March 26, 2015

Public Notice for Initial Study (IS)
Environmental Checklist and Evaluation of Environmental Impact

Bureau of Reclamation, Trinity River Restoration Program – Channel Rehabilitation for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites

Trinity County

The Regional Water Board is proposing to continue to regulate the Bureau of Reclamation, Trinity River Restoration Program – Channel Rehabilitation for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites (Project) pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1341) and Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act authority. In addition, staff will consider all comments on this Initial study that are submitted in writing and received at this office during a 30-day comment period that begins on the first date of issuance of this notice and ends at 5:00 p.m. on the last day of the comment period.

California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15177 provides that an initial study is to be prepared to analyze whether the subsequent project was described in the Master EIR; however, it does not expressly require public circulation when it is not being used to support a decision to adopt a negative declaration or to prepare an EIR. (See e.g. Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15073 [public review of proposed negative declaration].) In this case the IS supports the determination that the initial project and subsequent project are nearly identical. Comments should be within the scope of the subject matter of the findings supported by the IS. Staff will consider comments submitted in writing and received at this office by mail during a 30-day comment period that begins on the first date of issuance of this letter and ends at 5:00 p.m. on the last day of the comment period.

If you have any questions, please contact staff member Gil Falcone at (707) 576-2830 or Stephen Bargsten at (707) 576-2653 within 30 days of the posting of this notice. Written comments can be submitted electronically to Northcoast@waterboards.ca.gov .

The application for this Water Quality Certification and the Regional Water Board's file for past permitted activities contain a significant amount of additional details about the past and proposed Projects including maps, photos and reports. The Regional Water Board file is available for public review.

150326_ChannelRehabISChecklist_PN

Trinity River Restoration Program
Channel Rehabilitation: Water Quality Certification and/or Waste Discharge Requirements for Remaining Phase I and Phase 2 Sites

---

Project Initial Study (IS)
Environmental Checklist and Evaluation of Environmental Impact

This IS checklist tiers to:

The Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report

and

Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management Activities for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites, Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse # 2008032110)

March 2015

California Lead Agency for CEQA
North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

Project Proponent and Federal Lead Agency for NEPA
Trinity River Restoration Program
U. S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation

Project Proponent's Consultant
North Wind Services, LLC

Trinity River Restoration Program:
Channel Rehabilitation Project
Initial Study and Evaluation of Environmental Impact

Introduction

The United States Department of Interior (USDI) Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) proposes to conduct mechanical channel rehabilitation activities at selected sites on the mainstem Trinity River downstream of Lewiston Dam. The activities proposed are hereafter referred to as the "proposed project" or "project." Project work would be part of the ongoing Trinity River Restoration Program's (TRRP) work to restore the anadromous fishery of the Trinity River. The proposed river channel rehabilitation activities would recreate complex salmon and steelhead habitat, enhance natural river processes for the benefit of wildlife, and provide conditions suitable for reestablishing native riparian vegetation.

The fundamental purpose of the TRRP is to restore historic river processes to the river via implementation of the 2000 Record of Decision (ROD) for the Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (Trinity River FEIS/EIR). It is the intent of the TRRP to recreate a properly functioning river, albeit on a smaller scale, in order to increase naturally spawning anadromous fish populations to levels that existed prior to construction of the Lewiston and Trinity Dams. The target reach for Trinity River restoration is the approximately 40-mile length of river downstream of Lewiston Dam to the confluence of the North Fork Trinity. In this reach, the ROD (USDI 2000) outlined six integral components for execution:

- Implementation of a variable annual flow regime according to recommendations provided in the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Report (USFWS and HVT 1999);
- Mechanical channel rehabilitation;
- Fine and coarse sediment management;
- Watershed restoration;
- Infrastructure improvement; and
- Adaptive environmental assessment and management.

In general, the TRRP approach to channel rehabilitation is to reconnect the river with its floodplain. This reconnection requires selective removal of terraces and riparian berms (i.e., berms that are anchored with woody vegetation and consolidated sand deposits) that developed after the Lewiston and Trinity Dams were completed and historic peak scouring flows were lost. Along with berm removal, the approach involves physical alteration of other alluvial features (e.g., floodplains) to inundate more frequently, placement of large wood, and removal of riparian vegetation at strategic locations to promote the alluvial processes necessary for the restoration and maintenance of complex riverine habitats.

The TRRP acts under guidance of the Trinity Management Council (TMC), a collaborative board of natural resource managing agencies, tribes, and local government. TMC member agencies include Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Hoopa Valley Tribe, Yurok Tribe, the California Natural Resources Agency represented by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), and Trinity County. Technical experts associated with each of these entities participate in the design and review of the projects.

The Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management Activities for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites, Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter referred to in its entirety as Master EIR/Programmatic EA; Regional Water Board and Reclamation 2009) was prepared by Reclamation and the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) to analyze the impacts of proposed channel rehabilitation and sediment management activities at the Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites along the Trinity River between Lewiston Dam and the North Fork of the river. On May 20, 2010, the Regional Water Board issued General Water Quality Certification R1-2010-0028 for the activities

proposed in that document. The following Initial Study (IS) contains a project description and details for environmental impact analyses which the Regional Water Board will consider in making its determination on whether to reissue the TRRP's General Water Quality Certification R1-2010-0028 for Trinity River channel rehabilitation activities.

Project History and Background

Completion of Trinity Dam and Lewiston Dam in 1964 blocked anadromous fish access to habitat upstream of Lewiston Dam restricting them to habitat below the dam. Trans-basin diversions from Lewiston Lake to the Sacramento River Basin altered the hydrologic regime of the Trinity River, diminishing annual flows by up to 90 percent. Consequences of diminished flows included encroachment of riparian vegetation, establishment of riparian berms, and fossilization of point bars at various locations along the river, as far downstream as the North Fork Trinity River. These geomorphic changes reduced the diversity of riparian age classes and riparian vegetation species, impaired floodplain access, and adversely affected fish habitat.

The location of the Trinity River relative to other components of the Central Valley Project (CVP) is shown on Figure 1-1 in the Master EIR/Programmatic EA. Trans-basin diversions from Lewiston Lake to the Sacramento River Basin altered the hydrologic regime of the Trinity River, diminishing annual flows by up to 90 percent. Consequences of diminished flows included encroachment of riparian vegetation, establishment of riparian berms, and fossilization of point bars at various locations along the river, as far downstream as the North Fork Trinity River. These geomorphic changes reduced the diversity of riparian age classes and riparian vegetation species, impaired floodplain access, and adversely affected fish habitat.

In 1981, in response to declines in salmon and steelhead populations, the Secretary of the Interior directed the USFWS to initiate a 12-year flow study to determine the effectiveness of flow restoration and other mitigation measures for impacts of the Trinity River Division (TRD) of the CVP. Then, in 1984, Congress enacted the Trinity River Fish and Wildlife Program to further promote and support management and fishery restoration actions in the Trinity River Basin. Under this program, nine pilot bank rehabilitation projects between Lewiston Dam and the North Fork Trinity River were implemented between 1991 and 1993, in addition to other actions. In 1992, Congress enacted the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). One purpose of the CVPIA (Section 3406(b)(23)) was to protect, restore, and enhance fish, wildlife, and associated habitats in the Trinity River Basin. The Act also directed the Secretary of the Interior to finish the 12-year Trinity River Flow Evaluation Report and to develop recommendations "regarding permanent instream fishery flow requirements, TRD operating criteria, and procedures for the restoration and maintenance of the Trinity River fishery." The Trinity River Flow Evaluation Final Report was ultimately published in 1999 by the USFWS and the Hoopa Valley Tribe, providing a framework for restoration activities below Lewiston Dam as well as the basis for the preferred alternative in the concurrent programmatic environmental analysis.

In 1994, the USFWS as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) lead agency and Trinity County as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) lead agency began the public process for developing the Trinity River FEIS/EIR. The ROD for the Trinity River FEIS/EIR (December 19, 2000; USDI 2000) directed USDI agencies to implement the Flow Evaluation Alternative, which was identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Trinity River FEIS/EIR (USFWS et al. 2000). The ROD set forth prescribed Trinity River flows for five water-year types: extremely wet (815,200 acre-feet annually [afa]), wet (701,000 afa), normal (646,900 afa), dry (452,600 afa), and critically dry (368,600 afa). The flows prescribed by the 2000 ROD are deemed to constitute the "existing [hydrological] environment" for CEQA purposes, and are considered the basis for the environmental analysis under both NEPA and CEQA.

The ROD for the Trinity River FEIS/EIR specified that mechanical channel rehabilitation activities would be implemented on the mainstem Trinity River between Lewiston Dam and the North Fork Trinity River. Conceptually, the overall intent of these activities was to selectively remove fossilized berms (berms that have been anchored by extensive woody vegetation root systems and consolidated sand deposits); re-vegetate and provide conditions for regrowth/sustenance of native riparian vegetation; and reestablish

alternate point bars and complex fish habitat similar in form to those that existed prior to the construction of the TRD.

The Trinity River FEIS/EIR identified 44 potential channel rehabilitation sites and three potential side-channel sites for consideration by the TRRP (USFWS et al. 2000). These sites were originally prescribed for rehabilitation in the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Report (USFWS and HVT 1999) and included in the preferred alternative identified in the ROD. Site selection was based on identifying locations where the maximum amount of habitat for native anadromous fishes could be initiated through construction projects, and then enhanced or maintained by a combination of river flows plus coarse sediment augmentation. The ROD prescribed rehabilitation efforts at these sites to be implemented in phases. Ultimately, sites at which rehabilitation activities could be implemented were selected using criteria that identified physical features and processes such as channel morphology, sediment supply, and high-flow hydraulics that would encourage a dynamic alluvial channel. Factors such as property ownership, access to the sites, and engineering and economic feasibility were also considered in the site selection process. Early TRRP planning efforts resulted in the identification of two phases, Phase 1 and Phase 2.

In 2009 the Master EIR/Programmatic EA was prepared by Reclamation and the Regional Water Board for proposed channel rehabilitation and sediment management activities at the remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites along the Trinity River between Lewiston Dam and the North Fork of the river. The document is divided into two parts. Part 1 is a Master EIR, which is a programmatic document prepared in part to meet the requirements of CEQA. This part is analogous to the federal Trinity River FEIS/EIR programmatic document prepared in 2000 and described above. This part of the document evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposed rehabilitation and sediment management activities at the TRRP's remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites. From a programmatic perspective, it provides a discussion of the existing conditions, environmental impacts, and mitigation measures required to comply with CEQA (California PRC, Section 21000 et seq.). In addition to addressing direct and indirect impacts associated with the proposed project and the alternatives, the Master EIR/Programmatic EA addresses cumulative and growth-inducing impacts that could be associated with activities at the Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites. Part 2 is an EA/EIR, an integrated NEPA/CEQA document that utilizes programmatic environmental analyses from Part 1 and evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposed channel rehabilitation and sediment management activities at a project-specific level for the remaining Phase 1 sites. The Part 2 EA/EIR was prepared to comply with NEPA (42 USC, Section 4321 et seq.) and CEQA (California PRC, Section 21000 et seq.).

The EA portion of the Master EIR/Programmatic EA tiers from the Trinity River FEIS/EIR (USFWS et al. 2000). However, the Trinity County Board of Supervisors – the CEQA lead agency for the Trinity River FEIS/EIR – never certified the EIR portion of the 2000 FEIS/EIR for the Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration Program. Therefore, the EIR portion of the Trinity River FEIS/EIR was not available for the CEQA portion of this document, or other earlier TRRP CEQA documents, to "tier" from. Consequently, four joint EA/EIRs were completed to analyze TRRP channel rehabilitation projects between 2004 and 2008[1]. Based upon the similarity of these projects and their environmental impacts, and agreement that future TRRP projects would have similar impacts, a separate programmatic document, the Master EIR/Programmatic EA was developed.

The Regional Water Board acted as lead agency for the Master EIR/Programmatic EA (State Clearinghouse number 2008032110) and subsequent site specific EA/ISs. The Master EIR/Programmatic EA provides a discussion of the existing conditions, environmental impacts, and mitigation measures required to comply with CEQA (California PRC, Section 21000 et seq.). In addition to addressing direct and indirect impacts associated with the proposed project and alternatives, the Master EIR/Programmatic EA addresses cumulative and growth-inducing impacts that could be associated with restoration activities at the remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites. The Regional Water Board certified the Master

[1] Hocker Flat (Reclamation and California DWR 2004), the Canyon Creek Suite (Reclamation and Regional Water Board 2006), Indian Creek (Reclamation and TCRCD 2007), and Lewiston-Dark Gulch (Reclamation and TCRCD 2008).

EIR/Programmatic EA on August 25, 2009 and General Water Quality Certification R1-2010-0028 was issued on May 20, 2010 for the activities proposed in the Master EIR/Programmatic EA.

Under California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15177, after a Master EIR has been prepared and certified, subsequent projects, which the lead agency determines as being within the scope of the Master EIR, will be subject to only limited environmental review. CEQA guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15177, subd. (b)(2)) state that the preparation of a new environmental document and new written findings will not be required if, based on a review of the IS prepared for the subsequent project, the lead agency determines, on the basis of written findings, that no additional significant environmental effect will result from the proposal, no new additional mitigation measures or alternatives are required, and that the project is within the scope of the Master EIR. Whether a subsequent project is within the scope of the Master EIR is a question of fact to be determined by the lead agency based upon a review of the subsequent project IS to determine whether there are additional significant effects or new additional mitigation measures or alternatives required for the subsequent project that are not already discussed in the Master EIR.

Environmental Setting and Project Location

The Trinity River originates in the rugged Salmon-Trinity Mountains of northern California in the northeast corner of Trinity County. The Trinity River Basin encompasses the majority of Trinity County and the easternmost portion of Humboldt County. The mainstem Trinity River flows a total of 170 miles from its headwaters to its confluence with the Klamath River at Weitchpec, on the Yurok Indian Reservation. The Trinity River passes through Trinity County, Humboldt County, the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation, and the Yurok Indian Reservation. Much of the basin is composed of federal lands managed by the USFS, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and, to a lesser extent, Reclamation. Ownership along the Trinity River corridor is a mixture of public, tribal, and private lands. Land use within the Trinity River Basin is greatly influenced by the large amount of public, tribal, and private lands, much of which is used for timber production and other natural resource-related uses. The area's numerous lakes and rivers provide many recreational opportunities, including fishing and boating. Private uses along the Trinity River are generally limited to scattered residential and commercial development.

The Trinity River flows generally southward until impounded by Trinity Dam and Lewiston Dam. The river drains a watershed of approximately 2,965 square miles; about one-quarter of this area is above Lewiston Dam. From Lewiston Dam, the river flows westward for 112 miles until it enters the Klamath River near the town of Weitchpec, 43.5 miles upstream from the Pacific Ocean. The Klamath River flows northwesterly for approximately 40 miles from its confluence with the Trinity River before entering the Pacific Ocean. The general setting for the TRRP is within the 40-mile reach of the mainstem Trinity River between Lewiston Dam and the confluence of the North Fork Trinity. The entire stretch is designated under the National and California State Wild and Scenic River Systems to preserve its Outstandingly Remarkable Values, which include the river's free flowing condition, anadromous and resident fisheries, outstanding geologic resource values, scenic values, recreational values, cultural and historic values, and the values associated with water quality. The segment of the Trinity River encompassed by the proposed project is classified and managed as a "Recreational" reach by the BLM and the Shasta-Trinity National Forest (STNF).

Project activities were proposed at selected sites in the approximately 40-mile length of on the mainstem Trinity River downstream of Lewiston Dam to the confluence of the North Fork Trinity River (See Figure 1-2 in the Master EIR/Programmatic EA for project locations). As stated previously in the Project History and Background section, these sites were selected by the TRRP in consultation with the TMC based on identification of locations where the maximum amount of habitat for native anadromous fishes could be initiated through construction projects, and then enhanced or maintained by a combination of river flows plus coarse sediment augmentation. Ultimately, sites at which rehabilitation activities could be implemented were selected using criteria that identified physical features and processes such as channel morphology, sediment supply, and high-flow hydraulics that would encourage a dynamic alluvial

channel. Factors such as property ownership, access to the sites, and engineering and economic feasibility were also considered in the site selection process.

Project Description

The activities that could occur at any of the TRRP sites are described in Chapter 2 of the Master EIR/Programmatic EA; that information describes the timing, type, size, intensity, and location of the activities associated with the sites consistent with the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15176 (a) and (c)). That information is summarized in this section.

The primary purpose of the proposed channel rehabilitation activities is to increase salmonid habitat for all life-stages. The proposed activities will create complex fish habitat and improve juvenile rearing habitat in the mainstem Trinity River and its side channels. Projects are designed to use alluvial processes of the Trinity River to maintain and increase salmonid habitat and complexity over time, and to provide conditions suitable for reestablishing and sustaining native riparian vegetation. Channel rehabilitation activities include removal of encroaching riparian vegetation that could impinge natural fluvial processes, rehabilitation of floodplain and in-channel alluvial features, construction of in-channel and off-channel habitat for aquatic and riparian dependent species, coarse and fine sediment management, and rehabilitation of upland habitat. Annually, project-specific proposals for channel rehabilitation activities are analyzed as subsequent projects within the scope of the Master EIR/Programmatic EA and submitted for review and approval by the Regional Water Board for enrollment under the General Water Quality Certification.

One or more of the activities listed in Table 1 could be implemented as part of a proposed project. These activities are intended to emphasize modifying existing grade control features, reconnecting the river's floodplain with the river, establishing or expanding side-channel habitat, and enhancing the bed and banks of the Trinity River to promote well-distributed aquatic habitat over a range of flows. Removal of alluvial material at select locations within the in-channel areas could provide opportunities to enhance the development of alternate point bars and supplement coarse sediment. Collectively, these activities are intended to enhance aquatic habitat for anadromous fish under a range of flow conditions. In addition to the activities included in Table 1, several others common activities—vegetation removal, watering, and monitoring—would occur to varying degrees. These are briefly discussed in Chapter 2 of the Master EIR/Programmatic EA.

Table 1. Rehabilitation Activities

Label	Activity Type
A	Recontouring and vegetation removal
B	Construction of inundated surfaces (450 cfs)
C	Construction of inundated surfaces (1,000 – 4,500 cfs)
D	Construction of inundated surfaces (6,000 cfs)
E	Low-flow side channels (300 cfs)
F	Medium-flow side channels (1,000 cfs)
G	Alcoves (450 cfs; 6,000 cfs)
H	Grade control removal
I	Sediment management (coarse and fine)
J	Placement of excavated materials
K	Staging/use areas (includes gravel processing and stockpiling)
L	Roads, existing
M	Roads, new
N	Temporary channel crossings (Trinity River and tributaries)
O	Revegetation

Activity A (Recontouring and Vegetation Removal)

The ground surface would be modified to reduce riparian encroachment and minimize the risk of stranding of juvenile salmonids. Vegetation would be cleared at some locations, but in most cases would not be removed from the activity area. Activity A also includes grading to construct or enhance topographic features that could develop into functional riparian habitat; excavation and fill will be balanced such that there is no net change in the volume of earthen material within the activity area. Activities would be accomplished using a variety of methods, including hand tools and heavy equipment, such as excavators, bulldozers, scrapers, and dump trucks.

Activities B, C, and D (Construction of Inundated Surfaces – 300 cfs, 1,000 to 4,500 cfs, and 6,000 cfs)

Activities associated with the construction of inundated surfaces would enhance the connection of these surfaces to the river at various flows. As a reference point, the ordinary high water mark (OHW) correlates to a 1.5-year recurrence flow (6,000 cfs as measured below Rush Creek; 6,600 cfs as measured below Canyon Creek). These activities are intended to expand the surface area of the channel that could be inundated by reoccurring flows below the OHW mark and cause more frequent inundation of these surfaces. Vegetation would be cleared as necessary, and earth would be excavated to meet design elevations for periodic inundation.

These newly inundated surfaces would provide important rearing and slow-water habitat for juvenile salmonids and other native anadromous fish. They would also provide low points that could enhance sinuosity and thereby provide the habitat variability that was historically present and is required to support rapid growth of native fishes. These treatment areas would rely on a combination of natural recruitment of native riparian vegetation and riparian planting to enhance the establishment of a diverse assemblage of native vegetation. If initial revegetation establishment is less successful than anticipated, additional efforts will be made to establish riparian vegetation consistent with the CDFW policy of no net loss in riparian vegetation from pre-project levels.

Activities E and F (Side Channels – 300 cfs; 1,000 cfs)

Modifications to historic side channels would reconnect the Trinity River with its floodplain at targeted flows. Side channels constructed for 300 cfs flows would provide off-channel, low-velocity habitat for a variety of aquatic organisms, including juvenile salmonids. Side channels constructed for 1,000 cfs flows would provide habitat for salmonid rearing when water is flowing through the channels. As flows recede, these side channels would drain naturally, reducing the likelihood of stranding of aquatic organisms. Side channels would be constructed to leave small berms at the upstream and downstream ends to protect water quality during construction. These berms would be removed at the end of construction if the water in the side channel is of appropriate quality for discharge to the river or the water in the side channel will be left in place for removal by subsequent high flows. Side channels may be pumped to uplands and dewatered during construction to remove turbid water before opening the side channel to the river.

Activity G (Alcoves – 300 cfs)

Alcoves would be excavated to design elevations at the downstream end of side channels (300 cfs) or other appropriate locations. These would be continuously inundated (approximately 1–2 feet deep during low flows) and would provide year-round juvenile fish habitat.

Activity H (Grade Control Removal)

Grade control structures, including constructed features, would be removed to increase channel complexity via promotion of channel migration, increased sinuosity, reduced fine sediment storage, increased coarse sediment transport, and restoration of bars.

Activity I (Sediment Management, Coarse and Fine)

In addition to site-specific creation and enhancement of alluvial features (bars), sediment management activities would occur at various sites. Sediment management activities include augmentation of coarse sediment (e.g., spawning gravel) and removal of fine sediment (0.5-0.8 millimeter size fraction) at key locations. Long-term, large-scale coarse sediment augmentation sites would be established at select

locations to encourage channel migration and the development of alternate bars. Augmentation activities also include efforts required to provide a long-term supply of coarse sediment and ensure that the TRRP has the administrative access necessary to implement these activities at specific locations. Selected vegetation would be removed to facilitate the introduction of this coarse sediment along the channel margin. As appropriate, salvaged large woody debris (LWD) would be retained and incorporated into riverine/in-channel activities to provide additional habitat complexity. The use of large wood is a vital component of channel rehabilitation work and includes incorporation of engineered log jams/hydraulic structures (wood and/or rock), habitat wood structures, skeletal bars, or boulder habitat placement. Coarse sediment would be introduced via mechanized equipment (e.g., conveyor, mechanical placement below the OHW) into the river channel under various high-flow conditions in a manner that facilitates the river's ability to route the coarse sediment downstream during high-flow periods.

Activity J (Placement of Excavated Materials)

Excavated materials would be placed in spoils areas so that there would be no increase in the elevation of the 100-year flood to comply with the requirements of Trinity County's Floodplain Ordinance. Spoiled materials would be spread in uniform layers that blend with the natural terrain. In general, revegetation of upland areas, including efforts required for erosion control, would be consistent with agency requirements and with authorization from land managers and owners. Refer to Activity O (Revegetation) for more information.

Activity K (Staging Areas)

Excavated materials would be transported across the staging areas to stockpile areas. Water would be applied for construction purposes, including dust abatement, as directed by the Contracting Officer. At select sites, staging areas may also be used for the processing and storage of coarse sediment required for long-term sediment management activities.

Activity L and M (Roads, Existing and New)

Existing roads would be used to access most activity areas within the Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites. Individual road segments may be used for one or more activities (e.g., access for equipment and personnel, removal of material, revegetation efforts, and monitoring activities). Roads used for TRRP activities may be constrained by load limits or other stipulations of the landowner/manager and may require substantial improvements (e.g., widening, surfacing). The location of some activity areas would require construction of new roads for specific project purposes. Site-specific locations will consider factors like topography, soils, existing vegetation, and the need for future vehicle access. Best management practices (BMPs) will be used to reduce the impacts of road-related sediment on the riparian and aquatic environments.

Activity N (Temporary Channel Crossings)

Temporary crossings would provide access across the mainstem Trinity River, existing and constructed side-channels, and tributaries. These temporary crossings may include constructed fords, temporary bridges, or other site improvements to facilitate access for construction-related traffic. Appropriate measures (e.g., mandatory use of anti-spawning mats or temporary bridges - supported by the National Marine Fisheries Service) would be taken to protect aquatic species if crossings outside of the summer (July 15- September 15) work window are required. All temporary crossings would be designed and constructed to meet the requirements for heavy equipment such as trucks, excavators, and scrapers. Fords would be constructed using native alluvial materials excavated from the bed and bank of the Trinity River or adjacent sources. With the exception of rip-rap or other stabilizing materials, material will be primarily extracted from activity areas within identified TRRP sites. Due to requirements to retain navigability and minimize impacts to aquatic resources, ford crossings would be submerged to depths of at least 1 foot under low-flow conditions. The construction of the temporary crossings would likely require some vegetation removal at entrances and exits to the channel. If temporary bridges or other constructed crossings are used, abutment material may be extracted from activity areas. All temporary crossings will be constructed in a manner that does not impede navigability at the specific site.

Activity O (Revegetation)

Impacts to vegetation are anticipated at most of the activity areas. Revegetation of riparian areas would rely primarily on natural recruitment of native species; however, vegetation planting would occur to address landowner requests and fish and wildlife requirements. In general, the TRRP objective is to ensure that riparian vegetation impacted by TRRP activities is replaced at a 1:1 ratio within the Trinity River corridor. Additional planting, seeding and mulching is also planned to control or inhibit the reestablishment of noxious and invasive plant species.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology / Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic	☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Summary of Mitigation Measures

The project was designed to avoid and minimize adverse impacts to resources. Implementation of the project includes all applicable mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program listed in Appendix E of the Master EIR/Programmatic EA: Those mitigation measures are hereby incorporated by reference and would be included as conditions of approval of the general certification.

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION, will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project (mitigation measures) have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent.

☐ I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Under California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15177, after a Master EIR[2] has been prepared and certified, subsequent projects which the lead agency determines as being within the scope of the Master EIR will be subject to only limited environmental review. Mitigation measures from the Master EIR will be implemented.

_____ _____

Signature Date

[2] North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2009. Channel rehabilitation and sediment management for remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites. Master environmental impact report, environmental assessment/ environmental impact report. Trinity River Restoration Program. August 2009. SCH#2008032110

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify: a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Environmental Checklist and Explanatory Notes

I. AESTHETICS Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Have an adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report*, Section 4.12 – Aesthetics. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.12 is adequate to reduce impacts to aesthetics to less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program in the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Conflict with existing zoning for timber production (TPZ)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report*, Section 4.2 – Land Use.

III. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐

III. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant**	**Less Than Significant With Mitigation**	**Less Than Significant**	**No Impact**
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise degrade the atmospheric environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Substantially alter air movement, moisture, temperature or other aspects of climate?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report,* Section 4.11 – Air Quality. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.11 is adequate to reduce impacts to air quality to less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:	**Potentially Significant**	**Less Than Significant With Mitigation**	**Less Than Significant**	**No Impact**
a) Have an adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have an adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Have an adverse effect on Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands either individually or in combination with the known or probable effects of other activities through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐
g) Otherwise degrade the biotic environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report,* Section 4.6 and 4.7 – Fishery Resources and Vegetation, Wildlife, and Wetlands. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Sections 4.6 and 4.7 is adequate to reduce impacts to biological resources to less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report,* Section 4.10 – Cultural Resources. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.10 is adequate to reduce impacts to cultural resources to less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report,* Section 4.3 – Geology, Fluvial Geomorphology, Minerals, and Soils. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3 is adequate to reduce impacts to geology and soils to less than significant.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report,* Section 4.11 – Air Quality.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Create a hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and consequently result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and consequently result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report,* Section 4.13 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.13 is adequate to reduce impacts to hazards and hazardous materials to less than significant.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Violate any applicable water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Place within a 100-year floodplain structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 1) flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, or 2) inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☒	☐
i) Otherwise degrade water quality?	☐	☒	☐	☐
j) Change the amount of surface water in a water body?	☐	☐	☐	☒
k) Change currents or the course or direction of water movements?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report*, Sections 4.4 and 4.5 – Water Resources and Water Quality. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.5 is adequate to reduce impacts to hydrology and water quality to less than significant.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities' conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report*, Section 4.2 – Land Use.

XI. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Result in the use of energy or non-renewable resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report*, Sections 4.2 and 4.3 – Land Use and Geology, Fluvial Geomorphology, Minerals, and Soils. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 is adequate to reduce impacts to mineral and energy resources to less than significant.

XII. NOISE Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Generate or expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Generate or expose persons to excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) A temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and consequently expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and consequently expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report*, Section 4.14 – Noise. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.14 is adequate to reduce impacts to noise to less than significant.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report*, Section 4.9 – Socioeconomics, Population, and Housing.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in 1) adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or 2) the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Roads?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report,* Section 4.15 – Public Services and Utilities/Energy.

XV. RECREATION	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report,* Section 4.8 – Recreation. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.8 is adequate to reduce impacts to recreation to less than significant.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Adversely affect rail, waterborne, or airborne transportation?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report*, Sections 4.15 and 4.16 – Public Services and Utilities/Energy and Transportation/Traffic Circulation. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Sections 4.15 and 4.16 is adequate to reduce impacts to transportation/traffic to less than significant.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Require or result in the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, for any of the following utilities?				
i) Water treatment or distribution facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Wastewater collection, treatment, or disposal facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Storm water drainage facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Electric power or natural gas?	☐	☐	☐	☒
v) Communications systems?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report*, Section 4.15 – Public Services and Utilities/Energy.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to 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 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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 probably future projects, as defined in Section 15130.)	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

References:

Reclamation and California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2004. Hocker Flat Rehabilitation Site: Trinity River Mile 78-79.1, Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact Report. Trinity River Restoration Program.

Reclamation and Trinity County Resource Conservation District (TCRCD). 2008. Lewiston–Dark Gulch Rehabilitation Project: Trinity River Mile 105.4–111.7, Environmental Assessment/Final Environmental Impact Report. Trinity River Restoration Program.

Reclamation and TCRCD. 2007. Indian Creek Rehabilitation Site: Trinity River Mile 93.7 to 96.5, Final Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact Report. Trinity River Restoration Program.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Regional Water Board and Reclamation). 2006. Canyon Creek Suite of Rehabilitation Sites: Trinity River Mile 73 to 78, Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report. Trinity River Restoration Program. September 2006. SCH#2005102025.

Regional Water Board and Reclamation. 2009. Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management Activities for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites, Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/Final Environmental Impact Report. SCH #2008032110

United States Department of Interior (USDI). 2000. Record of Decision: Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. Washington D.C.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service and Hoopa Valley Tribe (USFWS and HVT). 1999. Trinity River Flow Evaluation Study, Report to the Secretary of the Interior, US Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

USFWS, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Hoopa Valley Tribe, and Trinity County (USFWS et al.). 2000. Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. State Clearinghouse No. 1994123009. October 2000.