

# NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

DIST./CO./RTE.	08-SBd-Mount Vernon Avenue
PM/PM	N/A
E.A. or Fed-Aid Project No.	EA 965120; BRLS-6507(003) (updated from BRLS-5033[042])
Other Project No. (specify)	BRLS-5033(042)
PROJECT TITLE	Mount Vernon Avenue Bridge Project
ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVAL TYPE	Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact
DATE APPROVED	June 27, 2011
REASON FOR CONSULTATION (23 CFR 771.129)	Check reason for consultation: <input type="checkbox"/> Project proceeding to next major federal approval <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in scope, setting, effects, mitigation measures, requirements <input type="checkbox"/> 3-year timeline (EIS only) <input type="checkbox"/> N/A (Re-Validation for CEQA only)
DESCRIPTION OF CHANGED CONDITIONS	Briefly describe the changed conditions or new information on page 2. Append continuation sheet(s) as necessary. Include a revised Environmental Commitments Record (ECR) when applicable.

## NEPA CONCLUSION - VALIDITY

Based on an examination of the changed conditions and supporting information: [Check ONE of the three statements below, regarding the validity of the original document/determination (23 CFR 771.129). If document is no longer valid, indicate whether additional public review is warranted and whether the type of environmental document will be elevated.]

- ☐ The original environmental document or CE remains valid. No further documentation will be prepared.
- ☒ The original environmental document or CE is in need of updating; further documentation has been prepared and ☒ is included on the continuation sheet(s) or ☒ is attached. With this additional documentation, the original ED or CE remains valid.
- Additional public review is warranted (23 CFR 771.111(h)(3)) Yes ☐ No ☒
- ☐ The original document or CE is no longer valid.
- Additional public review is warranted (23 CFR 771.111(h)(3)) Yes ☐ No ☐
- Supplemental environmental document is needed. Yes ☐ No ☐
- New environmental document is needed. Yes ☐ No ☐ (If "Yes," specify type: \_\_\_\_\_)

## CONCURRENCE WITH NEPA CONCLUSION

I concur with the NEPA conclusion above.

  
Signature: Environmental Branch Chief

2-2-18  
Date

  
Signature: Project Manager/DLAP

02-02-18  
Date

## CEQA CONCLUSION: (Only mandated for projects on the State Highway System.)

Based on an examination of the changed conditions and supporting information, the following conclusion has been reached regarding appropriate CEQA documentation: (Check ONE of the five statements below, indicating whether any additional documentation will be prepared, and if so, what kind. If additional documentation is prepared, attach a copy of this signed form and any continuation sheets.)

- ☐ Original document remains valid. No further documentation is necessary.
- ☐ Only minor technical changes or additions to the previous document are necessary. An addendum has been or will be ☐ prepared and is ☐ included on the continuation sheets or ☐ will be attached. It need not be circulated for public review. (CEQA Guidelines, §15164)
- ☐ Changes are substantial, but only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous document adequate. A Supplemental environmental document will be prepared, and it will be circulated for public review. (CEQA Guidelines, §15163)
- ☐ Changes are substantial, and major revisions to the current document are necessary. A Subsequent environmental document will be prepared, and it will be circulated for public review. (CEQA Guidelines, §15162) (Specify type of subsequent document, e.g., Subsequent FEIR)
- ☐ The CE is no longer valid. New CE is needed. Yes ☐ No ☐

## CONCURRENCE WITH CEQA CONCLUSION

I concur with the CEQA conclusion above.

N/A  
Signature: Environmental Branch Chief

N/A  
Date

N/A  
Signature: Project Manager/DLAP

N/A  
Date

## NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

### CONTINUATION SHEET(S)

*Address only changes or new information since approval of the original document and only those areas that are applicable. Use the list below as section headings as they apply to the project change(s). Use as much or as little space as needed to adequately address the project change(s) and the associated impacts, minimization, avoidance and/or mitigation measures, if any.*

#### ***Changes in project design, e.g., scope change; a new alternative; change in project alignment***

In June 2011, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was adopted for the proposed project, which included replacement of the Mount Vernon Avenue Bridge in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California. A full description of the project improvements can be found in Sections 1.4.1 and 1.4.2.2 of the June 2011 Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared for the proposed project. An exhibit showing the 2011 project footprint for the bridge replacement project is attached (Attachment A). No changes to the project design have occurred since adoption of the 2011 EA/FONSI.

#### ***Changes in environmental setting, e.g., new development affecting traffic or air quality;***

Since the FONSI was adopted in June 2011, no changes to the original project footprint have occurred. Site surveys were conducted in 2017 to confirm that the environmental setting within the original project footprint has remained the same. The only major change that occurred was construction of a Metrolink parking structure, which was built immediately outside the southeast quadrant of the 2011 project footprint. This area was originally unused, unimproved open space, with mainly weedy grasses and palms. An open drainage channel that crossed the area supported most of the trees and nonnative shrubs within the open space. A remnant riparian community was adjacent to the drainage channel. This open space area and remnant riparian community has since been removed and redeveloped with the Metrolink parking structure. No other changes to the immediate surrounding environmental setting have occurred since adoption of the 2011 EA/FONSI.

#### ***Changes in environmental circumstances, e.g., a new law or regulation; change in the status of a listed species.***

None. There are no changes in the environmental circumstances associated with the project.

#### ***Changes to environmental impacts of the project, e.g., a new type of impact, or a change in the magnitude of an existing impact.***

Environmental resources that have changed since adoption of the 2011 EA/FONSI are discussed below.

##### **Biological Resources and Jurisdictional Resources**

As mentioned previously, a Metrolink parking structure was built immediately outside the southeast quadrant of the 2011 project footprint. This area was originally unimproved open space, with mainly weedy grasses and palms. An open drainage channel that crossed the area supported most of the trees and nonnative shrubs within the open space. A remnant riparian community was adjacent to the drainage channel. This open space area has since been removed and redeveloped with the Metrolink parking structure. A field review of the original project area, as well as surrounding areas, was conducted on June 26, 2017, to document existing conditions within the project footprint and surrounding areas. The area was carefully examined 1) to determine if any changes to biological conditions (i.e., physical conditions as well as vegetation and wildlife habitat and resources) occurred since preparation of the 2006 Natural Environment Study/Minimal Impacts (NES/MI) and 2) document current biological conditions. In addition to field surveys, aerial imagery of the biological study area (BSA) was reviewed to further evaluate site conditions. No changes to the biological setting within the original project footprint were observed.

Consistent with the original project NES/MI (approved in 2006), suitable wildlife habitat in the BSA is limited to nonnative ornamental trees and the bridge. The potential for wildlife in the BSA is limited primarily to the bat and bird roosting and nesting habitat that exists at the bridge and in the ornamental vegetation within the BSA (e.g., palm trees). Bridge hinges and pier rafters may provide nesting and/or roosting habitat for bats and birds, and bridge/pier surfaces may serve as potential nesting habitat for birds. Trees may provide both nesting and roosting habitat for bats and birds. All avoidance and minimization measures previously identified in the 2011 EA/FONSI for impacts on nesting and roosting habitat for bats and birds, invasive species, and migratory birds have been updated to ensure that all

## NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

measures are consistent with current standard practices. Measures BIO-7 from the 2011 EA remains as BIO-7 below. The new updated measures presented below replace in their entirety the biological resources measures presented in the 2011 EA:

- BIO-1:** Within 7 days prior to the commencement of construction activities (if between January 15 and September 1), a qualified biologist shall perform a nesting bird survey that will consist of one site visit to determine whether there are active songbird nests within 200 feet of the project footprint and raptor nests within 500 feet of the project footprint. This survey shall also identify the species, and to the degree feasible, nesting stage (e.g., incubation of young, feeding of young, near fledging). Nests shall be mapped (not by using GPS because close encroachment may cause nest abandonment). If active nests are found, construction shall not occur within 200 feet of the songbird's nest or within 500 feet of a raptor's nest, or within an appropriate buffer established by the qualified biologist, until the nesting attempt has been completed and/or abandoned because of non-project-related reasons. The qualified biologist can subsequently reduce this buffer based on professional experience related to observations of behavior and specific construction activities occurring near the nest.
- BIO-2:** To avoid impacts on any bats that may be roosting in palm trees within the project area, all direct impacts on palm trees shall be avoided during construction, and highly vibrative and/or noisy work shall be avoided near palm trees. If it is not possible to avoid direct impacts (e.g., tree removal, tree disturbance, tree trimming) or indirect impacts (e.g., noise, vibrations near trees) on palm trees, a qualified bat biologist shall survey the trees (e.g., conduct acoustic nighttime surveys) prior to disturbance to determine whether bats are roosting in the trees. If bats are found to be present, the bat biologist shall monitor construction activities to ensure that no bats are affected during construction. The qualified bat biologist may also provide other avoidance measures to ensure that all impacts on this species are avoided and minimized.
- BIO-3:** A qualified bat biologist who is familiar with crevice-dwelling bat and bird species shall survey the project disturbance limits and Mount Vernon Avenue Bridge in June, prior to construction, to assess the potential for the bridge's use for bat roosting, bat maternity roosting, and bird roosting/nesting because maternity roosts and nests are generally formed in spring. The qualified bat biologist shall also perform pre-construction surveys within 2 weeks prior to construction because bat and bird roosts can change seasonally. These surveys will include a combination of structure inspections, exit counts, and acoustic surveys.
- BIO-4:** If recommended by the qualified bat biologist, to avoid indirect disturbance of bats and birds while roosting in areas that would be subject to, or adjacent to, impacts from construction activities, any portion of the structure that is deemed by a qualified bat biologist to have potential bat or bird roosting habitat and that may be affected by the proposed project shall have temporary bat and bird eviction and exclusion devices installed under the supervision of a qualified and permitted bat biologist prior to the initiation of construction activities. Eviction and subsequent exclusion will be conducted during the fall (September or October) to avoid trapping young flightless bats inside during the summer months or hibernating/overwintering individuals during the winter. Such exclusion efforts are dependent on weather conditions, take a minimum of 2 weeks to implement, and must be continued to keep the structures free of bats and birds until the completion of construction. All eviction and/or exclusion techniques shall be coordinated between the qualified bat biologist and the appropriate resource agencies (e.g., California Department of Fish and Wildlife).
- BIO-5:** Inspection and cleaning of construction equipment shall be performed to minimize the importation of nonnative plant material. Eradication strategies (i.e., weed control) shall be implemented should an invasion of nonnative plant species occur.
- BIO-6:** After construction, species that have been listed as having a high or moderate rating on the California Invasive Plant Council's California Invasive Plant Inventory shall not be planted in any revegetated areas (California Invasive Plant Council 2006).
- BIO-7:** Trucks with loads carrying vegetation shall be covered and vegetative materials removed from the site shall be disposed of in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

### Cultural Resources

Two ditches that were identified and evaluated for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) have since been destroyed during construction of the Metrolink parking structure. The two ditches were the Santa Fe Ditch (P-36-014221) and Viaduct Boulevard Ditch (P-36-014222). The Metrolink

## NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

Parking Structure Historic Property Survey Report prepared by David M. Van Horn in 2009 found that neither ditch was eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Pedestrian field surveys on October 6 and December 21, 2017, were conducted to document any changes to the environmental setting. No new cultural or historic resources were observed. The conditions listed in the adopted EA previously prepared for this project remain in effect and apply to the current project. No additional measures would be required.

### **Traffic and Circulation**

Existing 2017 traffic conditions have been reviewed, based on traffic data presented in the final traffic/circulation study approved in October 2017, and compared to the 2006 traffic conditions presented in the 2011 EA/FONSI. As shown in Table 1, the existing level of service (LOS) has degraded for those intersections analyzed since adoption of the 2011 EA/FONSI; however, all analyzed intersections still operate at an acceptable LOS. LOS A through D are considered acceptable LOS within the City of San Bernardino.

**Table 1. Year 2009 and Year 2017 Traffic Conditions, Intersection Level of Service**

Intersections	Traffic Control Intersection	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Delay <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Delay <sup>1</sup>	LOS
Year 2009 Conditions					
Mount Vernon/5 <sup>th</sup> Street	Signal	10.8	B	11.6	B
Mount Vernon/2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	Signal	14.7	B	18.7	B
Mount Vernon Avenue/Rialto Avenue	Signal	6.0	A	5.8	A
Year 2017 Conditions <sup>2</sup>					
Mount Vernon/5 <sup>th</sup> Street	Signal	48	D	47.5	D
Mount Vernon/2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	Signal	22.4	C	24.5	C
Mount Vernon Avenue/Rialto Avenue	Signal	16.4	B	16.3	B
<sup>1</sup> Average control delay, in seconds per vehicle <sup>2</sup> Source: AECOM. 2017. <i>Final Traffic/Circulation Study for the Mount Vernon Avenue Overhead Replacement Project</i> . Approved: October 2017.					

A roadway segment capacity analysis was conducted to evaluate existing conditions during a typical weekday. Under existing conditions, Mount Vernon Avenue is a four-lane undivided major arterial between Kingman Street and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. With its current capacity, the roadway volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio is 0.43, which is lower than the V/C ratio of 0.37 that was present in 2009; however, under both 2009 and 2017 conditions the roadway operates under LOS A. The 2017 traffic study shows that capacity along Mount Vernon Avenue is still adequate for the travel demand.

**Table 2. Roadway Capacity (Year 2009 and 2017)**

Location	Number of Lanes	Capacity	Existing Weekday Volume	V/C	Level of Service
<b>2009</b>					
Mount Vernon Ave between 5 <sup>th</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Streets	4	40,000	14,677	0.37	A
<b>2017</b>					
Mount Vernon Ave between 5 <sup>th</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Streets	4	40,000	17,297	0.43	A
Source: AECOM. 2017. <i>Final Traffic/Circulation Study for the Mount Vernon Avenue Overhead Replacement Project</i> . Approved: October 2017.					

### **Detour Analysis – Pedestrians and Bicyclists**

A final detour analysis report<sup>1</sup> was approved in January 2018. Consistent with the previous pedestrian and vehicular detour analysis conducted in 2004 for the 2011 EA, the majority of traffic would detour around the project site via Rialto Avenue, G and H Streets, and 5<sup>th</sup> Street. In addition, traffic on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street would

<sup>1</sup> AECOM. 2018. *Final Detour Analysis Report for the Mount Vernon Avenue Overhead Replacement Project*. Approved January 2018.

## NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

detour to Rialto Avenue to access Mount Vernon Avenue. The 2018 detour analysis assumed that some percentage of traffic would use an alternate north-south route via Rancho Avenue. Adequate wayfinding and detour signage will be placed to assist motorists along the detour route.

According to the 2004 detour analysis, 242 pedestrians and cyclists crossed the bridge on Monday, May 3, 2004, with the greatest number of trips, 26 trips, occurring between 4:00 and 5:00 p.m. New 24-hour pedestrian and bicycle counts were collected in May 2017; the new counts show that 175 pedestrians (90 northbound and 85 southbound, or 175 combined directions) and 74 cyclists (32 northbound and 42 southbound, or 74 combined directions) crossed the bridge, resulting in a total of 249 pedestrian and cyclist crossings. The results of the new pedestrian and cyclist counts show that the counts collected in 2004 remain largely unchanged compared to 2017. On Mount Vernon Avenue, sidewalks are currently provided; however, on the bridge structure, the sidewalks are reduced to 3 feet, 6 inches. Continuous sidewalks are provided on both sides of the street on 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, and Rialto Avenue. Striped crosswalks are provided on all four approaches at all study area intersections as well. This is consistent with the conditions documented in the 2011 EA/FONSI.

Bicycle usage is encouraged within the City of San Bernardino; however, there are currently no striped or marked bicycle facilities within the study area. This is consistent with the conditions documented in the 2011 EA/FONSI. A Class II or III bicycle facility is planned on Mount Vernon Avenue for the study area, as shown in the City of San Bernardino Bicycle Facilities Master Plan.

Measure TR-2 from the 2011 EA, with some updating, remains valid to address transporting pedestrians across the railyard during construction, as do Measures TR-1 and TR-3 that address project notification and access during construction. The updated Measure TR-2 is presented below. This addresses timeframes in the original measure for when the bridge was anticipated to be out of service in the 2011 EA.

**TR-2:** San Bernardino County Transportation Authority will make arrangements to provide free bus passes to residents of the area surrounding the bridge. These passes would be valid for travel on Omnitrans buses that serve the area.

This will provide mobility to area residents affected by the bridge closure since there will be no pedestrian access across the BNSF rail yard while the bridge is out of service. The bus passes will provide alternative, motorized means for pedestrians to travel across the rail yard during that time.

### Public Transportation

Public transportation in the San Bernardino area is currently provided by Omnitrans, the regional public transit operator for San Bernardino County. Omnitrans operates 14 local fixed routes in the City of San Bernardino. As of January 2018, the following weekday Omnitrans bus routes serve the study area directly.

- Route 1 (Colton – Del Rosa): Local fixed-route service that operates along Mount Vernon Avenue and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street in the study area, with service provided every 15 minutes.
- Route 3/4 (West San Bernardino – Baseline – Highland): Local fixed-route service that provides service along Mount Vernon Avenue and 5<sup>th</sup> Street in the study area, with service provided every 20 minutes.
- Route 14 (Fontana – Foothill – San Bernardino): Local fixed-route service that provides service along 5<sup>th</sup> Street in the study area, with service provided every 15 minutes.

In the 2011 EA the following routes were identified as serving the project area vicinity.

- Routes 3/4 and 14 – Near the northern end of the project
- Route 1 – Adjacent to the southern end of the project and traversing Mount Vernon Avenue to 2<sup>nd</sup> Street via the existing bridge, 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, and J Street.

As noted above, the bus routes that serve the project area have changed since the 2011 EA/FONSI was adopted. Therefore, Measure TR-5 in the adopted 2011 EA/FONSI needs to be updated. This measure has been updated to read, as follows.

**TR-5:** During preparation of the TMP, coordination with shall occur to address any bus routes that could be affected during construction.



# NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

## Detour Analysis – Vehicular Traffic

In the 2011 EA, an analysis of intersections that would be expected to be affected by detoured or diverted traffic during construction was conducted. Twenty-two intersections were evaluated. An updated Detour Analysis report was approved for the project in January 2018, which evaluated twenty-three intersections. The results of the intersection analysis included in the 2011 EA for the Opening Year of 2012 and those evaluated in the updated detour analysis for the updated Opening Year of 2021 are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Opening Year Levels of Service with Detour Analysis (Year 2012 vs 2021)**

Location	Control	2012		2021	
		AM	PM	AM	PM
Foothill Boulevard and Rancho Avenue	Unsignalized	C	C	<b>F*</b>	<b>F*</b>
5th Street and Medical Center Drive	Signalized	A	A	B	B
5th Street and Cabrera Avenue	Signalized	A	A	B	B
5th Street and Mount Vernon Avenue	Signalized	B	C	C	<b>E</b>
5th Street and L Street	Signalized	A	A	B	B
5th Street (Foothill Boulevard) and 4th Street	Signalized	A	A	A	A
5th Street and H Street	Signalized	C	<b>E</b>	D	<b>F</b>
4th Street (I-215 On Ramps) and H Street	Unsignalized	A	A	B	C
3rd Street and I Street	Signalized	A	A	N/A	N/A
3rd Street and H Street	Signalized	A	A	C	C
2nd Street and Mount Vernon Avenue	Signalized	Closed		B	B
2nd Street and K Street	Signalized	A	B	A	B
2nd Street and I Street	Signalized	A	A	B	B
2nd Street and I-215 SB On Ramp	Signalized	A	B	B	C
2nd Street and I-215 NB On Ramp	Signalized	B	B	B	B
2nd Street and G Street	Signalized	B	<b>F</b>	D	D
Rialto Avenue and Rancho Avenue	Signalized	A	A	B	B
Rialto Avenue and Santa Fe Way	Signalized	A	A	B	B
Rialto Avenue and Mount Vernon Avenue	Signalized	B	C	D	<b>F</b>
Rialto Avenue and K Street	Signalized	B	C	C	C
Rialto Avenue and I Street	Unsignalized	A	A	B	B
Rialto Avenue and G Street	Signalized	B	<b>F</b>	D	<b>F</b>
I-215 SB Ramps/5th Street	Signalized	N/A	N/A	C	B
I-215 NB Ramps/5th Street	Signalized	N/A	N/A	C	D
N/A – intersection not included in study Closed – intersection would be closed during construction SB – southbound NB – northbound Bold – indicates unsatisfactory operation Shaded – indicates intersection is along the proposed detour route * - LOS is F with or without implementation of the detour					

In the 2011 EA it was noted that with implementation of the detour, three intersections were predicted to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Under the no-detour scenario all of these intersections were predicted to operate at an acceptable LOS (i.e. the cause of the impact was due to the detour). Measure TR-4, included in the 2011 EA, identified temporary improvements that would be implemented during construction to address the impacts at these intersections. In the 2017 detour analysis it was noted that with implementation of the detour, five intersections are predicted to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Under the no-detour scenario all of these intersections are predicted to operate at an acceptable LOS, with the exception of the Foothill Boulevard/Rancho Avenue intersection, which is predicted to operate at

## NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

LOS F in the AM and PM peak hour under both the with detour and without detour scenarios. So the LOS reflected at this intersection is not a result of the proposed detour. The following shows the intersections that would operate at an unacceptable LOS under the with detour scenario under the original 2012 opening year (as identified in the 2011 EA) and the current 2021 opening year (as identified in the 2018 updated detour analysis).

	2011 EA	2018 Detour Analysis
Foothill Boulevard and Rancho Avenue (AM and PM peak hour)		X
5th Street and Mount Vernon Avenue (PM peak hour)		X
5th Street and H Street (PM peak hour)	X	X
2nd Street and G Street (PM peak hour)	X	
Rialto Avenue and Mount Vernon Avenue (PM peak hour)		X
Rialto Avenue and G Street (PM peak hour)	X	X

X – intersection projected to operate at an unacceptable LOS under the with detour condition

As noted previously, in the 2011 EA it was identified that with implementation of the detour, three intersections were predicted to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Measure TR-4 in the 2011 EA identified temporary improvement that would address these impacted intersections. In the 2018 updated detour analysis, improvements have been identified at four of the five intersections that are projected to operate at an unacceptable LOS under the with detour condition. The fifth intersection, Foothill Boulevard/Rialto Avenue, does not require any temporary improvements as the unacceptable LOS is not a result of the traffic detour. Furthermore, the temporary improvements at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street/G Street are no longer required as the traffic at this intersection is not predicted to operate at an unacceptable LOS under the with detour condition. The temporary traffic improvements identified in Measure TR-4 shall be included as follows, in compliance with the recommendations in the 2018 updated detour analysis.

- 5th Street/Mount Vernon Avenue - Restripe westbound approach as a through lane and an exclusive right-turn lane
- 5th Street/H Street - Restripe northbound approach as two exclusive left-turn lanes and a shared through/right-turn lane
- Rialto Avenue/Mount Vernon Avenue - Restripe northbound approach as a shared left-turn/through lane and two exclusive right-turn lanes
- Rialto Avenue/G Street - Restripe eastbound approach as two exclusive left-turn lanes and a shared through/right-turn lane; and Change the phasing on eastbound and westbound approaches to split phasing

The traffic measures listed in the adopted 2011 EA/FONSI would still be applicable as presented, with the exception of TR-4, which has been updated based on recommendations in the 2018 updated detour analysis report, as noted above. The entirety of updated Measure TR-4 is presented below.

**TR-4:** A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be developed and implemented. The TMP will include a requirement to maintain access to all businesses and residences during project construction. Temporary improvements should be implemented prior to closure of the existing bridge and remain in place until the new bridge is opened to traffic. The temporary improvements will be removed and the intersections returned to their existing configurations after the new bridge is opened to traffic. Temporary circulation improvements will be included at the following locations to improve operations:

- 5th Street/Mount Vernon Avenue - Restripe westbound approach as a through lane and an exclusive right-turn lane
- 5th Street/H Street - Restripe northbound approach as two exclusive left-turn lanes and a shared through/right-turn lane
- Rialto Avenue/Mount Vernon Avenue - Restripe northbound approach as a shared left-turn/through lane and two exclusive right-turn lanes
- Rialto Avenue/G Street - Restripe eastbound approach as two exclusive left-turn lanes and a shared through/right-turn lane; and Change the phasing on eastbound and westbound approaches to split phasing

## NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

### **Noise**

In December 2017, a memorandum was prepared to address potential changes in traffic noise since adoption of the original Noise Study Report (NSR), approved in June 2006 (see Attachment B). Because of updates to the traffic data for the Mount Vernon Avenue Bridge Project that have occurred since the previous NSR was approved in 2006, it was necessary to investigate the potential effects of the revised traffic data on the noise levels at the project site. According to the memorandum, a traffic noise impact occurs when the noise level approaches or exceeds the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). A noise level is deemed to "approach" the NAC when it is within 1 decibel. The modeled receivers are all residential land uses where the impact criterion would be 67 A-weighted decibels (dBA), which means that noise impacts would occur with traffic noise levels of 66 dBA or more. In the 2006 NSR, noise levels at all receivers were predicted to be at least 6 decibels below the NAC impact criteria. If it can be demonstrated that changes in traffic volumes would not increase traffic noise levels by 6 dBA or more, then it can be concluded that there would be no new noise impacts due to the inclusion of updated traffic data from the 2017 traffic study.

A review and comparison of the old (2006) and new (2017) traffic volume data indicated that updated traffic volumes would change predicted noise levels by approximately -0.3 to 1.2 decibels. Applying even the worst-case increase of 1.2 decibels to all of the 2006 predicted noise levels, the noise levels associated with the proposed project would remain well below the impact criteria at all identified sensitive noise receptors. Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that there would be no new noise impacts due to the inclusion of the 2017 traffic data.

Item 8 in Measure N-2 is now outdated as it was prepared prior to Caltrans' current 2015 Standard Specifications and Special Provisions. Therefore, the text shall now read as follows.

**N-1 (8):** Sound control shall conform to the provisions in Section 14-8.02, Noise Control, of Caltrans' 2015 Standard Specifications and Special Provisions. The contractor shall not exceed 86 dBA (maximum noise level [ $L_{max}$ ]) at 50 feet from the job site between 9:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. Internal combustion engines shall be equipped with the manufacturer-recommended muffler. Internal combustion engines shall not be operated on the job site without the appropriate muffler.

### **Hazardous Materials/Waste**

A Final Supplemental Initial Site Assessment (FSISA)<sup>2</sup> was prepared in January 2018 as a supplement to the 2010 Initial Site Assessment (ISA) conducted for the proposed project to confirm the findings of the previous ISA and investigate how site conditions have changed with regard to hazardous materials/waste since that time. The 2018 FSISA revealed no new evidence of changes to recognized environmental conditions in connection with the site, except for the following:

- Soil underlying the bridge within the BNSF property has been affected by total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) and metals from historical railway operations. Affected soil in areas adjacent to the northern end of the bridge was excavated between February and May 1994. Regulatory closure for affected soil was granted in May 2003. However, portions of the affected soil are most likely still in place directly underneath the bridge. Additionally, the results of a 2013 Limited Subsurface Investigation (LSI) confirmed the presence of TPH in borings that were taken directly underneath the northern section of the bridge. This is considered a recognized environmental condition (REC).
- A preliminary vapor encroachment screen was conducted to identify a vapor encroachment condition (VEC), which indicates the presence, or likely presence, of chemicals of concern (COC) in subsurface soils at the site caused by the release of vapors from contaminated soil or groundwater either on or near the site. Based on the results of the Vapor Encroachment Screening Matrix (VESM), a VEC cannot be ruled out beneath the site and is therefore considered a REC. It should be noted that a vapor intrusion screening was not conducted for the site during the 2010 ISA; this is a new environmental condition identified for the site.

The 2011 EA/FONSI identified hazardous wastes impacts from the presence of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs), lead-based paint (LBP), and herbicide-contaminated soils. Ninyo & Moore conducted ACM and LBP surveys in 2004 and 2010. The 2018 FSISA concluded that ACMs and LBP are likely to be encountered during demolition of the Mount Vernon Avenue Bridge.

<sup>2</sup> Ninyo & Moore. 2018. *Final Supplemental Initial Site Assessment, Mount Vernon Avenue Bridge Project*. Adopted January 2018. Prepared by for the San Bernardino County Transportation Agency and Caltrans.



## NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

The 2011 EA/FONSI concluded that, based on historic use as a rail yard and the common use of herbicides on railroad tracks, residual herbicides may be present in soil beneath the asphalt along the proposed shoofly track area and beneath the bridge. However, chlorinated herbicides (with the exception of one minor detection of pentachlorophenol) and organochlorine pesticides were not detected in soil samples collected along the proposed shoofly track area or beneath the bridge during Ninyo & Moore's 2013 LSI. Therefore, the 2018 FSISA has determined that the presence of chlorinated herbicides is not considered a REC to the site.

No other changes to the environmental setting have occurred, and no new RECs have been identified in the 2018 FSISA. The conditions listed in the adopted EA previously prepared for this project would remain in effect and apply to the current project, with the exception of HAZ-7, which has been updated in the 2018 FSISA to add additional detail regarding the procedures that shall be implemented if contaminated soil is discovered. Updated Measure HAZ-7 is as follows.

**HAZ-7:** A soil monitoring plan should be prepared prior to construction and should be implemented during all phases of construction. Disturbed soils should be monitored for visual evidence of contamination (e.g., staining or discoloration). If visual evidence of contamination is observed, the soil should be monitored for the presence of volatile organic compounds using appropriate field instruments, such as organic vapor measurement with photoionization detectors or flame ionization detectors. If the monitoring procedures indicate the possible presence of contaminated soil, a contaminated soil contingency plan should be implemented and should include procedures for segregation, sampling, and chemical analysis of soil. Contaminated soil will be profiled for disposal and transported with appropriate hazardous or non-hazardous waste manifests by a state-certified hazardous material hauler to a state-certified disposal or recycling facility that has been licensed to accept and treat the type of waste indicated by the profiling process. The contaminated soil contingency plan should be developed and in place during all construction activities. In the event that these processes generate any contaminated groundwater that must be disposed of outside of the dewatering/National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) process, the groundwater should be profiled, manifested, hauled, and disposed of in the same manner.

Measures HAZ-16 and HAZ-17 described below have also been added based on the recommendations made in the 2018 FSISA. They have also been added to the updated Environmental Commitments Record.

**HAZ-16:** Caltrans Standard Special Provisions and Non-Standard Special Provisions should be prepared that provide contractors with guidance on preparing submittals and handling affected materials.

**HAZ-17:** Demolition or renovation of any structure requires notification and submittal of fees to the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

### **Water Quality**

No changes to the setting within the original project footprint were observed, and no new impacts have been identified. All avoidance and minimization measures previously identified in the 2011 EA/FONSI for impacts on water quality and stormwater runoff are still applicable to the project. Measure WQ-2 has been updated to reflect Regional Water Quality Control Board Order Number R8-2010-0036, which supersedes Order Number R8-2002-012, referenced in the 2011 EA/FONSI:

**WQ-2:** The project will have an additional 5,000 square feet of impervious surface; therefore, in accordance with RWQCB Order Number R8-2010-0036 and San Bernardino County NPDES Permit No. CAS618036, a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) will be necessary to establish post-construction best management practices (BMPs).

### **Conclusion**

No changes to the original project footprint or project design have occurred since adoption of the 2011 EA/FONSI. Based on the results of this environmental re-validation and technical studies, some of the avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures for noise, traffic, water quality and stormwater runoff, biological resources, and hazardous materials have been updated to be consistent with current standard practices and reflect existing conditions at the project site.

## NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

***Changes to avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures since the environmental document was approved.***

Based on the results of the environmental re-validation and technical studies, some of the avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures for noise, traffic, water quality and stormwater runoff, biological resources, and hazardous materials have been updated to be consistent with current standard practices and reflect existing conditions at the project site. Those updated measures are included in the above discussion.

***Changes to environmental commitments since the environmental document was approved, e.g., the addition of new conditions in permits or approvals. When this applies, append a revised Environmental Commitments Record (ECR) as one of the Continuation Sheets.***

Based on the results of the environmental re-validation and technical studies, some of the avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures for noise, traffic, water quality and stormwater runoff, biological resources, and hazardous materials have been updated to be consistent with current standard practices and reflect existing conditions at the project site. They are included in the attached ECR.