Chapter 3 Comments and Coordination

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process to determine the scope of environmental documentation, the level of analysis, potential impacts and mitigation measures, and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including project development team meetings, interagency coordination meetings, and public meetings. This chapter addresses Caltrans' efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

A Value Analysis (VA) study was conducted in April 1999. A Value Analysis is a systematic approach to identify and evaluate alternative solutions to improve the overall value of projects. The VA team identified performance criteria (e.g., operations, access, environmental, maintenance, compliance with standards) and assigned a relative weight to each. Four alternatives were evaluated against each of the criteria and a total performance was developed. The performance of each alternative was then divided by its cost to determine a value index. The team found that the value index of Alternative 1.1 (predecessor to Alternative 1 in this document, and the only remaining build alternative) best met the purpose and need of the project. The VA team also developed alternative ways to improve performance and/or reduce cost.

Agencies contacted during the planning and preparation of this document include:

State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP)

United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)

Lassen National Forest

Native American Heritage Commission

Pit River Tribe / Illmawi Band

McArthur-Burney Falls Memorial State Park

United States Fish and Wildlife Service

State Department of Fish and Game (DFG)

City of Burney/Burney Chamber of Commerce

California Water Resources Control Board

California Department of Boating and Waterways

Pacific Crest Trail Association

Volcanic Legacy Scenic Byway-All American Road

In addition to the early coordination with the public agencies, a public open house was held in Burney on July 29, 2004. A notice of this meeting was published in the Record Searchlight on July 21 and 28, 2004 and letters were sent to landowners adjacent to the project location. Caltrans hosted an informational booth at the Intermountain Fair in McArthur in September 2004, at which staff answered questions, displayed videos, and distributed flyers about the project.

There has been continuous coordination with the various regulatory agencies relevant to the project. Discussions with regulatory agencies began in 1999 and continued through 2006. Meetings and information exchanges have been conducted with the California State Parks, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Lassen National Forest, California Department of Fish and Game, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

For the biological evaluation, the main coordination and consultation has been with California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Lassen National Forest. All relevant federal and state endangered species consultations have been appropriately processed. The results of these consultations are shown in the Natural Environment Study (March 2006). Issues and comments received from the Lassen National Forest at a meeting on June 27, 2005 after review of Caltrans' 2005 Draft Natural Environment Study have been incorporated into the final Natural Environment Study (March 2006) and this document.

Chapter 4 List of Preparers

This document was prepared by the following Caltrans North Region staff:

Tom Balkow, Senior Environmental Planner. B.S., Biological Conservation; 14 years environmental planning experience. Contribution: Document support.

Timothy Ellison, Landscape Associate, B.S., Landscape Architecture, CA Landscape Architect #2255; 34 years landscape architectural, planning, design, construction and maintenance experience. Contribution: Visual Impact Assessment consultation, support and coordination with project design.

Thomas J. Graves- R.G./C.E.G (Registered Geologist, Certified Engineering Geologist: Engineering Geologist); 24 years Engineering and Environmental Geology experience. Contribution: Conducted Initial Site Assessment and Site Investigation for Hazardous Waste.

J. Scott Lewis, Engineering Geologist, PG, CEG, RGP. B.S., Ecology, B.A. Geology, M.S. Geophysics, M.S. Geological Engineering; 20 years combined experience in geology, geophysics, and geological engineering. Contribution: Directed and performed roadway portion of geotechnical investigation, assisted in bridge foundation portion of geotechnical investigation.

Aaron McKeon, Associate Environmental Planner. M.R.P., City and Regional Planning; 6 years environmental planning experience. Contribution: Prepared Community Impact Assessment.

Dan McGann, Associate Environmental Planner (Archaeology). B.A., Anthropology and English; 26 years experience in California archaeology. Contribution: Section 106 compliance for the project.

Christine Ottaway, Landscape Associate MLA, MS; 9 years environmental planning experience. Contribution: Wrote Visual Impact Assessment.

Keith Pommerenck, Associate Environmental Planner (Noise). B.S., Environmental Resources; 18 years experience preparing noise reports. Contribution: Noise and Air Quality report.

Ted Schultz, P.E., NPDES Coordinator. B.S., Civil Engineering; 30 years of transportation and facility engineering experience: Contribution: Water Quality Assessment.

Barbara Shields, Associate Environmental Planner. M.A., Geography; 10 years environmental planning experience. Contribution: Initial Study/Environmental Assessment and coordinated the environmental process for the project.

Benjamin Tam, Transportation Engineer. 8 years noise experience/16 years Caltrans experience. Contribution: Technical noise studies.

Daniel Whitley, Associate Environmental Planner (Natural Sciences). B.S., Range Ecology; UC Davis; 19 years as a biologist. Contribution: Conducted FESA and CESA consultations, Natural Environment Study.

Appendix A California Environmental Quality Act Checklist

The following checklist identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. The California Environmental Quality Act impact levels include "potentially significant impact," "less than significant impact with mitigation," "less than significant impact," and "no impact."

Supporting documentation of all California Environmental Quality Act checklist determinations is provided in Chapter 2 of this Initial Study/Environmental Assessment. Documentation of "No Impact" determinations is provided at the beginning of Chapter 2. Discussion of all impacts, avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures is under the appropriate topic headings in Chapter 2. A summary of mitigation and minimization measures can be found in Appendix D.

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
AESTHETICS - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?		X		
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		X		
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
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 (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
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:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
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, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial 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?		X		
b) Have a substantial 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
COMMUNITY RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Cause disruption of orderly planned development?				X
b) Be inconsistent with a Coastal Zone Management Plan?				X
c) Affect lifestyles or neighborhood character or stability?				X
d) Physically divide an established community?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
e) Affect minority, low-income, elderly, disabled, transit-dependent, or other specific interest group?				X
f) Affect employment, industry, or commerce, or require the displacement of businesses or farms?				X
g) Affect property values or the local tax base?				X
h) Affect any community facilities (including medical, educational, scientific, or religious institutions, ceremonial sites, or sacred shrines?				X
i) Result in alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic?			X	
j) Support large commercial or residential development?				X
k) Affect wild or scenic rivers or natural landmarks?				X
l) Result in substantial impacts associated with construction activities (e.g., noise, dust, temporary drainage, traffic detours, and temporary access, etc.)?		X		

CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
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 Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
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 onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.				X
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?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
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?				X
e) For a project 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, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially 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)?				X
c) Substantially 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 substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?			X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite?			X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) 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?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
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?				X
NOISE - Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X		
e) For a project 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, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:				

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	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)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
PUBLIC SERVICES -				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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:				
Fire protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?			X	
RECREATION -				

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	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?			X	
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?			X	
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:				
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)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
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?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incomplete uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
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?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in 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?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, or 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?			X	
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)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X