Print From

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2020110050

Project Title: I-40 Colorado River Bridge Replacement Project (0R380)

Lead Agency: California Department of Transportation, District 8

Contact Name: Gabrielle Duff

Email: gabrielle.duff@dot.ca.gov Phone Number: 909-501-5142

Project Location: Near City of Needles (*City*) San Bernardino County (*County*)

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), proposes to replace the Colorado River Bridge (California Bridge No. 54-0415, Arizona Bridge No. 957) spanning the California/Arizona state line on Interstate 40 near Topock. The purpose of the project is to improve the safety and integrity of the bridge by addressing deck deterioration and strengthening the girders to increse the load rating to accommodate all permit vehicle traffic. The safety of the traveling public will be enhanced because standard lane and shoulder widths are proposed as well as an upgrade to the bridge rail system.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

With implementation of VIS-1, impacts to scenic resources would be less than significant.
As the project could result in take or removal or modification of habitat for species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species by CDFW and USFWS, impacts would be potentially significant. Implementation of mitigation measuresTE-3, and avoidance and minimization measures NC-1 through NC-3 and NC-6 through NC-8, PS-1 through PS-2, AS-1 through AS-6, TE-1 through TE-2, and TE-4 through TE-7, impacts on bonytail chub, western yellow-billed cuckoo, southwestern willow flycatcher, Arizona Bell's vireo, monarch butterfly, Mojave desert tortoise, northern Mexican gartersnake, and non-listed special status species would be reduced to less than significant. However, even with the incorporation of these measures, impacts on razorback sucker, California black rail, and Yuma Ridgway's rail would remain significant and unavoidable as these species are CDFW fully protected, and the project would result in take. With implementation of NC-4, and NC-1 through NC-3, and NC-5 through NC-8, impacts on sensitive natural communities would be less than significant. With implementation of mitigation measures WET-3 and avoidance and minimization measures WET-1 and WET-2, and NC-1 and NC-2, impacts on wetlands and jurisdictional aquatic resources would be less than significant. Measure NC-6 would avoid or minimize any potential impact on wildlife crossings and movement. Measures NC-7 and NC-8, AS-2, and AS-3 would avoid or minimize any potential impacts on nesting birds. Implementation of CR-1 through CR-4 would avoid or minimize potential effects on undocumented cultural materials and CR-5 to CR-7 would lessen the effects to NOTH/Route 66 Segments 4 and 5. (Continued on page 3)

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

During the NOP public scoping meeting, key issues raised by agencies and the public included: mitigation measures and alternatives, water resources, biological resources, air quality, climate change, cultural resources, recreation, tranportation and traffic, and Tribal Cultural Resources.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

Cooperating Agencies: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard.

Responsible Agencies: California State Lands Commission.