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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for the Updated Local Funding Mechanisms for Sacramento Area Flood Control Improvements (proposed program), includes comment letters and responses to comments on the Draft Subsequent Program EIR (Draft SEIR) for the Updated Local Funding Mechanisms. This document together with the Draft SEIR comprise the Final SEIR or SEIR.

1.2 ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Section 2, “Project Description,” repeats the project description from the Draft SEIR, for context.

Section 3, “Comments and Responses,” contains all identified comments received on the Draft SEIR and presents responses to significant environmental issues raised in the comments, as required by Section 15132 of the State California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines). All comment letters are labeled to correspond with an index table (Table 3-1, page 3-1) in Section 3. Each individual comment is assigned a number (e.g., 1-1) that corresponds with the response that follows the comment.

Section 4, “Corrections and Revisions to the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report,” presents specific changes that were made to the text of the Draft SEIR in response to comments raised on significant environmental issues, or where clarification, further explanation, or correction was needed. For those comments that have resulted in corrections or revisions to the Draft SEIR, the text of the Draft SEIR is reproduced in Section 4.2, “Corrections and Revisions.” Changes in the text are indicated by strikethrough (strikethrough) where text has been removed and by underline (underline) where text has been added.

Section 5, “References,” identifies the new or supplemental documents and personal communications cited in this document.

Section 6, “Report Preparers,” identifies the preparers of this document.

1.3 COMMENTS THAT REQUIRE RESPONSES

Section 15088(c) of the CEQA Guidelines specifies that the focus of the responses to comments shall be on the disposition of significant environmental issues. Responses are not required on comments regarding the merits of the proposed project or on issues not related to the proposed project’s environmental impacts. Therefore, if comments on the Draft SEIR do not address significant environmental issues raised by the proposed program, responses may not be possible or warranted. Nevertheless, where feasible and relevant, responses have been provided to supply as much information as practical about the proposed program to the public, interested agencies, and decision makers.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

On September 17, 2015, the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this SEIR and filed the NOP with the State Clearinghouse. The public comment period on the NOP ended on October 16, 2015. A scoping meeting was held on October 6, 2015, to solicit input on the scope and content of the SEIR from agencies, individuals, and organizations. The Draft SEIR was circulated for a 45-day public review period on February 1, 2016. SAFCA held a public hearing at 3:00 p.m. on February 18, 2016 in the

---

1 The State CEQA Guidelines are found at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.
The public comment period on the Draft SEIR closed on March 16, 2016. Lead agencies are required to provide responses to any commenting agency’s comments on Draft EIRs at least 10 days before the certification of the Final SEIR (Section 15088[b] of the State CEQA Guidelines). As a courtesy, SAFCA will provide electronic notice of the availability of the Final SEIR, including responses to comments, to all commenters at least 10 days before certification of the Final SEIR.

Thereafter, the SAFCA Board will review the Draft SEIR and this Final SEIR document, which together form the complete final SEIR. The Board will consider the comments on the Draft SEIR and the responses to comments, as well as the whole of the administrative record, and will determine whether the SEIR should be certified as adequate under CEQA. If so, SAFCA will adopt a resolution certifying the SEIR, pursuant to Section 15090 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Once the SEIR is certified, the Board will consider approval of the proposed program, and will adopt Findings pursuant to Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, for each significant impact. For each significant environmental impact identified in the SEIR, SAFCA must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. According to Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the three possible findings are:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the program which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impact as identified in the Final SEIR;

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency; or

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final SEIR.

In addition, if one or more significant impacts is determined to be unavoidable, the Board must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, which finds that the benefits of the proposed program outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effect, and that the adverse environmental effects may therefore be considered acceptable.

If SAFCA determines to approve the proposed program, SAFCA will adopt a MMRP, consistent with Section 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines, that describes when each of the mitigation measures adopted for the program will be implemented, identifies who is the responsible implementing party, and provides a mechanism for monitoring or reporting on implementation.
2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Changes in Federal and State levee design standards and proposed remediation measures, largely in response to Hurricane Katrina, are generating costs not foreseen when SAFCA’s Consolidated Capital Assessment District (CCAD) and Development Impact Fee (DIF) programs were created in 2007 and 2008, respectively. The updated funding mechanisms would replace the current CCAD and DIF programs.

As with the existing CCAD, the proposed assessment district would encompass properties in the developed areas within SAFCA’s jurisdictional boundary in Sacramento and Sutter Counties that would specifically benefit from the proposed flood improvements. The assessments would be apportioned to each benefiting property based on flood-damage reduction benefits received from the financed activities. As with the existing DIF program, the updated program would apply to undeveloped areas that are developed for urban use after the assessment district is formed. The purpose of the DIF program would be to ensure that new development does not substantially increase the expected damage of an uncontrolled flood. Toward this end, the development fees would be used to support implementation of additional flood control improvements.

The updated funding mechanisms would provide financing to support the following projects; those projects not evaluated in the prior Local Funding Mechanisms EIR certified in 2007 are listed in **bold-face font**:

- physical and operational improvements to Folsom Dam that would increase the dam’s low-level discharge and flood control storage capacities and construction of a new bridge across the American River downstream of the dam;

- implementation of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) reformulated American River Common Features (ARCF) project, including raising portions of the American River North and South Levees, cutoff wall construction along the American River Levees and the Sacramento River East Levee, closure structure construction at Mayhew Drain, and bank and levee armoring along the American River North and South Levees and the Sacramento River East Levee in the Pocket area;

- levee improvements around the Natomas Basin, including construction of adjacent levees, cutoff walls, earthen seepage berms, relief wells, and **measures to reduce interior basin flooding by restricting or otherwise controlling flows through the gap in the Pleasant Grove Creek Canal Levee at Sankey Road**;

- South Sacramento Streams channel improvements, including excavating channels to increase conveyance capacity, and constructing box culverts under bridges to increase conveyance capacity, floodwalls to contain high-stream flows, and a detention basin at Southgate Park on Florin Creek;

- North Sacramento Streams flood control improvements, including constructing cutoff walls, earthen seepage berms, and relief wells along the Arcade Creek North and South Levees and the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal East Levee and rehabilitating the Magpie Creek Diversion Channel West Levee;

- habitat enhancement in the American River Parkway, including removing nonnative vegetation, restoring riparian vegetation in the upper floodplain, and creating shallow floodplain habitat;

- implementation of a levee integrity program to construct bank protection improvements to control erosion along the American and Sacramento Rivers and their tributaries; buttress and armor levees to reduce the risk of failure; maintain flood conveyance capacity by relocating and redesigning obstructions and appropriately managing vegetation roughness; ensure residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural improvements are designed to maintain structural integrity of the levee system and provide adequate space for ongoing maintenance and improvement; ensure all levees are maintained to urban levee standards; and ensure that
local levee maintaining agencies have adequate access to and/or visibility along the landside toe of existing levees to conduct levee patrols and flood fights;

- acquisition of easements from willing sellers to retire development rights and preserve the agricultural character and incidental flood storage capacity of rural floodplains; and

- widening the Sacramento and Yolo Bypasses, including lengthening the Sacramento Weir, setting back the Sacramento Bypass North Levee and the Yolo Bypass East Levee (between Interstate 5 and the Sacramento Bypass), removing the Old Bryte Landfill, acquiring land in the Elkhorn Basin to accommodate Bypass expansion, elevating or relocating the Sierra Northern Rail Line tracks from the Elkhorn Basin to the west side of the Yolo Bypass, enhancing riparian habitat values along the Tule Canal/Toe Drain in the Yolo Bypass, improving the Yolo Bypass West Levee (between Cache Slough and Midway Road), and implementing flood control measures in the City of Rio Vista to offset potential increases in floodwaters flowing through the lower reach of the Yolo Bypass.

Some of the improvements which were not analyzed in the 2007 EIR were analyzed at a program-level in other documents. The SEIR incorporates by reference information contained in these documents, which are as follows:


- Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency. 2014 (March). Florin Creek Multi-Use Basin Project Initial Study with Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND). Prepared by ESA, Sacramento CA

Summaries of the analyses in these documents are provided in Appendix C of the Draft SEIR.

The remaining improvements, which have not previously been evaluated at a program-level and are thus analyzed in the SEIR, are described in Section 2.3, “Project Characteristics.”

### 2.2 PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

SAFCA’s overall program objective is to establish funding mechanisms that are capable of providing the local share of the cost of constructing and maintaining State and Federally recommended flood control improvements and related environmental mitigation and habitat enhancements along the Lower American and Sacramento Rivers and their tributaries in the Sacramento metropolitan area. The specific program objectives are to:

- complete the projects necessary to provide 100-year flood protection for developed areas in Sacramento’s major floodplains as quickly as possible;
► achieve the State of California’s 200-year flood protection standard for these areas within the timeframe mandated by the Legislature; and

► improve the resiliency, robustness, and structural integrity of the flood control system over time so that the system can safely contain flood events larger than a 200-year flood.

To meet these objectives, SAFCA proposes to create a new assessment district, CCAD 2, that reflects the updated floodplain mapping data for the Sacramento area developed by the California Department of Water Resources and refined by MBK Engineers, and new depth-damage curves for residential, commercial, and industrial structures developed by USACE in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. CCAD 2 would replace the existing CCAD following redemption of existing CCAD bonds. It would assume existing CCAD liabilities and provide new funds to complete the approved program of improvements described in the 2007 Final Engineer’s Report with the proposed changes outlined in Chapter 2 and described in more detail below, in Section 3.2.

SAFCA also proposes to update the DIF program to expand the potential uses of DIF revenues to include support for the ongoing State/Federal/Local effort to increase the conveyance capacity of the Sacramento and Yolo Bypass systems. As discussed in Chapter 2, these flood system improvements are expected to be part of a comprehensive flood-risk reduction, environmental enhancement, and agricultural sustainability program for the Yolo Bypass to be carried out over many years. This program would lower the floodwater elevations in the Sacramento River channel in the Natomas Basin and Pocket areas, thereby reducing the residual risk of flooding in these areas and offsetting the potential for new development in these and other levee-protected areas covered by the CCAD to increase Sacramento’s exposure to flood damages.

2.3 PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed project evaluated in the SEIR is a restructuring of SAFCA’s existing local funding mechanisms to support additional improvements required to meet State and Federal flood-risk management standards. This section describes the additional program components (changes in the program) that SAFCA would fund using the proposed new CCAD 2 and updated DIF program, which were not evaluated in the 2007 EIR or other EIRs. These activities are described below at a level-of-detail consistent with the intended use of this SEIR, which is to support SAFCA’s decision whether to update its project funding mechanisms as proposed.

2.3.1 LOWER SACRAMENTO RIVER EROSION CONTROL

► Implement up to about 10 miles of rock bank protection and launchable rock trenches\(^2\) along the banks of the Sacramento River East Levee between the community of Freeport and the mouth of the American River to prevent erosion of flood control structures during sustained high-flow events.

2.3.2 YOLO AND SACRAMENTO BYPASS SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

► Lengthen the existing Sacramento Weir by approximately 1,500 to 1,800 feet extending northward from the northerly end of the existing weir along the current alignment of the Sacramento River West Levee.

► Construct new setback levees along (1) approximately 2 miles of the north side of the Sacramento Bypass between the lengthened Sacramento Weir and the Yolo Bypass, and (2) approximately 5 miles of the east side of the Yolo Bypass between Interstate 5 (I-5) and the new Sacramento Bypass North Levee. Seasonal agricultural use of the land in the areas enclosed by the new levee setbacks would be maintained.

\(^2\) A launchable rock trench is a large trench at the waterside toe of the levee, which is filled mostly with large rocks, covered with about 3 feet of dirt, and revegetated with grasses, bushes, and small trees.
Relocate water and drainage infrastructure pumps and related facilities at various locations along the existing Sacramento Bypass North Levee and the existing Yolo Bypass East Levee downstream of I-5 to appropriate locations along the new setback levee.

Remove the Old Bryte Landfill through disposal and recycling at licensed facilities of the wastes contained in the landfill based on waste characterization results, and restore the site for potential agricultural use. Landfill contents that are not characterized as Class I hazardous waste could be disposed at the Kiefer Landfill (Sacramento County), the L and D Landfill (Sacramento County), the Yolo County Central Landfill, and the Potrero Landfill (Solano County). Hazardous waste from the Old Bryte Landfill would likely be disposed at the Buttonwillow Landfill (Kern County). Some landfill contents might be reused on-site.

Elevate approximately 1,500 to 1,800 linear feet of the Sierra Northern Railway line along its current alignment through the widened portion of the Sacramento Bypass or alternatively relocate approximately 7 miles of the line to west side of the Yolo Bypass.

Relocate Yolo County Road 124 to the landside toe of the new setback levees and north of extended Sacramento Weir, respectively.

Excavate benches along the eastern edge of the Tule Canal to provide borrow material for levee construction and establish a woodland corridor along the eastern edge of the Tule Canal south of I-5.

Strengthen portions of the Reclamation District No. 2068 (RD 2068) levee along the west side of the Yolo Bypass between Cache Slough and Midway Road to resist increases in floodwater conveyed to the lower portion of the bypass through the widened Sacramento Weir and Bypass.

Construct a new floodwall to protect portions of the City of Rio Vista south of State Route 4 against increases in floodwater conveyed to the lower portion of the Yolo Bypass through the widened Sacramento Weir and Bypass.

2.3.3 LEVEE MODERNIZATION

Provide access to and/or visibility of up to 20 feet along the landside toe of the American River North and South Levees of the American River, the Sacramento River East Levee, and Arcade Creek North and South Levees in order to bring these levee systems into compliance with applicable State and Federal standards and allow responsible levee-maintenance personnel to conduct flood patrols and respond to signs of stress during large flood events. Based on a screening-level review of the existing conditions, it is estimated that approximately 11 miles of these levee systems do not currently meet the applicable standards. As noted in Section 2.2.5, the rights necessary to secure the requisite access or visibility must be secured over the next 40 years. SAFCA is working with the City and County and the American River Flood Control District on a plan to accomplish this objective.
3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains the comment letters received on the Draft SEIR for the Updated Local Funding Mechanisms. A list of each commenter on the Draft SEIR and assigned letter numbers are provided in Section 3.2. Master Responses applicable to more than one comment are provided in Section 3.3. Section 3.4 presents each comment letter received on the Draft SEIR and the responses thereto. Each comment contained in the comment letter is summarized at the beginning of each comment response in Section 3.5.

3.2 LIST OF COMMENTERS ON THE DRAFT SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Table 3-1 presents the numerical designation for each comment letter received, the author of the comment letter, and the date of the comment letter. Section 3.4 presents each comment letter received on the Draft SEIR and the responses thereto.

In addition to receiving comment letters, SAFCA held a public hearing on the Draft SEIR on February 18, 2016. During this public hearing, Jim Geary with the Friends of the Sacramento River Parkway, made one comment that identified an environmental issue; he described the proposed program as a long term project that is going to really change vegetation dynamics along the Sacramento River Parkway. This comment does not identify any particular concern related to the analysis contained in the Draft SEIR requiring a more detailed response.

Table 3-1. Comment Letters Regarding the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Letter #</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Commenting Entity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jessica Davenport</td>
<td>Delta Stewardship Council</td>
<td>March 9, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graham Brownstein et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 16, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Marcos Guerrero</td>
<td>United Auburn Indian Community</td>
<td>March 16, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stephen Green et al.</td>
<td>Save the American River Association</td>
<td>March 16, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Scott Morgan</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse</td>
<td>March 17, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 MASTER RESPONSES

3.3.1 MASTER RESPONSE 1: EROSION CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS

Several comments relate to erosion control improvements on the Lower American River, and specifically referenced the improvements identified in the USACE ARCF GRR EIS/EIR. The commenters report that USACE’s ARCF GRR EIS/EIR identifies rock armoring and installation of launchable rock trenches along approximately 11 miles of river banks, and associated removal of 65 acres of riparian forest and 135 acres of other vegetation. The commenters generally express concerns about whether impacts to habitat and recreation were adequately described in the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR and the Draft SEIR.

When the Consolidated Capital Assessment District (CCAD) was established in 2007 on the basis of the 2007 Engineer’s Report and the 2007 EIR, USACE had not completed its reevaluation of the risk of erosion along the Lower American River. Therefore, in the 2007 Engineer’s Report, which documented the costs of improvements and allocated assessments to fund those improvements, SAFCA and its consultants focused on the most immediate erosion risks, affecting no more than 1 to 2 miles of the system. However, the 2007 EIR conservatively considered up to 10 miles of erosion control improvements (please refer to Table 3-1, “Summary of
Improvements To Be Funded By the Proposed Local Funding Mechanisms,” on page 3-45 of the 2007 EIR document, which is included as Appendix B to the Draft SEIR). Now that USACE has released its GRR for public review, that document identifies approximately 11 to 12 miles of the system which could be susceptible to erosion, with erosion control improvements programmed for these areas. The ARCF GRR EIS/EIR, which is incorporated into the Draft SEIR by reference, considers the impacts of these improvements. Table C-3 in Appendix C to the Draft SEIR summarizes the impact discussions in the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR.

The 2007 EIR evaluated the potential impacts of approximately 10 miles of erosion control improvements at a program-level. The EIR considered a full scope of impacts, including potential impacts on sensitive habitat (Impact 4.7-a), recreation (Impacts 4.13-b, 4.13-c, and 4.13-d), and visual resources (Impacts 4.14-b and 4.14-c). After considering public comments on these analyses, SAFCA’s Board certified the Final EIR for the Local Funding Mechanisms in April 2007.

Because erosion control improvements on the Lower American River were evaluated in the 2007 EIR, and also in USACE’s ARCF GRR EIS/EIR, the Draft SEIR did not further discuss this issue. That is because the Draft SEIR analyzed changes to the components of the flood-risk reduction program which had not previously been evaluated, which consist of improvements to the Sacramento Weir and Bypass, the Yolo Bypass, flood control improvements in the City of Rio Vista, and improvements associated with Levee Modernization as more fully described in Section 2.3, “Project Characteristics.”

SAFCA is seeking to reconstitute the Lower American River Task Force (LARTF) Bank Protection Working Group (BPWG) to address near-term bank protection needs, and to lay the groundwork for implementing the comprehensive long-term bank protection recommended in the GRR. The GRR includes language that commits USACE to develop the details of the recommended bank protection program in close coordination with the LARTF and the BPWG. This was the approach SAFCA used in the 1990s to address what were then determined to be the most urgent erosion risks in the American River Parkway. This approach was broadly supported by all of the stakeholders at that time, including several neighborhood groups participating in the LARTF.

SAFCA’s technical consultant team has been working with the LARTF’s BPWG and USACE to provide peer review of USACE’s technical analysis of what sites require armoring, and has been working as a partner seeking to avoid or minimize habitat effects of erosion control measures, and to compensate on site wherever possible. SAFCA’s consultant will facilitate the LARTF’s BPWG in 2016, during which time it is anticipated that participants in the BPWG will reach agreement on the methods that will be used to identify the sites that are most susceptible to erosion, and the design of the remediation measures that should be implemented at specific sites. This process will establish a template for identifying and addressing the risk of erosion at less critical locations over time.

The analysis provided in both the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR and the Draft SEIR was conducted at the program-level. As additional detail becomes available and future projects are proposed as part of the programs, project-level CEQA and if required NEPA environmental review will be required. Many comments question whether the potential impacts of erosion control improvements can be evaluated without site-specific details of where the improvements would be constructed. Because construction and engineering details for erosion control improvements are not available, except for generally identified at-risk stretches of the Lower American River and the Sacramento River, the 2007 EIR and the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR conservatively assumed that these improvements could be required along up to 10 miles (2007 EIR) and 11 to 12 miles (ARCF GRR EIS/EIR) of the Lower American River and provided a program-level discussion of the types and severity of impacts that could result. As the details of the recommended bank protection program are developed in discussion with the BPWG, and site-specific improvements are designed, these improvements will be subject to project-level environmental review, including site-specific analysis of potential recreation, habitat, and aesthetics impacts and development of appropriate mitigation measures.

Individual responses to comments relating to erosion control improvements are also provided in Section 3.4, “Comments and Responses.”
3.3.2 MASTER RESPONSE 2: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND OTHER DOCUMENTS AND AGENCIES

As described in Section 2.1, “Program Overview,” the Draft SEIR was prepared to analyze proposed changes to SAFCA’s local funding mechanisms and the program of improvements that would be funded. The Draft SEIR builds on the analysis in the 2007 EIR to incorporate changes to the improvements that would be funded by the local funding mechanisms. The analysis provided in Sections 4.2 through 5 of the Draft SEIR includes both new analysis and analyses summarized from five other CEQA documents incorporated by reference (including the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR). The ARCF GRR EIS/EIR includes analysis of projects that are a subset of the projects that would be funded by the mechanisms analyzed in the Draft SEIR.

SAFCA would provide local funds to construct the program of improvements described in Section 2.1, “Program Overview.” Although SAFCA would provide funding for these improvements, some of these projects would likely be constructed by others, potentially including (but not limited to) the California Department of Water Resources and USACE. Some improvements, such as levee modernization improvements, might also be implemented by local jurisdictions or local levee maintaining agencies. In the 2007 EIR and the Draft SEIR, SAFCA identifies program-level mitigation measures to be implemented by agencies as part of their specific program improvements. However, as the details for individual program components (projects) are developed, project-level CEQA review (and NEPA, if warranted) will be conducted by the implementing agency, and additional or modified project-specific mitigation measures may be identified.

3.4 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The written individual comments received on the Draft SEIR and the responses to those comments are provided in this section. Each comment letter is reproduced in its entirety and is followed by the response(s) to the letter. Where a commenter has provided multiple comments, each comment is indicated by a line bracket and an identifying number in the margin of the comment letter.
From: "Davenport, Jessica@deltacouncil" <jessica.Davenport@deltacouncil.ca.gov>
Date: March 9, 2016 2:10:37 PM PST
To: "Tim Washburn (washburnt@saccounty.net)"
Cc: "Huang, Daniel@deltacouncil" <Daniel.Huang@deltacouncil.ca.gov>, "Chao, You Chen@deltacouncil" <YouChen.Chao@deltacouncil.ca.gov>, "Mierzwa, Michael@DWR" <Michael.Mierzwa@water.ca.gov>, "Jimenez, Mary@DWR" <Mary.Jimenez@water.ca.gov>, "Williams, Christopher@DWR" <Christopher.Williams@water.ca.gov>, "Brehmer, Erin@DWR" <Erin.Brehmer@water.ca.gov>, "Vink, Erik@DPC" <Erik.Vink@dca.ca.gov>, "Ruffolo, Jennifer@deltacouncil" <Jennifer.Ruffolo@deltacouncil.ca.gov>, "Ray, Dan@deltacouncil" <dan.ray@deltacouncil.ca.gov>
Subject: Comments on the Local Updated Funding Mechanisms SPEIR

Dear Tim,

We would like to use this opportunity to coordinate with you regarding flood risk improvement activities in the Sacramento area, and in particular, within the Delta. We first want to thank you for your participation in the development of the Delta Levees Investment Strategy (DLIS) and providing input as a regional expert in flood risk reduction planning. As you know, the DLIS is currently a major initiative for the Delta Stewardship Council, and the healthy dialogue and input we’ve received from stakeholders and technical leads will help us to craft a strategy that is credible, practical, and valuable for the Delta region and the State of California. We hope SAFCA staff will continue to engage in the DLIS development process and provide valuable input.

We’ve recently looked over the draft Subsequent Program Environmental Impact Report (SPEIR) for the Updated Local Funding Mechanisms for Sacramento Area Flood Control Improvements. This SPEIR assesses the impacts of a suite of potential flood risk reduction actions throughout the Sacramento area that could be in part funded by SAFCA as a local cost-share partner, with SAFCA’s ability to pay contingent on the success of its proposal to create a new consolidated capital assessment district (CCAD) and to update the existing development impact fee (DIF) program. Only a few of these flood risk reduction efforts would occur or have the potential to occur within the Delta, including: erosion control improvements along the urban levees of the Sacramento River; improvements providing greater landside levee access; and modifications to the Yolo Bypass to increase its conveyance capacity.

We recognize that SPEIR’s analysis is at a broad programmatic level, with only general details provided regarding each of the proposed flood risk reduction projects/activities. Some of these initiatives, including erosion control on urban levees, were analyzed in more detail within the North Sacramento Streams DEIR released last year. We sent a comment letter on May 1st 2015 to Pete Gelichi in response to that DEIR, which outlined our perspective on the project and how it may be a covered action under the Delta Plan. As the rest of the activities analyzed in the SPEIR are defined in greater detail through subsequent CEQA and technical analyses, we recommend SAFCA consider whether these actions have the potential to be covered actions and engage Council staff early on in the process about how to ensure the project is consistent with the Delta Plan. We also encourage SAFCA staff to review the Council’s latest report, Improving Habitat along Delta Levees (available on the web at http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/docs/delta-council-meeting-levees-white-paper/improving-habitats-long-delta-levees-review-pass). This report provides many insights into how to incorporate habitat benefits into levee improvement work so we can work towards a more sustainable flood control system for the region that achieves flood risk reduction and benefits native fish and wildlife.

As you know, there are several major planning initiatives revolving around the Yolo Bypass. We know that SAFCA was a core leader in developing the Lower Sacramento/Delta North Region Corridor Management Framework (CMF) with WSAFCA, Yolo and Solano Counties, RD 2068, and Solano County Water Agency. The SPEIR appears to provide a program level analysis of the potential impacts from implementing the CMF. Meanwhile, there are many other ongoing planning efforts for the Yolo Bypass
including: 1) USBR/DWR developing a suite of projects to fulfill requirements under the 2009 National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Biological Opinion; 2) USACE’s Sacramento River General Reevaluation Report (GRR), which is in the early stages of developing ecosystem restoration and flood risk management alternatives for the lower Sacramento River flood control system, many of which currently focus on potential changes to the Yolo Bypass; and 3) the Sacramento Basin-Wide Feasibility Study (BWFS) which currently identifies five potential future scenarios for the Yolo and Sacramento Bypasses. We hope that SAFCA will engage with these other planning processes and support efforts to identify a strategy that can balance multiple objectives for the Bypass including regional agricultural sustainability, flood risk reduction for the Sacramento urban and Delta regions, and wildlife improvements for native terrestrial and fish species.

We also want to make sure you are aware of the effort by the Delta Protection Commission to develop the Delta Flood Risk Management District Feasibility Study to identify feasible financing mechanisms to pay for levee improvements in the Delta and evaluate other methods of reducing flood risk in the Delta. There may be enough similarities between SAFCA’s initiative to develop a new CCAD and DPC’s feasibility study so that both organizations can benefit from a mutual exchange of ideas. The final report for the feasibility study is expected to be released in June (if you have any questions about this study, please contact Jennifer Ruffolo, DPC Program Manager, at jennifer.ruffolo@delta.ca.gov or 916-375-4882).

We also want to thank you for your participation with the development of the DLIS and providing input as a regional expert in flood risk reduction planning. We look forward to a continued close relationship between our two agencies. Feel free to contact us with any questions about any issues we raised in this email.

Best,
Jessica Davenport
Acting Deputy Executive Officer
Planning, Performance and Technology Division
Delta Stewardship Council
(916) 445-2168
980 Ninth St, 15th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Every Californian should conserve water. Find out how at:
SaveOurWater.com & Drought.CA.gov
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Response</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>SAFCA appreciates the comment and intends to continue work with the Council on this important strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>SAFCA acknowledges that portions of the program described in the Draft EIR would occur within the legal Delta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>SAFCA is in receipt of the comment letter on the referenced EIR, and responses to comments from the Council and other agencies will be included in the Final EIR for the referenced project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>SAFCA intends to engage with Council staff on portions of the program that will be covered actions, as detailed analyses are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 to 1-7</td>
<td>SAFCA intends to continue to work with the Council and other agencies in planning for the Yolo Bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8 to 1-9</td>
<td>SAFCA appreciates the Council’s suggestion to discuss funding strategies with the Delta Protection Commission, and looks forward to continued collaboration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Graham Brownstein [mailto:grahambrownstein@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 2:48 PM
To: Washburn, Timothy
Subject: Comment Letter on SAFCA Draft SEIR

Mr. Washburn,

Please find attached a comment letter on SAFCA’s Draft Subsequent Program Environmental Impact Report, Updated Local Funding Mechanisms for Sacramento Area Flood Control Improvements, Consolidated Capital Assessment District No. 2.

On a personal note, I’ll add that it was great hearing your comments at the Working Group mtg yesterday. I strongly believe that the Working Group presents our best opportunity for ensuring meaningful flood protection improvements while protecting and even enhancing the environmental, recreational and aesthetic resources of the watershed.

It was also apparent yesterday, based on the presentation by Todd Rivas of the Corps, that we have a long ways to go to develop the detailed information needed to be able to make a thorough assessment of the true weak points along the American River and then figure out how to address those points with minimum environmental damage while also hopefully enhancing the environment along the totality of the Lower American. I greatly hope that the overall project process will allow sufficient time for the Working Group to develop the information needed.

Thank you for all of your efforts on this important matter. The undersigned of the attached letter greatly appreciate your consideration. And we look forward to working with you to achieve the best possible project for our community and region.

All the best,
Graham

--
Graham Brownstein, Attorney
333 University Avenue, Ste 200
Sacramento, CA 95825
w: 916-563-7185
c: 916-478-1088

CONFIDENTIAL: The contents of this email message and any attachments may contain information which is privileged, confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law. This information is intended solely for the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient of this message, or if you have received this message in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.
March 16, 2016

Tim Washburn, Director of Planning
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA)
1007 7th Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 874-7606
washburnt@saccounty.net

Subject: Comments on the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) Draft Subsequent Program Environmental Impact Report, Updated Local Funding Mechanisms for Sacramento Area Flood Control Improvements, Consolidated Capital Assessment District No. 2

Dear Mr. Washburn,

This letter serves as a comment to the SAFCA Draft Subsequent Program Environmental Impact Report, Updated Local Funding Mechanisms for Sacramento Area Flood Control Improvements, Consolidated Capital Assessment District No. 2 ("Draft SEIR"), issued February, 2016, which incorporates by reference the American River Watershed Common Features General Reevaluation Report Final EIS/EIR ("GRR Final EIS/EIR" or "FEIS/EIR"), prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.¹ Many of the undersigned previously submitted comments similar to those contained in this letter on the GRR FEIS/EIR. We appreciate the opportunity to also comment on the SAFCA Draft SEIR. Although the GRR FEIS/EIR and Draft SEIR combine several different projects in the watershed, all of our comments, unless otherwise noted, focus on the Lower American River, our area of special concern.

We strongly support the need to do more to protect Sacramento from catastrophic flooding. We are concerned, however, that the Corps' GRR FEIS/EIR and now the SAFCA Draft SEIR fail to adequately catalog and evaluate existing conditions along the Lower American River and thus fail to adequately address the significance of impacts that will occur due to the proposed flood protection measures. Rock armoring and deep trenching along 11 miles of river banks and removal of 65 acres of riparian forest and more than 100 acres of other vegetation to strengthen the levees represents very significant impacts on the environment as well as cherished recreational and aesthetic resources – impacts that may not be mitigated by the measures proposed to date.

We understand that the Corps and SAFCA have provided certain assurances that the environment as well as recreational and aesthetic resources will be preserved to the greatest extent possible and that mitigation measures will be undertaken to address significant impacts caused by the flood protection work. However, that mindset is not fully reflected in the documents on which these comments are submitted. We urge a more careful and fine-grained approach going forward, an approach based on a comprehensive analysis of each stretch of the river so that the flood protection measures can be designed appropriately and so that the river and Parkway are not unnecessarily damaged. The documents produced to date are highly generalized and propose a nearly uniform approach along the lower 11 miles of the American River.

The purpose of this flood protection effort is ostensibly to address weak points in the system. That cannot happen without a much more thorough assessment of the existing conditions than has

¹ Draft SEIR at 4.1-1.
The purpose of environmental review documents is to disclose existing conditions and impacts on existing conditions before making final decisions on a project so that decision-makers and the public know what is happening and mitigation measures can be designed to address those impacts. Again, that cannot happen without a much more thorough assessment of existing conditions. The purpose of the Lower American River Bank Protection Working Group is to do the thorough assessment that is needed so that this project can be designed in a way that does address actual weak points in the system and minimizes damage to the environment and recreation. However, the agencies responsible for the project finalize their planning documents and put in place funding mechanisms before the detailed assessment has occurred, we all run the risk of being locked in to a plan that does not address the actual weak points and does a lot more damage to the environment than is necessary.

The Corps and SAFCA propose removing 65 acres of riparian forest along 11 miles of the Lower American River's famed Parkway, equivalent to about 50 football fields; modifying levee and bank slopes; disturbing a further 135 acres of Parkway; and buttressing the river's banks with 2.75 million tons of rock revetments. This would occur along and in a very heavily-used area of the river and Parkway (see green lines on map, below, from roughly Paradise Beach upriver 7 miles). Tremendous care must be taken, before funding is secured and actual work begins, to ensure much more detailed study and assessment of the existing environment and options for achieving increased flood protection with the minimum possible impacts on environmental, recreational and aesthetic resources in the American River Watershed.

Our overarching concern is that there is not enough detail in the FEIS/EIR or the Draft SEIR to understand which Lower American River and Parkway resources will actually be affected by the project. These resources are of enormous importance to our community, and not being able to understand how this project will impact them frustrates both the community's ability to understand the proposal and the ability to make informed choices by those who must make decisions about this project. We are concerned that the project provides the community with no real alternatives to razing 65 acres of riparian forest and an additional 135 acres of other vegetation, while hard-armoring up to 11 miles of the Lower American River.

1. Comments Regarding Removal of 65 Acres of Riparian Forest

We thank you for conceding that at least for some time, the effects of removing 65 acres of riparian forest from the Parkway due to the erosion protection work described in the Final EIS/EIR will be “significant.” The Final EIS/EIR concedes that most of the 65 acres of riparian forest slated for removal “is located on land designated by the Parkway Plan as Protected Areas or Nature Study Area.” Although due to the lack of detail in the Final EIS/EIR, we have no idea which particular areas of the forest will be removed at this juncture, we agree that it would seem impossible to remove this much forest from the parkway area indicated without it being “significant,” from biotic, visual, and recreational perspectives. We share your and other groups’ concerns for wildlife, including threatened and endangered species—aquatic, terrestrial, and avian—that depend on this forest for their habitat. As a rare riparian forest, not to mention one in the middle of one of California’s largest cities, these impacts are indeed “significant.”

\[\text{Final EIS/EIR at 122}.\]
\[\text{Final EIS/EIR at 122-123}.\]
We appreciate your recognition that our community considers the Lower American River and its Parkway our recreational “crown jewel,” and that you will accordingly seek a variance from the Corps’ national policy of removal of all trees from all levees. We greatly appreciate your proposal that tree cutting on the Lower American River will be done with regard to site-specific needs and not a one-size-fits-all policy. With that significant detail in mind, we draw your attention to various aspects of your plan that nonetheless concern us.

As noted above, our fundamental issue with the analysis of the significance of the riparian forest and wetland removal is that it relies on an insufficient level of detail. The Final EIS/EIR concedes that it is not currently known where rock armorings versus rock trenches will be installed (a choice discussed below), but notes that both how the forest is removed and how/whether the bank’s morphology is changed depends on the choice between these strategies. The Final EIS/EIR is thus unable to point out with any detail which sections of forest will be removed and which will be allowed to remain standing. Nonetheless, the Final EIS/EIR determines that the impacts to vegetation in the Parkway will be “less than significant” after mitigation. We question this determination in light of this lack of detail. As noted in the Final EIS/EIR, the project could affect not only large, majestic 100-year-old trees, but numerous species of concern.

The Corps’ and SAFCA’s response is that these concerns will be addressed at the design stage. However, at that juncture, 11 miles of treatment will have been authorized without details on what is actually needed for any given stretch of the river. If the Corps and SAFCA believe that it is necessary to remove a cherished recreational and ecological asset, i.e., a given shoreline and its associated forest, one would think that the Corps and SAFCA would know what it intends to replace it with.

We applaud the Corps’ and SAFCA’s resolve to continue to work with the Lower American River Bank Protection Working Group and hope that the Corps and SAFCA will directly engage an even broader range of community participants in the design of the project proposed. Participants should include not only the undersigned but also other groups and individuals concerned with the varied uses to which the Parkway is put, including, for example, those who fish, kayak, raft, bird-watch, bike, walk, and otherwise recreate along the river and the Parkway.

The Corps and SAFCA propose to mitigate this significant 65-acre forest removal by replanting trees, both onsite and offsite. It is not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of this mitigation without knowing what sections of forest will be cut and what sections will be replaced on the same site versus replaced nearby versus replaced on a distant site. In short, the Corps and SAFCA are saying, “trust us to do the right thing.” That flies in the face of the fundamental purpose of the environmental review.

---

4 See, e.g., Final EIS/EIR at 2, 12, and 354.
5 Final EIS/EIR at 122-123.
6 Final EIS/EIR at 122-123.
7 See, e.g., Final EIS/EIR at 128-129 and Appendix F to Final EIS/EIR at PDF p. 943 ("The Corps concurs that the vegetation and aesthetic resources of the Parkway should not be unnecessarily sacrificed. The ARCF GRR is a public safety project and all measures proposed are to reduce the risk of fire loss and damages from a catastrophic flooding event. Additionally, the effects analyzed in the EIS/EIR are a worst-case scenario based on a maximum footprint. In the preconstruction engineering and design phase of the project, the Corps will conduct site specific analysis to revalidate the proposed construction footprint and anticipates that there is a strong possibility of minimizing the effects that are disclosed in this study.")
8 See, e.g., Appendix F to Final EIS/EIR at PDF p. 942.
9 See, e.g., Final EIS/EIR at 122 and 129.
process: to identify prior to decision-making the impacts associated with a proposed project such that mitigation measures can be incorporated to minimize the impacts. If a decision is to be made based on the Corps Final EIS/EIR, the SAFCA SEIR, and associated documents, then the Corps and SAFCA need to do a more thorough analysis of the actual details of the project being considered, such that all interested parties can know, prior to decisions being made, what the impacts will be.

Off-site replanting does not restore the Parkway to the condition it was in before the project, reduces recreational amenities to users of the Parkway including shade along the river, reduces riparian habitat for wildlife in the Parkway, and, if the off-site replanting is not done along a river, contributes to the net loss of California’s now rare riparian forests. The lack of detail in the Final EIS/EIR and the Draft SEIR makes it impossible to ascertain the significance of the proposal and its proposed mitigation. For reasons including but not limited to those stated above, we generally oppose offsite mitigation.

2. Comments Regarding Need for Entropy of Project

We strongly question whether each and every linear foot of riverbank in the 11-mile project area must be treated with either rock armoring or rock trenches. The Final EIS/EIR does not address this question, and seems to assume that each linear foot of riverbank in the area will be treated with either one or the other erosion control strategies. In some instances, the only way to avoid an impact, say removal of a beach, may be to avoid treatment in that section.

Many of us are concerned that the Final EIS/EIR and the Draft SEIR place us, forgive the expression, between a rock and a hard place. On the one hand, rock armoring through rock revetments will severely impact riverside recreation and will mar views from the river and its opposite side. Yet as bad as that sounds to us, the only “alternative,” the rock trenches, will apparently cause a significantly larger impact to the riparian forest than the revetments, which impact will be somewhat permanent, since no large trees may be planted on it and many more trees may be cut to emplace it. The ecology and overall sense of the parkway may forever be changed. Please strongly consider the pros and cons of each treatment, and, crucially, whether doing neither is a possible alternative.

Again, without sufficient analysis of the actual treatments to be employed along all of the actual specific stretches of the river and Parkway considered for this project, it is simply not possible to know what the impacts of this project will be or whether or how to mitigate these impacts. This is a fundamental failure of the Final EIS/EIR and Draft SEIR that needs to be addressed.

3. Comments Regarding Segmentation

The next issue we will address is “segmentation,” that is: how will the project be divided up? When the Corps and SAFCA begin the “design phase,” and the details of how the levees will be reshaped, and which areas of parkway forest will be allowed to stay and which must be removed become clear, we wonder at what level of detail this will be accomplished? Will the analysis be mile-by-mile, or will it be more fine-grained and careful, with attention to the shoreline features, recreational uses, and forest features as they exist for each, say, 25 feet of river and Parkway? The Final EIS/EIR and Draft SEIR do not cover this detail, and we note that if the analysis, even at the design stage, is at too high a level, e.g., mile-by-mile, key features of the parkway that make it both a recreational and ecological treasure could be unnecessarily overlooked, and hence, destroyed. Key habitat, fishing, swimming, boat launch, bird-watching, and other environmental and recreational spots could be easily missed if the design is conducted at too high a level of detail.
4. Comments Regarding Impacts to Recreation

The Final EIS/EIR and Draft SEIR do not adequately characterize the many varied uses of the river and Parkway and thus do not catalog and assess the harms to such uses that will be the result of the proposed project. For instance, the impacts to recreation seem focused on use of the Parkway’s paved bikeway.\textsuperscript{10} While a key asset, there are others equally worthy of close consideration, such as swimming, shoreline recreation, fishing, walking, and bird-watching. The Final EIS/EIR and Draft SEIR pay inadequate attention to the value our community puts on the river for all of these activities. Put simply, the public will not enjoy recreating on rock revetments.

The Final EIS/EIR and Draft SEIR do not seem to survey the recreational uses the river’s banks are put to,\textsuperscript{11} and hence seem to inadequately judge the significance of the project and fail to set forth alternatives to it.\textsuperscript{12} For instance, there are numerous fishing spots\textsuperscript{13} that may, or may not, be eliminated by the placement of rock revetments or the reshaping of the river’s banks and levees. The same can be said for swimming spots.\textsuperscript{14} The same can be said for quiet places along the river to sit and read, watch wildlife, sit with friends and family, bird-watch, or otherwise recreate. Will these beloved spots on the river be destroyed? These recreational resources should be cataloged in detail, and should be consulted if and when the Corps and SAFCA elect to modify the river’s banks and remove its riparian forest.\textsuperscript{15} This is especially true since the south side of the river is slated to be significantly impacted (7 miles) and much of the recreational use, such as the Howe, Watt, and Gristmill river access points, as well as Paradise Beach and Sacramento State University, are on the south side of the river.

We are surprised and disappointed that the impacts to recreation are characterized as “less than significant” when the project proposes the elimination of many of our community’s most cherished recreational sites on the river and Parkway. This is a key flaw of the Final EIS/EIR and Draft SEIR.

Conclusion

In summary, it may be the case that significant areas of the Parkway must be modified so that Sacramento is better-protected from floods, to the detriment of the Parkway’s habitat and recreational assets, but the Final EIS/EIR and Draft SEIR only give the community the barest of information to understand which treatments are proposed to occur along particular stretches of the river. This level of detail is insufficient. Since the Final EIS/EIR and Draft SEIR do not provide detail on how the project will be designed, and thus how the river and Parkway will be specifically affected, they do not adequately account for what impacts will be “significant” to the community.

The Final EIS/EIR and Draft SEIR also appear to be overly broad by ultimately proposing a one-size-fits-all approach for all 11 miles of the Lower American River when, in fact, not all segments of river identified may need treatment.\textsuperscript{16} Again, without more detail in the Final EIS/EIR and SEIR, it is simply not

\textsuperscript{10} Final EIS/EIR at 282.
\textsuperscript{11} See Final EIS/EIR at 283-285. Much is missing.
\textsuperscript{12} Final EIS/EIR at 288-290.
\textsuperscript{13} For instance, it’s difficult to see how the popular fishing and recreation site “clay banks” near SARA Park will be permanently altered by this proposal—will the upland forest be removed, the banks armored, both, or neither?
\textsuperscript{14} We have a concern that swimming spots, particularly beaches, where sand is a friend of recreation but a foe of erosion, may be unduly impacted by this proposal.
possible to assess what this project will actually mean for the community and the environment nor is it possible to assess what mitigation measures may be required to address significant impacts.

Finally, we must stress the importance of the process underway via the Lower American River Task Force’s Bank Protection Working Group to more fully assess precisely the kinds of details that are lacking in the Final EIS/EIR and Draft SEIR. This process needs time for us to have any reasonable opportunity to develop the kind of detail that is required for carefully and fully assessing and modeling the flood risk in a site-specific manner and for ultimately developing plans for improving flood management while also protecting the environmental and recreational resources so cherished by Sacramento. Please do not push this project forward without giving adequate time for the Working Group to do a thorough job.

We urge your careful consideration of these comments as you proceed with this project. While flood protection is paramount, we appreciate your shared notion that it can be done thoughtfully and carefully, with the greatest possible care given to our community’s natural and recreational resources. Nobody wants to see their favorite beach or stretch of forest disappear without darn good reason. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Graham Brownstein
2930 American River Drive
Sacramento, CA 95864

Matthew Carr
8801 Woodman Way
Sacramento, CA 95826

Betsy Welland
4950 Keane Drive
Carmichael, CA 95608

Pamela Britton
11030 Mammoth River Court
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Ginger Enrico
1117 Nile River Court
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

JoEllen Arnold
2210 C Street
Sacramento, CA 95816

Robert Sewell
2221 C Street
Sacramento, CA 95816
Gary J. Kukkola
2585 King Richard Drive
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Felix E. Smith
4720 Talus Way
Carmichael, CA 95608

Dan Winkelman
1374 Young Wo Circle
Folsom, CA 95630

Chris Lewis and John Hunter
Sacramento Valley Chapter, California Native Plant Society
4900 Kenneth Avenue
Carmichael, CA 95608

Dale Steele and Sean Ward
Friends of Sutter’s Landing
P.O. Box 162644
Sacramento, CA 95816

Paradise Beach area. It is unclear how this well-loved beach area will be affected by the proposed erosion control work.
Area upriver of Howe Avenue. The forest, ponds, beaches, and walking trails in the area pictured, on the south bank, are of high environmental and recreational value. It is unclear how they will be affected.

Area upriver of Watt Avenue. We note the vast difference between the south-bank areas in this image of the area upriver of Watt Avenue and the preceding image of the area upriver of Howe Avenue. Do both segments require one of the two same treatments?
Gristmill river access area. This area is frequented by people who appreciate the riparian forest, and contains good habitat. The Final EIS/EIR gives no information as to how this treasured area of the river will be affected.

Sample Photo. Riparian forest near SARA Park, River Mile 11. Note person in photo in comparison to size of trees. It is impossible to know what will become of this stretch of forest from the Final EIS/EIR.
**Project Map.** The green lines along both banks of the Lower American River, from roughly Paradise Beach upriver seven miles to the Gristmill Park river access, are all the information provided in the Final EIS/EIR regarding specific project areas and areas of impact. It is impossible to adequately evaluate and assess actual impacts with this level of detail. Much more detail is necessary to adequately evaluate this project and any proposed mitigation.
2-1 to 2-2 Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements,” and responses to Comments 2-3 through 2-55, below.

2-3 to 2-4 Please refer to Master Response 2, “Relationship between the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and Other Documents and Agencies.”

2-5 to 2-7 Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.”

2-8 to 2-11 The 2007 EIR, which is incorporated by reference and summarized in the SEIR, describes existing conditions for every resource topic analyzed, including but not limited to vegetation, wildlife, and sensitive biological resources in Section 4.7.2 (pages 4.7-5 through 4.7-18). Descriptions of existing recreation on the Lower American River are presented in Section 4.13.2.2 (pages 4.13-2 and 4.13-3) of the 2007 EIR, and descriptions of existing visual resources on the Lower American River was provided in Section 4.14.2.2 (pages 4.14-2 and 4.14-3) of the 2007 EIR. Because the analyses in the 2007 EIR and this SEIR are at a program level for a very large geographic area, the program level description of existing conditions is appropriate. When site-specific projects are proposed, site-specific environmental review, including existing conditions on the site and in the vicinity of the proposed project, will be required. In addition, please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.” SAFCA anticipates that the Bank Protection Working Group will be a venue for discussion of erosion control projects as they are proposed.

2-12 Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.” Erosion control improvements on the Lower American River were addressed in the 2007 EIR, and in the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR, incorporated by reference in this Final SEIR. The funding mechanisms to address erosion control on the Lower American River were established in 2007 on the basis of the 2007 Engineer’s Report and 2007 EIR.

2-13 Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.”

2-14 to 2-16 The 2007 EIR, which is incorporated by reference and summarized in the SEIR, analyzed impacts related to the erosion control improvements at a program level. These analyses include but are not limited to vegetation, wildlife, and sensitive biological resources in Section 4.7.3 (pages 4.7-18 through 4.7-25) recreation in Section 4.13.3 (pages 4.13-5 and 4.13-6), and visual resources in Section 4.14.3 (pages 4.14-5 to 4.14-7) of the 2007 EIR. When site-specific projects are proposed, site-specific environmental review will be provided. Erosion control improvements on the Lower American River are analyzed at a level of detail commensurate with the detail available on program activities in the 2007 EIR. In addition, please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.”

2-17 to 2-26 Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.”

2-27 and 2-28 The level of analysis in the 2007 EIR, the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR, and this SEIR is program-level, because the activities analyzed are regional programs (local funding mechanisms and flood-risk damage reduction measures for the region). The 2007 EIR and the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR disclose the potential impacts of approximately 10 miles (2007 EIR) and 11-12 miles (ARCF GRR EIS/EIR) of erosion control improvements, respectively. When site-specific projects are proposed for authorization, site-specific environmental review will be required. In addition, please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.”
SAFCA anticipates that the Bank Protection Working Group will be a venue for discussion of erosion control projects as they are proposed, and SAFCA will continue to seek broad input from the public and interested stakeholder groups as detailed project-specific designs are developed. In addition, please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.”

SAFCA and others have completed substantial erosion control improvements along the Lower American River. These erosion control projects have been designed to create habitat, and to replace habitat damaged by the repairs. These past improvements indicate that mitigation has been completed and successful in the American River Parkway. Past hydraulic modeling work has indicated that approximately 200 acres of riparian forest habitat can feasibly and successfully be created, primarily in the lower portion of the American River Parkway, within approximately 5 1/2 miles of the confluence with the Sacramento River. Because of the importance that trees and vegetation along the river bank have for in-stream habitat, USFWS and NMFS are expected to require that mitigation be constructed along the bank wherever possible. In addition, please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements,” and the Response to Comments 2-27 and 2-28.

Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.”

Section 4.13, “Recreation,” of the 2007 EIR analyzed recreation impacts due to the entire flood control improvements program, and found that the proposed program would have significant impacts related to encroachment on American River Parkway land, creating of permanent in-water channel hazards, and significant effects on recreational opportunities during construction. The 2007 EIR found that these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation, including a fee for habitat restoration, designing in-water features to avoid hazards, and preparing plans to manage recreational traffic and notify the public of temporary access restrictions. Recreation impacts due to the proposed changes in the program are analyzed in Section 4.13 of the Draft SEIR, which found impacts on recreational opportunities during construction activities to be potentially significant. The Draft SEIR includes mitigation measures requiring a bicycle detour plan and a recreation plan to minimize and publicize impacts on recreational activities, and these measures would reduce recreation impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Please see responses to comments 2-1 to 2-45.

Please refer to the response to Comment 2-11. SAFCA and USACE will be responsible for developing detailed assessment of the flood-risk and need for erosion control improvements at specific locations, and implementing mitigation as required by project-specific and detailed NEPA and CEQA analyses. The Bank Protection Working Group will be a venue for discussion and will provide input on avoidance and mitigation of impacts.

SAFCA thanks the commenters for providing comments on the Draft SEIR.

The photos and map provided by the commenters will be referred to the decision makers.
From: Marcos Guerrero [mailto:mguerrero@auburnrancheria.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 9:52 PM
To: johnsonr@saccounty.net; washburnt@saccounty.net
Cc: Scott, Barry <bscott@gelconsultants.com>; Bassett, John (MSA) <bassett@saccounty.net>
<mmmoore@auburnrancheria.com>; Melodi McAdams <mmcadams@auburnrancheria.com>
Subject: Comments to Subsequent Program Draft Environmental Impact Report on Updated Local Funding Mechanisms for Sacramento Area Flood Control Improvements

Dear Director Timothy Washburn,

Thank you for the opportunity to continue to consult on the public draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) of a Subsequent Program Environmental Impact Report on Updated Local Funding Mechanisms for Sacramento Area Flood Control Improvement. The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) of the Auburn Rancheria is comprised of Miwok and Southern Maidu (Nisenan) people whose tribal lands are within Placer County and whose area of geographic traditional and cultural affiliation encompasses all of Amador, El Dorado, Nevada Placer, Sacramento, Sutter and Yuba counties, as well as portions of Butte, Plumas, San Joaquin, Sierra, Solano and Yolo counties, which includes the area of the proposed project. The UAIC is particularly concerned about development within its area of geographic traditional and cultural affiliation that has potential to impact the lifeways, cultural sites, and landscapes that may be of sacred or ceremonial significance. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this and other projects in your jurisdiction.

It has been determined that this project will have a significant impact on multiple cultural resources and cemeteries since implementation of the proposed project will:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 or a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21084.1;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource; or
- Disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

UAIC agrees with the finding that the project will cause substantial adverse change to unique archaeological and tribal cultural resources which is consistent with the following impact analyses and mitigation measures as discussed in the EIR:

1. CR-1: Possible Damage to or Destruction of Historical Resources; Mitigation Measure
   CR-1: Implement Procedures for Inventory and Evaluation of Historical Resources and for Eligible Resources, Implement Feasible Avoidance or Treatment Measures.

2. CR-2: Possible Damage to or Destruction of Identified or Unidentified Archaeological Resources; Mitigation Measure
   CR-2: Implement Procedures for Inventory and Evaluation of Archaeological Resources and for Identified Cultural Resources (Including Archaeological Sites, Tribal Cultural Resources and Traditional Cultural Properties, and Cultural Landscapes), Implement Feasible Avoidance or Treatment Measures.

3. CR-3: Possible Damage to or Destruction of a Tribal Cultural Resource; Mitigation Measure
   CR-3: Develop and Implement a Native American and Archaeological Monitoring Plan and Conduct Archaeological and Native American Monitoring of Sensitive Areas During Construction.
4. CR-4: Possible Disturbance, Damage to, or Destruction of Human Remains. Mitigation Measure CR-4: Stop Work if Archaeological Materials are discovered during Construction, Assess Significance of the Materials, and Implement Appropriate Avoidance or Treatment Measures, if warranted. UAIC also recommends these additional mitigation measures so that the mitigation process is more straightforward:

5. If adverse impacts to TCRs, unique archeology, or other cultural resources occurs, consultation with UAIC regarding mitigation contained in the Public Resources Code sections 21084.3(a) and (b) and CEQA Guidelines section 15370 should occur, in order to coordinate for compensation for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

6. Develop a standard operating procedure, points of contact, timeline and schedule for the project so all possible damages can be avoided or alternatives and cumulative impacts properly assessed.

In order to ascertain how the project will affect cultural resources that are of importance to the UAIC, we respectfully request to participate in the drafting of, and receive copies of any draft and final archaeological reports that are completed for the project; including California Historical Resources Information System records search requests, results and summaries. We also request copies of future environmental documents for the proposed project so that we have the opportunity to consult on potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures related to cultural and natural resources. The information gathered from the project documentation will provide us with a better understanding of the natural and cultural resources on site and is invaluable for consultation purposes. UAIC is aware of several significant historical resources and tribal cultural resources in your project area that qualify as eligible properties for listing to the local, state and federal registers.

We would also like to make a few general points for consideration as you continue to refine the scope and content of this project. They may perhaps be the basis for additional mitigation measures to be included in the FEIR and for SAFCA to respond to each of them in its Responses to Comments:

- All environmental planning should be designed to avoid and preserve known cultural sites by putting them into conservation easements, open space or other protected areas with sufficient protective buffers;
- UAIC’s preference is to avoid all resources and protect them in place. The UAIC is interested in conservation easements for culturally significant prehistoric sites;
- The UAIC requests to provide paid Tribal Monitors when survey, testing, excavation and data recovery are required, or in cases where ground disturbance is proposed at or near sensitive cultural resources;
- The UAIC is deeply interested in the culturally appropriate and dignified treatment of ancestral human remains, grave goods and cultural items from prehistoric sites where such activities as digging, excavation and data recovery may be performed. UAIC’s preference is avoidance first, but if avoidance is not possible, then reburial directly on-site as close as possible to the area of discovery;
- Development of a Memorandum of Agreement for any direct, indirect and cumulative adverse effects or impacts to unique archaeological or tribal cultural resources;
- Development of burial, cultural resources treatment and tribal monitoring plans if human remains or cultural items have been found on-site; and
• UAIC recommends that Native American design elements be incorporated into any final aesthetic and architectural designs.

The UAIC’s preservation committee would like to set up a meeting and continue consultation on the proposed project.

With respect,

Marcos Guerrero, RPA
Cultural Resources Manager
United Auburn Indian Community
Tribal Historic Preservation Department
10720 Indian Hill
Auburn, CA 95603
Direct: 530-883-2364
Cell: 916-300-8792
Fax: 530-883-2390

Nothing in this e-mail is intended to constitute an electronic signature for purposes of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (E-Sign Act), 15, U.S.C. §§ 7001 to 7006 or the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act of any state or the federal government unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this e-mail.
SAFCA appreciates UAIC’s consultation efforts on this SEIR and the comments on the Draft SEIR provided by UAIC. SAFCA recognizes that UAIC is a Tribe that is culturally affiliated with the geographic locations addressed in this SEIR and understands that UAIC is concerned about potential impacts on resources of importance to UAIC.

The commenter correctly lists the cultural resources impacts identified in the Draft SEIR. SAFCA respectfully clarifies that the identified impacts are potential impacts, and the Draft SEIR states that each cultural resources impact identifies a possible impact rather than stating that the “project will have a significant impact,” as stated by the commenter. Impacts are identified as potential because the SEIR analyzes impacts at the program-level and not at a project-specific-level. Site-specific conditions can be reviewed and any impacts identified when individual project sites are identified.

Mitigation Measure CR-5 already describes the requirements of California PRC Section 21084.3 but has been revised to include specific reference to Subsections (a) and (b). Mitigation Measure CR-5 has also been revised to include definitions of mitigation as provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15370. As shown in Section 4.2, “Corrections and Revisions to the Draft Environmental Impact Report,” the following underlined text has been added to Mitigation Measure CR-5:

“…As a part of the consultation, the parties may propose mitigation measures (as broadly defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15370), including, but not limited to, those recommended in Section 21084.3 (listed above), capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource. If the California Native American tribe requests consultation regarding alternatives to the project, recommended mitigation measures, or significant effects, the consultation shall include those topics. The consultation may include discussion concerning the type of environmental review necessary, the significance of tribal cultural resources, the significance of the project’s impacts on the tribal cultural resources, and, if necessary, project alternatives or the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation which may include a) avoiding the impact by not taking a certain action; b) minimizing impacts by limiting the action; c) rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or repairing the environment; d) reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; or e) compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments (CEQA Guidelines Section 15370).”

Mitigation Measure CR-4 has been revised to respond to the comment. As shown in Section 4.2, “Corrections and Revisions to the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report,” the following underlined text has been added to the first bullet in Mitigation Measure CR-4:

Before the commencement of construction, a qualified professional archaeologist and a tribal monitor or representative shall give a presentation to all construction personnel regarding the likelihood and type of Native American and non-Native American resources that might be found during construction operations associated with the individual flood control projects, and measures that shall be taken in the event that potential archaeological or historical resources are found during construction. The presentation shall include providing all construction personnel with standard operating procedures and points of contact in the event of a discovery of cultural material during construction. Consulting culturally affiliated Native American Tribes shall be provided
3-5 Because the SEIR analyzes impacts at a program-level and project-specific analysis has not been conducted, no archaeological or other technical reports will be prepared to support this SEIR. As projects are identified and funded, the specific implementing agencies will be required to comply with CEQA (and NEPA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act processes, including Native American consultation requirements as specified in California PRC 21080.3 (Assembly Bill 52)). SAFCA will provide notice of its future inventory activities to UAIC, as requested. However, portions of the program described in the SEIR may be undertaken by other agencies. Culturally affiliated Native Americans may contact individual implementing agencies with requests to participate in inventory activities and review technical reports and other pertinent data. Please refer to Master Response 2, “Relationship between the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and Other Documents and Agencies.”

3-6 As projects are identified and funded, the specific implementing agencies will be required to comply with CEQA, NEPA, and Section 106 processes, including Native American consultation requirements as specified in California Public Resources Code 21080.3 (Assembly Bill 52). In accordance with California PRC 21080.3.1(b), California Native American Tribes may request in advance to be notified, in writing, by the lead agency of any proposed projects in a specified geographic area. SAFCA will provide future environmental documents to UAIC, as requested. However, portions of the program described in the SEIR may be undertaken by other agencies. A request to review environmental documents should be made to the appropriate implementing agencies either in advance, or as notices of preparation and initial studies are released for public review. Please refer to Master Response 2, “Relationship between the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and Other Documents and Agencies.”

3-7 SAFCA recognizes the importance of including a complete inventory of cultural resources in environmental documents in order to fully evaluate potential impacts on those resources. SAFCA encourages the commenter to consult with the appropriate implementing agencies and to provide information concerning the nature and location of significant cultural resources and Tribal Cultural Resources for consideration in project design, alternatives analysis, determination of methods of avoidance, and other aspects of project implementation. Please refer to Master Response 2, “Relationship between the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and Other Documents and Agencies.”

3-8 In consideration of the points made by the commenter, SAFCA has concluded that no changes in the impacts or mitigation in the Draft SEIR are necessary and that each point has either already been addressed by a mitigation measure, or should be addressed in a project-specific environmental review to be conducted by the appropriate implementing agency. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are required. Please refer to Master Response 2, “Relationship between the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and Other Documents and Agencies.” Each point made by the commenter is addressed in Responses 3-9 through 3-15, below.

3-9 and 3-10 SAFCA acknowledges the commenter’s preference with respect to conservation easements. Mitigation Measures CR-2 and CR-5 identify that avoidance of significant cultural resources is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts. Mitigation Measure CR-2 specifically includes conservation easements as one option of mitigating impacts through protection of the resource.

3-11 SAFCA recognizes the importance of including Native American participation in a complete inventory of cultural resources in order to fully evaluate potential impacts on those resources. SAFCA has historically provided paid Tribal monitors for its projects, and expects to continue to do so in the future. SAFCA further encourages the commenter to consult with other agencies that...
may implement portions of the program to provide recommendations for paid Tribal surveys and monitoring as appropriate for individual projects. Please refer to Master Response 2, “Relationship between the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and Other Documents and Agencies.”

3-12 SAFCA acknowledges the commenter’s concern for the dignified, respectful, and culturally appropriate treatment of ancestral human remains and associated items and material. Mitigation Measure CR-6 states the requirements for the treatment and disposition of Native American human remains and associated items and materials and that Native American human remains and associated grave goods must be treated with appropriate dignity. The disposition of Native American human remains and associated items and materials, however, shall be determined by the Most Likely Descendant in consultation with the landowner.

3-13 SAFCA recognizes the importance of including Native American participation in the identification of Native American cultural resources, identification of impacts, and identification of appropriate mitigation. Treatment of important cultural resources should be specified in mitigation measures in EIRs and Initial Studies/Mitigated Negative Declarations. Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) may be negotiated as an agreement between a specific implementing agency and another entity such as a Native American Tribe to address project-specific concerns separate from the CEQA process, but an MOA is not a part of the CEQA environmental review process and is not identified in the CEQA Statute or Guidelines as a mechanism to mitigate a significant impact. Please refer to Master Response 2, “Relationship between the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and Other Documents and Agencies.”

3-14 Mitigation Measure CR-3 specifies that a Native American monitoring plan and an archaeological monitoring plan shall be prepared in consultation with a culturally affiliated Native American Tribe if the results of inventory, including Native American consultation, indicate that a project area is sensitive for the presence of cultural resources including Native American burials. The treatment of Native American burials is determined by the Most Likely Descendant in consultation with the landowner and therefore the contents of, or need for, a burial treatment plan would need to be determined in consultation between those parties and the specific implementing agency or through separate agreements between implementing agencies and a Native American Tribe. Please refer to Master Response 2, “Relationship between the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and Other Documents and Agencies.”

3-15 Incorporation of Native American design elements into aesthetic and architectural designs, with respect to cultural resources, could be identified as a mitigation measure for a project-specific impact to a specific cultural resource, if that design element would mitigate an impact to a significant cultural resource. As specific projects are identified and funded, implementing agencies would be required to comply with CEQA processes, including Native American consultation requirements as specified in California PRC 21080.3 (Assembly Bill 52) and at that time Native American Tribes may consult with an implementing agency concerning the identification of specific design and aesthetic considerations as mitigation. Please refer to Master Response 2, “Relationship between the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and Other Documents and Agencies.”

3-16 SAFCA welcomes continued consultation with UAIC and other culturally affiliated Native American Tribes.
March 16, 2016

Mr. Timothy Washburn, Director of Planning
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
1007 - 7th Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

w ashburnt@saccounty.net

By e-mail and U.S. Mail

Subject: Draft Subsequent Program Environmental Impact Report for Updated Local Funding Mechanisms

Mr. Washburn:

We have reviewed the Draft Subsequent Program Environmental Impact Report for Updated Local Funding Mechanisms (LFM DSEIR) and these are our comments.

Our organization, the Save the American River Association (SARA), was instrumental in protecting the lands along the Lower American River from development and in the creation of the American River Parkway. Founded in 1961, we have been protecting and advocating for the River and Parkway for 55 years.

Our primary concern with the LFM DSEIR is with the impacts on lands adjacent to the Lower American River due to proposed “erosion control” activities. In particular, we are concerned about the proposal to “Implement rock bank protection and learnable rock trenches along up to 11 miles of the north and south levees of the American River to prevent erosion of flood control structures during sustained high-flow events.” (LFM DSEIR p. 2-15)

Given the importance of the Lower American River Parkway to Sacramento, we find it frustrating and odd that the description of the impacts of the above erosion control proposal have been relegated to a table in an appendix. (LFM DSEIR Appendix C, Table C3) We understand that the LFM DSEIR is intended as a “subsequent” EIR, and that it “incorporates by reference” several other documents, including the draft American River Common Features General Reevaluation Report Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (2015, Corps of Engineers and Central Valley Flood Protection Board) (DGRR DEIS/EIR). The latter is a critical document in terms of what is included in the proposed Sacramento Area Flood Control Area (SAFCA) Updated Local Funding Mechanism. It would seem to us, therefore, that the LFM DSEIR has done an unacceptable job of presenting the data by placing the summary of the impacts of proposals in the DGRR DEIS/EIR in a table in Appendix C. This summary table should be relocated to the main document.
The above is important to us and also to the SAFCA Board, because the SAFCA Board should be fully informed of the impacts of adopting the proposed Local Funding Mechanisms. Given the way in which this has been handled, we do NOT believe this has been the case. (Additionally, the public should have an opportunity to express our opinions to the SAFCA Board concerning this proposal).

According to the summary in Table C-3 of Appendix C of the LFM DSEIR, “For the American River, the construction of launchable rock trenches would result in the removal of 65 acres of riparian habitat within the American River Parkway.” (p. C-3) Calculating from 65 acres and 11 miles long, this would mean an average trench width of about 49 feet, although the specific width would vary from location to location. (Additionally, there will be what could be termed a “spatial” effect, in that large trees such as oaks and walnuts could not be planted over the trenches, due to insufficient soil depth. Indeed, there would likely need to be an ongoing program to remove large trees from the trenched areas. This “spatial” effect would seriously impact the vegetation and wildlife of the area, as well as recreation and visual resources for existing and future users. These are significant effects.

On a positive note, the LFM DSEIR states: “Regardless of whether the proposed program or alternatives are selected for implementation, project level CEQA (and potentially NEPA) documentation will be required when specific project details are available for each proposed funded facility.” While this is a very good thing, the requirement for CEQA and possibly NEPA documentation does not, in and of itself, guarantee that only needed projects are selected or that adverse environmental impacts are minimized.

There has been discussion about the role of the Lower American River Task Force (LARTF) and a subgroup, the Bank Protection Working Group (BPWG) in the projects proposed in the LFM DSEIR. We strongly support the work of the LARTF and BPWG. It appears possible to us that these groups could provide both technical analysis and feedback from stakeholders (such as SARA). This could serve to critique the need for specific projects as well as minimizing adverse environmental impacts.

We recommend, therefore, that SAFCA commit, in the final versions of the Local Funding Mechanism Environmental Impact Report and Engineer’s Report on CCAD 2, to support the LARTF and BPWG. This support would include funding and staff time for the duration of the proposed Lower American River erosion control work.

In addition, there are several other matters that have caught our attention.

First, in the LFM DSEIR, Exhibit 1-2 (p. 1-5) “Funded Facilities” it is not clear whether this is supposed to represent “facilities” (i.e. projects) already constructed, facilities to be funded by the proposed Consolidated Capital Assessment District 2 (CCAD 2) or a combination of these. It would be much more informative if the “facilities” proposed were broken out from the “facilities” already constructed. (Also, we note that Exhibit 1-2 shows no “facilities” on the south levee upstream from the Mayhew Drain. This ignores the levee raising and widening that occurred some years ago, and the proposed armoring of river bank or levee in the area (see DGRR DEIS/EIR). This should be corrected.
Second, it is unclear why specific proposed projects are reviewed for environmental impacts in the LFM DSEIR. We understand that it means that the proposed projects have not been reviewed in documents incorporated by reference (e.g. the DGRR DEIS/EIR). Does this mean that the projects reviewed in the LFM DSEIR are to be funded exclusively by SAFCAs, and not by the Corps of Engineers or State of California?

Third, in Table 4.1-1 Proposed Program Components and Environmental Review Status, under Common Features Levee Improvements / Erosion Control, it states: “Construct approximately 10 miles of bank and levee armoring along the north and south levees of the American River,” and indicates that this is “no change” compared to the 2007 Local Funding EIR. However, according to the Draft Engineer’s Report for CCAD 2, “The 2007 Final Engineer’s Report assumed that this (erosion control) work would affect about 2 to 3 miles of riverbank on both sides of the river. The USACE’s American River Common Features General Reevaluation Report (ARCF GRR) estimates that as much as 11 or 12 miles of riverbank could be affected. CCAD 2 would include funding for the local share of the cost of this enlarged erosion control program.” (p. 2-4) Thus, the statement cited above in Table 4.1-1 is wrong, as the contemplated distance involved has increased from 2 or 3 miles to 11 or 12 miles. The statement should be changed from “no change” to “greatly increased” or something like that.

Fourth, the paragraph summarizing Vegetation and Wildlife effects of erosion control work on the American River Parkway (Appendix C, Table C-3, p. C-3-3) does not state whether these effects are viewed as “significant” or not. In comparison, the other paragraphs (e.g. concerning Sacramento River levee work) of the same section clearly state whether impacts are viewed as significant or not.

Finally, we would like to point out that the DGRR DEIS/EIR was a draft document, which has been superseded by the Final version. Although there do not appear to be large differences between the proposed projects in the Draft and Final versions, there have been some changes to the descriptions and analyses in the documents. It would therefore be appropriate to update the references in the LFM DSEIR, and make appropriate changes as needed.

Given the above shortcomings, we conclude that the LFM DSEIR is deficient and inadequate. It would be preferable that the document be revised and recirculated. At a minimum, an addendum containing all changes to the LFM DSEIR should be included in the final document.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Stephen Green  
President, Save the American River Association  

James Morgan  
SARA Board  
LARTF Bank Protection Working Group
4-1 Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements,” and responses to Comments 4-1 through 4-23, below.

4-2 to 4-5 Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.” Erosion control improvements on the Lower American River were analyzed in the 2007 EIR and in the USACE ARCF GRR EIS/EIR, which is incorporated by reference. As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, the USACE ARCF GRR EIS/EIR is available for public review at USACE Sacramento District offices, as stated on page 1-10 of the Draft EIR, and has been briefly summarized in Appendix C to the Draft SEIR. There are no restrictions in CEQA or the CEQA Guidelines on the format of the summary, so long as the summary is in the EIR. Appendix C, which is cross-referenced on page(s) 1-10, 4.1-2, and 4.1-7 of the Draft SEIR, is available on SAFCA’s website, and on a CD attached to hard copies of the Draft SEIR. SAFCA’s Board conducted a public hearing on the Draft SEIR on February 18, 2016 during the regular Board meeting. The public will have a further opportunity to express opinions on this proposal prior to the Board’s determination on whether to certify the SEIR during the public hearing on April 21, 2016.

4-6 to 4-9 The comment restates information provided in the Draft SEIR. Comment noted.

4-10 Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.” Erosion control improvements on the Lower American River were addressed in the 2007 EIR, and in the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR, incorporated by reference. Detailed, site-specific analysis of projects cannot be performed until project-specific designs have been developed. As required for all projects where impacts may be significant impact, EIRs for future projects with the potential to significantly impact habitat or recreational values will be required to consider alternatives to the project as proposed, and to implement feasible mitigation to avoid, mitigate, or reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

4-11 to 4-12 Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements,” and the Response to Comment 2-29. SAFCA has committed to providing consultant staffing as part of its effort to reconstitute the BPWG as an adjunct of the LARTF to address near-term bank protection needs, and to lay the groundwork for implementing the comprehensive long-term bank protection recommended in the GRR. The GRR includes language that commits USACE to develop the details of the recommended bank protection program in close coordination with the LARTF and the BPWG. This was the approach SAFCA used in the 1990s to address what were then determined to be the most pressing erosion risks in the American River Parkway. This approach was broadly supported at that time by all of the stakeholders including several neighborhood groups participating in the LARTF.

4-13 The funded facilities include all facilities that would be funded by CCAD2, including any new facilities which are described in Draft SEIR Chapter 3, “Project Description.” The funded facilities include facilities that were constructed or are being constructed using funding approved in the original CCAD, for which actual costs remain that would be paid using the new CCAD2. SAFCA has tried to simplify consideration of the various facilities through the summary provided in Table 4.1-1, “Proposed Program Components and Environmental Review Status.” This table identifies the facilities that are analyzed in the SEIR. Regardless of whether other facilities have been constructed or are still under construction, they have already been the subject of separate CEQA (and in some case NEPA) review and so are not reviewed again in the SEIR.
As shown in Section 4.2, “Corrections and Revisions to the Draft Environmental Impact Report,” Exhibit 1-2 has been updated as requested by the commenter, and now shows facilities upstream of Mayhew Drain.

This SEIR analyzes changes to the local funding mechanisms for the flood control improvements program, including new projects that are eligible for CCAD2 funding. Table 4.1-1, “Proposed Program Components and Environmental Review Status,” identifies the list of funded facilities that would be funded by CCAD 2 as the local share of funding. This table also identifies whether the proposed improvements were analyzed in the 2007 EIR, and identifies projects that were analyzed in documents incorporated by reference. As with the whole range of funded facilities, the specific facilities analyzed in the Draft SEIR include facilities that are expected to receive State and/or Federal funding, facilities that will be funded by SAFCA to serve as a local “match” for Federally and State-funded improvements, and facilities that will be funded by SAFCA without State or Federal funding.

Please refer to Master Response 1, “Erosion Control Improvements.” Approximately 10 miles of erosion control improvements on the Lower American River were addressed in the 2007 EIR, and approximately 11 to 12 miles were addressed in the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR, incorporated by reference. Please refer to the response to Comment 4-20.

As shown in Section 4.2, “Corrections and Revisions to the Draft Environmental Impact Report,” text has been added to Table C-3 to summarize the conclusions of the ARCF GRR EIS/EIR that impacts related to launchable rock trench and bank protection on the American River would be less than significant with mitigation; although temporal loss of riparian habitat would be significant.

As shown in Section 4.2, “Corrections and Revisions to the Draft Environmental Impact Report,” text has been added to Table C-3 to describe changes between the Draft and Final ARCF GRR EIS/EIR.

The commenter has not identified any new or substantially more severe significant effects on the environment due to the proposed changes in the local funding mechanisms program for flood control improvements than were analyzed in the Draft SEIR. Please refer to Section 4.2, “Corrections and Revisions to the Draft Environmental Impact Report,” which includes all of the revisions made to the Draft SEIR in response to comments.
March 17, 2016

Tim Washburn
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
1007 7th Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Updated Local Funding Mechanisms for Sacramento Area Flood Control Improvements
SCH#: 2006072098

Dear Tim Washburn:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Supplemental EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on March 16, 2016, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lead Agency Contact
- **Name**: Tim Washburn
- **Agency**: Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
- **Phone**: 916 674 8732
- **Address**: 1007 7th Street, 7th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
- **Fax**

### Project Location
- **County**: Sacramento
- **City**: Sacramento
- **Region**: Various
- **Lat / Long**: Various
- **Cross Streets**: Various
- **Parcel No.**: Various
- **Township**: Various, including flood control works, agriculture, and public right-of-way

### Proximity to:
- **Highways**: SR 99, 160, I-5, 80
- **Airports**: Various
- **Railways**: Sierra Northern
- **Waterways**: Sacramento & American Rivers & 1rbs, Yolo/Sac Bypasses Natomas Basin
- **Schools**: Various
- **Land Use**: Various, including flood control works, agriculture, and public right-of-way

### Project Issues
- Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic-Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Other Issues

### Reviewing Agencies
- Caltrans, District 3 S; Department of Bouling and Waterways; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 2; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 3; Delta Protection Commission; Department of Parks and Recreation; Central Valley Flood Protection Board; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, Division of Transportation Planning; Air Resources Board; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Sacramento); Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; Delta Stewardship Council

### Dates
- **Data Received**: 02/01/2016
- **Start of Review**: 02/01/2016
- **End of Review**: 03/16/2016

*Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.*
5-1 The comment describes the absence of comments from State agencies; no response is required.
4 CORRECTIONS AND REVISIONS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section presents specific text changes made to the Draft SEIR since its publication and public review. The changes are presented in the order in which they appear in the original Draft SEIR and are identified by the Draft SEIR page number. Text deletions are shown in strikethrough (strikethrough) and text additions are shown in underline (underline).

4.2 CORRECTIONS AND REVISIONS

Throughout the Draft SEIR document, references to “Code of California Regulations” are replaced with references to the “CEQA Guidelines.”

TABLE ES-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR PROGRAM-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED FUNDING MECHANISMS

Page ES-5
Impact AG-4, “Physically Divide an Established Community,” was incorrectly numbered as Impact AG-1 in the first column of Table ES-1. The text is corrected to read “AG-4.”

Page ES-6
Impact BIO-F3, “Possible Water Quality Degradation During and Following In-Water Construction Activities,” a reference to “Mitigation Measure BIO-F3: Implement Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs), Prepare and Implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and Comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Conditions” has been added to the “Mitigation Measure” column.

Page ES-13
For Impact GHG-1, “Temporary, Short-Term Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” the level of significance after mitigation has been corrected to match the significance conclusion for Impact GHG-1 on page 4.18-8 of the Draft SEIR, which is “Significant and Unavoidable.”

SECTION 1.2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED LOCAL FUNDING MECHANISMS AND FUNDED FACILITIES

Page 1-5
Exhibit 1-2 has been modified as shown on the following page:
Exhibit 1-2. Funded Facilities
**SECTION 4.5  WATER QUALITY**

**Page 4.5-24**

The text in Section 4.5.5, “Conclusion” has been modified as follows:

Implementing Mitigation Measures WQ-1, and WQ-2, and WQ-3 would reduce the potentially significant Impact WQ-1 (possible water quality effects from stormwater runoff, erosion, and spills associated with construction) to a less-than-significant level because a SWPPP and site-specific BMPs specifically designed to reduce erosion, siltation, and pollutant transport would be implemented; and because a SPCP with measures specifically designed to prevent transport of hazardous materials to waterways and implement cleanup activities in the event of accidental spills would be implemented. Implementation of Mitigation Measures WQ-2 and WQ-3 would reduce the potentially significant Impact WQ-2 (possible effects on groundwater or surface water quality resulting from contact with the water table during construction) to a less-than-significant level because implementation of dewatering provisions would decrease the potential for release of these contaminants, and would provide for cleanup should these releases occur. Impact WQ-3 (long-term operational effects on groundwater levels resulting from installation of flood protection components) would be less than significant.

**SECTION 4.7  TERRESTRIAL BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Page 4.7-25**

The text in the third paragraph of “Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Identify Habitat and Implement Measures to Avoid and Minimize Potential Impacts” has been modified as follows:

If effects to pond turtle habitat cannot be avoided, measures shall be implemented to minimize unavoidable effects. Before beginning any project activities in such habitat, appropriate measures to minimize adverse effects on pond turtles shall be identified and provided to CDFW for comment. Such measures are likely to include, but would not be limited to, conducting surveys after dewatering of suitable aquatic habitat and moving stranded turtles to appropriate areas (turtles shall only be handled by a qualified biologist authorized by CDFW), conducting preconstruction surveys of uplands adjacent to suitable aquatic habitat, minimizing disturbance of potential nesting habitat during the nesting season, installing fencing to exclude turtles from nesting in areas where ground disturbance would occur, conducting worker awareness training, and periodic biological monitoring.

**Page 4.7-27**

The text in the third paragraph of “Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Identify Roosting Habitat and Implement Measures to Avoid and Minimize Disturbance and Loss of Roosting Habitat” has been modified as follows:

Surveys shall be conducted if implementation of program activities along the Sacramento River East Levee could result in disturbance of maternity roosting habitat. If vegetation removal or other disturbance is required during the pupping season, focused surveys for maternity roost sites shall be conducted by a qualified biologist before initiating such activities. If a special-status bat maternity roost is found, a qualified biologist shall identify appropriate measures to minimize adverse effects, and provide the proposed measures to CDFW for comment. Such measures are likely to include, but not be limited to, focusing construction activities that must be conducted during the pupping season to less-sensitive periods in the pupping cycle, implementing protective buffers around active maternity roosts, conducting worker awareness training, and periodic biological monitoring.

**SECTION 4.8  CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**Page 4.8-18**

Mitigation Measure CR-4 has been modified as follows:
Mitigation Measure CR-4: Stop Work If Archaeological Materials are Discovered during Construction, Assess Significance of the Materials, and Implement Appropriate Avoidance or Treatment Measures, if Warranted (for Impact CR-2, Possible Damage to or Destruction of Identified or Unidentified Archaeological Resources).

If archaeological materials are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the agency implementing the program component shall ensure that work is stopped within 100 feet of the find, and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to assess the significance of the find and develop appropriate treatment measures in cooperation with consulting parties, including culturally affiliated Native American Tribes if the find is a Native American archaeological site. Treatment measures typically include developing avoidance strategies or mitigating impacts through data recovery programs, such as excavation or detailed documentation, alternative mitigation, and, for sites of Native American origin, mitigation informed through tribal consultation. The appropriate treatment depends on the situation of the discovery and the views of consulting parties. Some Tribes consider data recovery programs to cause substantial adverse changes to unique historical, archaeological and tribal cultural resources; therefore, data recovery is not always the best option for mitigation.

The agencies implementing program components and their primary contractors for engineering design and construction shall ensure that the following measures are implemented to reduce the potential for previously undiscovered cultural resources to be encountered and damaged during construction activities:

- Before the commencement of construction, a qualified professional archaeologist and a tribal monitor or representative shall give a presentation to all construction personnel regarding the likelihood and type of Native American and non-Native American resources that might be found during construction operations associated with the individual flood control projects, and measures that shall be taken in the event that potential archaeological or historical resources are found during construction. The presentation shall include providing all construction personnel with standard operating procedures and points of contact in the event of a discovery of cultural material during construction. Consulting culturally affiliated Native American Tribes shall be provided with project schedule information and points of contact in the event of a discovery of cultural material.
- If unrecorded cultural resources (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, animal bone, bottle glass, ceramics, structure/building remains) are encountered during the site survey or during construction activity, all ground-disturbing activities shall be restricted within a 100-foot radius of the find or a distance determined by a qualified professional archaeologist in consultation with a tribal representative to be appropriate based on the potential for disturbance of additional cultural resource materials. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with a monitor or representative from a culturally affiliated Native American Tribe, shall identify the materials, determine their potential to meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource or a historical resource, and formulate appropriate measures for their treatment, which shall be implemented by the agency implementing the project. Potential treatment methods for significant and potentially significant resources may include, but would not be limited to, no action (i.e., resources determined not to be significant), avoidance of the resource through changes in construction methods or project design, implementation of protection and management measures, alternative mitigation (such as funding a cultural resources program or off-site cultural resources facility), and/or implementation of a program of testing and data recovery, in accordance with all applicable Federal and State requirements.

For unique archaeological resources and archaeological historical resources the preferred mitigation is preservation-in-place of as much of the resource as possible, where feasible, through project modification or protective measures. In some cases, archaeological data recovery can mitigate impacts that cannot be avoided.

**Timing:** During construction activities.
Responsibility: The agency(ies) implementing the program component.

Mitigation Measure CR-5 has been modified as follows:

**Mitigation Measure CR-5: Implement Procedures for Inventory and Evaluation of Tribal Cultural Resources and Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures to Avoid Significant Adverse Effects** (for Impact CR-3, Possible Damage to or Destruction of a Tribal Cultural Resource).

California Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area in which a program component is located may have expertise concerning their tribal cultural resources (California PRC Section 21080.3.1) and shall be consulted concerning the proposed project, the kind of environmental review required, tribal cultural resources that may be impacted, and measures to avoid or minimize impacts. In accordance with California PRC Sections 21084.3 (a) and (b) public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. If the implementing agency determines that the project may cause a substantial adverse change to a tribal cultural resource, and measures are not otherwise identified in the consultation process, the following are examples of mitigation measures that, if feasible, that may be considered to avoid or minimize significant adverse impacts:

1. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to, planning and 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.

2. Treating 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:
   a) Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
   b) Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
   c) Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

3. 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.

4. Protecting the resource.

As a part of the consultation, the parties may propose mitigation measures (as broadly defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15370), including, but not limited to, those recommended in Section 21084.3 (listed above), capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource. If the California Native American tribe requests consultation regarding alternatives to the project, recommended mitigation measures, or significant effects, the consultation shall include those topics. The consultation may include discussion concerning the type of environmental review necessary, the significance of tribal cultural resources, the significance of the project’s impacts on the tribal cultural resources, and, if necessary, project alternatives or the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation which may include a) avoiding the impact by not taking a certain action; b) minimizing impacts by limiting the action; c) rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or repairing the environment; d) reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; or e) compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments (CEQA Guidelines Section 15370).

Any information, including, but not limited to, the location, description, and use of the tribal cultural resources, that is submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review
process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public without the prior consent of the tribe that provided the information.

If the lead agency publishes any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process, that information shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. The confidential information, may, however, be exchanged between public agencies that have lawful jurisdiction over the preparation of the environmental document.

Timing: During project-specific environmental review.
Responsibility: The agency(ies) implementing the program component.

5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Page 5-1

The third sentence in the “Approach to Analysis” section includes an inaccurate reference to Section 5.2.3. This reference is corrected to refer to Section 5.2.2 for summaries of relevant planning documents.

Page 5-9

The third paragraph under “Air Quality,” includes an inaccurate reference to Mitigation Measure AIR-3. The reference is corrected to refer to Mitigation Measure AIR-2.

APPENDIX C SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Table C-3, “Impact Summary of the American River Common Features General Reevaluation Report Project Impacts” has been modified to reflect changes between the Draft and Final GRR EIS/EIRs. Revisions are shown on the following pages:
### Table C-3. Impact Summary of the American River Common Features General Reevaluation Report Project EIS/EIR Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Impact Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geological Resources</strong></td>
<td>Excavation of approximately 1 million cubic yards of borrow material could significantly impact geological resources by causing substantial soil erosion or the permanent loss of topsoil. Construction and earthmoving activities would result in temporary disturbance of soil during the construction period, and could expose these disturbed areas to substantial erosion during rain storms following construction, if not properly restored. However, with the implementation of avoidance and minimization measures, any potential impacts to geological resources from excavation of borrow sites and construction disturbance would be <strong>less than significant</strong>. There would be no seismic resources impacts. There would be minimal effects to geological resources associated with Operations and Maintenance activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td>Construction activities along the East Side Tributaries would be within the existing levee footprint. There would be a change in land use at Magpie Creek, with the exception of a vacant parcel that already floods during high water events and there would be no impact on land use from the acquisition of this land. Land use changes in borrow sites is not expected to be significant because these sites would be returned to their pre-borrow conditions or used for mitigation. Once the borrow locations and reclamation of the sites has been finalized, a determination will be made if additional NEPA/CEQA documentation is needed. This would occur only if the changes in land use are determined to be substantial, or if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns that have bearing on the proposed action or its impacts. The Parkway Plan clearly establishes both the importance and need to provide erosion protection measures within the Parkway; therefore, by proposing to construct these improvements, the ARCF GRR is consistent with these aspects of the Parkway Plan. Policy 4.16 of the Parkway Plan establishes that erosion control projects should be designed “to minimize damage to riparian vegetation and wildlife habitat, and should include a revegetation program that screens the project from public view, provides for a naturalistic appearance to the site, and restores affected habitat values”. The Corps is proposing a combination of bank protection measures and launchable rock trench measures to address the need for erosion protection. Each of these measures would involve the removal of riparian vegetation during construction, however the habitat removed under each measure provides different types of habitat values; in areas where bank protection is constructed, bank side habitat would be impacted and proposed mitigation measures would focus on replacing this habitat. In areas where launchable rock trench is constructed, upland habitat would be impacted and the proposed mitigation measures would focus on replacing this habitat type. As a result, the Corps would evaluate each stretch of levee on a site-specific basis during the design phase of the project, including potential site-specific effects and the site’s hydraulic conditions, in order to determine the appropriate measure to implement at each site. In selecting whether bank protection improvements and to a lesser extent launchable rock trench improvements along the American River should be deployed, the Corps will coordinate closely with the Sacramento County Department of Parks and Recreation, the National Park Service, the other Federal and State agencies responsible for managing the resources of the Parkway, and non-governmental stakeholders. In carrying out this effort, the Corps will coordinate through the formal and informal processes that have been created to facilitate management of the Parkway. Where erosion protection is needed to meet established flood risk reduction objectives, the selection of the method of protection will be based on a determination of which method would do the most to protect valuable Parkway land, fish and wildlife resources, and recreational facilities considering both the short term impacts of construction and the long term effects of any mitigation measures included in the design of the project. Mitigation for the lands converted from parkway land to flood control uses will be mitigated by paying fees to the County under the Habitat Restoration Program Fees (HRP) per the American River Parkway Plan Flood Control Policies. HRP funds are to be used for natural resource protection or enhancement as well as for land acquisition. This effect would be <strong>less than significant</strong> with mitigation. Construction of levee raises along the Sacramento River would require acquisition of private property along the landside of the Sacramento River in the Pocket and Little Pocket areas. Acquisition of private property would be required to allow for construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C-3. Impact Summary of the American River Common Features General Reevaluation Report Project EIS/EIR Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Impact Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hydrology and Hydraulics | Construction of levee remediation measures would combine construction of improvement measures while maintaining the present levee alignments in their existing location (fix in place) along the American River, the Sacramento River, NEMDC, Arcade Creek, Dry Creek, Robla Creek; and Magpie Creek. These landside fix-in-place only that do not change in-channel geometry or characteristics; therefore, these remediation measures would not substantially alter the erosion or siltation, increase the rate of surface runoff in a manner that would result in any flooding, effect stormwater drainage systems, or create additional sources of runoff. In addition, remediation measures would not alter flows from those expected under the future without project condition, there would be no significant change or effect on hydraulics. As a result, effects on hydrology and hydraulics would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required. Widening the Sacramento Bypass would allow more water to flow into the bypass that would then flow into the Yolo Bypass. This would lower the water surface elevation downstream of the confluence with the American River and subsequently reduce the need for levee raising along the Sacramento River in the Pocket area. The widened portion of the weir will only be operated when flood releases from Folsom Dam are above the existing objective release of 115,000 cfs which would occur during flood events greater than 1/100 annual chance of exceedance (ACE) event. For flood events greater than 1/100 ACE event when releases from Folsom Dam would go above 115,000 cfs, because of the additional flood storage provided by anticipated operation and physical improvements to Folsom Dam coupled with the widened Sacramento Weir and Bypass, the net effect would be to slightly decrease the peak compared to the existing peak flow in the Yolo Bypass. Although widening of the Sacramento Weir and Bypass would result in the creation of a new drainage area within the Sacramento Bypass, the area would be contained within the levee system and would not result in substantial additional erosion, siltation, or runoff. The expanded bypass would not create or contribute flows in excess of the existing capacity of the system. No housing would be permitted within the new flood hazard area, and no structures would be permitted that would impede or redirect flows within this area. As...
### Table C-3. Impact Summary of the American River Common Features General Reevaluation Report Project EIS/EIR Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Impact Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a result, effects to hydrology and hydraulics from widening of the Sacramento Weir and Bypass would be <strong>less than significant</strong>, and no mitigation would be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Water Quality and Groundwater Resources| No groundwater contamination would be expected due to construction of the proposed slurry cutoff walls and other improvements proposed for the levees within the study area. Within the American River, the installation of the rock trench would not have an impact on water quality because the trench would be located outside of the river natural channel and no in-water work would occur. However, because work would occur on the waterside of the levee there is a potential for spills from construction operations. Where bank protection construction is proposed within the American River, revetment would be placed along the river bank to prevent erosion. The placement of revetment along the river banks would temporarily generate increased turbidity in the immediate vicinity of the construction area. Additionally, placement of revetment in the water could result in a sediment plume, generated from the channel bottom and levee side, becoming suspended in the water and could generate turbidity levels above those identified as acceptable by the Basin Plan. Turbidity effects from landside construction (e.g., vehicle, staging, placement of construction equipment) would be limited to stormwater runoff carrying loose soil from staging areas and construction vehicle access areas. Best management practices identified as part of the avoidance and minimization measures would be implemented to reduce the effect of runoff into the stormwater system to **less than significant**. As rock revetment is placed in the open water, **significant** indirect effects would result as the sediment and turbidity plume would drift further downstream and later affect the water quality in those areas found further downstream of the project area. Implementing the avoidance and minimization measures, impacts could be reduced to **less than significant**. Within the Sacramento River, there could be significant affects to water quality due to increased turbidity during construction. The use of barges to install the revetment could cause additional turbidity as the barge moves into the site and anchors. This is considered a **significant** affect to water quality during construction. Avoidance and minimization measures include a turbidity monitoring program. As part of a turbidity monitoring program the contractor would monitor turbidity in the adjacent water bodies, where applicable criteria apply, to determine whether turbidity is being affected by construction and to ensure that construction does not result in a rise in turbidity levels above ambient conditions, in accordance with the Central Valley RWQCB Basin Plan turbidity objectives. The monitoring program would be coordinated with the Central Valley RWQCB prior to construction, and would be implemented by the construction contractor. The contractor would be required to use BMPs to prevent runoff from all construction areas. In addition, environmental commitments included in the project to reduce the potential for impacts to water quality include: preparation of the SWPPP, Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan (SPCCP), and a bentonite slurry spill contingency plan (BSSCP). Within the East Side Tributaries, the installation of the slurry walls along these creeks would be done from the top of the levees and no in-water work would occur. BMPs would be implemented to prevent runoff from the construction site into drainage systems. Staging areas would be designed and located in areas to prevent potential runoff into waterways. Because no in-water work would occur and there is a very low risk of discharge into waterways, this alternative would have a **less than significant** effect on water quality. Construction of the new north levee associated with the Sacramento Bypass Weir would occur when water is not flowing through the bypass, and therefore there would be **no impacts** to water quality during construction of the new north levee of the bypass. There is a potential for water quality impacts to occur if the weir is constructed in a way that debris or other construction materials could enter the Sacramento River. However, it is likely that the weir could be constructed behind the existing levee, which would result in **no impacts** to water quality. During construction, the widened bypass area would be graded to ensure that there is positive drainage during flows and...
Table C-3. Impact Summary of the American River Common Features General Reevaluation Report Project EIS/EIR Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Impact Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td>For the American River, the construction of the launchable rock trenches would result in the removal of 65 acres of riparian habitat within the American River Parkway. Trees would be removed as the trench is constructed over the course of multiple years. Construction would likely occur from May through October when birds are likely to be nesting. If nesting birds are located adjacent to the project area, coordination with the resource agencies would occur. Compensation measures are based on the largest potential footprint and worst case scenario for the purposes of compliance with NEPA. If design refinements are made that result in reduced impacts to vegetation, compensation would be coordinated with the appropriate resource agencies and adjusted accordingly. To compensate for the removal of 65 acres of riparian habitat within the American River, approximately 130 acres of replacement habitat would be created. To comply with the American Parkway Plan, lands within the Parkway would be evaluated for compensation opportunities. Any trees planted would take many years to mature to the level where they provide the same value as those removed. Because there would be many years between when the trees are planted and when they mature to a value of those removed, this short term impact is considered significant for the temporal loss of riparian habitat. However, with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the long-term impact would be less than significant, once newly planted vegetation is established. In addition to the 65 acres of riparian habitat, construction would occur on an additional 135 acres of ruderal herbaceous habitats within the Parkway. These additional 135 acres are primarily the levees, patrol roads, and open lands with no trees. These disturbed areas would be restored following construction and would be reseeded with native grasses. As a result, the impacts to these areas would be less than significant, with mitigation. Additionally, there is approximately 0.5 acre of wetland that could be removed with implementation of erosion control. If the wetlands are removed for project construction, then appropriate compensation would occur through the purchase of credits at an approved mitigation bank. With the implementation of this mitigation, effects to wetlands would be less than significant. For the Sacramento River, The maximum degraded area (the upper one half of the levee) is approximately 110 acres and contains about 750 trees of various sizes and species. As the levee is degraded, all vegetation located in the degraded area would be removed. On the landside of the levee, where levee raises are required, all trees would be removed from the levee slope and within 15 feet of the levee toe to construct the levee raise. The removal of these trees is considered significant, because it would take many years for the replacement trees to establish to the value of those removed. Degrading the levee will include removal of all vegetation on the upper half of the landside slope. Because this area is very urbanized, the primary effects to wildlife would be to avian species. If nesting birds are located adjacent to the project area, coordination with the resource agencies would occur. Effects to vegetation and wildlife would be potentially significant due to the temporal loss of vegetation in the area during the growth and development period of the mitigation sites. Within the Sacramento River, a vegetation variance would be obtained to reduce the impacts to vegetation and wildlife. This would allow most of the trees on the lower one half of the waterside slope to remain in place. Within the East Side Tributaries, off-site mitigation would be for the removal of 50 trees in the Arcade Creek area. Furthermore, a total of 20 acres would be needed to compensate for the removal of the vegetation along the Sacramento River and within the new weir footprint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are approximately 8 acres of riparian vegetation, and 1,500 feet of linear feet of vegetation that would be removed to construct the weir structure. A total of 20 acres would be needed to compensate for the removal of the vegetation along the Sacramento River and within the new weir footprint. Although replacement trees would be planted off-site to compensate for the removal of 8 acres, the newly planted vegetation will take many years to mature to an equal value of those removed. Because the plantings would take a long time to provide the same value of habitat as those removed this impact would be significant on vegetation and wildlife. Any trees planted would take many years to mature to the level when they provide the same value as those removed. Because there would be many years between when the trees are planted and when they mature to a value of those removed, this impact is considered significant for the temporal loss of riparian habitat and cannot be mitigated to less than significant.

Within the East Side Tributaries, there would be a maximum of 200 trees removed from both the landside and waterside to construct the project. This would result in a temporary impact to approximately 4 acres of grasses along the creek channel and levee slopes. Once construction is complete the area would be planted with native grass seed mix to prevent erosion and replace the grasses removed for construction. The grasslands are likely to grow back in a single season, therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

Impacts from the construction of the Sacramento Weir and Bypass would expand existing habitat by about 300 acres. No grading or altering of the lands within the existing bypass will occur. There is a potential for additional wetlands to develop in the additional 300 acres since this land will no longer be farmed. The conversion of this land back to its natural state would have benefits to other wildlife and could become an expansion of the Sacramento Bypass Wildlife Refuge. Construction activities would likely cause any wildlife within the bypass and adjacent areas to relocate to nearby rural lands and away from human activities. Once construction is complete the wildlife is expected to return to the area. Therefore, the impacts to wildlife in the Sacramento Bypass would be less than significant.

Within the American River, rock placement would most likely disturb the native resident fish by increasing noise, water turbulence, and turbidity, causing them to move away from the area of placement. In some places, pelagic native juvenile species utilizing the near shore habitat for cover, moving away from that cover could put them at a slight risk of predation. Native benthic species would not be affected due to their location away from the levee slope where revetment placement would take place. Construction during the project may disturb soils and the nearshore environment, leading to increases in sediment in the nearshore aquatic habitat. This in turn may increase sedimentation (i.e., deposition of sediment on the substrate), suspended sediments, and turbidity. Increases in suspended solids and turbidity will generally be short-term in nature. The natural bank element of SRA would be lost with the placement of rock along the levee slope. Over time sediment would settle into the rock voids and provide similar substrate characteristics as a natural bank. Direct effects are less than significant to resident native fish species because it was determined that existing conditions would not be worsened by project construction which includes the creation of planting berms to provide shade and instream woody material elements of SRA habitat. Construction of a launchable rock filled trenches would be constructed outside of the natural river channel with no significant direct effects to native fish species. No impact would occur. The direct effects would not result in a substantial reduction in population abundance, movement, and distribution. Indirect effects were not considered significant to resident native fish species because it was determined that existing conditions would not be worsened by project construction, and would not result in a substantial reduction in population abundance, movement, and distribution. Indirect effects would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of BMPs.

Direct effects on the Sacramento River in relation to rock placement would be the same as described above for the American River. Work in along the Sacramento River involves construction of cutoff walls to address seepage and stability measures and levee raises for overtopping measures. These measures would be constructed outside of the natural river channel with no direct effects to native fish species. Indirect effects were not considered significant to resident native fish species because it was determined that existing conditions would not be worsened by project construction which includes the creation of planting berms to provide shade and instream woody material elements of SRA habitat. Construction of a launchable rock filled trenches would be constructed outside of the natural river channel with no significant direct effects to native fish species. No impact would occur. The direct effects would not result in a substantial reduction in population abundance, movement, and distribution. Indirect effects were not considered significant to resident native fish species because it was determined that existing conditions would not be worsened by project construction, and would not result in a substantial reduction in population abundance, movement, and distribution. Indirect effects would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of BMPs.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>material elements of SRA habitat. Program actions along the Sacramento River would require ground-disturbing activities that potentially cause erosion and soil disturbance, subsequently resulting in sediment transport and delivery to aquatic habitats. Increases in sedimentation and turbidity have been shown to affect fish physiology, behavior, and habitat. An increase in sedimentation and turbidity could occur in adjacent water bodies during earth-moving activities and could be considered significant. Indirect effects would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of BMPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of cutoff walls and flood control structures within the East Side Tributaries would take place above the waterline which would not have significant direct effects. Due to SRA habitat located on the lower portion of NEMDC below Arcade Creek and between Norwood Avenue and the Sacramento Northern Bike Trail, there would be significant direct effects by reducing the available areas for shade and possible food sources available to the existing native and nonnative fish species present in the study area. Indirect effects to loss of SRA habitat would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of compensation for the loss of vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program actions along the East Side Tributaries would require ground-disturbing activities that potentially cause erosion and soil disturbance, subsequently resulting in sediment transport and delivery to aquatic habitats. An increase in sedimentation and turbidity could occur in adjacent water bodies during earth-moving activities and could be considered significant. Indirect effects would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of BMPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed construction in the Sacramento Bypass would take place during the dry season when no water would be flowing through the project area from the Sacramento River. There would be no significant direct effects to native fish populations because they would not be present in the construction footprint during the proposed construction. By widening the Sacramento Weir and Bypass, the project would create additional floodplain habitat, which could benefit native fish consistent with the results of the Knaggs Ranch Study. The increase of floodplain habitat could increase opportunities for successful rearing and feeding during seasonal flooding. As a result, indirect effects of the Sacramento Bypass and Weir widening for native fish species would be considered a benefit to the species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Status Species</td>
<td>Direct effects to valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB) may occur if elderberry shrubs are incidentally damaged by construction personnel or equipment. Temporal loss of habitat may occur due to transplantation of elderberry shrubs. Potential impacts due to damage or transplantation include direct mortality of beetles and/or disruption of their lifecycle. Although compensation measures include restoration and creation of habitat, mitigation plantings would likely require one or more years to become large enough to provide supporting habitat. As a result, under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the ARCF GRR is likely to adversely affect the VELB. With the implementation of the avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, including replacement of habitat for species either on-site or in close proximity to last habitat, impacts to VELB would be less than significant, including for operation and maintenance activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effects to giant garter snake (GGS) under the ARCF GRR would result from construction activities along the East Side Tributaries (NEMDC, Dry/Robla, Magpie, &amp; Arcade Creeks). If GGS are determined to be present, there would be a potential for short-term effects to GGS upland habitat during construction. Construction activities could disturb GGS due to vibration, noise, and dust. Furthermore, equipment could possibility harm or kill a snake if the snakes are present in the burrows along the levee slopes of the NEMDC. With the implementation of the avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, including replacement of habitat for species either on-site or in close proximity to last habitat, impacts to GGS would be reduced to less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Area</td>
<td>Impact Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is estimated that approximately 71 acres of riparian habitat used by Swainson’s hawk for roosting and nesting could be affected by project construction. Additionally, approximately 2.5 acres of non-native grassland intermixed with barren ground would be removed or disturbed as a result of construction activities at levees. Much of this habitat is within the Sacramento urban area, where Swainson’s hawks nest and forage along the American and Sacramento Rivers. If any hawks are found, coordination with the resource agencies would occur and appropriate avoidance and minimization measures would be established prior to the start of construction. With the implementation of the avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, including replacement of habitat for species either on-site or in close proximity to last habitat, impacts to Swainson’s hawk would be reduced to <strong>less than significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts to western yellow-billed cuckoo, burrowing owl, white-tailed kite, and purple martin would be <strong>less than significant</strong> with mitigation, due to the timing of construction activities and limited long-term habitat effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction activities are not likely to affect winter-run adults Chinook salmon because construction will avoid the primary migration period (December through July), will be restricted to the channel edge, and will include implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures. Therefore, no construction-related effects on winter-run Chinook salmon spawning or spawning habitat will occur. With the implementation of the avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, including replacement of habitat for species either on-site or in close proximity to last habitat, impacts to winter-run Chinook salmon would be reduced to <strong>less than significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of the bank erosion protection measures may result in adverse effects to juvenile and smolt winter-run chinook salmon, their critical habitat, and EFH. Construction activities that increase noise, turbidity, and suspended sediment may disrupt feeding or temporarily displace fish from preferred habitat. Rearing or outmigrating salmon may not be able to readily move away from nearshore areas that are directly affected by construction activities such as placement of rock revetment; these effects could result in stress, injury, or mortality. Restricting in-water activities to the August 1 through November 30 work window (beginning on July 1 for sites upstream of RM 60) and implementing the avoidance and minimization measures will minimize, but not avoid, potential construction-related effects on juveniles and smolts. Construction would result in <strong>less than significant</strong> effects to winter-run Chinook salmon, and their critical habitat, with the implementation of mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The potential for construction-related ARCF GRR project effects on spring-run Chinook salmon will be similar to those described for winter-run Chinook salmon. With implementation of the avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, impacts to spring-run Chinook salmon would be reduced to <strong>less than significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction activities that increase noise, turbidity, and suspended sediment may disrupt adult passage of the Central Valley fall-/late fall-run Chinook salmon through the study area and may displace these fish as a result of effects on their preferred habitat and spawning habitat. However, because construction activities will be restricted to the channel edge and will include implementing avoidance and minimization measures, adverse effects on habitat will be minimized to below the significance thresholds. The project could represent a long-term loss of a small amount of potential spawning habitat because repairs will require covering bottom substrates with revetment. In general, it is expected that channel areas immediately adjacent to erosion sites do not support spawning riffles. With implementation of the avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, impacts to the Central Valley fall-late fall-run Chinook salmon would be reduced to <strong>less than significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The potential for construction-related effects on migrating adult Central Valley steelhead would be similar to that described above for adult winter-run Chinook salmon. Construction-related activities may affect but are not likely to adversely affect adult migration. With implementation of the avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, impacts to Central Valley steelhead would be reduced to <strong>less than significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>The potential for construction-related effects on Central Valley steelhead juveniles and smolts and their habitat will therefore be similar to that described above for winter-run Chinook salmon. With implementation of the avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, impacts to Central Valley steelhead would be reduced to <strong>less than significant</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction-related effects on delta smelt include disruption of spawning activities, disturbance or mortality of eggs and newly hatched larvae, and alteration of spawning and incubation habitat. As a result, potential construction-related effects to delta smelt physical habitat would include disruption of spawning activities, disturbance or mortality of eggs and newly hatched larvae, alteration of spawning and incubation habitat, and loss of shallow water habitat for spawning. Juvenile delta smelt may be subject to disturbance or displacement caused by construction activities that increase noise, turbidity, and suspended sediment. Incidental take of delta smelt may occur from direct mortality or injury during a construction activity, or by the impairment of essential behavior patterns (i.e., feeding, escape from predators). In addition, physiological impairment could be caused by toxic substances (i.e., gasoline, lubricants, oil) entering the water. Construction related effects on delta smelt rearing and migration will be minimized by restricting in-water construction activities on the Sacramento River to the August 1 through November 30 work window, thereby avoiding the seasons when these life stages are most likely to occur. Due to the potential impacts during construction, the delta smelt may be adversely affected during construction under Section 7 of the ESA. However, with the implementation of appropriate mitigation and compensation measures, these impacts would be <strong>less than significant</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction activities during July may have adverse impacts on any adult green sturgeon that are still migrating upstream. Because construction activities will largely avoid the peak migration period, will be restricted to the channel edge, and will implement the avoidance and minimization measures, adverse effects will be minimized. If larvae or juveniles are present during construction, in-water activities could result in localized displacement and possible injury or mortality to individuals that do not readily move away from the channel or nearshore areas. Project actions associated with bank protection measures may increase sediment, silt, and pollutants, which could adversely affect rearing habitat or reduce food production, such as aquatic invertebrates, for larval and juvenile green sturgeon. The direct and indirect effects to green sturgeon would be <strong>less than significant</strong> with mitigation because large trees which provide SRA habitat would remain on the levees by obtaining a vegetation variance. Additionally, planting berms at revetment areas would create additional habitat once the mitigation sites are established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is approximately 1 acre of land within the construction footprint of the new levee and floodwall that could potentially include vernal pool habitat. This 1 acre could be adversely affected from ground disturbing activities, operation of construction vehicles, or by construction of the new levee and maintenance road. Indirectly, acquisition of this property would allow for the protection of the vernal pool habitat on this land, and the maintenance of the land to allow for vernal pools to thrive. As a result, creation of the flood basin would have positive impacts to the vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp by allowing for long-term protection of vernal pool habitat. As a result, it is anticipated that effects to vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp would be <strong>less than significant</strong> with the implementation of the mitigation measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A maximum of 375 acres of rice fields would be permanently removed from production and incorporated into the Sacramento Bypass. The additional land would become open space and would likely become similar riparian and wetland habitat supporting listed wildlife and fish (when there is water in it) as the existing vegetation in the Bypass. While the loss of rice fields and shortening the existing irrigation canals has a short term negative effect on GGS, the conversion of this land back to its natural state would have long term...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Benefits</td>
<td>Ecological benefits to the GGS and other wildlife and could become an expansion of the Sacramento Bypass Wildlife Refuge. The expansion of the Sacramento Weir and Bypass could have a positive beneficial effect on special status wildlife such as the giant garter snake and its riparian vegetation once construction is complete and lands are converted from farming activities to open space where wetlands and shrubby riparian habitat is expected to naturally regenerate with the increased area that is periodically inundated from flooding during the rainy season. As a result, impacts to GGS associated with the bypass widening would be less than significant, with the implementation of mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Within the Sacramento River, impacts could be incurred to prehistoric sites located under or near the levees that may be disturbed by construction of the cutoff walls, measures to correct the levee geometry, and installation of bank protection. Other affects to historic properties may result from disturbance of cultural resources sites due to the construction of access ramps and possibly removal of structures due to the acquisition of properties for levee construction, inspection, maintenance, monitoring, and flood-fighting access. Within the East Side Tributaries, proposed activities that would occur within the APE for these levee improvements includes construction of cutoff walls, correction of the levee geometry, installation of floodwalls (NEMDC), installation of a conduit or box culvert, installation of geotextile material and a floodwall, correction of the levee geometry (Arcade Creek), raising of a floodwall, correction of the levee geometry (Dry and Robla Creeks), raising of the existing levee, construction of maintenance roads, installation of floodgates, construction of a box culvert, and creation of a detention basin (Magpie Creek Diversion Canal). The effects of the activities described above for the East Side Tributaries would likely result in an adverse effect to some historic properties located within the APE for the East Side Tributaries. The effects of implementation of the ACRF GRR would likely result in an adverse effect to some historic properties located within the area of potential effects (APE) for the project. Adverse effects to historic properties are considered significant. The Sacramento Bypass has not been previously inventoried for cultural resources, however the Sacramento Weir has been previously recommended as eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Although specific design refinements for the widening of the weir are not complete, modifications to the weir may result in an adverse effect to the Sacramento Weir, which could result in a significant effect. For purposes of NHPA compliance, the specific individual determinations of effect for historic properties that may be affected would be completed under the stipulations of the Programmatic Agreement (PA), which include a framework to identify historic properties, evaluate NRHP eligibility, and assess effects. The significant effects to cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant by implementing stipulations in the PA intended to resolve adverse effects to historic properties through development of a Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) and potential development of HPTPs. However, effects to cultural resources under CEQA would remain significant and unavoidable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Circulation</td>
<td>Along the American River, Haul trucks would increase traffic on major surface streets such as Watt Avenue, Fair Oaks Boulevard, Howe Avenue, Folsom Boulevard. Overall, project construction would result in a substantial temporary and short-term increase in traffic on local roadways, and these temporary and short-term impacts are considered significant. The increased traffic in the Parkway would result in impacts to recreational users and residents who back up to the levee structure. Those that use the bike path in the Parkway as a commuter route would also be impacted during construction. Outside of the Parkway, hauling on residential roads to access the Parkway would result in significant impacts to residents along the selected routes. For work along the Sacramento River, haul trucks would increase traffic on major surface streets such as Pocket Road, Freeport Boulevard, and Riverside Boulevard. Overall, project construction would result in a substantial temporary and short-term increase in traffic on local roadways, and these temporary and short-term impacts are considered significant. For work within the East Side Tributaries, haul trucks would increase traffic on major surface streets such as Marysville Boulevard and Raley Boulevard. There are many smaller surface streets that will also be used to transport the material to the construction sites. Overall,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project construction would result in a substantial temporary and short-term increase in traffic on local roadways, and these temporary and short-term impacts are considered <strong>significant</strong>. There are many smaller surface streets that will also be used to transport the material to the construction sites. Additionally, the Sacramento Weir and Bypass expansion would require fill material to construct the new levee. Hauling would occur on existing roads in the rural area of Yolo County. Impacts to traffic would be short-term and <strong>significant</strong> until construction is completed. Once completed traffic would return to the pre-project conditions. Where rock berms are constructed, to reduce the risk of erosion, the rock material would be transported from a commercial rock quarry by either barge or haul trucks. The barges are not expected to have a significant impact on traffic as the Sacramento River is not a major transportation corridor for goods. The primary traffic on the Sacramento River is recreational boaters and they would be able to maneuver around any barges transporting materials to the construction site. Transporting rock using barges would have a <strong>less than significant</strong> impact on traffic. The Yolo Shortline Railroad could be temporarily closed and the trains rerouted during construction of Yolo Bypass construction. Construction would not require any closures of the UPRR line adjacent to the NEMDC levee; however, construction vehicles and haul trucks would cross the tracks at access points, which would be coordinated with UPRR prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Annual construction emissions under the truck delivery scenario would not exceed the General Conformity threshold for nitrogen oxides (NOx) in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). This would result in a <strong>less than significant</strong> effect. However, the annual construction emissions for the barge delivery scenario would exceed the General Conformity threshold for NOx, resulting in a <strong>significant</strong> adverse effect. With the implementation of the Enhance Exhaust Control Practices for off-road equipment and only using on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks or equipment that comply with EPA on-road emission standards, annual construction emissions would be reduced to below <em>de minimis</em> thresholds. Therefore, this direct effect would be reduced to a <strong>less-than-significant</strong> level. After implementation of mitigation measures to reduce NOx by 20 percent, construction emissions would still exceed SMAQMD thresholds. Therefore implementation of the ARCF GRR would result in a <strong>significant</strong> effect. The USACE would be required to pay an off-site mitigation fee for NOx emissions in the SVAB. With the implementation of this mitigation measures, NOx emissions would be reduced to a <strong>less-than-significant</strong> level. Nearby land uses, especially those residences located downwind of the project sites, could be exposed to dust generated during construction activities, indirectly resulting in potential adverse health effects. This indirect effect would be <strong>significant</strong>. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce the impact from dust emissions during construction to a <strong>less-than-significant</strong> level. Nearby land uses, especially those residences located downwind of the project sites could be exposed to DPM generated during construction activities, indirectly resulting in potential adverse health effects. However, construction activities along each segment are not expected to take place for more than 180 days at each reach, which is well below the 70-year exposure period often assumed in chronic health risk assessment. Moreover, construction activities would occur linearly along the segment alignment and would not occur over a prolonged period in any one general location and all off-road diesel equipment would comply with CARB regulations regarding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consecutive idling. In addition, implementation of mitigation measures, which is required under other air quality effects, would further reduce exhaust emissions during construction to a less-than-significant level. Odors associated with diesel exhaust emissions from onsite construction equipment in the SVAB may be noticeable from time to time by adjacent receptors. Therefore, this direct effect would be less than significant. In addition, implementation of mitigation measures, which are required under other air quality effects, would further reduce exhaust emissions and provide advance notification of construction activities. Construction of the Sacramento Weir and Bypass Widening would occur in the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) and include clearing of trees and vegetation, degrading and excavating the levee, construction of the new levee, relocation of utilities, and delivery and installation of rip-rap on the waterside slope. Construction of the Sacramento Weir and Bypass would reduce the need for levee raises along the Sacramento River. Some emissions from the project would exceed applicable CEQA and NEPA significance criteria. Therefore, USACE would implement mitigation measures to reduce the potential air quality effects of the project to a less than significant level. The SMAQMD requires construction projects to implement basic construction emission control practices to control fugitive dust and diesel exhaust emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While the truck delivery scenario would generate slightly more greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions relative to the barge delivery scenario, emissions would be well below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD’s) GHG threshold. Construction-related GHG emissions are not anticipated to indirectly contribute to climate change; this indirect effect is considered less than significant. Implementation of mitigation measures would further reduce this effect. The ACRF GRR would not directly conflict with or obstruct the implementation of applicable GHG emission reduction plans. This indirect effect is less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Construction-related activities associated with the ARCF GRR would generate temporary, short-term, and intermittent noise at or near noise sensitive receptors in and around the study area due to construction activities associated with the proposed levee repairs. Erosion protection construction activities in the American River Parkway could result in temporary significant impacts on residents, recreationists, and other noise sensitive groups. There is the potential for significant effects to sensitive receptors that are 500 feet or less from the construction site. Noise effects to sensitive receptors would be significant during construction of the Sacramento River levee improvements. Effects associated with the erosion protection work on the Sacramento River would be consistent with those described for the American River above. Noise effects would include construction work associated with the slope stability, seepage, erosion, and height improvements for the Sacramento River levees, including the construction of a slurry wall and levee raise. During construction, noise-reducing measures would be employed in order to ensure that construction noise complies with local ordinances. Prior to the start of construction, a noise control plan would be prepared that would identify feasible measures to reduce construction noise, when necessary. Mitigation measures would reduce these noise levels to less than significant. The majority of the features proposed for the East Side Tributaries’ levees would have similar noise effects to those described under the Sacramento River above and would be significant. However, construction of floodwall feature in the East Side Tributary would not increase noise levels beyond that of the additional levee features proposed for this reach. For construction related to the Sacramento bypass and weir, noise would be generated from construction equipment and activities, however in this case the study area is primarily rural.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Along the American River, portions of the road on top of the levee would be closed to pedestrian access during the construction period. Additionally, construction of the launchable rock trench would disturb several miles of bike trails as well as access to public parks and boat launches within or adjacent to the Parkway. Such closures and disturbances would result in non-compliance with the American River Parkway Plan which states that flood control berms, levees and other facilities should be, to the extent consistent with proper operation and maintenance of these facilities, open to the public for approved uses, such as hiking, biking and other recreational activities. These closures and disturbances would also result in non-compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Recreational resources that could potentially be affected by construction of the erosion protection measures include Paradise Beach, the Campus Commons Golf Course, the Guy West Bridge, and the boat launches at Howe Avenue, Watt Avenue, and Gristmill Park. Construction vehicles would be present in staging areas at various points along the Parkway and construction activities could result in potential disruptions/detours not only of bike trails, but of hiking trails and equestrian trails as well. The access roads in and out of the Parkway at various locations would be used as haul routes for trucks transporting borrow material resulting in increased traffic along the entry routes used by recreationists. Proximity to construction equipment and activities may also degrade recreational experiences, due to noise, visual effects, smells, and air quality. This would be a <strong>significant</strong> effect on recreation activities during construction. To ensure public safety, flaggers, warning signs, and signs restricting access would be posted before and during construction, as necessary. In the event that bike trails would be disrupted, detours would be provided. Detour routes would be clearly marked, and fences would be erected in order to prevent access to the project area. In areas where recreational traffic intersects with construction vehicles, traffic control will be utilized in order to maintain public safety. The public will have continued access to the Parkway and recreation facilities during construction, but bike and running trail users would likely be required to detour onto public roads or alternative trails. If any access point needs to be closed during construction, notices will be posted providing alternative access routes. These mitigation measures will reduce the effects on recreation; however, impacts would still be <strong>significant</strong> because of the duration of construction and the inability to provide similar quality recreation during construction. Any recreation facilities affected by the project would be replaced in-kind within the existing area and no long-term impacts are anticipated. Mitigation measures would be implemented to keep the public informed of construction activities to mitigate for effects to bike trail/recreation trail access. Coordination with recreation user groups would occur prior to and during construction for input into mitigation measures that would reduce affects to the maximum extent practicable. Advance notice would be given to recreation users informing them of anticipated activities and detours to reduce the affects. Mitigation measures would be implemented in order to reduce impacts on recreation; however, even with mitigation measures, effects to recreation during construction would be <strong>significant</strong>. Because the construction would be occurring for several years and would take away the overall pleasure of recreation activities, there would be a <strong>significant</strong> effect that cannot be mitigated. While bike trails, running paths, boat ramps, and equestrian trails can all is rerouted or accessible a short distance away, there would still be an overall reduction in the recreation quality with continuous construction over a 10 year period and, therefore, would result in a significant effect. Construction will also occur during the summer months when the Parkway recreation activities are at the peak. The timing of construction cannot be mitigated as it is unsafe to perform construction activities in the floodway during the flood season. Once construction is complete the recreation facilities would be returned to the pre-construction conditions and long term effects would be <strong>less than significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Construction of levee improvements would have potential short-term effects to recreation along the Sacramento River. There would be short-term term **significant** effects along the Sacramento River reach of the project, however, there would be no long-term effects because the area would be returned to the pre-construction conditions once completed.

Construction of levee improvements within the East Side Tributaries would have minimal effect on recreation uses, except for the levee trail, which is sometimes used as a walking path or for cycling. Since there are very few recreation uses in these areas, any effects to recreation would be temporary and **less than significant**.

Construction of levee improvements associated with the Sacramento Weir and Bypass widening would have possible short-term effects on recreational use. During construction, certain areas would be closed to the public while other areas might be used as haul routes or borrow/disposal sites. Activities such as bird watching, walking, running, and jogging along the Sacramento Bypass levee crown and nearby roads would be restricted. Construction activities would have a **significant** effect on the Yolo Shortline Railroad as portions of the railway may have to be shut down or relocated during construction activities.

Construction would occur on approximately 11 of the 26 miles of the American River Parkway, a construction area of nearly 200 acres. This would create a reduction in the visual quality of the Parkway. While this is considered a short-term impact, with the number of construction vehicles required and the construction timeframe extending for 10 years, this is considered a **significant** effect to the visual tranquility of the Parkway. Significant effects to visual resources during construction cannot be avoided and cannot be mitigated.

Construction equipment would need to be moving within the Parkway during construction activities to access sites and transport materials. Once construction is complete vehicles movement in the Parkway would return to the pre-project conditions. The short term effects will be **significant**, however, the planting of trees will reduce the effects to visual resources to **less than significant** once the trees are established and provide similar views as those removed.

The loss of riparian vegetation from the construction of the launchable rock trenches would have a long term impact on the visual resources in the Parkway. This is considered a **significant** effect to visual resources and cannot be mitigated.

During construction of the bank protection sites along the American River, activities in the Parkway would be similar to those for the rock trench. Construction vehicles would be moving throughout the Parkway transporting materials to the sites. The footprint for the bank protection sites would be adjacent to the river channel, varying distances from the public access areas. Visual effects at bank protection sites are considered to be **less than significant** because the sites would quickly revegetate and provide a natural looking environment similar or enhanced from existing conditions.

Construction activities along the Sacramento River would require the hauling of equipment and materials to the sites. There would be large construction equipment on barges and on top of the levee during construction of the levee improvements. Boaters and pedestrians would be able to see the construction equipment and activities. Residents that back up to the levee would also see the construction activities from their backyard and windows. Implementation of the ACRF GRR would require the removal of some vegetation and landscaping from private property in areas where levee raising is recommended. This would have a long term effect on those individual residents as the levee and maintenance corridor would replace portions of their landscaped backyard. This would be a **significant** effect to the individual homeowners because it would decrease the existing visual character of the backyards. Significant effects to visual resources during construction cannot be avoided and cannot be mitigated. Construction equipment would need to be moving along the levee and within the river during construction activities to access sites and transport materials. Once construction is complete vehicle and barge movement would return to the pre-project conditions. To mitigate the removal of understory vegetation, planting berms will be installed and planted with vegetation to provide a similar visual appearance as before construction. By constructing the planting berms and installing vegetation the long term effects to visual resources will be reduced to **less than significant**.
<table>
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<td>Construction of the bank protection would be visible from the river and the levee. While construction is taking place, people would have a visual disturbance compared to the existing conditions. The visual effects would be short-term and, vegetation planted along the bank would cover the rock and provide natural habitat within 3 to 5 years. Large trees would also remain in place, which would reduce the effects to visual resources. Effects to visual resources are short-term and are considered <em>less than significant</em>. Construction equipment would use the levee roads and ramps to access each area of construction for the East Side Tributaries. Residents would view the equipment during construction activities, however, this would last only one construction season and once complete the area would return to the pre-construction conditions. Levee modifications along the NEMDC, Dry/Robla, and Magpie Creeks would not <em>significantly</em> alter the visual environment in these areas. Levee improvements, and specifically levee raises along Arcade Creek would require the acquisition of residential private property. Most of the properties in this area have minimal or no backyard landscaping and there is no vegetation on the levee slopes, therefore, overall the visual effects in this area would be <em>less than significant</em>. However, there are a few residents that have landscaping which would need to be removed. This would result in an affect to that individual resident; however, because overall there are limited residents that have landscaping this effect would be considered <em>less than significant</em>. Furthermore, Construction on the levees would move laterally so most people would experience activities near their residences for one construction season. These effects are considered to be short term and <em>less than significant</em>. Activities at borrow sites would consist of large excavation equipment removing soil to extract suitable material and transporting the material to the levee construction sites. Activities at borrow sites would consist of large excavation equipment removing soil to extract suitable material and transporting the material to the levee construction sites. No mitigation would be required for borrow sites. Expansion of the Sacramento Weir and Bypass would include the removal of the existing north levee and contouring of land within the expanded bypass. This requires the use of large construction equipment to remove and rebuild the levee. Large equipment moving throughout this area would be a change from the natural environment that currently exists. This would be a short-term impact and once construction is complete the area would become a natural floodway. Since this is not a populated area, this impact is considered <em>less than significant</em>. Construction of the weir would have some visual effects as the concrete weir is formed and poured. This would also require the relocation of the River Road and rail road on top of the weir. This impact is considered <em>less-than-significant</em> because it is short-term and a small footprint which will not have a substantial effect on the overall scenic value of the river.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C-3. Impact Summary of the American River Common Features General Reevaluation Report Project EIS/EIR Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Impact Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>would be taken to minimize potential impacts to water supply infrastructure, temporary interruptions could occur if water supply infrastructure is damaged or otherwise rendered inoperable at a time when it is needed. However, with the implementation of the proposed avoidance and minimization measures, this effect would be reduced to less than significant. Project construction in the vicinity of these structures include bank protection, slurry wall installation, slope reshaping, ETL 1110-2-583 vegetation policy compliance, and possibly launchable rock trench construction near the Fairbairn water treatment plant. Construction would not impact the water supply facilities themselves, however, there is the potential for increased turbidity near the in-stream intake facilities due to construction of bank protection sites and increased fugitive dust during slurry wall and slope reshaping work. BMPs and minimization measures would be implemented to reduce both turbidity and fugitive dust. Implementation of the ARCF GRR has the potential to impact storm water systems due to an increase in turbidity from construction-related runoff. The contractor would prepare and implement a SWPPP prior to construction that would detail the measures that would be implemented to reduce impacts to storm water systems to less than significant. Construction-related activities could potentially affect wastewater utilities in that pipes and other utilities that penetrate the levee would have to be removed or relocated. Population size would not increase as a result of the project, therefore, there would be no increase in wastewater needs and no increases to flows or drainages within the project area and any impact to wastewater facilities would be considered less than significant. Construction of the ARCF GRR would temporarily increase solid waste generation in the study area. Sources of solid waste related to construction activities would include cleared vegetation and debris. Other solid waste materials, such as asphalt, concrete, pipes, and gravel, would be removed from the footprint of the proposed construction sites and disposed of at an appropriate, licensed landfill. Project construction and operation would not cause existing regional landfill capacity to be exceeded; therefore this impact is considered less than significant. Implementation of the ARCF GRR is not expected to create additional demand for electricity or natural gas and would not require the construction or expansion of natural gas lines. Because the potential exists for damage and service interruptions to existing electrical and natural gas service utilities both identified and unidentified, this construction effect, though temporary, would be considered potentially significant. With the implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures, this effect would be reduced to less than significant. Construction-related activities could potentially impact communication and cable lines within the project footprint and surrounding areas. Construction activities could also potentially cause damage to existing infrastructure resulting in a temporary interruption in service. Such an impact would be considered potentially significant as the extent of the damage could affect the ability of service providers to quickly restore interrupted service. In order to mitigate for any disruption to public utilities and service systems, consultation with all known service providers would take place prior to construction to identify specific infrastructure locations and appropriate protection measures. Consultation would continue during construction to ensure avoidance/protection of facilities to minimize service disruptions. Construction of the alternatives would not result in the need for new or altered law enforcement or fire protection facilities, however there is the potential for traffic and access related impacts to fire and police services. Construction activities could affect emergency fire protection services because they could potentially spark a fire on a project site or an adjacent area. However, this possibility is highly unlikely and a project-specific fire protection program would be developed prior to any construction-related activities and implemented during construction. Any effects to Fire and Police Protection Services would therefore be considered less than significant and no mitigation would be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hazardous Wastes and Materials

Construction activities would involve the use of potentially hazardous material, such as fuels, oils and lubricants, and cleaners, which are commonly used in construction projects. Any hazardous substance encountered during construction would be removed and properly disposed of by a licensed contractor in accordance with Federal, State, and local regulations. Compliance with applicable regulations would reduce the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials during transport and construction activities. The risk of significant hazards associated with the transport, use, and disposal of these materials is low. With the implementation of mitigation measures, effects along the American River would be less than significant.

If construction work were to occur at the Sacramento Terminal bulk petroleum handling facility, coordination with Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) would occur prior to construction activity. In locations where the railroad is located on the top of the levee in this reach of the project, soil sampling will be done to determine if any contaminants have leached into the soil from the railroad ties. With the implementation of mitigation measures, effects along the Sacramento River would be less than significant.

Existing hazardous waste sites within the East Side Tributaries could be affected by construction activities. The contractor would be required to comply with all Federal, State, and local laws if contaminated soil is encountered. Any hazardous substance encountered would be removed and properly disposed of by a licensed contractor in accordance with Federal, State, and local regulations. With the implementation of mitigation measures, effects along the East Side Tributaries would be less than significant.

The exact location of borrow sites has not been determined. Testing of borrow sites would occur prior to the use of material and sites which have contaminated soils would not be used for this project. Any hazardous substance encountered during construction would be removed and properly disposed of by a licensed contractor in accordance with Federal, State, and local regulations. With the implementation of mitigation measures, effects at borrow sites would be less than significant.

No construction activities associated with the Sacramento Weir and Bypass would occur in proximity of the Old Bryte Landfill, located adjacent to the north levee of the Sacramento Bypass, until the landfill has been completely remediated and meets all Federal, State and local regulatory requirements. Therefore, there would have no impacts.

Environmental commitments included in the project to reduce the potential for impacts to water quality include: preparation of the SWPPP, SPCCP, and a BSSCP. Project areas would be tested for contaminants prior to construction, and any materials found would be disposed of in accordance with all Federal, State, and local regulations at an approved disposal site. If construction activities would occur in close proximity to sites listed in the existing conditions section, a Phase II ESA should also be conducted. This would further reduce the risk of exposure to workers and the public during construction and assist in the remediation planning.

### Socioeconomic, Population, and Environmental Justice

Because the project is set in an urban area, no change in population is expected to occur. The project area is already at built out and any additional population increases would not be substantial. The project is not anticipated to displace a significant number of residents or divide an established community. Any disruption of communities would be short term during construction when traffic, noise, and other construction related activities could affect resident’s daily life styles. Construction would result in less than significant affects because the impacts would be short term and no long term impacts are expected to occur.
Table C-3. Impact Summary of the American River Common Features General Reevaluation Report Project EIS/EIR Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Impact Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All levees would be constructed to the same criteria and standard and would reduce the risk of flooding to the existing populations and lands behind the existing levee system. The benefits of the ARCF GRR project would extend to all of the Sacramento Metropolitan area; therefore it would not provide disproportionate benefits or effects to any minority or low-income populations. By reducing the risk of flooding the ARCF GRR project could result in positive impacts to the socioeconomics by reduced likelihood of flooding, loss of lives, and pain and suffering. In addition, the ARCF GRR project would also reduce the cost of flood insurance to structures removed from the 100-year FEMA floodplain. Therefore, the effect is less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USACE 2015; data compiled by AECOM in 2015; data adjusted by GEI Consultants, Inc. in 2016 to incorporate changes between the Draft and Final ARCF GRR EIS/EIR.
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