A1 NEPA Notice of Intent
RETRIEVABILITY:
By name, Social Security Number (SSN), or other personal identifier.

SAFEGUARDS:
Records are maintained in secure areas available only to designated persons having official need for the record. Automated systems employ computer hardware/software safeguard features and controls which meet administrative, physical, and technical safeguards.
to be placed on the mailing list should also be sent to this address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Questions about the proposed action and EIS/EIR should be addressed to Ms. Elizabeth Holland at (916) 557–6763, e-mail: elizabeth.g.holland@usace.army.mil or by mail (see ADDRESSES).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
1. Proposed Action. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is preparing an EIS/EIR to analyze the impacts of the work proposed by SAFCA to implement the NLIP Phase 3. The NLIP Phase 3 is proposed by SAFCA to reduce the risk of flooding to portions of the City and County of Sacramento and Sutter County, CA lying within the Natomas Basin.

2. Alternatives. The EIS/EIR will address an array of flood risk management alternatives. Alternatives analyzed during the investigation will consist of a combination of one or more flood protection measures. These measures include raising the existing levee in place, constructing seepage berms, constructing adjacent setback levees, installing seepage wells and seepage cutoff walls, and relocating irrigation ditches.

3. Scoping Process. a. A public scoping meeting will be held on August 6, 2008 to present information to the public and to receive comments from the public. This meeting will begin a process to involve concerned individuals, and local, State, and Federal agencies.

b. Significant issues to be analyzed in depth in the EIS/EIR include effects on hydraulic, wetlands and other waters of the U.S., vegetation and wildlife resources, special-status species, cultural resources, land use, fisheries, water quality, air quality, transportation, and socioeconomics. The EIS/EIR will also evaluate the cumulative effects of the proposed NLIP and other related projects in the study area.

c. The Corps is consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act, and with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to provide a Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report.

d. A 45-day public review period will be provided for individuals and agencies to review and comment on the draft EIS/EIR. All interested parties are encouraged to respond to this notice and provide a current address if they wish to be notified of the draft EIS/EIR circulation.

4. Availability. The draft EIS/EIR is scheduled to be available for public review and comment in late 2008.

Dated: July 9, 2008
Thomas Chapman,
P.E., COL, EN, Commanding.

[FR Doc. E8–16445 Filed 7–17–08; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3710–E2–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Notice of Availability of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Port of Los Angeles Channel Deepening Project, Los Angeles, CA

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District (USACE) and the Los Angeles Harbor Department (Port) have prepared a joint Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Port of Los Angeles Channel Deepening Project, Los Angeles, California. This Draft SEIS/SEIR describes the affected resources and evaluates the potential impacts to those resources as a result of the Proposed Action and alternatives. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to dispose of approximately 3.0 million cubic yards of dredge material required to complete the Channel Deepening Project and to beneficially reuse the dredge material within the Port of Los Angeles.

Three Alternatives have been analyzed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, including No Action. Alternative 1, Port Development and Environmental Enhancement was developed with a focus on using dredge material for port development and environmental enhancement and would involve use and development of the following disposal sites: Berths 243–245, the Northwest Slip, CSWH Expansion, the Eelgrass Habitat Area, and LA–2. Alternative 2, Environmental Enhancement and Ocean Disposal was developed with a focus on environmental enhancement related uses of the remaining material and does not include any disposal options associated with port development. Under Alternative 2, dredge material would be disposed at the CSWH Expansion, Eelgrass Habitat Area, LA–2 and the Anchorage Road Soil Storage Site. Under Alternative 3, the No Action Alternative, no further dredging would take place and the Channel Deepening Project would not be completed.

This Notice also serves as the Public Notice/Notice of Availability for the Section 404 Permit under Clean Water Act (CWA). A preliminary application has been received for a Department of the Army permit for the activity described herein. The Corps is considering an application submitted by the Port for a permit, in accordance with Section 404 of the CWA and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, to complete dredging activities outside of the Federal Channel and placement of the dredge material in waters of the United States in the Port of Los Angeles.

This SEIS/SEIR would be used by the Corps as part of their application review process. The Corps and the Port independently determined under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), respectively, that there are potential significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action, and an Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report are required.

DATES: Submit comments on or before September 1, 2008.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Joy Jaiswal, Chief, Ecosystem Planning Section, at (213) 452–3851 or e-mail at Jyotsna.I.Jaiswal@usace.army.mil. Additional Information: This Draft SEIS/SEIR has been filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to be published in the Federal Register and is available for a forty-five (45) day public review period. The public review period for the Draft SEIS/EIR will be from July 18, 2008 to September 1, 2008. Please forward your comments on the Draft SEIS/SEIR by mail, email, or fax to the contacts listed below by September 1, 2008.

Ms. Joy Jaiswal, Chief, Ecosystem Planning Section, Attn: Ms. Megan Wong, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, P.O. Box 532711, Los Angeles, California 90053–2325, Fax: (213) 452–4204. Megan.T.Wong@usace.army.mil or Dr. Ralph Appy, Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD), 425 South Palos Verdes Street, San Pedro, CA 90731.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
1. Authorization
The Port of Los Angeles Channel Deepening Project was authorized for
TO: Agencies and Interested Parties

FROM: Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency

DATE: July 18, 2008

SUBJECT: Announcement of:


2) Public Scoping Meeting to be held on August 6, 2008; and

3) Scoping comments due by August 18, 2008

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Sacramento District, and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) will be the federal and state lead agencies, respectively, and will prepare an environmental impact statement/environmental impact report (EIS/EIR) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the subject project in the Natomas Basin in Sacramento and Sutter Counties, California. USACE and SAFCA are soliciting input from interested agencies and the public as to the scope and content of the EIS/EIR.

INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) specifies that a public agency must prepare an EIR on any project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant direct or indirect effect (also referred to as “significant impact”) on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21080[d]). SAFCA is proposing the Natomas Levee Improvement Program (NLIP), Phase 3 Landside Improvements Project (Phase 3 Project), as described below, and has determined that the proposed project may have significant impacts on the environment. Therefore, acting as the lead agency for CEQA compliance, SAFCA will prepare an EIR that evaluates these significant environmental impacts.

To implement the proposed project, SAFCA requires a permit from USACE pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for the discharge of fill into jurisdictional waters of the United States, and permission pursuant to Section 408 of the Rivers and Harbors Act for alteration of a federal project levee. A joint EIS/EIR will be prepared to evaluate the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project, including those impacts associated with USACE’s decision making processes for Sections 404 and 408.

PURPOSE OF THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The purposes of this notice are to:

1. briefly describe the proposed project and the anticipated content of the draft EIS/EIR to be prepared for the proposed project;
2. announce the public scoping meeting to facilitate public input and to be held: Wednesday, August 6, 2008, from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. at 1321 Garden Highway (Sierra Health Foundation) in Sacramento, California; and

3. solicit input by August 18, 2008, from interested federal and state agencies, and from interested organizations and individuals about the content and scope of the draft EIS/EIR, including the alternatives to be addressed and the potentially significant environmental impacts.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Landside Improvements Project is part of SAFCA’s efforts to reduce flood risk for the Sacramento area, and is part of the NLIP evaluated in SAFCA’s programmatic EIR on Local Funding Mechanisms for Comprehensive Flood Control Improvements for the Sacramento Area (State Clearinghouse # 2006072098). Volume II of that EIR contained a project-level evaluation of the Natomas Cross Canal South Levee Phase 1 Improvements (Phase 1 Project). In 2007, SAFCA prepared the EIR on the NLIP Landside Improvements Project (State Clearinghouse # 2007062016), which covers the three additional phases of “landside” improvements to the levees protecting the Natomas Basin in Sacramento and Sutter Counties, including the Phase 2 Project and Phase 3 Project. The Phase 2 Project was analyzed at a project level and the remainder of the Landside Improvement Project was analyzed at a program level. On November 29, 2007, the SAFCA Board of Directors certified the EIR and approved implementation of the Phase 2 Project components proposed for construction in 2008. Following completion of the EIR on the NLIP Landside Improvements Project, USACE prepared an EIS to meet USACE’s NEPA requirements to support USACE’s decisions on 408 permission and 404 permitting. A Record of Decision (ROD) is expected to be signed by USACE in October 2008.

The EIS/EIR to be prepared for the Phase 3 Project will evaluate the environmental effects of the Phase 3 Project at a project level, and will evaluate subsequent phases of the Landside Improvements Project at a general, program level. These subsequent phases will be subject to additional project-specific NEPA and CEQA analysis in the future prior to approval and implementation.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following objectives were adopted by SAFCA in connection with approval of the NLIP: (1) provide at least a 100-year level of flood protection to the Natomas Basin as quickly as possible, (2) provide “200-year” protection to the basin over time, and (3) avoid any substantial increase in expected annual damages as new development occurs in the basin.

The specific purpose of the Landside Improvements Project is to provide at least 100-year flood protection as quickly as possible while laying the groundwork to achieve at least “200-year” flood protection over time.

Additional project objectives adopted by SAFCA in connection with approval of the Phase 2 Project that are also applicable to the Phase 3 Project are to:

(1) use flood control projects in the vicinity of the [Sacramento International] Airport to facilitate changes in the management of Airport lands that reduce hazards to aviation safety, and

(2) use flood control projects to increase the extent and connectivity of the lands in Natomas being managed to provide habitat for giant garter snake, Swainson’s hawk, and other special-status species.
The Phase 3 Project includes the following major activities, which will be analyzed at a project level in the EIS/EIR:

► Along the Sacramento River east levee, construct a raised adjacent setback levee from just north of Elkhorn Reservoir to just south of Interstate 5 (I-5) (Reaches 5A–9B) with cutoff walls and seepage berms where required to reduce seepage potential, and install woodland plantings.

► Widen the Pleasant Grove Creek Canal (PGCC) west levee between Howsley Road and Sankey Road and construct cutoff walls or seepage berms where required to reduce seepage potential.

► Widen the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal (NEMDC) west levee from Elkhorn Boulevard to the NEMDC Stormwater Pumping Station.

► Construct a cutoff wall in the NEMDC west levee from the NEMDC Stormwater Pumping Station to Northgate Boulevard where required to reduce seepage potential.

► Construct a new canal designed to provide drainage and associated giant garter snake habitat (referred to as the “GGS/Drainage Canal”) between Elkhorn Reservoir and the West Drainage Canal at I-5, relocate the Elkhorn Canal downstream of Elkhorn Reservoir, and reconstruct the Reclamation District 1000 Pumping Plant No. 2.

► Recontour the land and create marsh and upland habitat at borrow locations.

► Realign and relocate irrigation and drainage canals and other infrastructure, such as utility poles, as needed to accommodate the flood control improvements.

► Remove encroachments as required to meet USACE, Central Valley Flood Protection Board, and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) criteria.

Phase 4 of the Landside Improvements Project will include the following activities that will be analyzed at a program level in the EIS/EIR:

► Along the Sacramento River east levee, construct an adjacent setback levee (raised where needed to provide adequate freeboard) from just south of I-5 to Gateway Oaks Drive (Reaches 10–20B) with cutoff walls and seepage berms where required to reduce seepage potential.

► Construct a cutoff wall in the American River north levee between Gateway Oaks Drive and Northgate Boulevard where required to reduce seepage potential.

► Widen the NEMDC west levee from Sankey Road to Elkhorn Boulevard.

► Relocate the Riverside Canal, improve the West Drainage Canal south of I-5 to provide enhanced GGS habitat, and construct modifications to several pumping plants.

► Recontour the land and create marsh and upland habitat at borrow locations.

► Remove encroachments as required to meet USACE, Central Valley Flood Protection Board, and FEMA criteria.
PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The EIS/EIR will describe the direct and indirect significant environmental effects of the Phase 3 Project. The EIS/EIR will also evaluate cumulative effects of the project when considered in conjunction with the other phases of the Landside Improvements Project and other related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, including other SAFCA projects.

On the basis of preliminary evaluation, USACE and SAFCA have determined that the probable environmental effects of the proposed project are as follows:

► **Agricultural Resources**: Conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use; temporary effects on agricultural productivity.

► **Land Use and Socioeconomics**: Temporary disturbance of an existing community.

► **Topography, Geology, and Soils**: Potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil during construction.

► **Hydrology and Hydraulics**: Minimized flood risk; potential temporary and/or permanent alteration of local drainage patterns; potential effects on groundwater recharge.

► **Water Quality**: Temporary effects on water quality during construction.

► **Fish and Aquatic Habitat**: Loss of fish or aquatic habitat through increased sedimentation and turbidity or release of contaminants during construction; loss of shaded riverine aquatic habitat (SRA).

► **Sensitive Aquatic Habitats**: Temporary disturbance or permanent loss of jurisdictional waters of the United States.

► **Vegetation and Wildlife**: Temporary disturbance or permanent loss of woodland habitats and wildlife corridors.

► **Special-Status Terrestrial Species**: Temporary disturbance or permanent loss of special-status species habitats; construction disturbance or take of special-status terrestrial species, especially to Swainson’s hawk and giant garter snake.

► **Cultural Resources**: Disturbance of historic or archaeological resources.

► **Paleontological Resources**: Potential disturbance of previously undiscovered fossils during earthmoving activities.

► **Transportation and Circulation**: Temporary increase in traffic and traffic hazards on local roadways during construction; temporary closure of roadways during construction of flood control improvements across the roadways.

► **Air Quality**: Temporary increases in pollutant emissions associated with construction activities.

► **Noise**: Temporary increases in noise and vibration levels near sensitive receptors during construction.

► **Recreation**: Temporary disturbance of recreational uses at Teal Bend Golf Club; temporary closure of the Ueda Parkway bike trail on the NEMDC west levee.
► **Visual Resources:** Temporary and long-term changes in scenic views or visual character of the project area.

► **Utilities and Service Systems:** Temporary disruption of irrigation supply; potential disruption of utility service.

► **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** Potential spills of hazardous materials; potential exposure to hazardous materials at project sites; potential for higher frequency of collisions between aircraft and wildlife at the Sacramento International Airport.

**PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING**

A public scoping meeting will be held to inform interested parties about the proposed project, and to obtain the views of agency representatives and the public on the scope and content of the EIS/EIR. The meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 6, 2008, from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m., at 1321 Garden Highway (Sierra Health Foundation) in Sacramento, California.

The meeting will have an open-house format with multiple stations set up to highlight different aspects of the proposed project and the NEPA/CEQA process. Attendees will have the opportunity to ask questions and discuss the project and the EIS/EIR process with project team members and to provide oral and written comments. The meeting space is accessible to persons with disabilities. Individuals needing special assistive devices will be accommodated to the best of our ability. For more information, contact Elizabeth Holland with USACE at (916) 557-6763 at least 48 hours before the meeting.

**PROVIDING COMMENTS ON THE NOP**

Interested parties may provide written or oral comments on the content and scope of the EIS/EIR at the public scoping meeting or may provide written comments directly to USACE or SAFCA. **Written comments must be provided to USACE or SAFCA at the earliest possible date, but must be received no later than 5 p.m. on Monday, August 18, 2008.** Agencies that will need to use the EIS/EIR when considering permits or other approvals for the proposed project should provide the name of a contact person. Comments provided by e-mail should include the name and address of the sender. Please send all written and/or e-mail comments to:

Elizabeth Holland, Planning Division  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District  
1325 J Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Telephone: (916) 557-6763  
E-mail: Elizabeth.G.Holland@usace.army.mil

Or  
John Bassett, Director of Engineering  
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency  
1007 Seventh Street, 7th Floor  
Sacramento, CA  95814  
Telephone: (916) 874-7606  
Fax: (916) 874-8289  
E-mail: BassettJ@saccounty.net
July 22, 2008

Elizabeth G. Holland
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento District, Planning Division
1325 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Ms. Holland:

This is in response to your request for comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program, Phase 3 Landslide Improvements Project.

Please review the current effective Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the County of Sacramento, Map revised July 6, 1998. Please note that the County of Sacramento, California is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The minimum, basic NFIP floodplain management building requirements are described in Vol. 44 Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR), Sections 59 through 65.

A summary of these NFIP floodplain management building requirements are as follows:

- All buildings constructed within a riverine floodplain, (i.e., Flood Zones A, AO, AH, AE, and A1 through A30 as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated so that the lowest floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation level in accordance with the effective Flood Insurance Rate Map.

- If the area of construction is located within a Regulatory Floodway as delineated on the FIRM, any development must not increase base flood elevation levels. The term development means any man-made change to improved or unimproved real estate, including but not limited to buildings, other structures, mining, dredging, filling, grading, paving, excavation or drilling operations, and storage of equipment or materials. A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis must be performed prior to the start of development, and must demonstrate that the development would not cause any rise in base flood levels. No rise is permitted within regulatory floodways.
All buildings constructed within a coastal high hazard area, (any of the "V" Flood Zones as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated on pilings and columns, so that the lowest horizontal structural member, (excluding the pilings and columns), is elevated to or above the base flood elevation level. In addition, the posts and pilings foundation and the structure attached thereto, is anchored to resist flotation, collapse and lateral movement due to the effects of wind and water loads acting simultaneously on all building components.

Upon completion of any development that changes existing Special Flood Hazard Areas, the NFIP directs all participating communities to submit the appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic data to FEMA for a FIRM revision. In accordance with 44 CFR, Section 65.3, as soon as practicable, but not later than six months after such data becomes available, a community shall notify FEMA of the changes by submitting technical data for a flood map revision. To obtain copies of FEMA’s Flood Map Revision Application Packages, please refer to the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/business/nfip/forms.shtml.

Please Note:

Many NFIP participating communities have adopted floodplain management building requirements which are more restrictive than the minimum federal standards described in 44 CFR. Please contact the local community’s floodplain manager for more information on local floodplain management building requirements. The Sacramento County floodplain manager can be reached by calling George H. Booth, Senior Civil Engineer, at (916) 874-6851.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Cynthia McKenzie of the Mitigation staff at (510) 627-7190.

Sincerely,

Gregor Blackburn, CFM, Branch Chief
Floodplain Management and Insurance Branch

cc:
John Bassett, Director of Engineering, Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
George H. Booth, Senior Civil Engineer, Sacramento County
Ray Lee, State of California, Department of Water Resources, Central District
Cynthia McKenzie, Flood Planner, CFM, DHS/FEMA Region IX
Alessandro Amaglio, Environmental Officer, DHS/FEMA Region IX

www.fema.gov
August 18, 2008

Elizabeth Holland, Planning Division
Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District
1325 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814

John Bassett, Director of Engineering
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
1007 Seventh Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Scoping Comments on Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for Natomas Levee Improvement Program, Phase 3, Landside Improvements Project

Dear Ms. Holland and Mr. Bassett:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is providing scoping comments on the environmental issues to be addressed in the joint Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/BIR) for the Natomas Levee Improvement Program (NLIP), Phase III, as requested in the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) letter of July 18, 2008.

The FAA, through the Airport Improvement Program, has provided federal funds for various aviation development activities at the Sacramento International Airport. The proposed flood protection improvements would increase protection of these developments for which federal funds have been expended.

Sacramento International Airport is a certificated airport under 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 139 of the FAA’s regulations. As a result of prior 14 CFR 139 inspections at Sacramento International Airport, the airport is required to maintain and implement a Wildlife Hazard Management Plan. The Wildlife Hazard Management Plan represents an ongoing effort by the Sacramento County Airport System to reduce wildlife-aircraft strike hazards and habitat attracting wildlife hazardous to aircraft operations at Sacramento International Airport.

The proposed NLIP, Phase III, project, if inappropriately designed, could change existing vegetation and wildlife habitat in ways that could attract wildlife hazardous to aviation and increase wildlife-aircraft collision strikes at Sacramento International Airport. FAA Circular 150/5200-33B, Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports, recommends a separation distance of 10,000 feet between airports serving turbine-powered (jet) aircraft and habitats that can attract wildlife hazardous to aircraft, and recommends a separation distance of 5 miles between hazardous wildlife attractants and the edge of an airport’s Area of
Operations if the attractant could cause hazardous wildlife movement into or across the approach or departure airspace. The EIS/EIR should address whether or not the proposed flood control improvements and mitigation measures associated with those improvements are consistent with the guidelines in FAA Circular 150/5200-33B, whether the proposed project would increase the amount of habitat available for wildlife hazardous to aircraft, and whether the proposed project would be likely to increase the risk of wildlife-aircraft collisions at Sacramento International Airport.

Sacramento International Airport is located on property acquired using a combination of Sacramento County and federal funds and the airport has received federal funding from various FAA Airport Improvement Program federal grants. As a result, Sacramento County is subject to FAA "grant assurances" regarding land use and other activities. The grant assurances require that airport revenue and assets must be used to support aviation purposes. Any agreement between the Sacramento County Airport System and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency for use of borrow material or other airport resources to implement the proposed project must be structured in such a way that Sacramento County remains in compliance with its previous commitments to the FAA regarding grant assurances.

Future actions to implement the proposed project may require one or more FAA approvals if they involve actions on Sacramento International Airport. Further discussions between the Army Corps of Engineers, the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, the Sacramento County Airport System, and the Federal Aviation Administration may be necessary to clarify whether FAA approvals are required.

Please contact FAA Environmental Protection Specialist Doug Pomeroy, telephone, 650-876-2778, extension 612, or e-mail Douglas.Pomeroy@faa.gov, if you have questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Douglas R. Pomeroy
Environmental Protection Specialist

cc: G. Hardy Acree, Director of Airports, Sacramento County Airport System
August 6, 2008

John Bassett
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
1007 8th Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 958714

RE: SCH# 2008072060 - Natomas Levee Improvement Program Phase 3, Sacramento County

Dear Mr. Bassett:

The Native American Heritage Commission has reviewed the above mentioned NOP. To adequately assess and mitigate project-related impacts on archaeological resources, the Commission recommends the following actions be required:

1. Contact the appropriate Information Center for a record search. The record search will determine:
   - If a part or all of the area of project effect (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
   - If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
   - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
   - The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
   - The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.

3. Contact the Native American Heritage Commission for:
   - A Sacred Lands File Check. Requests must be made in writing with the County, Quad map name, township, range and section.
   - A list of appropriate Native American Contacts for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in the mitigation measures.

4. Lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.
   - Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archaeological resources under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5 (f). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
   - Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
   - Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA §15064.5 (e), and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 653-4038.

Sincerely,

Debbie Pilas-Treadway
Environmental Specialist III

CC: State Clearinghouse
August 27, 2008

08SAC0160
03-SAC-5/80/99
Natomas Levee Improvement Program
Phase 3 Landside Improvements Project
Notice of Preparation
SCH# 2008072060

Mr. John Bassett
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
1007 7th Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Bassett:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program, Phase 3 Landside Improvements Project. Our comments are as follows:

- The project, Phase 3 Landside Improvements, is part of an effort by the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) to reduce the risk of flooding to the Sacramento area. The waterway improvements include levee widening, setback levees, cutoff walls, and seepage berms along the Sacramento River east levee, the Pleasant Grove Creek Canal west levee, and the Natomas East main Drainage Canal west levee. This is a multi-site project that is likely to have multiple access points from the State Highway System (SHS). The environmental document should identify access points to the SHS and provide the estimated type and number of vehicles. A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) should be prepared by the project proponent and submitted to the Caltrans District 3 Traffic Manager, Paul Wilkinson. He may be reached at (916) 859-7978. A copy of the TMP is provided for your reference.

- Any work conducted within State right-of-way and the installation of “project information” or “truck pull out” signs near the work sites will require an encroachment permit. For permit assistance, please contact the Encroachment Permits Central Office at (530) 741-4403.

“Caltrans improves mobility across California”
Please provide our office with the information requested above. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Ken Champion at (916) 274-0615.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

ALYSSA BEGLEY, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning - South

c: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse
State of California
Department of Transportation

Transportation Management Plan Guidelines

Prepared By:
Division of Traffic Operations
Office of Systems Management Operations
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

With the construction of California's state highway system virtually complete, the California Department of Transportation (Department) major emphasis on transportation projects has largely shifted from new construction to reconstruction, operation, and maintenance of existing facilities. As traffic demand steadily increases, Department work activities can create significant additional traffic delay and safety concerns on already congested highways. Planning work activities and balancing traffic demand with highway capacity becomes more critical.

In order to prevent unreasonable traffic delays resulting from planned work, Transportation Management Plans (TMPs) must be carefully developed and implemented in order to maintain acceptable levels of service and safety during all work activities on the state highway system.

B. WHAT ARE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLANS?

A TMP is a method for minimizing activity-related traffic delay and accidents by the effective application of traditional traffic handling practices and an innovative combination of public and motorist information, demand management, incident management, system management, construction strategies, alternate routes and other strategies.

All TMPs share the common goal of congestion relief during the project period by managing traffic flow and balancing traffic demand with highway capacity through the project area, or by using the entire corridor. Certain low-impact Maintenance and Encroachment Permit activities do not require the development of individual TMPs. "Blanket" TMPs are developed for those activities. A blanket TMP is a generic list of actions that would be taken to keep delay below the delay threshold when performing activities on highways. Each district Maintenance and Encroachment Permit office should have a list of activities to which blanket TMPs apply.

All Capital projects require individual TMPs. Blanket TMPs are suitable for minor projects. Major TMPs are required for high-impact projects. Generally, major TMPs are distinguished by being:

- Multi-jurisdictional in scope, encompassing the Department of California Highway Patrol (CHP), city, county and regional governments, state DOTs, employers, merchants, developers, transit operators, ridesharing agencies, neighborhood and special interest groups, emergency services, and Transportation Management Associations;

- Multi-faceted, comprised of an innovative mix of traffic operations, facility enhancement, demand-management and public relations strategies, as well as more traditional work zone actions, construction methods and contract incentives, customized to meet the unique needs of the impacted corridor;

- In place over a longer period of time, sometimes implemented up to a year or more prior to the start of actual construction, with specific elements often implemented incrementally to coincide with construction phasing.

C. POLICY
Department Deputy Directive 60 (DD-60) titled Transportation Management Plans (see APPENDIX) requires TMPs and contingency plans for all state highway activities.

Policy Statement:

The Department minimizes motorist delays when implementing projects or performing other activities on the state highway system. This is accomplished without compromising public or worker safety, or the quality of the work being performed.

TMPs, including contingency plans, are required for all construction, maintenance, encroachment permit, planned emergency restoration, locally or specially-funded, or other activities on the state highway system. Where several consecutive or linking projects or activities within a region or corridor create a cumulative need for a TMP, the Department coordinates individual TMPs or develops a single interregional TMP.

TMPs are considered early, during the project initiation or planning stage.

Major lane closures require District Lane Closure Review Committee (DLCRC) approval.

Definitions:

Major lane closures are those that are expected to result in significant traffic impacts despite the implementation of TMPs.

Significant traffic impact is 30 minutes above normal recurring traffic delay on the existing facility or the delay threshold set by the District Traffic Manager (DTM), whichever is less.

Contingency Plans address specific actions that will be taken to restore or minimize effects on traffic when congestion or delays exceed original estimates due to unforeseen events such as work-zone accidents, higher than predicted traffic demand, or delayed lane closures.

II. TMP DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

A. OVERVIEW

Responsibilities:

The DTM:

- Acts as the single focal point for all traffic impact decisions resulting from planned activities on the state highway system.
- Determines the extent of a TMP.
- Facilitates review and approval of TMP measures and planned lane closure requests.
- Directs the termination or modification of active planned lane closure operations when traffic impact becomes significant, without compromising traveler or worker safety.
The TMP Manager:
- Acts as the single focal point for development and implementation of TMPs.

The Construction Traffic Manager (CTM):
- Serves as a liaison between Construction, the DTM and the TMP Manager.
- Reviews the TMP and traffic contingency plan for constructability issues.
- Act as a resource for the Resident Engineer, DTM and TMP Manager during TMP implementation and reviews the contractor’s contingency plan.

The extent of a TMP is determined by the DTM during the preliminary studies of a capital project. For all TMPs, an itemized estimate of the proposed strategies and their respective costs are included in the Project Study Report (PSR) or Project Study Scoping Report (PSSR) for proper funding consideration. The workload required to develop and implement TMPs is estimated in advance and captured in the district work plan.

For major TMPs, a TMP team may need to be formed and led by the TMP Manager. The itemized strategies and costs are further refined in the project report stage as determined by the TMP team and appropriate functional units using the most current geometric information available. Those elements of the TMP not included as part of the main construction contract should be itemized under State Furnished Material and Expenses using the appropriate Basic Engineers Estimate System (BEES) codes in the plans, specifications and estimates. During construction, TMP activities are to be monitored and evaluated by the TMP team and those elements found not to be cost effective should be modified as deemed appropriate or eliminated. The TMP process is explained in detail in the following sections.

B. FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING

When identifying funding for various TMP elements, it is important to distinguish between capital outlay and capital outlay support.

Work done by district staff for the planning and designing of TMP activities for capital projects are a normal part of the project development process and should be captured as capital outlay support. The TMP Manager and each functional manager should work closely with the project manager to ensure that TMP activities are included in all project work plans. TMP support activities to consider include ridesharing programs, Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) contracts, public awareness campaigns, parallel route improvements and the Request for Proposal (RFP) process up to award of the contract. Note that some of these activities may also have a capital component in addition to the support component discussed here. Workload hours for TMP activities must be included in the Capital Outlay Support (COS) project’s work plan in order to be resourced (funded) by COS. These activities should then be charged to each project’s expenditure authorization (EA), using the appropriate Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) code for that stage of the project. TMP-related work should be charged only to the WBS codes reserved for those activities. These codes can be found on the Department’s Division of Project Management’s Intranet web page.

Work done by district staff for implementing TMP elements during construction of capital projects are also a normal part of the project development process. Again, workload (hours) for implementing TMP activities must be included in the COS project’s work plan in order to be resourced (funded) by COS. These activities should then be charged to the appropriate project’s phase three EA, and WBS code 270 (Perform Construction Engineering and Contract Administration).
Some funds necessary to implement TMP elements not done by the Department staff, including consultant contracts, can be sourced from capital outlay funds allocated by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) as itemized in the plans, specifications and estimates. Some TMP elements, such as parallel route improvements and highway advisory radios, could be a phase of the construction contract or separate construction contracts while others such as public awareness campaigns and transit subsidies must be separate contracts or cooperative agreements.

The TMP elements that need to be in place prior to start of construction are identified and funded as stage construction or first order of work under a single package presented to the CTC. If approved, the Division of Budgets may assign specific amounts for each TMP activity. All TMP activities may not necessarily be included under the main contract. Service contracts such as those for freeway service patrols, public service or consultant contracts, information campaigns, or establishing telephone hotlines must be arranged separately with consultants and other providers. For most projects, it takes four to six months to get a service contract in place. This means that all consultant contracts have been advertised, the consultant selected, and the contract ready for signature and award immediately following CTC allocation of funds. Other activities such as parallel route improvements are usually included in the main construction contract and as a first order of work under a cooperative agreement.

In some cases, the CTC can be petitioned to fund a portion of the TMP as an initial phase of the main project. This is usually for a high priority project where plans, specifications, and estimates for the main project are not yet finalized, but early funds are needed to initiate TMP activities such as making transit arrangements with local governments. The petition to fund an initial phase comes from the district, explaining why a portion of the project must proceed before funding for the main project is allocated. These early funds reduce the programmed funds for the main project accordingly.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) supports the TMP concept and views major reconstruction projects as an excellent opportunity to initiate continuing traffic management strategies that provide improved traffic operations long beyond the completion of work. Examples include: installation of permanent Changeable Message Sign (CMS), full structural section shoulders, continuing auxiliary lanes, and wider shoulders for incident management during construction if cost-effective in the long term. All cost-effective transportation management activities that address the problem of delay or safety are eligible for 100 percent Federal Aid funding.

TMPs and contingency plans for Encroachment Permit projects are developed by the permittee or by Department staff. Staff time for development, review and implementation of TMPs for Encroachment Permits is charged to the permit. Maintenance normally develops TMPs for its projects; Maintenance and staff from other functional areas that expend time on Maintenance TMP charge to the designated Maintenance EA.

C. TMP IN PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT

The TMP is part of the normal project development process and must be considered in the Project Initiation Document (PID) or planning stage (project K phase). Since projects are generally programmed, budgeted, and given an Expenditure Authorization (EA) upon PID approval, it is important to allow for the proper cost, scope and scheduling of the TMP activities at this early stage of development. TMPs that are retrofitted to projects already programmed must be handled on a case by case basis and may require a contract change order.
Prior to PID approval, the initiating unit sends conceptual geometrics to the district Division of Operations for evaluation. The DTM estimates the extent of the TMP required and determines whether potential traffic delays are anticipated that cannot be mitigated by traditional traffic handling practices or well-planned construction staging. The TMP Manager must sign-off on the TMP DATA SHEET in the PID. A TMP cost estimate should be developed for each alternative being considered. An estimate should not be based only on the project cost. The cost of a TMP could range from a small percentage of project cost to 20 percent or more. Further guidance can be obtained from the following publications "Wilbur Smith & Associates TMP Effectiveness Study" and Frank Wilson & Associates "A Traffic Management Plan Study for State Route 91" located in Headquarters Traffic Operations, Office of System Management Operations.

TMP Elements

A list of potential TMP strategies with their respective elements is categorized in TABLE 1. As many different elements as are feasible should be considered for the proposed project's preliminary TMP.

When developing a preliminary TMP at this early stage, use the most current layout of the roadway (geometrics) information available and consider:

- Contingency Plans
- Lane closure policies and procedures
- TMC coordination
- Multi-jurisdictional communication and buy-in
- CHP and local law enforcement involvement
- Emergency closures
- Clearance of alternate routes for STAA and oversized
- Special training or workforce development
- Duration of construction (months)
- Length of project (miles)
- Number of major construction phases
- Urbanization (urban, suburban, or rural)
- Traffic volumes

Wilbur Smith Associate's TMP Effectiveness Study and Frank Wilson & Associate's A Traffic Management Plan Study for State Route 91 During Construction of HOV Lanes (both available from Headquarters Division of Traffic Operations, Office of System Management Operations) are excellent sources for guidance on selecting the most cost-effective TMP elements. The district Public Information office is also an experienced source for estimating the effectiveness of public information campaign options, and can help the TMP Manager estimate their cost and effectiveness in reducing traffic demand through the project area.

Public information campaigns serve two main purposes in TMPs. They inform the public about the overall purpose of the project to generate and maintain public support; and they encourage changes in travel behavior during the project to minimize congestion. Because they give travelers the information they need to make their own travel choices, public information campaigns can be the single most effective of all TMP elements.

The FSP is a congestion relief program of roving tow trucks operating in most metropolitan and some rural areas. The FSP program is operated by Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) with funding from the Department. The Department also reimburses the CHP for training and supervisory services provided for the FSP. The RTPAs contract with tow companies
for commute time service and some weekend and mid-day service to assist motorists with simple repairs (i.e. flat tire, one gallon of gas) or tow the automobile from the highway.

FSP is available for incident management during construction. However, construction-related FSP service needs to be funded as part of the TMP. A cooperative agreement with the RTPA is required, outlining the services provided and the fund transfer. An interagency agreement with the CHP is required for any support services (field supervision and dispatch operator services). These agreements should be initiated with the RTPA and the CHP as soon as it is determined that FSP should be in the project TMP.

The Department’s HQ Traffic Operations is currently working on Master Agreements with the RTPAs for future FSP services. This process will simplify the process for both the Department and the RTPAs by eliminating the need for a cooperative agreement for each project. Only a task order form will be needed for each project. A similar agreement is being created with the CHP. Please contact HQ Traffic Operations, Freeways Operations Branch for more information.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMP STRATEGIES AND THEIR ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Public Information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and Mailers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Releases (including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Media Sources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings/Speaker’s Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Hotline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Information (videos, slide shows, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local cable TV and News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveler Information Systems (Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Motorist Information Strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Message Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changeable Message Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinguishable Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Mounted Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Traffic Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Advisory Radio (fixed and mobile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Lane Closure Web Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department's Highway Information Network (CHIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radar Speed Message Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Incident Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction or Maintenance Zone Enhanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Program – COZEPP or MAZEPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Surveillance Stations (loop detectors and CCTV) Closures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 Cellular Calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP Officer in TMC during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Traffic Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP Helicopter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Construction Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive/Disincentive Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Metering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Rental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the DTM determines that a major TMP is required, the TMP Manager forms a TMP development team. The team’s membership will vary according to the TMP elements proposed and the project’s impacts. At a minimum, it should include representatives from Construction, Public Affairs, Project Development, Traffic Operations (including Transportation Permits), the CHP and local agencies. Others to be considered as the plan gets refined are Rideshare, Transportation Planning, Public Transportation, Maintenance, Structures, CHP, local law enforcement, local transit agencies, emergency services, and FHWA. Local Maintenance field staff familiar with conditions in the project area should be team members or should be consulted as needed as the TMP develops.

**D. TMP IN PROJECT REPORT**

As more information becomes available during the project report phase the preliminary scope and cost of the overall TMP and the individual elements should continue to be refined. The TMP team will coordinate the TMP strategies with the project engineer and appropriate units, with
each team member handling their area of expertise. For major projects, subcommittees or task forces may be formed to handle the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation details of some elements. The TMP Manager will keep the Project Manager and district Construction Coordinator updated and must sign-off on the TMP data sheet of the project report.

It is appropriate at this point to develop a timeline schedule for major TMPs keeping in mind that many elements of the TMP have to begin prior to the start of construction. Many TMP elements listed in Table 1 need to be developed separately but concurrently with the project plans. They may be bid and constructed or initiated separately from the project or be included in the project plans and be installed or implemented as the first order of work.

Some tasks may take a long time depending on the complexity of the major project and the type of transportation management necessary. For example, if building new park-and-ride lots are necessary for the Ridesharing element, the planning phase would have to be extended for several months and a design phase added.

An additional activity involves analyzing the existing traffic volume in the corridor, both on the freeway and surface streets. This will provide a basis for establishing the goal of the TMP, i.e., the number of vehicles that should be removed from the freeway, and in determining the capability of the surrounding surface streets to handle the additional traffic demand. It can also provide a database for evaluating the overall effectiveness of the TMP.

E. TMP IN PS&E

Those TMP elements that are not part of the main contract, but are identified as capital outlay costs tied to the main project, should be itemized as State Furnished Materials and Expenses using the appropriate BEES item cost (see TABLE 2). The Project Engineer should consult with the TMP Manager to ensure that the appropriate "Maintaining Traffic" Standard Special Provisions (SSP) are included in the PS&E. The SSPs should always require the contractor to submit a contingency plan.

The TMP and PS&E should address oversize and overweight vehicles traveling under a transportation permit. Additional construction area signs should be provided that restrict travel to overwidth vehicles whenever the lateral clearance drops to 15 feet or less.

The DTM must concur with the PS&E and with Encroachment Permit and Maintenance TMPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TMP BEES ITEM CODES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066003 State Furnished Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066004 Miscellaneous State Furnished Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066005 Concurrent Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066006 Miscellaneous Concurrent Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066008 Incentive Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066009 Utility Expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>869070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. TMP DURING CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS

During construction, those TMP elements that are part of the main contract or Encroachment Permit are implemented under the general direction of district Construction or Encroachment Permits. Those separate contracts/agreements such as for rideshare and transit activities and public awareness campaigns will be under the direction of their respective contract managers.

Special effort should be given to assure that Changeable Message Sign (CMS), Highway Advisory Radio (HAR) and other media tools provide accurate and timely information to motorists regarding lane closure times and

TMP elements must be carefully monitored for cost effectiveness. The TMP team should determine whether the implemented measures are reaching the predetermined goals for cost effectiveness. If an element’s predetermined goal is not immediately reached during implementation, but there is a general trend toward meeting that goal, the element can remain in effect and the FHWA will continue to participate. Elements that show no sign of approaching their predetermined goals as determined by the TMP Manager must be modified as deemed appropriate or dropped.

Contractor compliance with lane closure pickup deadlines can be enforced in two ways. A “maintaining traffic” SSP allows a penalty to be assessed to the contractor for value of traffic delay when the contractor exceeds the lane closure window. The minimum penalty is $1,000 per 10 minutes, but it can greatly exceed the minimum, depending on traffic volumes and the highway facility. The DTM calculates the "delay penalty" during PS&E. The second method is for the state representative to suspend the contract work.

A contractor or the Department forces (such as Maintenance) can be ordered to pick up a lane closure early if traffic impacts become significant either due to a project incident or activities outside the project area. Early pickup should only be ordered when traveler and worker safety will not be compromised. The "maintaining traffic" SSPs for capital projects provide for compensating contractors for early pickup. Encroachment Permit provisions require the permittee to pick up a closure early without compensation.

DTM’s are to ensure that lane closures will not be terminated early, or may be extended beyond the lane closure window when the activity needs to be completed for the safety of the public or workers. These activities may include structure inspections and repairs, guardrail repairs, culvert replacement.

In order to avoid significant traffic impacts, it is essential to monitor and respond immediately to delay, pick up closures on time, and have solid traffic and contractor contingency plans.

A Department staff member who can make informed decisions about implementing contingency plans and modifying, terminating or extending approved lane closures should be available to respond to significant delays and other unexpected events whenever lane closures are in place.
The designated employee(s) may be Traffic Operations, Construction, or TMC staff, depending on the district.

At the end of the project a post-TMP evaluation report must be completed by the TMP Manager for all major TMPs and for TMPs where the actual delay exceeded the threshold set by the DTM. Post-TMP meetings with the CHP and other partners can be held to identify what went well and what could have been done differently. Samples of past TMP reports can be obtained from headquarters' Traffic Operations, Office of System Management Operations and from the DTM.

**Contingency Plan**

Both traffic and contractor contingency plans are required for all planned work. Both blanket and individual TMPs must include contingency plans. The traffic contingency plan, prepared by the Department or a consultant, addresses specific actions that will be taken to restore or minimize affects on traffic when the congestion or delay exceeds original estimates due to unforeseen events such as work-zone accidents, higher than predicted traffic demand, or delayed lane closures. The contractor contingency plan addresses activities under the contractor’s control in the work zone. After the contractor’s contingency plan is submitted and approved, it becomes part of the TMP contingency plan.

The TMP contingency plan should include, but is not limited to the following:

- Information that clearly defines trigger points which require lane closure termination (i.e., inclement weather, length of traffic queue exceeds threshold);
- Decision tree with clearly defined lines of communication and authority;
- Specific duties of all participants during lane closure operations, such as, coordination with CHP or local police, etc.;
- Names, phone numbers and pager numbers for the DTM or their designee, the Resident Engineer (RE), the Maintenance Superintendent, the Permit Inspector, the on-site traffic advisor, the CHP Division or Area Commander, appropriate local agency representatives, and other applicable personnel;
- Coordination strategy (and special agreements if applicable) between DTM, RE, on-site traffic advisor, Maintenance, CHP and local agencies;
- Contractor’s contingency plan;
- Standby equipment, State personnel, and availability of local agency personnel for callout (normally requires a Cooperative Agreement);
- Development of contingencies based on maintaining minimum service level.

**G. RETROFITTING PROGRAMMED PROJECTS**

Usually the extent of the TMP is to be determined prior to programming (PID approval). However, it may sometimes be necessary to retrofit a TMP to a project that is already programmed due to project changes, policy changes, emergencies or unforeseen conditions. These projects must be handled on a case by case basis since the course of action will depend on how far along the project development process is and how extensive the TMP needs to be. Retrofitted TMPs may require a TMP team and TMP Manager and involvement from all functional units as discussed earlier in these guidelines. The project manager is responsible for
initiating a TMP investigation since they are most knowledgeable of project status. Some suggestions for funding retrofitted TMP are:

Use of Minor Funds

Minor A and B money has been used to pay for TMP measures that total less than $1,000,000. The districts will not usually be reimbursed for this even though the FHWA agrees to participate (it is not economically feasible for the Department to process minor funds for reimbursement). There have been exceptions however, and that decision is at the discretion of the Federal Resources Branch in headquarters Budgets Program.

Charge to Other Project Phase 4 (Construction) Funds

Funds from other construction contracts in the district may be used if those projects are in the vicinity of, or will be affected by, the project requiring TMP funds. At the discretion of the Deputy District Director for Construction a list of chargeable project EAs may be submitted to headquarters Accounting for prorated charging. Very few Accounting staff are aware of the process required and headquarters Traffic Operations, Office of System Management Operations should be contacted for assistance.

Project Cost or Scope Changes

The CTC has delegated to the Director of the Department the authority to increase a project’s cost by up to 20 percent without prior commission approval. This authority has been delegated to other Department managers as described in Project Management Directive PMD6. This increase can be used for TMP implementation and will be 100 percent reimbursable by the FHWA. The increased costs must be absorbed by other projects in the district since the total capital outlay allocation remains the same.

H. LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

The TMP Deputy Directive 60 applies to all projects on state facilities, including those not funded by the state. District Directors are responsible for assuring local compliance. Since many measure projects are split funded, the Department and local entities must work cooperatively to develop an effective TMP. The Department is responsible for approving all PSRs and it is at this point that agreements should be reached concerning the costs and scope of TMP measures.

III. CORRIDOR, REGIONAL AND MULTI-FUNCTIONAL AREA TMPS

When multiple or consecutive projects are within the same general corridor, the cumulative impact can result in excessive traffic delays and detour conflicts. These may be multiple capital projects, the involvement of more than one district, or a combination of capital projects and Encroachment Permit and/or Maintenance activities. Corridor or regional coordination will minimize or eliminate these impacts and reduce inconvenience to the motoring public.

When multiple projects are in the same corridor or on corridors within the same traffic area, it may be possible to develop a single corridor or regional TMP. In other cases, individual TMPs are developed and funded from their own sources, and a bare-bones corridor or regional TMP addresses the cumulative impact. Each project covered by corridor and regional TMP contributes resources in proportion to its traffic impact. During TMP implementation, the TMC serves as an information clearinghouse and coordinates operations. The TMC helps identify conflicts and recommends appropriate action. When provided with accurate and up-to-date lane closure information the TMC provides real-time traffic information via electronic media, CMS, and HAR.
The TMP Manager coordinates the development and implementation of corridor and regional TMPs. The TMP Manager forms a TMP team including, as a minimum, representatives from Construction, Maintenance, Public Affairs and Traffic Operations for each of the affected districts. The initial meeting is held several months in advance of the construction season to set milestones, and allow time to gather project information and prepare and distribute information.

The corridor/regional TMP may need elements in addition to those provided by the individual TMP for each project. Those elements may include changeable message signs at key locations outside individual project limits, the establishment of an information hot line and web-sites for all projects involved. The use of the statewide Caltrans Highway Information Network (CHIN) number (1-800-427-ROAD), and particularly the use of TMCs as a central reporting hub. The Northern Valley TMC in District 3 has established reporting procedures specifically for interregional TMPs that are obtainable from headquarters Traffic Operations.

IV. MAJOR LANE CLOSURE APPROVAL PROCESS

This process applies to all major lane closures on the state highway system. Major lane closures are those lane closures that are expected to result in significant traffic impacts despite the implementation of TMPs. A “significant traffic impact” is defined in DD-60 as (a) 30 minutes above normal recurring traffic delay on the facility, or (b) the delay threshold set by the DTM, whichever is less. When a planned lane closure is expected to have a significant traffic impact, Headquarters District Lane Closure Review Committee (DLCRC) review and approval is required. The functional unit directly involved in the work must submit the major lane closure request to the DLCRC for approval as detailed below.

A traveler’s trip should not be increased by more than 30 minutes due to planned Department activities. The DTM may set a lower maximum if the economic impact of a delay over 20 minutes would be high. The lesser of these delay limits is the maximum delay threshold allowed for any activity. Only the DLCRC can approve a higher delay threshold for a project.

Additionally, it should be noted that TMP activities are comprehensive, and involve actions in addition to traffic management through the work zone, as detailed in these TMP Guidelines. All lane closure operations and other planned activities should be evaluated at the earliest possible developmental stage for potential impacts and mitigation strategies. Pre-implementation meetings and contingency plans remain important aspects of all lane closure operations to minimize impacts of unforeseen events.

A. THRESHOLD CRITERIA FOR LANE CLOSURES REQUIRING APPROVAL OF THE DLCRC

DLCRC review and approval is required when planned activities are expected to result in a traffic delay that exceeds 30 minutes or the delay threshold set by the DTM, which ever is less.

DLCRC review and approval is not required for emergency closures due to natural events or incidents. However, the DTM must be notified, and every effort must be made to minimize traveler delay and reopen traffic lanes as soon as practical.

Applicability

The DLCRC, comprised of the CHP, District Public Information Officer, and Deputy District Directors of Construction, Design, Maintenance and Operations, approves all requests for major lane closures that meet the above threshold criteria. The criteria are applicable for moving or static lane closure operations. The DLCRC will decide when to submit lane closure requests that
are of an interregional, statewide, environmental, or otherwise sensitive nature to the Headquarters Lane Closure Review Committee (HQLCRC) for their approval.

The DLCRC is responsible for determining when HQLCRC approval is required. The HQLCRC is comprised of the Division Chiefs for Construction, Maintenance, Design and Local Programs, and Traffic Operations along with the Headquarters Public Information Officer, and a representative from the CHP. The HQLCRC may review the closure or leave the decision to the DLCRC. The HQLCRC should be advised of all planned lane closures that exceed the above threshold criteria. All planned lane closures that exceed the above threshold criteria and are of an interregional, statewide, environmental, or otherwise sensitive nature, as determined by the district LCRC, may also require approval of the HQLCRC.

Contents of Major Lane Closure Request Submittal

The functional unit requesting the lane closure and responsible for its performance prepares a proposed lane closure submittal. Sufficient information is provided to ensure complete understanding of the proposal. The submittal is sent through the DTM for review before sending it on to the LCRC. If additional TMP efforts can reduce the expected additional delay to less than 30 minutes, then the closure does not have to go to the LCRC. The DLCRC/HQLCRC may require additional information during its review. At a minimum, the following information is recommended initially:

1. Location and vicinity maps showing the state highway(s), local street network, and other adjacent lane closures or nearby work that may affect traffic during the same period, including special events;
2. Dates, times and locations of the lane closure(s);
3. Brief description of the work being performed during the lane closure(s);
4. Brief description of each lane closure and its anticipated affect on traffic;
5. Amount of expected delay and corresponding queue length for each lane closure;
6. Summary of TMP strategies that will be used to reduce delay and motorist inconvenience during the lane closure(s) (refer to Table 1). A copy of the approved TMP for the project, if available;
7. Contingency plan (see "Contingency Plan" below).

B. EVALUATION

The LCRC is responsible for approving major lane closures and will use the items below for evaluating lane closure operations. In its evaluation of the proposal, the LCRC will give consideration to the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of information provided as well as other reliable sources of information available to the LCRC.

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of effectiveness in the following areas:

- Promoting motorist and worker safety;
- TMP strategies;
- Plans for coordination with adjacent construction, maintenance, encroachment permits, and special events;
• Plans for coordination with TMC and field personnel;
• Plans for coordination with public media;
• Plans for use of existing field elements such as traffic surveillance loops, changeable message signs, highway advisory radio, and Closed Circuit Television cameras;
• Lines of communication and authority (top to bottom);
• Plans for monitoring delay (or corresponding queue length) during lane closure operations;
• Alternatives to proposed closures;
• Viability of contingency plans;

C. Post-Closure Evaluation Statement

A Post-Closure Evaluation statement will be submitted to headquarters’ Traffic Operations Program, Office of System Management Operations, on all projects that exceed expected delay or run outside of the closure window. No more than one page is suggested. The functional unit performing the lane closure will prepare the statement within five working days of the date the lane closure exceeded the threshold criteria. The statement should explain:

• The cause and impact of delays;
• Either actions taken or to be taken to avoid or mitigate an occurrence or recurrence;
• Why the expected delay was exceeded and/or why it was necessary to exceed the closure window;
• How the situation can be avoided in the future.

Post-closure evaluation statements are only for closures formally approved by the District LCRC under this process (i.e. exceed the lesser of 30 minutes or the DTM limit).
August 15, 2008

John Bassett
Director of Engineering
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
1007 Seventh Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) ON THE NATOMAS LEVEE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PHASE 3 LANDSIDE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT.

Dear Mr. Bassett:

The Sacramento County Department of Transportation (SACDOT) has reviewed the NOP for the above referenced project. We appreciate the opportunity to review this document and have the following comments to offer:

- The project proposes truck haul routes to access borrow and levee improvement sites via the County’s rural roadways. The project would add significant amounts of truck traffic to these rural roads and would result in an impact to the existing pavement structure. Typically, rural area pavement sections were design to carry low traffic volumes. The project construction truck traffic would shorten the life of pavement section and possibly result in damage to these roadways. We would ask that the project proponent enter into a maintenance agreement with the Maintenance and Operations Section of SACDOT. This agreement shall cover the maintenance and repair of any roadway damaged by the project’s construction activities.

- The proposed roadway closure and detours plans shall be coordinated with SACDOT staff.

- The project would result in the change of geometrics at the side street intersections with the Garden Highway. These roadways include Elverta Road, Elkhorn Road, and Power Line Road. The project proponent shall coordinate the proposed improvement plans with SACDOT staff.

- SACDOT would like to work with SAFCA about the possibility of adding a public pathway on top of the levee for use by pedestrians and bicyclists. We would work with

"Leading the Way to Greater Mobility"
stakeholders to pursue the viability of bike path for recreational uses. A recreational facility of this magnitude (40 plus miles) would be a great asset and benefit to Sacramento and Sutter Counties as well as the City of Sacramento.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (916) 874-6121 or Kamal Atwal at (916) 875-2844

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dean Blank, P.E.
Principal Civil Engineer
Department of Transportation

DB:ka

c: Dan Shoeman, DOT
Matt Darrow, DOT
Kamal Atwal, DOT
Ron Vicari, DOT
Rizaldy Mananquil, DOT
Steve Hong, County Engineering
Tricia Stevens, Planning and Community Development Department
August 18, 2008

John Bassett, Director of Engineering
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
1007 7th Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Comments to Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIS/EIR on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program, Phase 3 Landslide Improvement Project

Dear Director of Engineering:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIS/EIR on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program (NLIP), Phase 3 Landslide Improvement Project. We understand that this EIS/EIR will analyze the Phase 3 NLIP Project at a project level, and will analyze the Phase 4 NLIP Project at a program level. Sutter County is concerned about project impacts in two areas: potential damages to existing county roads, and traffic impacts from the earthmoving/hauling operation.

Potential Damages to Existing County Roads:

The project will generate a substantial number of loaded truck trips used to haul fill material to construct the project(s). County roads in Sutter County are not engineered to handle a substantial number of loaded trucks, as evidenced by road damaged caused by previous and ongoing phases of the project. There is a draft agreement between Sutter County and the Sacramento County Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) to address road repairs. Although this agreement is likely to be approved by both agencies and seems to mitigate the road maintenance concerns of Sutter County, the impact of the project on these facilities needs to be addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR.

Traffic Impacts:

The traffic impacts caused by the increased volume of truck traffic should be analyzed using a Traffic Impact Study that includes the latest traffic count and level of service (LOS) data, which are available from Caltrans and the Sutter County Public Works Department. The project(s) is of such a long duration, lasting several construction seasons, that Sutter County considers it to exceed what would be considered a short-term construction related traffic impact.
Potential haul routes, project traffic routes, and staging areas for the project(s) should be determined using the Traffic Impact Study. A Traffic Routing Plan and Traffic Safety and Control Plan should be developed for the project(s) that are directly supported by the Traffic Impact Study. These plans should be coordinated with and reviewed by State (CHP) and local (Sheriff) law enforcement and State (Caltrans) and local (Sutter County PW) road agencies.

Sutter County will require a highway permit from SAFCA's contractors, which will notify the County of the project(s)' specific timing and other parameters.

If you have questions on this response or need more information, you can contact me at (530) 822-7450 or email ssantacroce@co.sutter.ca.us.

Sincerely,

Steven R. Santa Croce
Senior Civil Engineer
Hello John
I attended the Scoping meeting on August 6 and was introduced to Phase 3 and 4 of the NLIP. The City of Sacramento, Department of Parks and Recreation maintains the multi-use trail along the NEMDC from the Sacramento Northern Parkway to Elkhorn Blvd. also known as the Ueda Parkway. We understand that the EIR/EIS for NLIP, Phase 3/4 will analyze Phase 3 in project level detail and Phase 4 in program level detail. We offer the following comments:

Phase 3:
Activities along the NEMDC such as widening the NEMDC west levee from Elkhorn Blvd to the NEMDC Pumping Station; constructing a cutoff wall in the NEMDC west levee from the Pumping Station to Northgate Blvd.; realigning and relocating irrigation and drainage canals and other infrastructure; and, removing encroachments as required to meet specific criteria, may have a direct impact on the Ueda Parkway during construction and post construction. We would like to know how the impacts will be addressed during all phases, such as if the Parkway will remain open or diverted in some fashion during construction, how the Parkway and adjacent open space will be reconstructed after construction, and if the access points to the Parkway will be re-instituted. This Parkway serves as a major alternative transportation option for commuters and serves as a regional recreation trail.

There is a potential borrow site south of Elkhorn Blvd. Our Department has identified this location for potential open space and park sites for the proposed Panhandle project. One of your activities is to recontour the land and create marsh and upland habitat at this location. How does that limit our use of the land for these identified uses? Will a permit from a regulatory agency be required to use this land as planned if this marsh and upland habitat is successful?

Phase 4:
The activity to construct a cutoff wall in the American River north levee between Gateway Oaks Drive and Northgate Blvd where required to reduce seepage potential is potentially in the same location as existing on-street and off-street bike trail along Garden Highway as well as a park site (Sand Cove) and open space site (Costa) near RM 19A. We would like to know what could be the possible impacts at some project level detail when that information is known.

Thank you for accepting our NOP comments. Please let me know if there are any questions on our comments or if we can be of any assistance. We look forward to receiving a copy of the EIR/EIS when it is available.

Dana

Dana Allen, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento
Department of Parks and Recreation
915 I Street, 5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 808-2762
f (916) 808-8266
August 7, 2008

John Bassett, Director of Engineering
SAFCA
1007 7th Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

John Bassett,

Regarding the July 18, 2008 notice of preparation Draft Environmental Impact report on the Natomas Levee improvement program.

Phase 4 of this project is located within the Rio Linda Elverta Recreation and Park District.

We request a presentation to our Board of Directors on Phase 2, 3, and 4 to allow them to better understand the projects impact on our community.

Also, now would be a good time to consider the levee improvements, and acquisition of land for potential park space.

Our Park District would very much like to see Sacramento Ueda Parkway extended from Elkhorn Blvd. North through our Park District to Sutter and Placer Counties. We would like to create equestrian, pedestrian, cycling pathways for public use that currently do not exist.

We would also like to discuss the Park Districts potential role in maintaining this area, when constructed, for the mutual benefit of all.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document and we look forward to discussing these ideas with you in the future.

Sincerely,

Don Schatzel
District Administrator
Rio Linda Elverta Recreation and Park District
August 17, 2008

John Bassett, Director of Engineering  
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency  
1007 Seventh Street, 7th Floor  
Sacramento, CA  95814

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report  
Natomas Levee Improvement Program, Phase 3 Landside Improvements Project

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Since a portion of the funds supporting SAFCA projects is derived from federal and state general funds, the proposed projects should be of some benefit to the entire river system. The best way to benefit the entire region is to reduce water elevation in the river system. This would include giving some land back to the river. SAFCA should not be permitted to raise levees or place additional materials inside river banks or channel areas. Any action which may reduce flow capacity or increase water elevation even “insignificantly” should not be permitted.

The Sacramento River system is a regional system and must be dealt with on a regional basis. Whatever is done in one particular area will affect all other areas in the system.

What must be done:

- Move levees back from river channel.
- Make channel deeper and wider.
- Remove levees from Islands in the Delta and East Bay estuaries.
- Remove homes, buildings, pads, marinas, etc. from inside levee areas.
- Increase flow capacity and in-stream retention capacity.
- Curtail discharge into river system by reclamation and drainage districts during periods of high water. These districts should be required to have adequate internal retention capacity to store storm water during high water periods.

Increased flood risk to surrounding communities:

- Any action which may reduce flow capacity of the river system even slightly will increase water elevation in the river, exposing neighboring communities to increase flood risk. The Sacramento River is already severely constricted particularly from the confluence of the Feather River to the East Bay region. The area that is drained by the Natomas Cross Canal-Pleasant Grove Creek Canal system, which includes the...
community of Pleasant Grove, is already significantly impacted by past improvements in the river system which have not been fully mitigated. In 1986 and 1997 this area endured serious flooding that would not have occurred prior to the construction of the levee system.

Additional Impacts on the Environment:
- Removal of agricultural land for “improvements”.
- Removal of additional agricultural land for mitigation of improvements.
- Removal of even more agricultural land due to development and mitigation encouraged by levee improvements.

Respectfully submitted,
Melvin Borgman