

### 3.2.17 Transportation and Traffic

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less-than-Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC —</b> <b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Environmental Setting

The focus of this analysis centers around construction traffic associated with repair of levee sites. No long-term operational traffic impacts would result from the project. There are two basic categories of construction traffic that would access the levee sites: (1) daily workers and staff; and, (2) material deliveries and hauling operations from earthwork activities. The daily workers would access the sites via the adjacent roadway network depending on their origins and destinations.

Traffic effects associated with the project were evaluated based on average daily traffic and specific time periods during the day (i.e., hourly basis, as needed). The analysis was based on the following assumptions:

- Material and equipment hauling activity would occur during normal work hours, from 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
- Each levee site would require approximately 2 to 4 weeks of active construction, and up to nine sites may be repaired at the same time.
- There would typically be 7 workers at each site per day.
- Material would originate from the following locations: San Rafael, Sacramento, Tracy, Ione, Jamestown, Sutter, Lodi, Elk Grove, Vina, and Smartsville.

Haul routes and access roads for each of the proposed repair sites are shown on Figures 3 through 35. These routes were selected based on the most direct/shortest paths and using designated truck facilities to the extent feasible, consistent with city and county guidance regarding selection of haul routes.

#### Roadway Network

Roadways within the project vicinity are traveled by a mix of vehicle types, with automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, emergency vehicles, and trucks with trailers traversing the larger arterials, and automobiles, trucks, and agricultural equipment using county roadways and local roads (on

county roadways). Descriptions of the types of roadways associated with the project are provided below. Traffic volumes for roadways within the vicinity of proposed project sites are presented in **Table TRA-1**, and were compiled from a variety of sources including county general plans and Caltrans traffic data. Traffic volumes were not available for local roads within the proposed project haul routes.

### **Regional Facilities**

**Interstate 80 (I-80):** I-80 is the second-longest interstate highway in the United States. The section of I-80 located within Yolo County (adjacent to Site 42), runs east-west, and is classified as a freeway. I-80 consists of six lanes, is divided by barriers, and has an exclusive bicycle path located on the north side of the corridor east of the site. Near the project, it has an Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) of approximately 146,500 vehicles.

**Interstate 5 (I-5):** I-5 is the major north-south highway on the Pacific Coast, extending from Mexico to Canada, and linking major cities within California, as well as Oregon and Washington. The section of I-5 within the proposed project haul routes traverses Sacramento, Tehama, and San Joaquin Counties. Classified as a freeway/interstate, I-5 consists of four lanes along most of the haul routes. It varies in traffic volume from 156,200 AADT in the City of Sacramento to 30,500 AADT near Site 76 in Tehama County.

**State Route 4 (SR 4):** SR 4 runs east-west south of Stockton in San Joaquin County, providing access to Sites 62, 69, and 70. It's a two-lane principal arterial with an AADT of approximately 14,700 vehicles.

**State Route 12 (SR 12):** SR 12 is a rural collector that runs east-west in the southwestern portion of Sacramento County. It provides two lanes and has an AADT of approximately 17,000 vehicles near Site 77.

**State Route 45 (SR 45):** SR 45 is one of the primary transportation corridors extending through Colusa County, providing access to Site 44. Because of its rural location, it is a two-lane, minor arterial with a relatively low AADT of 900 vehicles.

**State Route 50 (SR 50):** SR 50 is located within the City of Sacramento. It heads east-west across I-5 and turns into I-305 west of the intersection. SR 50 is an eight-lane freeway that has an AADT of 232,200 vehicles.

**State Route 70 (SR 70):** SR 70 is a major transportation corridor that runs north/south within the southeastern portion of Sutter County, providing access to Site 54. It is a four-lane expressway with an AADT of 18,000 vehicles.

**State Route 84 (SR 84):** SR 84 travels south from West Sacramento, through Yolo County, into Solano County. Where it traverses the project study area in Yolo County, it is a conventional two-lane highway with an AADT between 430 (Site 48) and 1,350 vehicles (Sites 51, 52, and 61), depending on the location.

**TABLE TRA-1  
EXISTING ADT ON PROJECT ACCESS ROUTES**

Phase	Site ID No	County	Regional Access				Local Roadways		
			Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes	(ADT)	Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes
4	42	Yolo	I-80	Freeway	6	146,500	Levee Road	Local	2
							Chiles Road (County Road 32)	Local (Emergency/Access Corridor)	2
	54	Sutter	SR 70	Expressway	4	18,800	Pleasant Grove Road	Urban Minor Arterial	2
							Levee Road	Rural Local Road	2
							Bear River Drive	Rural Major Collector	2
	48	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	430	South River Road	Local	2
							Private Road	Local	2
	51	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,350	Levee Road	Local	2
							South River Road	Local	2
							County Road 141	Local	2
							County Road 142	Local	2
							County Road 144	Local	2
	52	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,350	Elk Slough	Local	2
							South River Road	Local	2
							County Road 141	Local	2
							County Road 144	Local	2
	53	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,350	Elk Slough	Local	2
							South River Road	Local	2
							County Road 141	Local	2
							County Road 144	Local	2
49	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,100	Private Road	Local	2	
						South River Road	Local	2	
						County Road 142	Local	2	
						County Road 144	Local	2	

**TABLE TRA-1  
EXISTING ADT ON PROJECT ACCESS ROUTES**

Phase	Site ID No	County	Regional Access				Local Roadways		
			Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes	(ADT)	Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes
4 (cont.)	50	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,100	Private Road	Local	2
							South River Road	Local	2
							County Road 142	Local	2
							County Road 144	Local	2
	46	Sacramento	SR 160	Rural Collector	2	1,500	Grand Island Road	Local Street	2
	47	Sacramento	SR 160	Rural Collector	2	1,500	Private Road	Local Street	2
							Private Road	Local Street	2
							Private Road	Local Street	2
							Grand Island Road	Local Street	2
	55	San Joaquin	I-5	Interstate	4	24,000	W. Lorenzen Road	Rural	2
							E. Lorenzen Road	Rural	2
							Kasson Road	Rural	2
44	Colusa	SR 45	Minor Arterial	2	900	Miller Landing Road	Local	2	
						Levee Road	Local	2	
						Ceres Avenue	Local	2	
5	76	Tehama	I-5	Interstate Freeway	4	30,500	State Highway 99w	State Highway	2
							Levee Road	Local/Minor	2
							Reno Avenue	Local/Minor	2
							Private Road	Local/Minor	2
	79	Butte	SR 99	State Highway	4	37,900	Oroville-Chico Highway	Rural Arterial	2
							Levee Road	Rural Local Road	2
							Lott Road	Rural Local Road	2
							Private Road	Rural Local Road	2

**TABLE TRA-1  
EXISTING ADT ON PROJECT ACCESS ROUTES**

Phase	Site ID No	County	Regional Access				Local Roadways		
			Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes	(ADT)	Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes
5 (cont.)	77	Sacramento	SR 160	Rural Collector	2	3,950	Tyler Island Road	Local Street	2
			SR 12	Rural Collector	2	17,000	Levee Road	Local Street	2
	58	Sacramento	SR 160	Rural Collector	2	2,150	Private Road	Local Street	2
							Randall Island Road	Local Street	2
	59	Sacramento	I-5	Freeway	4	55,900	River Road	Local Street	2
							Vorden Road	Local Street	2
							Herzog Road	Local Street	2
							Twin Cities Road	Local Street	2
	60	Sacramento	I-5	Freeway	4	55,900	River Road	Local Street	2
							Vorden Road	Local Street	2
							Herzog Road	Local Street	2
							Twin Cities Road	Local Street	2
	62	San Joaquin	SR 4	Principal Arterial	2	14,700	S Roberts Road	Rural	2
							Levee Road	Rural Residential	2
			I-5	Interstate	4	150,000	Private Road	Rural Residential	2
							Private Road	Rural Residential	2
							Private Road	Rural Residential	2
	61	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,350	Clarksburg Road	Local	2
S River Road							Local	2	
Netherlands Road							Local	2	
School Street							Local	2	
69	San Joaquin	SR 4	Principal Arterial	2	14,700	Private Road	Rural Residential	2	
						John Tuk Road	Rural Residential	2	
						Levee Road	Rural Residential	2	

**TABLE TRA-1  
EXISTING ADT ON PROJECT ACCESS ROUTES**

Phase	Site ID No	County	Regional Access				Local Roadways		
			Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes	(ADT)	Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes
<b>5</b> (cont.)	70	San Joaquin	SR 4	Principal Arterial	2	14,700	Private Road	Rural Residential	2
							John Tuk Road	Rural Residential	2
							Levee Road	Rural Residential	2
	73	San Joaquin	I-5	Interstate	4	114,500	Private Road	Rural Residential	2
							Levee Road	Rural Residential	2
							Private Road	Rural Residential	2
	74	San Joaquin	I-5	Interstate	4	103,000	Undine Road	Rural Residential	2
							Levee Road	Rural Residential	2
							Private Road	Rural Residential	2
	63	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,250	Clarksburg Road	Local	2
							Willow Avenue	Local	2
							S River Road	Local	2
	65	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,250	Clarksburg Road	Local	2
							Willow Avenue	Local	2
							S River Road	Local	2
	67	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,250	Clarksburg Road	Local	2
							Willow Avenue	Local	2
							S River Road	Local	2
72	San Joaquin	I-5	Interstate	4	114,500	Private Road	Rural Residential	2	
						Levee Road	Rural Residential	2	
						Private Road	Rural Residential	2	

**TABLE TRA-1  
EXISTING ADT ON PROJECT ACCESS ROUTES**

Phase	Site ID No	County	Regional Access				Local Roadways		
			Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes	(ADT)	Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes
<b>5</b> (cont.)	71	San Joaquin	I-5	Interstate	4	79,000	S Roberts Road	Rural Residential	2
							Private Road	Rural Residential	2
							Undine Road	Rural Residential	2
							Private Road	Rural Residential	2
							Levee Road	Rural Residential	2

SOURCES: Butte County 2018, Caltrans 2018, County of Sacramento 2017, County of Yolo 2009, Glenn County 1993, Sutter County 2011, Tehama County 2009, San Joaquin County 2016.

**State Route 99 (SR 99):** SR 99 is a two- to four-lane state highway where it serves the project sites in Tehama and Butte Counties. SR 99 is one of the primary transportation routes through Tehama County, and provides access to a large number of the developed urban and rural areas. SR 99 runs north-south through Butte County, connecting it with Yuba City and Sacramento to the south, and Red Bluff to the northwest. Near Site 79, it is a four-lane highway with an AADT of approximately 37,900 vehicles.

**State Route 160 (SR 160):** SR 160 is a two-lane rural collector that runs parallel to the Sacramento River levees in the Delta from the Sacramento City Limits at the northern edge of Freeport to the southern tip of the Delta at Antioch Bridge (Senator John Nejedly Bridge). Where it traverses areas near the project sites, it ranges in AADT from 1,500 vehicles (near Sites 46 and 47) to 3,950 vehicles (near Site 77).

### ***Local Roadways***

Local roadways surrounding the project site are typically paved or unpaved, low volume roadways that support two-directional traffic. As noted above, traffic volumes for these facilities were not available. However, due to their rural location, functional classifications, and lack of connectivity to major activity centers, local roadways are assumed to be relatively free of congested traffic conditions.

### ***Airports/Airstrips***

Sacramento International Airport, four municipal airports (Stockton Metropolitan Airport, Red Bluff Municipal Airport, Corning Airport, and Chico Municipal Airport), and a number of smaller airports and airstrips (Van Dyke Strip, Rio Linda Airport, Sacramento Executive Airport, Flying B Ranch Airport, Franklin Field, Spezia Airport, Deer Creek Ranch Airport, Butte Creek Hog Ranch Airport, etc.) are located within a 10-mile radius of a rehabilitation site.

### ***Transit***

Transit service in the project study area varies widely depending on the county and the intensity of land uses (i.e., rural, suburban, urban) surrounding the proposed rehabilitation sites. Types of service range from fixed-route and paratransit service in large metropolitan areas (i.e., City of Sacramento), to public dial-a-ride service in more rural areas. Due to the remote nature of many of the proposed rehabilitation sites, direct transit access is not provided to any of the sites. However, YoloBus routes (e.g., Davis Express Trip, Cache Creek, and East Davis-Sacramento Express) and County Trax Route 6 utilize regional access routes for Sites 42 (I-80) and 76 (SR 99), respectively. As shown below in **Table TRA-2**, the remaining sites are located over a half a mile from a bus stop or are located in rural areas where direct transit access is not provided.

### ***Pedestrian and Bicycle System***

Pedestrian facilities include sidewalks, crosswalk, and pedestrian signals, and are generally located in developed communities. The proposed project is generally located in rural areas where pedestrian facilities are limited. One off-street bike path, and a number of on-street bike lanes, provide access to some of the project sites. As shown below in **Table TRA-3**, these bike lanes are typically located on local roadways, except one bike path that is located adjacent to I-80.



**TABLE TRA-2  
EXISTING BUS ACCESS TO PROJECT SITES**

Phase	Site ID No	Served by Transit (Y/N)	Name of Service Provider and Route Number
<b>4</b>	42	N	YoloBus Routes: Davis Express Trip, Cache Creek, and East Davis-Sacramento Express utilize access routes, but does not serve the site.
	54	N	None
	48	N	None
	51	N	None
	52	N	None
	53	N	None
	49	N	None
	50	N	None
	46	N	None
	47	N	None
	55	N	None
	44	N	None
<b>5</b>	76	N	County Trax Route 6 utilizes access routes, but does not serve the site.
	79	N	None
	77	N	None
	58	N	None
	59	N	None
	60	N	None
	62	N	None
	61	N	None
	69	N	None
	70	N	None
	73	N	None
	74	N	None
	63	N	None
	65	N	None
	67	N	None
72	N	None	
71	N	None	

SOURCES: Butte County 2018, County of Sacramento 2017, County of Yolo 2009, Glenn County 1993, Sutter County 2011, Tehama County 2009, Regional Transit Committee 2017, San Joaquin County 2016.

**TABLE TRA-3  
EXISTING BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS TO PROJECT SITES**

Phase	Site ID No	Designated Bicycle Facility (Y/N)	Type	Designated Pedestrian Facility (Y/N)	Type
4	42	Y	Existing Class I Path on I-80	N	N/A
	54	N	N/A	N	N/A
	48	N (Planned)	Proposed Class II Lane on South River Road	N	N/A
	51	N (Planned)	Proposed Class II Lane on County Road I44	N	N/A
	52	N (Planned)	Proposed Class II Lane on County Road I44	N	N/A
	53	N (Planned)	Proposed Class II Lane on County Road I44	N	N/A
	49	N (Planned)	Proposed Class II Lane on County Road I44	N	N/A
	50	N (Planned)	Proposed Class II Lane on County Road I44	N	N/A
	46	N	N/A	N	N/A
	47	N	N/A	N	N/A
	55	N (Planned)	Proposed Class III Bike Route on Kasson Road	N	N/A
	44	N	N/A	N	N/A
	5	76	N	N/A	N
79		N (Planned)	There is a planned Class 2 Bike Route on the Oroville Chico Hwy and Lott Road	N	N/A
77		N (Planned)	Class II Bike Lane (Planned) – SR 12	N	N/A
58		N (Planned)	Class II Bike Lane (Planned) – SR 160	N	N/A
59		N (Planned)	Class II Bike Lane (Planned) – Twin Cities Road Class I Bike Path (Planned) – Isleton-Stone Lakes Trail	N	N/A
60		N (Planned)	Class II Bike Lane (Planned) – Twin Cities Road Class I Bike Path (Planned) – Isleton-Stone Lakes Trail	N	N/A
62		N	N/A	N	N/A
61		N (Planned)	Proposed Class II Lane on County Road I44	N	N/A
69		N	N/A	N	N/A
70		N	N/A	N	N/A
73		N	N/A	N	N/A
74		N	N/A	N	N/A
63		N (Planned)	Proposed Class II Lane on South River Road	N	N/A
65		N (Planned)	Proposed Class II Lane on South River Road	N	N/A
67		N (Planned)	Proposed Class II Lane on South River Road	N	N/A
72		N	N/A	N	N/A
71		N	N/A	N	N/A

SOURCE: Butte County 2011, Colusa County 2012, Sacramento County 2011, County of Yolo 2009, Glenn County 2018, Sutter County 2011, Tehama County Transportation Commission 2013, San Joaquin Council of Governments 2012.

## Discussion

- a) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable traffic plan, ordinance or policy or impact the performance of the circulation system because hauling of materials would not require alterations to existing circulation systems. Access to repair sites would occur primarily along existing paved public roads, levee crown roads, or unpaved private farm roads. Where existing roads are not adequate for site access, temporary access roads may be constructed for hauling equipment and materials to and from the site. Temporary access roads would be located in remote locations and would connect to low volume roadways; therefore, they would not affect existing circulation and impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Equipment, rock, and personnel would be mobilized to each site, with materials being transported from San Rafael, Sacramento, Tracy, Ione, Jamestown, Sutter, Lodi, Elk Grove, Vina, and Smartsville. **Table TRA-4** details the percent increase in traffic that would occur on regional access routes as a result of each project site. It should be noted that some of the proposed rehabilitation sites would be repaired using an in-water barge with a mounted crane to transport materials and a work boat. However, to provide a conservative assessment of potential impacts to project study area transportation facilities, all material haul trips were assumed to be performed using trucks. In addition to the truck traffic associated with haul trips, each site would also require an additional 14 vehicle trips per day for the seven employees working at each site (1 trip inbound, 1 vehicle trip outbound).

**TABLE TRA-4**  
**CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC IMPACTS TO REGIONAL ACCESS**

Phase	Site ID No	County	Regional Access				Project Traffic		
			Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes	(ADT)	Truck Trips per Site	Truck Trips per Day <sup>1</sup>	Percent Increase
4	42	Yolo	I-80	Freeway	6	146,500	2,198	220	0.15%
	54	Sutter	SR 70	Expressway	4	18,800	594	59	0.31%
	48	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	430	1,052	105	24.4%
	51	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,350	102	10	0.74%
	52	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,350	234	23	1.7%
	53	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,350	124	12	0.89%
	49	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,100	490	49	4.5%
	50	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,100	102	10	0.91%
	46	Sacramento	SR 160	Rural Collector	2	1,500	2,212	221	14.7%
	47	Sacramento	SR 160	Rural Collector	2	1,500	2,212	221	14.7%
	55	San Joaquin	I-5	Interstate	4	24,000	2,836	284	1.2%

**TABLE TRA-4  
CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC IMPACTS TO REGIONAL ACCESS**

Phase	Site ID No	County	Regional Access				Project Traffic		
			Name	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes	(ADT)	Truck Trips per Site	Truck Trips per Day <sup>1</sup>	Percent Increase
<b>4</b> (cont.)	44	Colusa	SR 45	Minor Arterial	2	900	638	64	7.1%
	76	Tehama	I-5	Interstate Freeway	4	30,500	2,480	248	0.81%
	79	Butte	SR 99	State Highway	4	37,900	3,270	327	0.86%
	77	Sacramento	SR 160	Rural Collector	2	3,950	330	33	0.84%
			SR 12	Rural Collector	2	17,000			0.19%
	58	Sacramento	SR 160	Rural Collector	2	2,150	3,986	399	18.6%
	59	Sacramento	I-5	Freeway	4	55,900	1,940	194	0.35%
	60	Sacramento	I-5	Freeway	4	55,900	730	73	0.13%
	62	San Joaquin	SR 4	Principal Arterial	2	14,700	2,776	278	1.9%
			I-5	Interstate	4	150,000			0.19%
<b>5</b>	61	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,350	9,556	956	70.8%
	69	San Joaquin	SR 4	Principal Arterial	2	14,700	2,626	263	1.8%
	70	San Joaquin	SR 4	Principal Arterial	2	14,700	164	16	0.11%
	73	San Joaquin	I-5	Interstate	4	114,500	1,276	128	0.11%
	74	San Joaquin	I-5	Interstate	4	103,000	1,962	196	0.10%
	63	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,250	3,868	387	31.0%
	65	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,250	828	83	6.6%
	67	Yolo	SR 84	Conventional Two-Lane Highway	2	1,250	450	45	3.6%
	72	San Joaquin	I-5	Interstate	4	114,500	992	99	0.09%
	71	San Joaquin	I-5	Interstate	4	79,000	512	51	0.06%

## NOTES:

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of the transportation analysis, a two-week construction period was assumed, with construction occurring five days per week. This is a conservative assumption, as construction could take up to four weeks with construction occurring up to six days a week at sites that require the largest amount of material hauling.

As shown in Table TRA-4, most regional access routes would experience a minimal increase in AADT. The magnitude of these increases is within the range of typical daily variation in traffic levels (usually on the order of  $\pm 5$  percent) that might be expected on the major roadways serving the project sites, and roadway operating conditions on these roadways would remain substantially similar to current conditions. The exceptions are Sites 44, 46, 47, 48, 58, 61, 63, and 65 with estimated increases in AADT of between 7 and 71 percent. Those percentages of increase in traffic volumes (greater than the above-cited  $\pm 5$  percent typical daily variation in traffic levels) would be noticeable to the average motorist. To determine whether project-generated increases in traffic volumes would be

significant, additional analysis is provided below for these sites using the concept of Level of Service (LOS). LOS grades range from LOS A (free-flow operations) to LOS F (highly-congested operations).

**Site 44:** The AADT on SR 45 in Colusa County in the vicinity of the project site would increase from 900 to 964 (+7 percent) during the two- to four-week construction period. SR 45 is an undivided, 2-lane uninterrupted-flow highway that would operate at LOS A with the additional project-generated trucks (FDOT 2012). Colusa County has an established LOS standard of LOS C for rural roadways; therefore, LOS A conditions are considered to be acceptable (Colusa County, 2012). Furthermore, the increase in traffic volume would be temporary (approximately a two- to four-week period); therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**Site 46:** The AADT on SR 160 in Sacramento County in the vicinity of the project site would increase from 1,500 to 1,721 (+15 percent) during the two- to four-week construction period. SR 160 is an undivided, 2-lane uninterrupted-flow highway that would operate at LOS A with the additional project-generated trucks (FDOT 2012). Sacramento County has an established LOS standard of LOS D for rural roadways; therefore, LOS A conditions are considered to be acceptable (County of Sacramento, 2017). Furthermore, the increase in traffic volume would be temporary (approximately a two- to four-week period); therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**Site 47:** The AADT on SR 160 in Sacramento County in the vicinity of the project site would increase from 1,500 to 1,721 (+15 percent) during the two- to four-week construction period. SR 160 is an undivided, 2-lane uninterrupted-flow highway that would operate at LOS A with the additional project-generated trucks (FDOT 2012). Sacramento County has an established LOS standard of LOS D for rural roadways; therefore, LOS A conditions are considered to be acceptable (County of Sacramento 2017). Furthermore, the increase in traffic volume would be temporary (approximately a two- to four-week period); therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**Site 48:** The AADT on SR 84 in Yolo County in the vicinity of the project site would increase from 430 to 535 (+24 percent) during the two- to four-week construction period. SR 84 is an undivided, 2-lane uninterrupted-flow highway that would operate at LOS A with the additional project-generated trucks (FDOT, 2012). Yolo County has an established LOS standard of LOS C for roadways; therefore, LOS A conditions are considered to be acceptable (County of Yolo, 2009). Furthermore, the increase in traffic volume would be temporary (approximately a two- to four-week period); therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**Site 58:** The AADT on SR 160 in Sacramento County in the vicinity of the project site would increase from 2,150 to 2,549 (+19 percent) during the two- to four-week construction period. SR 160 is an undivided, 2-lane uninterrupted-flow highway that would operate at LOS A with the additional project-generated trucks (FDOT, 2012). Sacramento County has an established LOS standard of LOS D for rural roadways;

therefore, LOS A conditions are considered to be acceptable (County of Sacramento, 2017). Furthermore, the increase in traffic volume would be temporary (approximately a two- to four-week period); therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**Site 61:** The AADT on SR 84 in Yolo County in the vicinity of the project site would increase from 1,350 to 2,306 (+71 percent) during the two- to four-week construction period. SR 84 is an undivided, 2-lane uninterrupted-flow highway that would operate at LOS A with the additional project-generated trucks (FDOT, 2012). Yolo County has an established LOS standard of LOS C for roadways; therefore, LOS A conditions are considered to be acceptable (County of Yolo, 2009). Furthermore, the increase in traffic volume would be temporary (approximately a two- to four-week period); therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**Site 63:** The AADT on SR 84 in Yolo County in the vicinity of the project site would increase from 1,250 to 1,637 (+31 percent) during the two- to four-week construction period. SR 84 is an undivided, 2-lane uninterrupted-flow highway that would operate at LOS A with the additional project-generated trucks (FDOT, 2012). Yolo County has an established LOS standard of LOS C for roadways; therefore, LOS A conditions are considered to be acceptable (County of Yolo, 2009). Furthermore, the increase in traffic volume would be temporary (approximately a two- to four-week period); therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**Site 65:** The AADT on SR 84 in Yolo County in the vicinity of the project site would increase from 1,250 to 1,333 (+7 percent) during the two- to four-week construction period. SR 84 is an undivided, 2-lane uninterrupted-flow highway that would operate at LOS A with the additional project-generated trucks (FDOT, 2012). Yolo County has an established LOS standard of LOS C for roadways; therefore, LOS A conditions are considered to be acceptable (County of Yolo, 2009). Furthermore, the increase in traffic volume would be temporary (approximately a two- to four-week period); therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

As shown above, both SR 160 in Sacramento County and SR 84 in Yolo County would be used to access several of the proposed rehabilitation sites where substantial increases in traffic volumes would occur. Even if construction activities were to occur simultaneously at these sites, however, the additive effect of construction vehicles would still not cause the LOS to drop from LOS A to the LOS D (Sacramento County) or LOS C (Yolo County) standards. Based on the analysis above, the project is not expected to conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including level of service, travel demand measure or other established standards, and impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Hauling of materials would be performed using highway approved trucks and trailers. The use of regional and local roadways to access the proposed rehabilitation sites could increase traffic safety hazards due to potential conflicts between construction vehicles (with slower speeds and wider turning radii than autos) and automobiles, and bicyclists. However, haul routes are along roadways with

little to no sharp curves or uncontrolled dangerous intersections, and all proposed levee sites have established ingress and egress. Furthermore, due to the low-volume nature and lack of bicycle and pedestrian activity of the immediately adjacent roadways, no backups or potential conflicts with other roadway users on the roads leading to the levee sites are anticipated. Therefore, no substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses would occur and there would be no impact.

- d) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed levee improvement sites are located where there is established ingress and egress. Temporary construction staging and permanent improvements to the levee would not block or interfere with emergency response vehicles. Increases in traffic volumes on local roadways providing access to the proposed rehabilitation sites could cause intermittent and temporary slowdowns in traffic flow, although as concluded above under impact discussion b), operational conditions are not expected to deteriorate on local roadways as a result of project-generated truck trips. The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access and the impact would be less than significant.

## References

Butte County, 2011. 2011 Butte County Bicycle Plan. Adopted June 14, 2011. Prepared by Butte County Public Works.

Butte County, 2018. Butte County General Plan 2030. Amended April 24, 2018.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), 2018. 2016 Traffic Volumes (AADT) GIS Data. Last Modified: April 3, 2018. Available:  
<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/gis/datalibrary/Metadata/AADT.html>.

Colusa County, 2012. Colusa County General Plan. Adopted July 31, 2012.

County of Sacramento, 2017. General Plan Circulation Element. County of Sacramento Office of Planning and Environmental Review. Adopted December 15, 1993. Amended December 13, 2017.

County of Yolo, 2009. County of Yolo 2030 Countywide General Plan Circulation Element. Adopted November 10, 2009.

Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), 2012. 2012 FDOT Quality/Level of Service Handbook Tables. Systems Planning Office. December 2012. Available:  
[http://www.fdot.gov/planning/systems/programs/SM/los/pdfs/FDOT\\_2012\\_Generalized\\_Service\\_Volume\\_Tables.pdf](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/systems/programs/SM/los/pdfs/FDOT_2012_Generalized_Service_Volume_Tables.pdf).

Glenn County, 1993. Policy Plan – Glenn County General Plan Volume 1. Prepared for: The Glenn County Board of Supervisors. Prepared by: QUAD Consultants in association with Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc. and Dowling Associates. June 1993.

Glenn County, 2018. Active Transportation Plan. 2018. Survey + Interactive Map.

Regional Transit Committee, 2017. Glenn Transit Service: Title VI Program. October 19, 2017.

Sutter County, 2011. Sutter County 2030 General Plan. Adopted March 29, 2011.

Tehama County, 2009. Tehama County General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. Adopted March 2009.

Tehama County Transportation Commission, 2013. Tehama County Bikeways Plan. Updated June 2013.

Sacramento County, 2011. Bicycle Master Plan. April 2011.

San Joaquin Council of Governments, 2012. Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to Schools Master Plan. Adopted September 2012.

San Joaquin County, 2016. San Joaquin County General Plan Policy Document. December 2016.

---



### 3.2.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

<u>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less-than-Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
<b>18. Tribal Cultural Resources —</b>				
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Environmental Setting

This section provides a discussion of the existing conditions, as well as relevant ethnographic conditions, related to tribal cultural resources at the proposed project repair sites, including laydown areas as well as the immediately surrounding area. Information in this section is based on the *2019 Storm Damage DWR Rehabilitation – Phases 4 and 5 Repair Sites: Cultural Resources Technical Report* (ESA 2018) prepared for the proposed project. Tribal cultural resources are resources that have cultural value to a California Native American tribe. Tribal cultural resources could include any site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object. Such resources must be listed or eligible for listing in the California or National Registers, or can be identified at the discretion of the lead agency. These can include Native American archaeological sites, ethnobotanical resources, Native American ceremonial areas, and Native American human remains.

### Ethnographic Context

Beginning in the early 16<sup>th</sup> century, but primarily during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, Native American lifeways and languages were documented throughout California. Whether by professional ethnographers or anthropologists, field personnel from government agencies such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, soldiers, merchants, settlers, or travelers, ethnographic accounts partly illuminate the traditions, beliefs, and cultures of Native American groups during specific points in time. Synthesized narratives such as the *Handbook of North American Indians* (Heizer 1978) categorize Native traditions and practices; however, the complexity of regional diversity should not be overlooked.

Depopulation and relocation of Central Valley Native Americans in the 19<sup>th</sup> century resulted in conflicting and incomplete information about tribal locations. Though cultural descriptions of these groups in the English language are known from as early as 1849, most of our current cultural knowledge comes from various early 20<sup>th</sup> century anthropologists (Levy 1978:413). The uncertainty regarding the territorial boundaries of the Native American groups that occupied the proposed project sites and vicinity derives from the fact that ethnographies historically demarcated contact-period tribal boundaries in various and conflicting ways (Waechter 1993).

The proposed project sites cross the traditional lands of the following indigenous groups: Eastern Miwok, Konkow, Nisenan, and Patwin, (Kroeber 1976; McLendon and Oswalt 1978; Johnson 1978; Riddell 1978; Wilson and Towne 1978; Levy 1978). While traditional anthropological literature portrays native peoples as having static cultures and boundaries, it is clear that many variations of culture and ideology existed within and between villages. While these “static” descriptions of separations between native cultures of California make it an easier task for ethnographers to describe past behaviors and ascribe people to a particular geographic locale, this approach masks Native adaptability and self-identity. Most California’s Native Americans never saw themselves as members of larger “cultural groups,” as described by anthropologists. Instead, they saw themselves as members of specific village communities, perhaps related to others by marriage or kinship ties, but viewing the village as the primary identifier of their origins. In short, all tribal group boundaries should be viewed as permeable and approximate.

Prior to appearance of European American explorers and settlers, the Upper Sacramento Valley portions of the Project Area (Butte, Colusa, and Sutter Counties) were occupied by the Konkow, Nisenan, and Patwin. The Konkow Maidu ranged along on the Sacramento River in Glenn and Butte Counties and along the Feather River in Butte County. The Patwin lived in what is now Colusa, Yolo, and Solano Counties. The Eastern Miwok occupied the southernmost portions of the Project Sites, where the Sacramento River meets the Delta in Sacramento County. The Nisenan lived along the southern terminus of the Sacramento River as it entered the delta, on either side of the Feather River north to what is now Marysville, and into the Sierra foothills, up the Yuba and American River watersheds.

As with other California Native American groups, the Gold Rush of 1849 had a devastating effect on the Native Americans that inhabited the proposed project sites. The flood of miners that came to the area in search of gold brought diseases with them that decimated tribal populations. Those who survived were subjected to violence and prejudice at the hands of the miners, and the Native Americans were eventually pushed out of their ancestral territory. Although this contact with settlers had a profound negative impact on the Native American populations through disease and violent actions, these groups survived and have maintained strong communities and action-oriented organizations to this day. These groups have continued to protect their cultural heritage and identity and maintain their languages and traditions (Castillo 1978).

The 2000 U.S. Census recorded 220,657 American Indians in California (excluding Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians) for those designating only one race. Of that number, some come from tribes outside the current boundaries of California. Currently, there are 109 federally recognized tribes in California and approximately 40 groups seeking to gain federal recognition.

## **Regulatory Information**

### **Public Resources Code 21074; 21083.09**

In September of 2014, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which added provisions to the Public Resources Code concerning the evaluation of impacts on tribal cultural resources under CEQA, and consultation requirements with California Native American tribes. In particular, AB 52 now requires lead agencies to analyze a project's impacts on "tribal cultural resources," separately from paleontological resources (PRC Section 21074; 21083.09). The Bill defines "tribal cultural resources" in a new section of the PRC, Section 21074. The Bill also requires lead agencies to engage in additional consultation procedures with respect to California Native American tribes (PRC Sections 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3).

### **Tribal Cultural Resources**

Impacts to TCR also are considered under CEQA (PRC Section 21084.2). Section 21074(a) defines a TCR as any of the following:

- Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
  - included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register; or
  - included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k).
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying these criteria, the lead agency would consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

According to PRC Section 21074(a)(c), a historical resource, unique archaeological resource, or non-unique archaeological resource may also be a TCR if it is included or determined eligible for the California Register or included in a local register of historical resources.

## **Methodology and Results**

Section 3.2.5, Cultural Resources describes the archival and field survey methods implemented by ESA archaeologists to identify potential prehistoric archaeological resources. As detailed in that discussion, results of the records search indicated that prehistoric archaeological sites were identified in proximity to several of the proposed project repair sites and laydown sites.

### **Native American Correspondence**

#### **California Natural Resources Agency Tribal Consultation Policy**

In 2012, the California Natural Resources Agency issued a final California Natural Resources Agency Tribal Consultation Policy that laid out the agency's duties towards collaborative, meaningful tribal consultation. This policy has five components:

Outreach—this component emphasizes early, meaningful, and regular consultation, dissemination of public documents to tribes for their review, and engaged follow-up and meetings with tribal representatives.

**Tribal Liaisons**—this component recommends the designation of a tribal liaison that serves as a central point of contact for tribes and that provides oversight of department tribal communications.

**Tribal Liaison Committee**—this component creates a tribal liaison committee, consisting of all the agency’s tribal liaisons, who are mandated to meet regularly and report back to the agency about consultation efforts and opportunities.

**Access to Contact Information:** this component mandates that the agency will work with the Native American Heritage Commission to maintain a contact list of tribal representatives.

**Training**—this final component mandates that the agency will provide training for tribal liaisons, executive staff, managers, and employees on implementation of the policy.

### California Department of Water Resources Tribal Policy

Similar to the Natural Resource Agency’s policy document, in 2016 DWR released its own Tribal Engagement Policy. This policy consists of seven bullet points, given below verbatim:

- Establish meaningful dialogue between DWR and California Tribes early on in planning for CEQA projects to ensure that DWR’s tribal outreach efforts are consistent with mandated tribal consultation policies, and to ensure that California Tribes know how information from consultation affected DWR’s decision making process;
- Establish guidelines to share information between DWR and California Tribes, while protecting their confidential information to the fullest extent of the law;
- Consult with California Tribes to identify and protect tribal cultural resources where feasible, and to develop treatment and mitigation plans to mitigate for impacts to tribal cultural places;
- Develop criteria in communication plans and grant funding decisions for all applicable DWR programs that will facilitate tribal participation;
- Provide cultural competency training for DWR executives, managers, supervisors, and staff on tribal engagement and consultation practices;
- Recognize that California Tribes have distinct cultural, spiritual, environmental, economic, public health interests, and traditional ecological knowledge about California’s natural resources;
- Enable California Tribes to manage and act as caretakers of tribal cultural resources.

ESA sent a Sacred Lands File search request to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on September 24, 2018. ESA received a response dated October 8, 2018 providing the results of the Sacred Lands File search and a contact list for potentially interested Native American Tribes.

The Sacred Lands File search identified areas of interest to the United Auburn Indian Community on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute series quadrangles of Knights

Landing, Courtland, and Clarksburg; and areas of interest to the Ione Band of Miwok Indians and the United Auburn Indian Community on the USGS 7.-minute series quadrangle Sacramento West. The NAHC letter stated that the Ione Band of Miwok Indians and the United Auburn Indian Community should be contacted directly concerning these results.

The NAHC also provided a contact list of 25 Native American tribes. On October 8, 2018 ESA drafted a letter for DWR to send to Native American tribes that previously requested notification under Assembly Bill AB52 will be invited to and a letter to send to Native American tribes that will be invited to share information or comments on the Project. The AB52 notification letters were sent out on October 23, 2018. On October 30, 2018 DWR received an email from United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria requesting to consult under AB52. In addition, a written request to consult under AB52 was received from Daniel Fonseca, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) for Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, on January 18, 2019. Consultation between DWR and both the Auburn Rancheria and Shingle Springs is ongoing.

In accordance to DWR Tribal Policy, a second set of letters was sent on December 7, 2018, to tribes whose areas of interest overlapped with the project areas but who were not consultants under AB52. These letters invited the tribes to share information or comment. Leland Kintner, the THPO for Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, responded in a letter dated December 20, 2018, stating that they wished to consult with DWR on the project. As per DWR tribal policy, consultation with Yocha Dehe will commence following the issuance of the current IS/MND.

## Discussion

a.i-ii) **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Sacred Lands File review identified resources of importance to Ione Band of Miwok Indians and the United Auburn Indian Community. The listed Native American tribes are in a process of ongoing consultation with DWR concerning the identified Sacred Lands.

The results of potential project impacts to prehistoric archaeological resources that could also be considered tribal cultural resources are discussed in Section 3.2.5, Cultural Resources of this document. **Mitigation Measures CUL-1** through **CUL-3** require preconstruction training, a protocol to follow in the event of an inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources, and archaeological monitoring at some project sites. These measures also apply to TCRs, and with continued consultation efforts with Native American tribes would reduce some impacts to TCR to a less-than-significant level. In addition, mitigation measures for addressing TCRs have been recently prepared for DWR and the USACE by GEI (2018) and have been updated for the current project and are included below:

### **Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Implement Procedures for Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Material and Implement an Inadvertent Discovery Plan**

Survey work and literature review have not identified any known TCR's within the project area, and tribal consultation is ongoing. Project-related activities associated with the project will require ground-disturbance, including excavation,

trenching, grading, and use of staging and borrow areas. These ground disturbing activities could result in damage to or destruction of previously unidentified TCRs, which could be present within the project sites. There is no evidence of the presence of buried archaeological sites in the APE and, therefore, this impact would be less than significant. It is nevertheless possible that archaeological resources could be discovered during construction. In the event that archaeological resources that are considered TCRs are discovered during construction, Mitigation Measure TCR-1, described below, shall be implemented.

- If an inadvertent discovery of archaeological cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, animal bone, any human remains, bottle glass, ceramics, building remains) is made at any other time during project-related construction activities or project planning, DWR, in consultation with the appropriate tribe(s), USACE, and other interested parties, will develop and implement appropriate protection and avoidance measures where feasible.
- These procedures will be developed in accordance with 36CFR 800.13 which specifies procedures for post-review discoveries. Additional measures, such as development of a Memorandum of Agreement and a Historic Property Treatment Plan, may be necessary if avoidance or protection is not possible. All the steps identified above will be detailed in an accidental-discovery plan developed before construction so that all parties are aware of the process that must be implemented should buried archaeological resources be uncovered during construction.

#### **Mitigation Measure TCR-2: Implement Procedures for Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains**

There is no evidence of the presence of human remains in the APE and, therefore, this impact would be less than significant. It is nevertheless possible that human remains could be discovered during construction. In the event that human remains are discovered during construction, Mitigation Measure TCR-2, described below, shall be implemented.

If an inadvertent discovery of human remains is made at any other time during project-related construction activities or project planning, DWR will implement the procedures listed below. Should human remains be identified in the project APE, the following performance standards shall be met prior to implementing or continuing actions such as construction, that may result in damage to or destruction of human remains. Avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to human remains or implementation of the procedures described below may be considered to avoid or minimize significant adverse impacts and constitute the standard by which an impact conclusion of less than significant may be reached:

- In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, DWR will immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the burial and notify the Yolo County Coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains.

- The Coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or State lands (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5[b]). If the Coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the NAHC by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050[c]).
- After the Coroner's findings have been made, the archaeologist and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant (MLD), in consultation with the landowner, shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains.
- The responsibilities of DWR for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California PRC Section 5097.9 et seq.

Upon the discovery of Native American human remains, DWR will require that all construction work must stop within 100 feet of the discovery until consultation with the MLD has taken place. The MLD will have 48 hours to complete a site inspection and make recommendations to the landowner after being granted access to the site. A range of possible treatments for the remains, including nondestructive removal, preservation in place, relinquishment of the remains and associated items to the descendants, or other culturally appropriate treatment may be discussed. California PRC Section 5097.98(b)(2) suggests that the concerned parties may mutually agree to extend discussions beyond the initial 48 hours to allow for the discovery of additional remains. Site-protection measures that DWR will employ are as follows:

- Record the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; and
- Record a document with the County in which the property is located;
- If agreed to by the MLD and the landowner, DWR or DWR's authorized representative will work with the landowner and MLD to rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance if the NAHC is unable to identify an MLD, or if the MLD fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being granted access to the site. DWR or DWR's authorized representative may also reinter the remains in a location not subject to further disturbance if he or she rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to DWR. Mitigation may still be needed if impacts occur to those burials; DWR will consult with the MLD to identify appropriate mitigation.
- If the human remains are of historic age and are determined to be not of Native American origin, DWR will follow the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code Section 7000 (et seq.) regarding the disinterment and removal of non-Native American human remains.

**Mitigation Measure TCR-3: In the Event that Tribal Cultural Resources or Traditional Cultural Properties are Discovered during Construction, Implement Procedures to Evaluate Tribal Cultural Resources/Traditional Cultural Properties and Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures to Avoid Significant Adverse Effects.**

California Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area in which the project is located may have expertise concerning their TCRs (California PRC Section 21080.3.1). Culturally affiliated Tribes will be further consulted concerning TCRs and TCPs that may be impacted. If these types of resources are discovered during construction. Further consultation with culturally affiliated Tribes will focus on identification of measures to avoid or minimize impacts on any such resources discovered during construction. Should TCRs or TCPs be identified in the project APE during construction, the following performance standards shall be met prior to continuance of construction and associated activities that may result in damage to or destruction of TCRs or TCPs:

- DWR shall evaluate each identified TCR/TCP, prior to construction, for CRHR and NRHP eligibility through application of established eligibility criteria (California Code of Regulations 15064.636 and CFR Part 63 respectively), in consultation with interested Native American Tribes.
- If a TCR is determined to be eligible for listing on the NRHP, DWR will avoid damaging effects to the TCR/TCP in accordance with California PRC Section 21084.3, if feasible. If DWR determines that the project may cause a substantial adverse change to a TCR/TCP, and measures are not otherwise identified in the consultation process, the following are examples of mitigation capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a TCR/TCP or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to a TCR/TCP. These measures may be considered to avoid or minimize significant adverse impacts and constitute the standard by which an impact conclusion of less-than significant may be reached:
  - Avoid and preserve resources in place, including, but not limited to, planning construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
  - Treat the resource with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the Tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
    - Protect the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
    - Protect the traditional use of the resource.
    - Protect the confidentiality of the resource.
    - Establish permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or using the resources or places.



- Protect the resource.

If a TCP is determined to be eligible for listing in the NRHP, then the procedures for determination of effect and, if adverse, treatment of the resource to resolve adverse effect will be conducted in accordance with the procedures required for compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR Parts 800.5–800.6).

## References

- Castillo, Edward D., “Twentieth-Century Secular Movements”, In *California*, pp. 350-360, edited by Robert F. Heizer, Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1978.
- ESA, 2018. *2019 Storm Damage DWR Emergency Rehabilitation – Phases 4 and 5 Critical Repair Sites: Cultural Resources Technical Report*. Prepared for DWR, October 2018.
- GEI, 2018. *Lower Elkhorn Basin Levee Setback Project—Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, May 2018.
- Heizer, Robert F., volume editor, *California*, Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1978.
- Johnson, Patti J., “Patwin”, In *California*, pp. 350-360, edited by Robert F. Heizer, Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1978.
- Kroeber, Alfred L., *Handbook of the Indians of California*, Courier Coporation, North Chelmsford, MA, reprint, 1976.
- Levy, Richard, “Eastern Miwok”, In *California*, pp. 398-413, edited by Robert F. Heizer, Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1978.
- McLendon, Sally, and Robert L. Oswalt, “Pomo: Introduction”, In *California*, pp. 274-288, edited by Robert F. Heizer, Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1978.
- Riddell, Francis A., “Maidu and Konkow”, In *California*, pp. 370-386, edited by Robert F. Heizer, Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1978.
- Waechter, Sharon A., *Addendum to the Report on the Archaeological Survey for the Proposed SMUD Gas Pipeline between Winters and Sacramento, Yolo and Sacramento Counties, California*, prepared by Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Davis, California, 1993.
- Wilson, Norman L., and Arlean H. Towne, “Nisenan,” In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 387-397, Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1978.

### 3.2.19 Utilities and Service Systems

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less-than-Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS —</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Environmental Setting

Potable water within the project area is provided by both groundwater and surface water. There are several municipal and community potable water systems within the vicinity of proposed project sites. These water systems rely on water sources such as local rivers in the vicinity of the project as well as groundwater. Additionally, in the rural areas, most of the groundwater is pumped by privately owned wells.

Wastewater is treated and disposed of through septic systems or sanitary sewer collection systems and wastewater treatment plants in the vicinity of the proposed project sites, most of which are operated by the associated cities and counties.

Electricity is provided to the proposed project area by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), which is generated and transmitted to the counties by a large network of power plants and transmission lines located throughout California. Most of the electrical service in the counties is carried through above-ground lines. However, new urban development is now typically served by underground service. PG&E currently has sufficient energy supplies and distribution facilities to meet anticipated demands and growth in the county (PG&E 2014).

Solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal services are provided to each of the cities and counties within the vicinity of the proposed project repair sites by either Waste Management or Recology. Adequate capacity is available at the existing landfills serving the proposed project sites and vicinity.

## Discussion

- a, c) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in the construction of any new facilities for stormwater, wastewater, or other utilities or result in population increase that would generate an increase in demand for utilities and service systems requiring new construction. Furthermore, it would not result in an exceedance of capacities at existing wastewater treatment facilities and there would be no impact.
- b) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project would require minimal water supply during construction activities for dust control. Water would be supplied by DWR contractors and trucked in via water trucks. Water would be sourced from locally available sources of nonpotable water regionally based on the vicinity to the proposed project repair sites and at volumes based on the size of the repair sites. The use of water for dust control would not substantially increase nonpotable water use over current conditions compared to local uses, such as agricultural irrigation. Water demand would be temporary and minor, and no new or expanded entitlements would be required. Therefore, potential impacts associated with availability of water supplies would be less than significant.
- d, e) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Materials generated from the proposed project construction activities in excess of required materials would be hauled off-site to predetermined disposal sites or landfills. The proposed project would not generate a volume of waste that would exceed the permitted capacity of landfills serving the proposed project region. Furthermore, all waste would be disposed of in accordance with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

## References

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), 2014. Electric Service Area Maps. Available: [https://www.pge.com/tariffs/tm2/pdf/ELEC\\_MAPS\\_Service\\_Area\\_Map.pdf](https://www.pge.com/tariffs/tm2/pdf/ELEC_MAPS_Service_Area_Map.pdf). Accessed November 7, 2018.

### 3.2.20 Wildfire

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>20. WILDFIRE —</b> If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Environmental Setting

The proposed project repair sites are located along major streams and rivers on the water side, and by agricultural, rural residential, open space, and a few urban areas on the land side, including laydown and stockpile sites. Most of the proposed project repair sites are located in areas identified by CAL FIRE as being located in areas with no fire hazard severity, while a few sites are located in areas identified as being in or adjacent to moderate fire severity zones (CAL FIRE 2019).

### Discussion

- a) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Project construction activities would use major regional and local roads to haul materials to project sites. In addition, each project site would have a specific internal traffic pattern with ingress/egress points of access to allow for construction vehicles to access and leave the project sites with minimal delays or potential blocking roads during active construction periods. Because all sites would include ingress/egress points for construction vehicles, the proposed project would not substantially impair or interfere with emergency response along regional and local roadways, and impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not result in changes to the existing environment at project sites that would exacerbate the risk of wildfires. All project sites would be returned to existing or better conditions after repair of the levee sites. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not result in the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that could increase the risk of wildfire at the project sites and impacts would be less than significant.
  
- d) **No Impact.** The proposed project would result in the repair of damaged levees to pre-damaged flood protection standards. Therefore, the proposed project would increase flood protection along the repair sites. Further, the repair sites are not located in areas with steep slopes that have been exposed by wildfires and there would be no impact.

## References

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), 2019. California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Update Project: [www.fire.ca.gov/fire\\_prevention/fire\\_prevention\\_wildland\\_zones\\_maps](http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland_zones_maps). Accessed February 6, 2019.

---

### 3.2.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less-than-Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE —</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- a) **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed project would be temporary in nature and involve construction activities to repair eroded levees in the State Plan of Flood Control and improve flood protection in the near future; thus providing a net benefit to the surrounding areas. The proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; reduce or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals; or, eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As discussed in the analyses provided in this Initial Study, adherence to federal, State, and local regulations, various environmental commitments implemented as part of the proposed project, and proposed mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-5, BIO-1 through BIO-8, CUL-1 through CUL-6, GHG-1, and NOI-1 and NOI-2, and TCR-1 through TCR-3 would reduce all potentially significant impacts to biological, cultural, and tribal cultural resources, as well as to other issue areas, to less-than-significant levels.
- b) **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** As noted throughout this document, the potential impacts of the proposed project are largely restricted to temporary and short-term construction-related impacts and are site-specific. As noted above, all of the potential direct and indirect impacts of the proposed project were determined to be fully avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level with incorporation of mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-5, BIO-1 through BIO-8, CUL-1 through CUL-6, GHG-1, and NOI-1 and NOI-2, and TCR-1 through TCR-3. As a result,

the potential impacts of the proposed project are not considered cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

- c) **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The potential impacts of the proposed project are temporary and short-term impacts and are site-specific. These impacts are all localized to the proposed project repair sites and may include limited adverse effects on air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, water quality/soils, and noise. However, the proposed project would not include any activities or uses that may cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, or on the physical environment. The proposed project has been designed to meet the DWR flood engineering standards and would incorporate adherence to local codes and regulations as conditions of project approval. Compliance with applicable local, State, and federal standards, as well as incorporation of project mitigation measures, would result in less-than-significant impacts.
-

This page intentionally left blank