

**ADDENDUM TO
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT**

**MOSQUITO ROAD BRIDGE
REPLACEMENT PROJECT**

State Clearing House #2015062076

Lead Agency: El Dorado County Department of Transportation

October 2019





ADDENDUM TO A CERTIFIED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The County of El Dorado, California, a municipal corporation, does hereby prepare, make declare, and publish the Addendum to a certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the following described project:

Project Name: Mosquito Road Bridge Replacement Facility

The County of El Dorado, Transportation Department, has reviewed the proposed project and on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that substantial evidence does not exist that the project, as identified in this Addendum, would have a significant effect on the environment beyond that which was previously evaluated in the EIR prepared for the Mosquito Road Bridge Replacement Project (SCH # 2015062076). A subsequent EIR is not required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Sections 21000, et. Seq., Public Resources Code of the State of California).

This Addendum to a certified EIR has been prepared pursuant to Title 14, Section 15164 of the California Code of Regulations.

Donna Keeler, Principal Planner
County of El Dorado

By: _____

Date: _____

Mosquito Road Bridge Replacement Project Addendum to an Environmental Impact Report

Project Name: Mosquito Road Bridge Replacement Project

Project Location: The project is located in the west-central portion of the county and within a rugged rural area of the Sierra Nevada foothills. The proposed Project site is along Mosquito Road in unincorporated El Dorado County northeast of Placerville. The existing Mosquito Road Bridge is within the canyon of the South Fork American River roughly six miles north of U.S. Highway 50 and 2.3 miles south of the communities of Mosquito and Swansboro.

Current Plan Designations and Zoning: land uses surrounding the Project site include rural and open space. The area around the Project site is densely vegetated. Very few sensitive receptors (e.g., residential land uses) are located within the immediate vicinity of the Project site. Land adjacent to Mosquito Road is zoned Residential Agriculture 20-acre or Unclassified, Timberland Preserve Zone with a land use designation of Natural Resources 1 dwelling unit/40 acre.

Lead Agency: The lead agency is the public agency with the primary approval authority over the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15051(b)(1), “the lead agency will normally be an agency with governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose such as an air pollution control district which will provide a public service or public utility to the project.” The lead agency for the proposed project is the El Dorado County Department of Transportation.

Project Description and Background: The County is proposing to replace the existing Mosquito Road Bridge (No. 25C0061) within the canyon of the South Fork American River (Project). The bridge is in the west-central portion of El Dorado County and within a rugged rural area of the Sierra Nevada foothills. The proposed Project site is along Mosquito Road in unincorporated El Dorado County northeast of Placerville. The existing Mosquito Road Bridge is roughly 6 miles north of U.S. Highway 50 and 2.3 miles south of the communities of Mosquito and Swansboro. The existing bridge and study area correspond to 38°46'32.95"N 120°44'54.65"W. The Project is sited on the Slate Mountain U.S. Geological Survey topographic quad.

The proposed Project would raise the bridge profile to approximately 400 feet over the river on the most direct alignment across the river. The new main bridge over the South Fork American River would be a multi-span, likely cast-in-place pre-stressed concrete box-girder, concrete arch, or network arch type bridge with a maximum span of approximately 650 feet. Depending on the final engineered profile, a minor bridge may be constructed over a small ravine leading to the main bridge over the river. This minor bridge would be approximately 120 feet long and would likely be a single-span, cast-in-place pre-stressed concrete box-girder, or precast I-girder type bridge. A large arch culvert with concrete headwalls may be constructed instead of the

minor bridge. The clear-span design of either the minor bridge or the large arch culvert would be above the ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) of the small ravine.

The proposed Project would provide a reliable river crossing with a fully accessible replacement bridge that is consistent with the roadway classification and regional transportation needs. In accomplishing this, the proposed Project would eliminate substandard roadway approaches that currently restrict vehicle access to the bridge—the one hairpin on the Placerville side of the canyon and the four hairpins on the Mosquito/Swansboro side of the canyon that have been the subject of one fatality. The Project involves an approximately 2,000-foot realigned roadway. The departure from the existing roadway on the south involves approximately 575 feet of roadway approach to the nearly 1,200-foot-long bridge, then a 300-foot northerly roadway approach where the alignment converges back to the existing roadway.

The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Mosquito Road Bridge Replacement Project was certified by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on August 9, 2017 after a 45 day comment period. The project included the replacement of the existing Mosquito Bridge within the Canyon of the South Fork American River.

Rationale for Preparation of the Addendum: CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (a) provides that the lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration (ND) if some changes or additions are necessary. None of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or ND have occurred (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164, subd. (a)).

An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR or ND (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (c)). The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the Final EIR prior to making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (d)). An agency must also include a brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR or ND pursuant to Section 15162 (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (e)).

Consequently, once an EIR or ND has been certified for a project, no subsequent EIR or ND is required under CEQA unless, based on substantial evidence:

(a) When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental

effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

- (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
- (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
- (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

This addendum and attached documents constitute substantial evidence supporting the conclusion that preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not required prior to approval of the proposed signal projects, and provides the required documentation under CEQA.

CLARIFICATIONS AND REVISIONS

Pursuant to CCC § 15164, *et seq*, the purpose of the Addendum is to clarify a mitigation measure and address a minor technical change in the project design. As lead agency, El Dorado County Department of Transportation has determined corrections and additions included in this addendum will not result in substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken, new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, as identified in CCR §15162, *et seq*.

Mitigation Measure Bio-3: Retain a Qualified Biologist to Conduct Periodic Monitoring during Construction.

Bio-3 Mitigation Measure describes the overall monitoring duties and activities throughout the duration of the construction period. The credentials or qualifications of the individual(s) implementing the mitigation measure have been determined to require further clarification. As

such, the mitigation measure will be clarified to state that the biological monitor shall be a qualified wildlife biologist or a designee who operates under the oversight of a qualified wildlife biologist.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3 is modified as follows:

Mitigation Measure Bio 3: Retain a Qualified Biologist to Conduct Periodic Monitoring during Construction.

El Dorado County will retain a qualified biologist to conduct periodic construction monitoring in and adjacent to all sensitive habitats (i.e., interior live oak woodland, willow thickets, and streams) in the construction area. The person conducting the monitoring shall be a qualified biologist or an approved individual who has been trained by, and under the oversight of, a qualified biologist. The frequency of monitoring will range from daily to weekly depending on the biological resource. The monitor, as part of the overall monitoring duties, will inspect the fencing once a week to ensure that fencing around environmentally sensitive areas is intact. The biological monitor will assist the construction crew as needed to comply with all Project implementation restrictions and guidelines. The biological monitor also will be responsible for ensuring that the contractor maintains the staked and flagged perimeters of the construction area and staging areas adjacent to sensitive biological resources. The monitor will provide El Dorado County with a monitoring log for each site visit, which will be provided to interested agencies upon request.

Certain activities will require a biological monitor to be present for the duration of the activity or during the initial disturbance of an area to ensure that impacts on special-status species are avoided. The activities that require specific monitoring are identified below in Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-10, BIO-11, and BIO-12.

Project Design Element & Sensitive Habitat Impact Updates

Geotechnical investigations and borings conducted on-site between September and November, 2017 revealed minor discrepancies with earlier site investigations causing additional foundation and stabilization work in the minor structure over the small ravine. These technical design considerations do not result in changes to the final alignments over the small ravine as described in the EIR. These considerations will however result in temporary and potentially permanent impacts within the OHWM of the ephemeral stream (i.e. "small ravine") during construction for access and subsurface improvement features and potentially after construction completes.

The project description in the certified EIR includes the construction of a minor bridge or large arch culvert over a small ravine leading to the main bridge, is revised as follows:

Depending on the final engineered profile, a minor bridge may be constructed over a small ravine leading to the main bridge over the river. This minor bridge would be approximately 155

feet long and would likely be a single-span, cast-in-place prestressed concrete box-girder, or precast I-girder type bridge. A large arch culvert with concrete headwalls or pipe culvert (of a minimum diameter of approximately 48") may be constructed instead of the minor bridge.

Temporary construction impacts and permanent impacts (associated with the closed culvert alternative) may occur below the ordinary high water mark.

Also since the approval of the Final EIR (FIER) in August 2017, minor changes to the sensitive habitat areas within the study limits of the project were observed to include changes to the Willow Thicket Wetland or Wet Meadow Wetland. As shown in the updated Wetland Delineation Report and associated Proposed Project Impacts exhibit (both attached), the Willow Thicket Wetland or "Wet Meadow" has reduced in size since the initial studies were performed. Similarly, as the design components have progressed, additional opportunities to avoid and minimize impacts have also been recognized. The results of these findings are that the permanent impacts to the Willow Thicket Wetlands noted in the FEIR have been reduced. Consequently, the reduction in the permanent impacts to the Willow Thicket Wetlands (i.e. "Wet Meadow Wetlands") equals the temporary impacts to the ephemeral stream (i.e. "small ravine") as discussed above.

Table A (below) summarizes the proposed changes to the impacts in the sensitive areas of the proposed project:

Table A - Changes in Impacts on Sensitive Land Cover Types

		Interior Live Oak Woodland (acres)	Wetland (acres)*	Ephemeral Stream (acres)*	Perennial Stream (acres)			
Permanent Impacts	FEIR	6.67	FEIR	0.06	FEIR	0	FEIR	0
	No change Current	6.67	Reduction of <0.03> Current	0.03	Increase of 0.03 Current	0.03	No change Current	0
Temporary Impacts	FEIR	7.62	FEIR	0	FEIR	0	FEIR	0
	No change Current	7.62	No change Current	0	Increase of 0.03 Current	0.03	No change Current	0
Total Impacts	FEIR	14.02	FEIR	0.06	FEIR	0	FEIR	0
	No change Current	14.02	Reduction of <0.03> Current	0.03	Increase of 0.03 Current	0.03 ¹	No change Current	0

Note 1: The temporary impacts and permanent impacts to the Ephemeral Stream are shown as the same number (and same Total Impacts) as the approximate area of impact is permanent if a closed bottom culvert alternative is constructed or may be temporary if open bottom arch is constructed.

As shown in Table A the total impacts to the sensitive areas of the proposed project remains unchanged from the FEIR, as the increase to temporary impacts in the Ephemeral Stream is equal to the decrease to permanent impacts in the Wet Meadow Wetlands. These projections of disturbance areas and impacts to the Wet Meadow Wetlands and Ephemeral Stream occur in

close proximity, along the same waterbody, and have been estimated conservatively as shown in the attached Proposed Project Impacts exhibit.

Mitigation for these changes (and impacts to the Ephemeral Stream) will also be consistent with the permanent impacts to the Wetland area as detailed in the FEIR, or specifically mitigation measure BIO-11 described below. Although this mitigation measure details permanent impacts on the Willow Thicket Wetland, it can also be applied to the Ephemeral Stream as a downstream extension of the water body.

Mitigation Measure Bio-11: Compensate for Permanent Impacts on Willow Thicket Wetland

El Dorado County will compensate for the loss of up to 0.06 acre of riparian willow thicket wetland either by purchasing mitigation bank credits, which can be in the form of preservation and/or creation credits, or by paying into the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Sacramento District In-Lieu Fee program. The mitigation ratio will be a minimum of 2:1 (2 acres of mitigation for 1 acre of wetland filled) if credits are for preservation of wetland habitat, or 1:1 (1 acre of mitigation for 1 acre of wetland removed) if credits are for creation of wetland habitat. The final ratio will be as required under the Section 404 permit in order to result in no net loss of wetland habitat. If mitigation bank credits are used for mitigation, the County will purchase willow wetland credits from an approved mitigation bank that has a service area that covers the project site.

Project Closures (and Detours) Clarification

Stated throughout the environmental document are “occasional short term closures of up to approximately 2 to 4 weeks (a duration consistent with current closures for bridge maintenance).” Based on further review of past maintenance activities and associated closure durations for the existing bridge maintenance, the occasional short term closures duration for the project should be stated as follows: “occasional short term closures of up to approximately 2 to **10 weeks** (a duration consistent with current closures for bridge maintenance).” This duration is based on historical closure durations on the existing bridge that have usually been performed annually in the summer and fall seasons (often between July and August, but varies) and have lasted from 2 weeks to 10 weeks (to include from August 16 through October 22, 2010). As stated in the environmental document, emergency response, and detour activities will be properly coordinated to ensure impacts are minimized and consistent with existing bridge maintenance activities.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

COMPARING CHANGES AND/OR NEW INFORMATION TO PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

The purpose of the checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any “**changes**” or “**new information**” that may result in a changed environmental impact evaluation. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no relevant change in the condition or status of the impact due to its insignificance or its treatment in a previous environmental document.

EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST EVALUATION CATEGORIES

Where Impact was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents

This column provides a reference to the pages of the other environmental documents where information and analysis may be found relative to the threshold listed under each topic.

Do Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the proposed project will result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact that have not already been evaluated and mitigated by the previous EIR. If a “yes” answer is given, additional mitigation measures acceptable to the applicant will be specified in the discussion section, including a statement of impact status after mitigation.

Any New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a) (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there have been changes to the project site or the vicinity (environmental setting) that have occurred subsequent to the certification of the previous EIR that would result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact that were not evaluated and mitigated by the previous EIR. If a “yes” answer is given, additional mitigation measures acceptable to the applicant will be specified in the discussion section, including a statement of impact status after mitigation.

Any New Information of Substantial Importance?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there is new information of substantial importance which was not known and could have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified. New information of substantial importance includes: (1) one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR, (2) significant effects previously examined that are substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR, (3) mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (4) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. If additional analysis is conducted and no new information of substantial importance is identified, no new or additional mitigation is necessary. If the additional analysis indicates new information of substantial

importance, no additional environmental documentation is needed if it is found that a new or modified mitigation would eliminate a new significant impact or reduce the increase in severity to less than substantial.

Prior Environmental Document Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.

Pursuant to Section 15162(a) (3) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether other environmental documents provide mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. If N/A is indicated, a previous environmental document and this initial study conclude that the impact does not occur with this project, and, therefore, no mitigation is needed.

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION SECTIONS

Discussion:

A discussion of the elements of the checklist is provided under each environmental category in order to clarify the answers and provide substantial evidence supporting the impact conclusion. The discussion provides information about the particular environmental issue, how the project relates to the issue, and the status of any mitigation that may be required or that has already been implemented. The discussion is organized into four sections: Changes to the Project; Changes in Circumstances; Changes in Information; and Conclusion.

CEQA Topics

The proposed Bio 3 mitigation measure clarification and Technical Revision – Project Design Element & Sensitive Habitat Impact Updates- would result in a limited potential to impact the physical environment. Therefore, it is reasonable and appropriate to focus this environmental analysis onto those CEQA topics for which impacts may be triggered as a result of the signal projects. The environmental checklist presented herein focuses on the following CEQA issue areas which were analyzed in the Mosquito Road Bridge Replacement Project: Biological Resources. This topic is evaluated in detail within the corresponding checklist section.

Prior CEQA Mitigation Measures:

Applicable mitigation measures from the previous environmental documents that apply to the changes or new information are referenced under each environmental category.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Biological Resources.</i> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly	pg. 3.3-1-3.3-47	No	No	No

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 CDFW or USFWS?				
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?	pg. 3.3-1 -3.3-47	No	No	No
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the CWA through direct removal, filling hydrological interruption or other means?	pg. 3.3-2 – 3.3-47	No	No	No
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?	pg. 3.3-2 – 3.3-47	No	No	No
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?	pg. 3.3-2 – 3.3-47	No	No	No
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?	pg. 3.3-2 – 3.3-47	No	No	No

g. Cause the introduction or spread of invasive plant species?	pg. 3.3-2 – 3.3-47	No	No	No
--	--------------------	----	----	----

Changes to the Project

The project components have not been altered from the components analyzed in the 2016 EIR; rather, the aforementioned information that was not available at the time the EIR was prepared. Accordingly, the proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts.

The environmental setting of the proposed Mosquito Road Bridge Replacement Project has not changed such that a new significant impact or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact could occur. Accordingly, new circumstances that would involve new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts do not exist.

Conclusion

Based on the above, the proposed project would not result in any changes, new circumstances, or new information that would involve new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts related to Biological Resources from what has been anticipated for the project in the 2016 EIR.

APPENDICES

A Proposed Project Impacts to Sensitive Areas

B. Wetland Delineation Report (*updated June 2018*)