would occur at borrow sites and adjacent to restoration sites, where appropriately sized material is available, and consists of scooping gravel into a mobile incline screener to separate gravel of an unsuitable size and transport via conveyer where the gravel is shaken and washed, if needed, to dislodge small particles, then stockpiled. The conveyer would be located over a shallow sump to catch the wash water. The sump would be filled with excess gravel and restored to the original grade once borrow activities are complete.

Gravel placed in the river would be previously washed to minimize turbidity plumes, if needed. Some turbidity is expected and would be monitored in accordance with relevant requirements and permits. If turbidity levels exceed permit standards, work would be suspended until the standards are met.

Consequently, instream work associated with in-river gravel and woody material placement could result in relatively small, short-term, turbidity plumes immediately downstream of the construction area. There would be no dewatering associated with project construction activities that would require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System “Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering [#CAG994004]” permit.

With the incorporation of the project construction practices described above into the proposed project, and implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”), the potential for impacts to water quality following project construction would be less than significant.

Gold mining historically occurred upstream and adjacent to the LAR, and management of mercury could be a concern during project construction due to processing methods used during historic mining operations. To address this concern, in 2009, Reclamation conducted sediment characterization testing at several sample pits within the gravel source areas at Mississippi Bar and Sailor Bar. Some test pits did report levels of cadmium, copper, lead, nickel, and zinc over thresholds allowed under the California Toxics Rule and EPA aquatic life standards, but only one pit contained elevated levels of mercury and arsenic. One site at the east of Sailor Bar had high concentrations of all metals. However, the project geologist reported that this is likely due to the presence of Mehrten Formation material in this pit. Mehrten Formation gravels consist of mafic volcanics and as such would have a higher metal content than the surrounding granitic gravels. Additionally, all metals detected at the test pits were associated with fine materials and not the gravel-sized sediment that will be used for project activities (Reclamation 2009). Since all material that will be introduced to the river will be sorted and fines removed at the gravel processing site, there is no concern about introducing the cleaned material to the river and there would be a minimal chance that mercury would be introduced into the LAR due to project gravel borrow or placement activities. The potential for impacts to water quality from elevated levels of mercury, or other metals, would be less than significant.

## **Hydrology**

Hydraulic model results show only small and localized velocity differences between the No Action and Proposed Action at several high flow rates, including 115,000 cfs (the former peak design discharge for the LAR); 160,000 cfs (the new peak design discharge for the LAR); and 192,000 cfs (USACE’s top-of-levee discharge). The velocity and water surface elevation (WSE) increases would not extend beyond the project area, span the entire wetted channel, or impact levees (see Appendix D: Figures 14-19). Additionally, results for all three flow scenarios show small WSE increases of 0.1 – 0.25 ft above RM 21.5 and 0.1 – 0.15 ft at RM 20.5 (upstream of Fair Oaks Bridge) (see Appendix D: Figure 1-10.1). However, these localized increases would represent a negligible increase in flood risk due to the following:

- The increases would not be adjacent to any federal or non-federal levees.
- The increases would be partially mediated by ongoing natural geomorphic processes in the LAR. The LAR from downstream of Nimbus Dam to RM 13.5 is a net erosional stream due to the lack of sediment input below Folsom and Nimbus dams. Therefore, sediment is continually eroding from within the channel and banks under existing conditions, which continuously increases conveyance capacity of the channel.
- As shown in Table 1-1 in Chapter 1, “Background,” past Reclamation restoration activities in the LAR (between 2008 and 2016) have already added gravel to several sites along the LAR between RM 23 and 13. Despite this past gravel placement, modeling results show a net reduction in WSE throughout much of the upper portion of the project area. This result demonstrates that past gravel augmentation projects have had no short- or long-term impact to WSEs as high flows periodically mobilize the gravel and move it downstream. Furthermore, there would be no downstream impacts to WSE (downstream of the project area) that can be attributed to project activities because the sediment supply in the LAR is not in equilibrium; the sediment that would be eroded from upstream gravel placement sites and deposited downstream only partially replaces the gravels that are being eroded in those downstream areas, resulting in no net increase in deposition or WSE.
- Based on an analysis of topographic/bathymetric change from 2006/2008 through 2017, a total of 338,000 cubic yards of sediment was exported (i.e., eroded and washed away) from the LAR, an annual average rate of 31,000 cubic yards/year. The study confirmed that the LAR exported more gravel than was replaced by the previous gravel augmentation projects and that the past gravel projects did not cause significant channel aggradation in any part of the LAR.
- The gravel that would be placed at restoration sites would be highly mobile at the flows analyzed for the proposed project. Despite this, the model conservatively assumes no topographic/bathymetric change in the LAR (i.e., the gravel would stay as placed and continue to back up flow). During actual flood flows of 115,000 cfs or higher, the gravel would move downstream, deposit over a dispersed area, and the net WSE impact would be smaller than what the model predicts. This conclusion is supported by data that show how the previously restored sites on the LAR evolved over the 2017 water year (which included a peak flow of approximately 82,000 cfs in the LAR). Pre- and post-conditions modeling did not demonstrate that the gravel moving downstream caused an increased flood risk under these conditions.

Under the baseline conditions (without gravel placement), sediment load rapidly increases in the erosional reach of the LAR (downstream of Nimbus Dam to RM 13.5) due to ongoing erosion of channel bed material, then rapidly decreases in the reach of historic instream aggregate mining between RMs 10.5-13.5 due to

coarse bed material deposition, and then gradually reduces downstream of RM 10.5 due to additional bed material deposition. The simulated project gravel placement would progressively increase sediment loads upstream of about RM 11, with minimal effects on sediment loads downstream of RM 11. The modeled increase in sediment load may include both gravel placed as part of the proposed project and original bed material which could be mobilized by project-induced hydraulic changes.

The gravel that would be placed as part of the proposed project is noticeably finer and more widely graded than the existing coarse surface material in the project reach of the LAR. If gravel placed by the project were mobilized, it would begin to disperse and mix with the existing bed material downstream of the restoration sites, thus locally increasing the mobility of surface bed sediment, and further increasing sediment outflow into the downstream reaches. However, these increases in sediment transport would not represent a significant impact related to onsite or offsite erosion or siltation due to the following:

- Although sediment transport could locally increase in the LAR due to project activities, 1D model results demonstrated that the gravel placed at the restoration sites deposits in the LAR between RMs 10.5-13.5. This reach was previously impacted by instream aggregate mining which created a “sediment trap.” This “sediment trap” captures the existing gravel load from the project reach under baseline conditions and would also capture the additional gravel load transported from the project reach with implementation of the project, greatly reducing further downstream effects under both scenarios. The “sediment trap” (depositional reach) of the LAR, which begins near William B. Pond Park captures approximately 93% of the long-term annual average sediment load in the LAR (see Appendix E: Table 4.1).
- The model shows that the project’s gravel placement would reduce channel erosion upstream of RM 12 (in the project area) and would not impact streambed elevation downstream of RM 12 (the leveed reach, below the project area).
- Placement of the proposed annual maximum gravel volume (30,000 tons/year) would not significantly affect channel capacity during the 16-year proposed project duration. Under baseline conditions, approximately 31,000 tons/year are transported out of the project reach this would increase to 38,800 tons/year under project conditions where the maximum allowed amount of gravel (30,000 tons/year) would be applied to the restoration sites. This represents an approximately 20% increase in the volume of transported sediment. However, even if 30,000 tons per year (the maximum permitted as part of the project for the 16 years from 2019 through 2034) were applied over the entire 73-year model simulation period, this volume would not affect overall LAR channel capacity due to the “sediment trap” between RMs 10.5-13.5 of the LAR created by past aggregate mining near William B. Pond Park.



Therefore, impacts from changes to hydrology directly, indirectly, and cumulatively would result in less-than-significant impacts.

### 3.9 Noise

The loudness of sound perceived by the human ear is dependent primarily on the overall sound pressure level and frequency content of the sound source. The human ear is not equally sensitive to loudness at all frequencies in the audible spectrum. To better relate overall sound levels and loudness to human perception, frequency-dependent weighting networks were developed. The standard weighting networks are identified as A through E. There is a strong correlation between the way humans perceive sound and A-weighted decibels (dBA). For this reason, the dBA can be used to predict community response to environmental and transportation noise. Sound levels expressed as dB in this section are A-weighted sound levels, unless noted otherwise.

#### 3.9.1 Affected Environment

The existing noise environment within the project area is typical of an open-space area within a suburban environment. In the vicinity of the project site, sensitive land uses include the American River Parkway, portions of the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, and single-family and multi-family residential uses with direct line of site to the proposed gravel augmentation sites, and those located along proposed gravel haul routes. These land uses could potentially experience noise impacts associated with project construction and/or increased traffic from project operation.

**Table 3-2. Construction Equipment and Typical Equipment Noise Levels**

Type of Equipment	Typical Noise Levels (dB)
	at 50 Feet
Dozer	85
Dump Truck/Haul Truck	84
Excavator	85
Front-end Loader	80
Generator	70
Gravel Screener/Sorter	85
Pick-up Truck	75
Scraper	85

Notes: dB = decibels;  $L_{max}$  = maximum instantaneous sound level;  $L_{eq}$  = 1-hour equivalent sound level (sound energy averaged over a continuous 1-hour period). Source: Reclamation 2008

### 3.9.2 Environmental Consequences

#### No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Reclamation would not place gravel in the LAR below Nimbus Dam, nor would side-channels be developed. There would be no impacts to noise since no construction, including the transportation of gravel, would take place.

#### Proposed Action

Construction noise impacts typically occur when construction activities take place during noise-sensitive times of the day (e.g., early morning, evening, or nighttime hours), when construction activities occur immediately adjacent to noise sensitive land uses, or when construction durations last over extended periods of time. The Proposed Action would generate construction noise from equipment operating at the project site; and transport of construction workers, construction materials, and equipment to and from the project site.

The County's noise ordinance (Section 6.68.070 of the Sacramento County Code) sets a noise standard of 55 dB  $L_{eq}$  between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. Section 6.68.090 (Exemptions) exempts construction noise from its noise standards, provided that construction noise occurs between 6 a.m. and 8 p.m. on weekdays, or 7 a.m. and 8 p.m. on weekends. Since all project-related construction activities would only occur within the hours specified in the County's code, the Proposed Action would not violate the County's construction noise standards, and this impact would be less than significant. The Proposed Action would not generate operational noise beyond occasional vehicle trips for monitoring activities.

The Proposed Action would include hauling gravel material from borrow sites at Sailor Bar and Mississippi Bar to the various gravel augmentation sites. Reclamation prepared traffic noise modeling for an earlier version of the Proposed Action, providing data on typical roadways that would be used for gravel hauling in the project vicinity, including U.S. Highway 50, Sunrise Boulevard, Hazel Avenue, Folsom Boulevard, Mather Field Road, Sunset Boulevard, Winding Way, and Illinois Avenue (Reclamation 2008). Increased traffic noise generated by the annual project in 2008 ranged from less than 0.1 dB on larger roads (including Sunrise Boulevard, Hazel Avenue, and U.S. Highway 50) to an increase of 3.9 dB on Winding Way. A project-related noise level increase of 5 dB or greater would be significant where ambient noise levels are less than 60 dB Ldn/CNEL; an increase of 3 dB would be significant where ambient noise levels exceed 60 dB Ldn/CNEL. Based on this threshold, all of the incremental traffic noise increases caused by the Proposed Action would be less than significant. Because the volume of material and roadways that would be used for hauling are similar to those modeled in 2008, traffic noise impacts for the Proposed Action would be less than significant.

## **3.10 Recreation**

### **3.10.1 Affected Environment**

The gravel augmentation sites and the Sailor Bar gravel acquisition site are located within the American River Parkway, administered by the Sacramento County Department of Regional Parks. The Mississippi Bar gravel acquisition site is located within the Folsom Lake SRA administered by the California Department of Parks and Recreation, through a contract with Reclamation. A portion of the project area within Folsom Lake SRA is on land owned by the State of California.

Both the American River Parkway and the Folsom State Recreation Area provide a wide range of recreational opportunities including boating, bicycling, hiking, jogging, horseback riding, fishing, bird watching, dog walking, and picnicking. In particular, Sailor Bar is a very popular fishing, boating, hiking, and dog walking area and contains equestrian trails. In addition, the Jedediah Smith Trail is very popular with cyclists, joggers, and hikers.

The area at Mississippi Bar is used mostly for horseback riding, hiking, and dog walking. Shadow Glenn Riding Stable is located at Mississippi Bar, as are a number of walking trails and a paved bicycle path. Nimbus Shoals is presently closed to boating and rafting. However, the Preliminary General Plan/Resource Management Plan for SRA proposes to develop a hand launch access point at this location when Reclamation removes the present fish weir. There is light boat traffic, primarily canoes, kayaks and drift boats between Sailor Bar and Upper Sunrise.

The major raft put-in is at the Sunrise access area with concessions on both sides of the river. Boating usage is much higher during weekends and holidays, than it is during the week. Fishing is particularly popular at Sailor Bar and numbers of fishers increases during late summer into early fall, as returning salmon become more numerous. The river is closed to fishing from November 1 through December 31 from the Hazel Avenue Bridge to Ancil Hoffman Park, when the bulk of the salmon spawn. The area around Sunrise to Nimbus Dam is a popular spot for steelhead fishing during winter, and the area above Arden Rapid is popular for shad fishing in spring.

### **3.10.2 Environmental Consequences**

#### No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Reclamation would not place gravel in the LAR below Nimbus Dam, nor would side-channels be developed. There would be no impacts to recreation since no construction, gravel augmentation, side channel development, or habitat enhancement would take place.

Proposed Action

**Mississippi Bar Borrow Area**

The borrow site and processing area at Mississippi Bar is adjacent to old dredger tailings and is an area that is not widely used by recreationists. Trucks and personnel would use an existing access road across the previously mined adjacent State land to access the borrow and processing area. Implementing Mitigation Measure REC-1 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”) would reduce impacts to access and the safety of recreationists to a less-than-significant level through compliance with a construction traffic control and road maintenance plan.

**Sailor Bar Borrow Area**

The existing access road for the Sailor Bar borrow area is a fire road closed to the public. Fire equipment and vehicle access would continue during construction. Implementing Mitigation Measure REC-1 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”) would reduce impacts to access and the safety of recreationists to a less-than-significant level through compliance with a construction traffic control and road maintenance plan.

**Gravel Augmentation and Restoration Sites**

Haul trucks and equipment would cross the Jedediah Smith Trail, equestrian trails, and hiking trails to access the river at any of the gravel augmentation and restoration sites. During construction, these trails would be signed, cautioning users that equipment would be crossing. Implementing Mitigation Measure REC-1 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”) would reduce impacts to access and the safety of recreationists to a less-than-significant level through compliance with a construction traffic control and road maintenance plan.

At all in-river restoration sites, boating/swimming traffic is historically light during weekdays when construction would occur, and in-river work would occur during flows generally less than 3,000 cfs. Additionally, the LAR is a river with all the hazards inherent to flowing cold water. There is recognition that no project can be built to be completely hazard free, particularly during higher flows, and personal responsibility is involved when recreating in and around the river. Implementing Mitigation Measure REC-2 (described in Section 3.12, “Environmental Commitments”) would reduce the impact associated with boater safety to a less-than-significant level through compliance with a boater safety plan.

During July and August, a few anglers seek early returning salmon; the number of anglers using the LAR increases in September and peaks in October, before the upper reach of the LAR is closed to fishing. In general, fish avoid in-water disturbances, such as construction. Therefore, it is not expected that anglers would want to access the river at specific restoration sites during the short construction period, as there are likely no fish. In any one year, the size of the construction site as compared to the areas inhabited by fish in the remainder of the river is

negligible and anglers can easily access other fishing sites during the construction period. Therefore, impacts to recreation are less than significant.

## **3.11 Transportation**

### **3.11.1 Affected Environment**

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) has recommended a screening criterion for assessing the effects of construction projects that create temporary traffic increases (ITE 1988). To account for the large percentage of heavy trucks associated with typical construction projects, ITE recommends a threshold level of 50 or more new peak-direction truck trips during the peak-hour. Therefore, a project would cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, and result in a significant effect related to traffic, if they would result in 50 or more new truck trips (100 passenger car equivalent [PCE] trips) during the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. This is considered an “industry standard” and is the most current guidance for significance thresholds

### **3.11.2 Environmental Consequences**

#### *No Action Alternative*

Under the No Action Alternative, Reclamation would not place gravel in the LAR below Nimbus Dam, nor would side-channels be developed. There would be no impacts to transportation since no construction, including hauling the gravel, would take place.

#### *Proposed Action*

Construction activities would be confined to the project site, off of paved roads. Transportation impacts would generally be related to hauling gravel from the two source areas to on-site stockpiles.

Construction-related traffic would occur from daily commutes by construction workers and the delivery of gravel. Gravel additions would be completed at up to three sites per year using a total of approximately 30,000 tons of gravel. Hauling of gravel outside of the project sites would be limited to Monday through Friday, except holidays, from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. for approximately 4 weeks per site (20 working days). Delivery of gravel to any site would not be done at the same time as delivery to another site. Using 24-ton trucks to transport the gravel to the staging area, each site would create approximately 59 trips (one-way) per day. Additional traffic would occur from daily worker trips to the site.

Floodplain and side channel habitat enhancements may occur at up to two sites per year. Excess gravel would be redistributed on the riverbank or in the channel within the project area. Traffic impacts related to side channel enhancements would occur from the initial staging of equipment on the project site and from daily commutes by construction workers.

Bicycle and pedestrian trails may be temporarily blocked during gravel delivery and construction activities. Haul trucks and equipment would cross several trails. During construction, these trails would be signed, cautioning users that equipment would be crossing. Access paths have been designed to avoid heavy recreation areas; however, several sites would require partial closures of recreation areas. Impacts to bicycle and pedestrian trails would be temporary and are discussed in Section 3.10, "Recreation."

Potential impacts to traffic would be temporary and related to the construction activities. Existing land uses would not be altered by the Proposed Action and there would not be permanent changes to traffic Levels of Service. Therefore, transportation-related impacts would be less than significant.

### **3.12 Environmental Commitments**

Environmental commitments (called mitigation measures under CEQA) are measures or practices considered in an EA and may be formally adopted in a FONSI to reduce or avoid adverse effects that could result from project operations and are in accordance with relevant permits. CEQA requires that the State lead agency implement and enforce mitigation measures that are adopted as part of the MND. With implementation of these mitigation measures, all potentially significant impacts identified in Appendix B, CEQA Environmental Checklist, are reduced to less than significant. The following section describes the environmental commitments that will be implemented (called mitigation measures to comply with CEQA):

#### **Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Minimize Injury and Mortality of Special-Status Fish Species.**

The City/Water Forum and its construction contractor(s) shall implement the following measures to avoid and minimize direct injury and mortality of special-status fish:

- In-water work shall be restricted to July 1 through September 30, with consideration of the spatial and temporal distribution of spawning and incubating steelhead and fall-run Chinook salmon. Work past September 30 would be with approval from the National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Construction may be conducted year-round in areas, such as floodplains and side channels, when flowing water is absent due to separation from the main channel by gravel berms that are either naturally present or artificially created.
- In-water work in floodplains and side channels shall be limited to inlet/outlet areas during the last stage of reconnection to the main channel if working outside of the instream work timing window.
- Instream habitat structures shall be placed when fish do not have access to the affected areas, or within timing windows, as described above.

- Measures such as slow, deliberate equipment operation and tapping the water surface before entering the channel shall be implemented during in-water work to alert fish to equipment operation in the channel before gravel is placed.
- Before project activities begin, worker Environmental Awareness Training shall be provided to inform agency staff and contractors of the need to avoid and minimize potential impacts on special-status fish and the possible penalties for not complying with these requirements. The training shall include, at a minimum, species identification, habitat requirements, and required practices for fish avoidance and protection. A designated enforcement lead shall be identified to employees and contractors to ensure that questions regarding avoidance and protection measures are addressed in a timely manner.
- A designated enforcement lead shall monitor in-water construction activities to confirm proper implementation of conservation measures and water quality protection measures.

**Timing:** Before and during ground-disturbing activities.

**Responsibility:** City/Water Forum and Construction Contractor(s).

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Waters of the United States and Water of the State.**

The City/Water Forum and its construction contractor(s) shall implement the following measures to avoid and minimize direct fill of waters of the United States and waters of the State in the Lower American River and minimize impacts on seasonal wetland habitats at the borrow sites.

- Ground disturbance shall be limited to gravel augmentation restoration sites and borrow sites. Existing access routes shall be used to obtain access to restoration and borrow sites. The total area of the project activity shall be limited to the minimum necessary. Borrow extraction areas and staging areas shall be placed to avoid and limit disturbance to the Lower American River and seasonal wetland habitats and shall provide a 250-foot setback from seasonal wetland habitats, to the extent feasible.
- Before the commencement of construction activities, high-visibility fencing shall be erected to protect areas of the Lower American River at gravel augmentation sites and identified seasonal wetland habitats at borrow sites that are located adjacent to disturbance areas but can be avoided from encroachment of personnel and equipment. The fencing shall be inspected before the start of each work day and shall be removed only when the construction within a given area is completed. Limits of waters of the United States and wetlands shall be incorporated into project bid specifications, along with a requirement for contractors to avoid these areas.

- A designated enforcement lead shall monitor all construction activities in waters of the United States to ensure that avoidance and minimization measures are being properly implemented and no unauthorized activities occur. The designated enforcement lead shall be empowered to stop construction activities that threaten to cause unanticipated and/or unauthorized significant adverse project impacts to allow resolution of these potential impacts by the City/Water Forum and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. Project activity shall not resume until the conflict has been resolved.
- Authorization for direct fill of jurisdictional habitat in the LAR and modification of seasonal wetlands at the borrow sites shall be obtained, as required, from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and CDFW.
  - **Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404:** Before any ground-disturbing project activities begin in areas containing wetlands or waters, a qualified biologist shall conduct a formal delineation of waters of the United States for CWA Section 404 permitting. The findings shall be documented in a detailed report for the formal Section 404 wetland delineation process.
  - Authorization for fill of jurisdictional waters of the United States shall be secured from the Corps via the Section 404 permitting process before project construction. Any mitigation measures determined necessary during the 404 permitting process shall be implemented during project construction.
  - **CWA Section 401:** Water quality certification pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA shall be obtained from the Central Valley RWQCB before starting project construction in any areas that may contain waters of the State. Any measures required as part of the issuance of water quality certification shall be implemented.
  - **Fish and Game Code (FGC) Section 1602 or similar agreement:** A CDFW lake and streambed alteration agreement or similar approval from CDFW shall be obtained by the City as needed for activities that will substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of water; substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, or lake; or deposit or dispose of debris, waste, or other material containing crumbled, flaked, or ground pavement where it may pass into any river, stream, or lake. Any conditions of issuance of the lake and streambed alteration agreement, including avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, shall be implemented as part of project implementation.

**Timing:** Before and during ground-disturbing activities.

**Responsibility:** City/Water Forum.



**Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Minimize Effects to Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle.**

The City/Water Forum and its construction contractor(s) shall implement the following measures to avoid and minimize potential adverse effects on valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB) during project implementation.

- Before project activities begin, worker Environmental Awareness Training shall be provided to inform agency staff and contractors of the need to avoid and minimize potential impacts on VELB and its host plant and the possible penalties for not complying with these requirements. The training shall include, at a minimum, species identification, habitat requirements, and required practices for their avoidance and protection. A designated enforcement lead shall be identified to employees and contractors to ensure that questions regarding avoidance and protection measures are addressed in a timely manner.
- All elderberry shrubs on or adjacent to work areas shall be temporarily fenced and designated as environmentally sensitive areas. These areas shall be avoided by all construction personnel. Fencing shall be placed at least 20 feet from the dripline of each shrub, unless otherwise approved by USFWS.
- Dirt roadways and disturbed areas within 100 feet of elderberry shrubs shall be watered at least twice a day to minimize dust emissions.

**Timing:** Before and during ground-disturbing activities.

**Responsibility:** City/Water Forum and Construction Contractor(s)

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Minimize Effects on Special-status and Other Nesting Birds.**

The City/Water Forum and its construction contractor(s) shall implement the following measures to avoid and minimize potential adverse effects on special-status and other nesting birds during project implementation:

- Before project activities begin, worker Environmental Awareness Training shall be provided to inform agency staff and contractors of the need to avoid and minimize potential impacts on nesting birds and the possible penalties for not complying with these requirements. The training shall include, at a minimum, species identification, habitat requirements, and required practices for their avoidance and protection. A designated enforcement lead shall be identified to employees and contractors to ensure that questions regarding avoidance and protection measures are addressed in a timely manner.
- If vegetation removal is required during the bird nesting season (February 1 through August 15), surveys for active bird nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in areas of suitable nesting vegetation designated for

removal. A minimum of one survey shall be conducted no more than 7 days before vegetation removal occurs. If active nests are found, removal of vegetation in which the nests are located shall be delayed until a qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged or the nest site is otherwise no longer in use.

- Preconstruction surveys for active nests of burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, bank swallow, purple martin, and colonial nesting herons and egrets shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in all areas of suitable nesting habitat that could be disturbed by project activities. A minimum of two surveys shall be conducted within 14 days before project activities begin, including at least one survey no more than 7 days before activities begin.
- Appropriate buffers shall be established and maintained around active nest sites to avoid nest failure from project activities. The appropriate size and shape of the buffers shall be determined by a qualified biologist and may vary depending on the nest location, nest stage, construction activity, and existing disturbance levels. The buffers may be adjusted if a qualified biologist determines it would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Monitoring shall be conducted to confirm that project activities are not resulting in detectable adverse effects on nesting birds or their young. No project activities shall occur within the buffer areas until a qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged or the nest site is otherwise no longer in use.

**Timing:** Before and during ground-disturbing activities.

**Responsibility:** City/Water Forum and Construction Contractor(s)

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Prepare and Implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and Associated Best Management Practices.**

When required, the City/Water Forum shall prepare and implement the appropriate Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), or Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), as needed, to prevent and control pollution and to minimize and control runoff and erosion in compliance with State and local laws. The SWPPP or SWMP shall identify the activities that may cause pollutant discharge (including sediment) during storms or strong wind events and the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be employed to control pollutant discharge. Construction techniques that will be identified and implemented to reduce the potential for runoff may include minimizing site disturbance, controlling water flow over the construction site, stabilizing bare soil, and ensuring proper site cleanup. In addition, the SWPPP or SWMP shall include an erosion control plan and BMPs that specify the erosion and sedimentation control measures to be implemented, which may include silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, geofabric, trench plugs, terraces, water bars, soil stabilizers re-seeding with native species and mulching to revegetate disturbed areas. If suitable vegetation cannot reasonably be expected to

become established, non-erodible material will be used for such stabilization. The SWPPP shall also include dust control practices to prevent wind erosion, sediment tracking, and dust generation by construction equipment, including during gravel processing.

The SWPPP or SWMP shall also include a spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plan, and applicable hazardous materials business plans, and shall identify the types of materials used for equipment operation (including fuel and hydraulic fluids), and measures to prevent and materials available to clean up hazardous material and waste spills. The SWPPP or SWMP shall also identify emergency procedures for responding to spills.

The BMPs presented in either document shall be clearly identified and maintained in good working condition throughout the construction process. The construction contractor shall retain a copy of the approved SWPPP or SWMP on the construction site and modify it as necessary to suit specific site conditions through amendments approved by the Central Valley RWQCB, if necessary.

**Timing:** Before and during construction.

**Responsibility:** City/Water Forum and Construction Contractor(s).

**Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Conduct Construction Personnel Education, Stop Work if Paleontological Resources are Discovered, Assess the Significance of the Find, and Prepare and Implement a Recovery Plan, as Required.**

To minimize the potential for destruction of or damage to potentially unique, scientifically important paleontological resources during project-related earthmoving activities, the City/Water Forum shall require the measures listed below to be implemented to minimize accidental damage to or destruction of unique paleontological resources.

- Before the start of any earthmoving activities all construction personnel involved with earthmoving activities, including the site superintendent, will be trained regarding the possibility of encountering fossils, the appearance and types of fossils likely to be seen during construction, and proper notification procedures should fossils be encountered.
- If paleontological resources are discovered during earthmoving activities, the construction crew shall notify the City/Water Forum and shall immediately cease work in the vicinity of the find. The City/Water Forum shall retain a qualified paleontologist to evaluate the resource and prepare a recovery plan in accordance with applicable guidelines (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1996). The recovery plan may include, but is not limited to, a field survey, construction monitoring, sampling and data recovery procedures, museum storage coordination for any specimen recovered, and a report of findings. Recommendations in the recovery plan that are determined by the City/Water

Forum to be necessary and feasible shall be implemented before construction activities can resume at the site where the paleontological resources were discovered.

**Significance after Mitigation:** Implementing this mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant effects related to the inadvertent damage or destruction of unique paleontological resources to a **less-than-significant** level because construction workers would be alerted to the possibility of encountering paleontological resources and, in the event that resources were discovered, work would stop immediately and fossil specimens would be recovered and recorded and would undergo appropriate curation.

**Timing:** During construction.

**Responsibility:** City/Water Forum and Construction Contractor(s).

**Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Implement Noise Controls.**

The City/Water Forum will implement four BMPs for the control of construction noise levels. Implementation of the following BMPs generally reduces construction-generated noise levels by 15 dB to 25 dB:

- Construction operations and the hauling of gravel would be limited to Monday through Friday, except holidays, from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m.
- Provide and maintain noise control devices for construction equipment. Construction equipment shall be properly maintained per manufacturers' specifications and fitted with the best available noise suppression devices (i.e., mufflers, silencers, wraps, etc.).
- Coordinate routes and arrange equipment to minimize disturbance to noise-sensitive uses. Construction equipment usage shall be arranged to minimize travel adjacent to occupied residences and turned off during prolonged periods of non-use.
- Designate a disturbance coordinator to respond to all public complaints.

**Timing:** During construction.

**Responsibility:** City/Water Forum and Contractor(s).

**Mitigation Measure REC-1: Prepare and Implement a Trail/Traffic Control and Road Maintenance Plan.**

Before the start of project-related construction activities, the City/Water Forum shall prepare and implement a plan to manage expected construction-related traffic to the extent feasible, and to avoid and minimize potential traffic congestion during project-related construction. The traffic control and road

maintenance plan shall outline the phasing of activities and the use of specific routes to and from the work site locations to minimize the daily volume of traffic on individual roadways.

The items listed below will be included, as terms of the construction contracts:

- Limit all heavy construction work to occur only between 7:00 am and 6:00 pm on weekdays, avoid hauling on public roads during weekends and holidays, and confine weekend/holiday work to less disruptive tasks using materials previously hauled to the site, to ensure that most construction work occurs when recreational use of the project areas is lightest.
- During construction, ensure that nearby trails are signed, cautioning users that equipment will be crossing.
- Provide a site-specific access plan specifying the roadways on which construction workers are allowed travel to access the work sites.
- Prohibit construction workers from accessing work sites from any locations other than those specified in the plan.
- Provide clearly marked bicycle detours to address bicycle route closures or if bicyclist safety will be otherwise compromised.
- Post warnings about the potential presence of slow-moving vehicles.

Consistent with the traffic control and road maintenance plan, assess pre- and postconstruction condition of roadways identified for use by haul traffic, including repairing to pre-project conditions project-related potholes, fractures, or other damage to roadways used during construction.

**Timing:** Before, during, and after construction.

**Responsibility:** Water Forum and Contractor(s).

**Mitigation Measure REC-2: Prepare and Implement a Boater Safety Plan.**

Recognizing the high recreational use of the Lower American River, the following safety measures will be implemented as part of the Boater Safety Plan to reduce risk during the design and construction of all in-river habitat elements:

- In-river safety personnel will be posted upstream of each site when boater traffic is heavy, typically Fridays and will implement the following safety measures:
  - Verbally communicate with recreational boaters to warn them of ongoing downstream in-river work,

*Lower American River Anadromous Fish Habitat Restoration Project*

- Communicate via radio with downstream construction equipment operators to temporarily stop in-river work until boater traffic has safely passed the restoration site, and
  - Post signs upstream of construction areas to warn boaters of the location and schedule of upcoming in-river work.
- Designs for gravel augmentation will ensure that restoration and enhancement activities do not impede navigation within the main channel and a navigable area at least 2 feet deep and up to 30 feet wide will be present at all restoration sites.
  - Habitat structures will be placed at the stream margins or within side channels and outside of the main channel flow and thus away from areas where the majority of boater traffic will occur.
  - The natural wood material will be angled diagonally down river to reduce the chances of hazardous contact with swimmers, boaters, anglers, and material.
  - If any tagged woody material that is placed in the river is washed downstream and, in the judgment of County Parks, becomes a safety hazard, the Water Forum will pay existing County contractors to have it removed or moved to a safe location.

**Timing:** During and after construction.

**Responsibility:** City/Water Forum and Contractor(s).

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1a: Conduct Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity and Awareness Training Program Prior to Ground-Disturbing Activities**

The City/Water Forum shall require the contractor to provide a cultural resources and tribal cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training program (Worker Environmental Awareness Program [WEAP]) for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers. The WEAP will be developed in coordination with an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology, as well as culturally affiliated Native American tribes. The City may invite Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes to participate. The WEAP shall be conducted before any project-related construction activities begin at the project site. The WEAP will include relevant information regarding sensitive cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, including applicable regulations, protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations.

The WEAP will also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for cultural resources and tribal cultural resources that could be located

at the project site and will outline what to do and who to contact if any potential cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are encountered. The WEAP will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any discovery of significance to Native Americans and will discuss appropriate behaviors and responsive actions, consistent with Native American tribal values.

**Timing:** During construction.

**Responsibility:** City/Water Forum and Contractor(s).

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1b: In the Event that Tribal Cultural Resources Are Discovered During Construction, Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures to Avoid Significant Impacts and Procedures to Evaluate Resources.**

If tribal cultural resources (such as Native American archaeological materials, sacred objects, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, or human remains and associated objects and materials) are encountered at the project site during construction, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural materials), and the construction contractor shall immediately notify the project's City/Water Forum representative. Avoidance and preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to cultural resources or tribal cultural resources. This will be accomplished, if feasible, by several alternative means, including:

- Planning construction to avoid tribal cultural resources, archaeological sites and/or other cultural resources; incorporating cultural resources within parks, green-space or other open space; covering archaeological resources; deeding a cultural resource to a permanent conservation easement; or other preservation and protection methods agreeable to consulting parties and regulatory authorities with jurisdiction over the activity.
- Recommendations for avoidance of cultural resources or tribal cultural resources will be reviewed by the City/Water Forum representative, interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes and other appropriate agencies, in light of factors such as costs, logistics, feasibility, design, technology and social, cultural and environmental considerations, and the extent to which avoidance is consistent with project objectives. Avoidance and design alternatives may include realignment within the project site to avoid cultural resources or tribal cultural resources, modification of the design to eliminate or reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources or modification or realignment to avoid highly significant features within a cultural resource or tribal cultural resource.
- Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes will be invited to review and comment on these analyses and shall have the opportunity to meet with the City/Water Forum representative

and its representatives who have technical expertise to identify and recommend feasible avoidance and design alternatives, so that appropriate and feasible avoidance and design alternatives can be identified.

- If the discovered cultural resource or tribal cultural resource can be avoided, the construction contractor(s), will install protective fencing outside the site boundary, including a 100-foot buffer area, before construction restarts. The boundary of a tribal cultural resource will be determined in consultation with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes and tribes will be invited to monitor the installation of fencing. Use of temporary and permanent forms of protective fencing will be determined in consultation with Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes.
- The construction contractor(s) will maintain the protective fencing throughout construction to avoid the site during all remaining phases of construction. The area will be demarcated as an “Environmentally Sensitive Area”.

If a tribal cultural resource cannot be avoided, the following performance standard shall be met prior to continuance of construction and associated activities that may result in damage to or destruction of tribal cultural resources:

- Each resource will be evaluated for California Register of Historical Resources- (CRHR) eligibility through application of established eligibility criteria (California Code of Regulations 15064.636), in consultation with consulting Native American Tribes, as applicable.

If a tribal cultural resource is determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, the City will avoid damaging effects to the resource in accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 21084.3, if feasible. The City shall coordinate the investigation of the find with a qualified archaeologist (meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology) approved by the City and with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes that respond to the City’s invitation. As part of the site investigation and resource assessment, the City and the archaeologist shall consult with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes to assess the significance of the find, make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be determined by the City to be significant. A written report detailing the site assessment, coordination activities, and management recommendations shall be provided to the City representative by the qualified archaeologist. These recommendations will be documented in the project record. For any recommendations made by interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes that are not implemented, a justification for why the recommendation was not followed will be provided in the project record.



Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American Tribes and the City/Water Forum representative will also consult to develop measures for long-term management of any discovered Native American cultural resources or tribal cultural resources. Consultation will be limited to actions consistent with the jurisdiction of the City and taking into account ownership of the subject property. To the extent that the City has jurisdiction, routine operation and maintenance within tribal cultural resources retaining tribal cultural integrity shall be consistent with the avoidance and minimization standards identified in this mitigation measure.

If the City determines that the project may cause a significant impact to a tribal cultural resource, and measures are not otherwise identified in the consultation process, the following are examples of mitigation capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to the resource. These measures may be considered to avoid or minimize significant adverse impacts and constitute the standard by which an impact conclusion of less-than significant may be reached:

- Avoid and preserve resources in place, including, but not limited to, planning construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
- Treat the resource with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the Tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
  - Protect the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
  - Protect the traditional use of the resource.
  - Protect the confidentiality of the resource.
  - Establish permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or using the resources or places.
  - Protect the resource.

**Timing:** During construction.

**Responsibility:** City/Water Forum and Contractor(s).

### **3.13 Cumulative Effects**

According to the CEQ regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA, a cumulative impact is defined as the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative effects can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

Considering the relatively short time each year that in-stream work would be underway, and meeting the standards, there would not be any significant cumulative water quality effects. There would be positive cumulative effects on salmon and steelhead from the Proposed Action and other projects. Project-generated construction-related mitigated criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions would not exceed thresholds. Thus, project-generated emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant. Project generated noise level would be short-term in nature and would not contain any long-term operations. The construction sites would likely be temporarily off limits to recreationists, and they would have to pursue their activities elsewhere. There are no significant adverse impacts associated with implementing the Proposed Action, and under CEQA are not considered to be cumulatively considerable incremental contributions to significant cumulative impacts.

Cumulative effects include the effects of future State, tribal, local, and private actions that are reasonably foreseeable in the project area considered in this EA/IS. Future federal actions that are unrelated to the Proposed Action are not considered in this section because they require separate consultation pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA.

Non-federal actions that may affect the project area include angling and State angling regulation changes, voluntary State or private sponsored habitat restoration activities (such as gravel augmentation as mitigation for the Folsom Dam Joint Federal Project), agricultural practices, water withdrawals and diversions, adjacent mining activities, and increased population growth resulting in urbanization and development of floodplain habitats. While state angling regulations have moved towards restrictions on selected sport fishing to protect listed fish species, incidental hooking of Chinook Salmon, hook and release mortality of steelhead, and trampling of redds by wading anglers may continue to cause a threat. Habitat restoration projects may have short-term negative effects associated with in-water construction work, but these effects typically are temporary, localized, and the outcome is expected to benefit listed species and habitats long-term after construction.

Increased water turbidity levels for prolonged periods of time may result from agricultural practices, adjacent mining activities, and increased urbanization and/or development of riparian habitat and could adversely affect the ability of young salmonids to feed effectively, resulting in reduced growth and survival.

Turbidity may cause harm, injury, or mortality to juvenile Chinook Salmon or steelhead in the vicinity and downstream of the project area. High turbidity concentration can cause fish mortality, reduce fish feeding efficiency and decrease food availability (Berg and Northcote 1985, McLeay *et al.* 1984, NMFS 1996a). Farming and ranching activities within or adjacent to the project area may have negative effects on water quality due to runoff laden with agricultural chemicals. Water withdrawals and diversions may result in entrainment of individuals into unscreened or improperly screened diversions, and may result in depleted river flows that are necessary for migration, spawning, rearing, flushing of sediment from spawning gravels, gravel recruitment, and transport of large woody materials. Future urban development may adversely affect water quality, riparian function, and stream productivity.

These actions would occur without respect to whether the Proposed Action is implemented, and there are statutes in place to control all these activities to minimize their detrimental impacts. In combination with these activities, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant cumulative effects or provide a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to any significant cumulative effects within or outside of the project area.

One specific reasonably foreseeable future project is Reclamation's Nimbus Hatchery Fish Ladder Project. In 2013, Reclamation signed a Record of Decision for the Nimbus Hatchery Fish Passage Project Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. The project is anticipated to begin in 2020 or later. Following the fish ladder construction and the initial years of fish ladder effectiveness testing, the weir foundation may be removed. The removal would likely occur sometime after 2020. Both projects would result in construction activities that could occur simultaneously. But the Proposed Action's construction activities are limited both spatially and temporally, and mitigation measures will reduce construction-related impacts that could interact. Therefore, the Proposed Action, in association with the Nimbus Hatchery Fish Ladder Project, would not result or contribute to any significant cumulative impacts.

This page intentionally left blank.

## Section 4. Consultation and Coordination

Several federal laws, permits, licenses, and policy requirements have directed or guided the NEPA analysis and decision-making process of this EA.

### 4.1 Public Review Period

The EA/IS was made available for public comment. Reclamation issued a press release on DATE, providing a link to the EA/IS and instructions on how to comment.

### 4.2 State Historic Preservation Officer

Reclamation will consult with the SHPO regarding a finding of no effects to historic properties pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.4(d)(1).

### 4.3 Endangered Species Act (16 USC Section 1531 et seq.)

ESA Section 7 requires federal agencies to ensure that discretionary federal actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of the critical habitat of these species.

Reclamation prepared a Biological Assessment (BA) for endangered winter-run Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) ESU, threatened Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon, and threatened California Central Valley steelhead (*O. mykiss*) distinct population segment (DPS). NMFS provided a BO to Reclamation on July 14, 2015. NMFS determined that the Proposed Action *may affect and is likely to adversely affect* Central Valley steelhead, and *may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect* Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon. NMFS also concluded that the Proposed Action is *not likely to destroy or adversely modify* critical habitats. It was determined that the Proposed Action would adversely affect the EFH of Pacific salmon in the project area. Reclamation has adopted the EFH conservation recommendations, which are included in the BO as NMFS's reasonable and prudent measures and associated terms and conditions.

Reclamation has determined the Proposed Action *may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect* the federally listed threatened VELB and Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo and would *not adversely modify* any designated or proposed Critical Habitat for terrestrial species. Reclamation will continue to consult with USFWS under Section 7 of the ESA.

#### **4.4 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act**

Reclamation will obtain a permit from the Corps for jurisdictional water of the United States (American River) wetland and other waters. A Waters of the United States Determination was completed for the American River.

#### **4.5 Section 401 of the Clean Water Act**

Prior to conducting work under a Section 404 Permit, Reclamation must obtain a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Central Valley RWQCB. This declaration states that any discharge complies with all applicable effluent limitations and water quality standards. Reclamation will submit an application to the Central Valley RWQCB for sites not included in the 2019 permit.

#### **4.6 Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act**

Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act applies to the American River from the mouth of the river to Bradshaw Road, including portions of the Proposed Action area. Reclamation will consult with the Corps on Section 10 as needed during the Section 404 process.

#### **4.7 Section 408 of the Rivers and Harbors Act**

Section 408 of the Rivers and Harbors Act applies to actions that would affect the federal flood control project for the Sacramento and American rivers. Although the Proposed Action does not include activities within the leveed reaches of the American River, the Corps has expressed concern that the gravel augmentation activities in the LAR have the potential to affect WSEs and channel conveyance capacity of the river over time within the leveed reach. The City and Reclamation are seeking authorization from the Corps under Section 408 to alter the Sacramento River Flood Control Project through implementation of the Proposed Action to the LAR at the restoration sites.

#### **4.8 State and Local Laws, Regulations, and Policies**

##### **4.8.1 Sacramento County Department of Regional Parks**

Much of the Proposed Action is located within the American River Parkway. Reclamation will coordinate with Sacramento County Department of Regional Parks for activities within the parkway.

## Section 5. Report Preparers

The following individuals were involved in the development and/or review of this EA/IS.

### **Bureau of Reclamation**

Janice Pinero .....Senior Document Review  
John Hannon .....Project Manager, Document Review  
Luke Davis .....Document Review

### **City of Sacramento**

Michael Voss.....Senior Deputy City Attorney, Document Review

### **Water Forum**

Lilly Allen .....Project Coordinator, Document Review

### **GEI Consultants, Inc.**

Phil Dunn .....Document Director (NEPA/CEQA Compliance), Document Review  
Erica Bishop.....Project and Document Manager, Project Description, Aesthetics, Forestry Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems  
Drew Sutton, AICP .....Document Review, Introduction, Noise, Transportation, Mandatory Findings of Significance  
Irene Ramirez.....Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions  
Sarah Norris .....Biological Resources  
Anne King .....Biological Resources Review  
Jesse Martinez, RPA.....Cultural Resources, Tribal Cultural Resources  
Denise Jurich, RPA.....Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources Review  
Brook Constantz.....Geographic Information Systems  
Ryan Snyder.....Geographic Information Systems  
Charisse Case .....Document Production

This page intentionally left blank.



## Section 6. References

The following data sources were reviewed during preparation of the EA/IS and proposed MND.

### Introduction

Reclamation. *See* U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. 2016. Lower American River Salmonid Spawning Gravel Augmentation and Sidechannel Habitat Establishment Project Final Environmental Assessment. February

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014. Lower American River Salmonid Spawning Gravel Augmentation and Sidechannel Habitat Establishment Project – Nimbus Basin Supplemental Environmental Assessment. August.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2011. Lower American River Salmonid Spawning Gravel Augmentation and Sidechannel Habitat Establishment Project Supplemental Environmental Assessment. August.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Lower American River Salmonid Spawning Gravel Augmentation and Sidechannel Habitat Establishment Project Supplemental Environmental Assessment. September.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2008. Lower American River Salmonid Spawning Gravel Augmentation and Sidechannel Habitat Establishment Project Final Environmental Assessment. August.

Reclamation *See* U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation

### Alternatives including the Proposed Action

USFWS *See* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

### Aesthetics

County of Sacramento. 2008. *American River Parkway Plan 2008*. Municipal Service Agency, Planning and Community Development Department. Available at <http://www.regionalparks.saccounty.net/Parks/Pages/ParkwayPlan.aspx>. Accessed: March 14, 2019.

County of Sacramento. 2019. *Zoning Map*. Department of Planning and Environmental Review. Available: [http://generalmap.gis.saccounty.net/JSViewer/county\\_portal.html#](http://generalmap.gis.saccounty.net/JSViewer/county_portal.html#). Accessed: March 16, 2019.

National Park Service. 2018. Letter from the National Park Service to Bureau of Reclamation. April 26, 2018.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2008. *Letter from the National Park Service to Bureau of Reclamation*. April 16, 2008.

### **Agriculture and Forestry Resources**

County of Sacramento. 2011 (November). *Sacramento County General Plan of 2005–2030*. Available: <http://www.per.saccounty.net/PlansandProjectsIn-Progress/Pages/GeneralPlan.aspx>. Accessed March 16, 2019

County of Sacramento. 2019. *Zoning Map*. Department of Planning and Environmental Review. Available: [http://generalmap.gis.saccounty.net/JSViewer/county\\_portal.html#](http://generalmap.gis.saccounty.net/JSViewer/county_portal.html#). Accessed: March 16, 2019.

California State Parks and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2010 (June). *Folsom Lake State Recreation Area & Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park General Plan/Resource Management Plan*. Available: [http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/21299/files/FLSRA\\_GP\\_RMP\\_Vol1\\_Final\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/21299/files/FLSRA_GP_RMP_Vol1_Final_Plan.pdf). Accessed: March 16, 2019.

California Department of Conservation. 2015. *Sacramento County Williamson Act Fiscal Year 2015/2016*. Available: [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/Sacramento\\_15\\_16\\_WA.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/Sacramento_15_16_WA.pdf). Accessed March 16, 2019.

California Department of Conservation. 2019. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/>. Accessed: March 16, 2019.

DOC See California Department of Conservation.

### **Air Quality**

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District 2015. *SMAQMD Thresholds of Significance Table*. Available: <http://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/CH2ThresholdsTable5-2015.pdf>. Accessed: March 19, 2019.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District 2019a. *Federal Planning*. Available: <http://www.airquality.org/residents/air-quality-plans/federal-planning>. Accessed: March 19, 2019.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District 2019b. *State Planning*. Available: <http://www.airquality.org/residents/air-quality-plans/state-planning>. Accessed: March 19, 2019.

SMAQMD See Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.

## Biological Resources

- Alabaster, J. S., and R. Lloyd. 1980. *Water quality criteria for freshwater fish*. Boston, Massachusetts: Buttersworth, Inc.
- Allen, M. A. 2000. Seasonal microhabitat use by juvenile spring Chinook salmon in the Yakima River basin, Washington. *Rivers* 7:314–332.
- Bureau of Reclamation. 2015 (May). *Delineation of Waters of the United States for the Lower American River Anadromous Fish Habitat Restoration Program Sacramento County, California*. U.S. Department of the Interior.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2019. Results of electronic database search for sensitive species occurrences. Version 5.2.14. Biogeographic Data Branch. Available at <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Maps-and-Data>. Accessed March 15, 2019.
- FISHBIO and Normandeau Associates. 2012. *Stanislaus River Chinook fry habitat assessment, 2007- 2011 Summary Report*. Prepared for South San Joaquin Irrigation District and Oakdale Irrigation District.
- Lindley, S. T. , R. Schick, E. Mora, P. B. Adams, J. J. Anderson, S. Greene, C. Hanson, B. P. May, D. McEwan, R. B. MacFarlane, C. Swanson, and J. G. Williams. 2007. Framework for assessing viability of threatened and endangered Chinook Salmon and steelhead in the Sacramento-San Joaquin basins. ESUs in California’s Central Valley basin. *San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science*. Volume 5, Issue 1, Article 4.
- Newcombe, C.P., and J.O.T. Jensen. 1996. Channel suspended sediment and fisheries: a synthesis for quantitative assessment of risk and impact. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 16:693-727.
- Palmer, M., and M. Hellmair. 2012. *Sacramento River Bank Protection Project Long-Term Aquatic Monitoring Program, Fiscal Years 2011 through 2015, Annual Report 2011*. Prepared by FISHBIO for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 66 p + appendices.
- Pasternack, G. B., Wang, C. L., and Merz, J. 2014. Application of a 2D hydrodynamic model to reach-scale spawning gravel replenishment in the lower Mokelumne River, California. *River Research and Applications* 20: 2: 205-225.
- Sacramento County. 2008. *American River Parkway Plan*. Available: [http://www.regionalparks.saccounty.net/Parks/Documents/Parks/ARPP06-021909\\_sm.pdf](http://www.regionalparks.saccounty.net/Parks/Documents/Parks/ARPP06-021909_sm.pdf). Accessed March 20, 2019. Sacramento, CA.

Water Forum 2008 (May). *Preliminary Delineation of Waters of the United States, Including Wetlands for the American River Gravel Augmentation Project*. Prepared by EDAW/AECOM. Sacramento, CA.

### **Cultural Resources**

EDAW 2009. "Historic Context for Mining along the Lower American River – Mississippi and Sailor Bars, Sacramento County, California." Prepared for the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation and City-County Office of Metropolitan Water Planning Water Forum. Prepared by EDAW, Sacramento, CA. July 2009. On file with Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, CA.

McGowan and Willis 1968: McGowan, Joseph A. and Terry R. Willis. 1968. *Sacramento: Heart of the Golden State*. Windsor Publications, Inc., Woodland Hills, CA.

SHPO. 2009. Letter regarding Proposed Gravel Acquisition and Augmentation Program along the Lower American River at Mississippi Bar and Sailor Bar, Sacramento County, California (Project No. 07-SCAO-237). To Michael A. Chotkowski, Regional Environmental Officer, Bureau of Reclamation, from the Office of Historic Preservation, Milford Wayne Donaldson, SHPO. August 5, 2009.

———. 2010. Executed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Bureau of Reclamations and the California SHPO Regarding the Resolution of Adverse Effects to Historic Properties from the Acquisition of Gravel from Sailor Bar on the American River, Sacramento County, California.

Reclamation 2015. Cultural Resources Compliance Memorandum No. 15-CCA0-090; Division of Environmental Affairs, Cultural Resources Branch (MP-153). For Lower American River Anadromous Salmonid Restoration Program. 8.3.2018. Mark Carper, archaeologist. On file with Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, CA. U.S. Census Bureau 2017. United States Census Bureau. 2017. "State and County Quick Facts." Available: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045216/00>. Accessed April 1, 2019.

Reclamation *See* U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation

### **Energy**

No references cited.

### **Geology and Soils**

California Geological Survey. 1965. *Geologic Atlas of California-Sacramento Sheet*. Available: [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/gam/GAM\\_012\\_Sacramento/](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/gam/GAM_012_Sacramento/). Accessed: March 20, 2019.

California Geological Survey. 2019. *California Geological Survey Regulatory Maps*. Available:  
<http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/WH/regulatorymaps.htm>. Accessed: March 20, 2019.

Jennings, C. W. and Bryant, W. A. 2010. *Fault Activity Map of California*. California Geological Survey Geologic Data Map No. 6. Sacramento, CA. Available:  
[http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/cgs\\_history/Pages/2010\\_faultmap.aspx](http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/cgs_history/Pages/2010_faultmap.aspx). Accessed March 20, 2019.

Sherer, Steve, 2008. *Memorandum*. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Regional Geologist, March 24, 2008.

Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, 1996. (October 10). Conditions of Receivership for Paleontologic Salvage Collections. Final draft. *Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin* 166:16–17.

SVP. *See* Society of Vertebrate Paleontology.

U.S. Department of Agriculture 2019. *Web Soil Survey*. Available:  
<https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>. Accessed: April 30, 2019.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

County of Sacramento. 2011. *Sacramento County Climate Action Plan, Strategy and Framework Document*. Available:  
<http://www.per.saccounty.net/PlansandProjectsIn-Progress/Documents/Climate%20Action%20Plan/CAP%20Strategy%20and%20Framework%20Document.PDF>. Accessed: March 19, 2019.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District 2015. *SMAQMD Thresholds of Significance Table*. Available:  
<http://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/CH2ThresholdsTable5-2015.pdf>. Accessed: March 19, 2019.

SMAQMD *See* Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2007 (November 7). Fire Hazards Severity Zones in SRA. Available:  
[http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire\\_prevention/fhsz\\_maps\\_sacramento.php](http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fhsz_maps_sacramento.php). Accessed March 16, 2019.

———. 2008 (July 30). Very High Fire Hazards Severity Zones in LRA. Available:

[http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire\\_prevention/fhsz\\_maps\\_sacramento.php](http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fhsz_maps_sacramento.php).  
Accessed March 16, 2019.

CAL FIRE *See* California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2019. EnviroStor. Available:  
<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Accessed March 19, 2019.

DTSC *See* California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

Sacramento County 2018. *Regional Parks Fire Risk Reduction*. Available:  
<http://www.regionalparks.saccounty.net/Rangers/Pages/FireRiskReduction.aspx>. Accessed: April 30, 2019.

State Water Resources Control Board. 2019. GeoTracker. Available:  
<http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Accessed March 19, 2019.

SWRCB *See* State Water Resources Control Board.

## **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2002. Upper Sacramento River TMDL for Cadmium, Copper & Zinc: Final Report. Report prepared by Sacramento River TMDL Unit.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2016. *2014-2016 Integrated Report (Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List / 305(b) Report*. Available at  
[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb5/water\\_issues/tmdl/impaired\\_waters\\_list/](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb5/water_issues/tmdl/impaired_waters_list/). Accessed March 19, 2019.

CVRWQCB *See* Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

California Department of Water Resources. 2003. *California's Groundwater Bulletin 118*. Available at [https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Bulletin-118/Files/Statewide-Reports/Bulletin\\_118\\_Update\\_2003.pdf](https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Bulletin-118/Files/Statewide-Reports/Bulletin_118_Update_2003.pdf). Accessed March 19, 2019.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018 (Spring). *Groundwater Information Center Interactive Map Application*. Updated June 2017. Available at  
<https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/gicima/>. <https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/gicima/>. Accessed March 19, 2019.

DWR *See* California Department of Water Resources.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2019. *FEMA Flood Insurance Rate for Sacramento, CA*. Available at  
<https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=american%20river#searchresultsanchor>. Accessed March 19, 2019.

FEMA See Federal Emergency Management Agency

Sacramento County Water Agency, 1995. *1994/1995 Annual Monitoring Report*. Sacramento, CA. December 1995.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. 2009. Sediment Characterization in Tailings, Total Mercury and Metals Sampling Assessment. American River Spawning Gravel Augmentation. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, Environmental Monitoring Branch, MP-157. May 2009.

### **Land Use and Planning**

California State Parks and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2010 (June). Folsom Lake State Recreation Area & Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park General Plan/Resource Management Plan. Available: [http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/21299/files/FLSRA\\_GP\\_RMP\\_Vol1\\_Final\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/21299/files/FLSRA_GP_RMP_Vol1_Final_Plan.pdf). Accessed: March 16, 2019.

County of Sacramento. 2008. *American River Parkway Plan 2008*. Municipal Service Agency, Planning and Community Development Department. Available at <http://www.regionalparks.saccounty.net/Parks/Pages/ParkwayPlan.aspx>. Accessed: March 14, 2019.

County of Sacramento. 2011 (November). *Sacramento County General Plan of 2005–2030*. Available: <http://www.per.saccounty.net/PlansandProjectsInProgress/Pages/GeneralPlan.aspx>. Accessed October 15, 2014.

### **Mineral Resources**

County of Sacramento. 2011 (November). *Sacramento County General Plan of 2005–2030*. Available: <http://www.per.saccounty.net/PlansandProjectsInProgress/Pages/GeneralPlan.aspx>. Accessed March 16, 2019.

Dupras, D. 1999. *Mineral Land Classification: Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate and Kaolin Clay Resources in Sacramento County, California—Plates 4 and 6*. Open-File Report 99-09. California Division of Mines and Geology, Sacramento, CA. Available: [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR\\_99-09/OFR\\_99-09\\_Text.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR_99-09/OFR_99-09_Text.pdf). Accessed: March 16, 2019.

### **Noise**

County of Sacramento. 1997. Mather Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan Noise Contours. Sacramento County, CA.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. 2008. Lower American River Salmonid Spawning Gravel Augmentation and Sidechannel Habitat Establishment Project Final Environmental Assessment. August.

Reclamation *See* U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation.

### **Population and Housing**

County of Sacramento. 2008. *American River Parkway Plan 2008*. Municipal Service Agency, Planning and Community Development Department. Available at <http://www.regionalparks.saccounty.net/Parks/Pages/ParkwayPlan.aspx>. Accessed: March 14, 2019.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. 2008. Lower American River Salmonid Spawning Gravel Augmentation and Sidechannel Habitat Establishment Project Final Environmental Assessment. August.

Reclamation *See* U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation

### **Public Services**

County of Sacramento. 2008. *American River Parkway Plan 2008*. Municipal Service Agency, Planning and Community Development Department. Available at <http://www.regionalparks.saccounty.net/Parks/Pages/ParkwayPlan.aspx>. Accessed: March 14, 2019.

———. 2018. *Regional Parks Fire Risk Reduction*. Available: <http://www.regionalparks.saccounty.net/Rangers/Pages/FireRiskReduction.aspx>. Accessed: April 30, 2019.

Sacramento Metro Fire. 2019. *Fire Station Locations*. Available: <https://www.metrofire.ca.gov/index.php/about-us/fire-station-locations>. Accessed: March 16, 2019.

SMF. *See* Sacramento Metro Fire.

### **Recreation**

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2018 (February). *News release: Nimbus Basin will be Closed to all Fishing as of March 2018*. Available: <https://cdfgnews.wordpress.com/2018/02/28/nimbus-basin-will-be-closed-to-all-fishing-as-of-march-2018/>. Accessed: March 25, 2019.

CDFW *See* California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

County of Sacramento. 2008. *American River Parkway Plan 2008*. Municipal Service Agency, Planning and Community Development Department. Available at <http://www.regionalparks.saccounty.net/Parks/Pages/ParkwayPlan.aspx>. Accessed: March 14, 2019.



County of Sacramento. 2011 (November). *Sacramento County General Plan of 2005–2030*. Available: <http://www.per.saccounty.net/PlansandProjectsInProgress/Pages/GeneralPlan.aspx>. Accessed October 15, 2014.

California State Parks and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2010 (June). *Folsom Lake State Recreation Area & Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park General Plan/Resource Management Plan*. Available: [http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/21299/files/FLSRA\\_GP\\_RMP\\_Vol1\\_Final\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/21299/files/FLSRA_GP_RMP_Vol1_Final_Plan.pdf). Accessed: March 16, 2019.

### **Transportation**

Institute of Transportation Engineers. 1988. *Traffic Access and Impact Studies for Site Development*. Transportation Planners Council. Washington, DC.

### **Tribal Cultural Resources**

No references cited.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2017 (September). *Water Control Manual for Folsom Dam and Lake, American River, California*. Appendix VIII to the Master Water Control Manual Sacramento River Basin, California. Available: <https://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Folsom-Water-Control-Manual-Update/>. Accessed: March 16, 2019.

Corps *See* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

### **Wildfire**

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2007 (November 7). *Fire Hazards Severity Zones in SRA*. Available: [http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire\\_prevention/fhsz\\_maps\\_sacramento.php](http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fhsz_maps_sacramento.php). Accessed March 16, 2019.

———. 2008 (July 30). *Very High Fire Hazards Severity Zones in LRA*. Available: [http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire\\_prevention/fhsz\\_maps\\_sacramento.php](http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fhsz_maps_sacramento.php). Accessed March 16, 2019.

CAL FIRE *See* California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

County of Sacramento. 2018 (May). *Sacramento County Evacuation Plan*. Available: <http://www.sacoes.org/EmergencyManagement/Documents/SAC%20Evacuation%20Plan%20FINAL%202018%20with%20appendicies.pdf>. Accessed: March 16, 2019.