Public Notice

Public Notice Number: 200100007
Date: February 12, 2003
Comments Due: March 14, 2003

US Army Corps of Engineers

Sacramento District
1325 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-2922

In reply, please refer to the Public Notice Number

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

SUBJECT: Application for a Department of the Army permit under authority of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act to discharge dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands, (waters) to construct a sewer interceptor line, as shown in the attached drawings.

APPLICANT: Kyle Frazier, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, 10545 Armstrong Avenue, Suite 101, Mather, California 95655-4153

LOCATION: This linear project extends from Gerber Road north to Jackson Road/Hwy 16, between Bradshaw Road and Elk Grove-Florin Road, in Sections 20, 28, 29, 32 and 33, Township 8 North, Range 6 East, and Sections 5, 6, and 7, Township 7 North, Range 6 East, MDB&M, in Sacramento, California. See Figure 1.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 24,300 linear foot sanitary sewer transmission line (See Figure 1). The project has been separated into the Bradshaw 6A (BR6A) and Bradshaw 6B (BR6B) components.

The applicant has stated that the project will result in temporary adverse affects to 2.3 acres of waters and permanent affects to 0.05 acre of waters. See attached Figure 2 for a table of affected waters, including vernal pools.

BR6A (Figures 3 through 12) consists of approximately 16,000 linear feet of 108-inch-diameter sanitary sewer pipe, crossing Elder and Gerber Creeks a total of 8 times. Specific cross sectional drawings for all 8 crossings have been provided by the applicant, however, only 4 of these are included in this notice (Figures 7 through 10). The pipe would be laid in a trench averaging 30 feet in depth, approximately 15 feet in width at the base, and approximately 60 feet in width at the top. The trench would be dug using excavators and backhoes. A 160-foot-wide corridor (80 feet on either side of the centerline) would be required for the trench and necessary equipment (i.e., vehicles and excavators). Gravel would be used as a base for the pipe, and cement and gravel would be used to surround the pipe. The excavated dirt would be sidecast beside the trench while the pipe is installed. The remainder of the trench would be filled by excavated dirt. At stream crossings, the sidecast material would be used as an earthen dam to temporarily dewater the trench. In addition, downstream flows would be maintained by culverting the streamflow around the work area. Excess dirt would be hauled off site to a disposal site chosen by the contractor. Within the 160-foot-wide corridor, permanent access roads would be constructed along sections of the project alignment to allow access for operation and maintenance. Figures 3 through 6 depict the location of these access roads. The proposed access roads would be graded and surfaced with gravel (Figure 11).

There will be one road crossing of Elder Creek (Figure 13) and one of an unnamed tributary (ST-1 on Figure 11). Both crossings will be designed to properly accommodate surface flows.

BR6B (Figures 13 through 19) would be very similar to the BR6A project in construction methodology. The interceptor consists of 8,339 feet of 108-inch-diameter, 493 feet of 90-inch-diameter, and 2,631 feet of 84-inch-diameter sewer pipe. The pipe would be laid in trenches averaging 30 feet from the edge of the existing pavement. A construction corridor approximately 130 feet wide along the edge of the existing pavement would be provided along Bradshaw Road. The remaining BR6B construction corridor would be approximately 140-160 feet wide. Gravel would be used as a base for the pipe, and cement and gravel would be used to surround the pipe. The excavated dirt would be sidecast beside the trench while the pipe is installed. The remainder of the trench would be filled by excavated dirt. At the Elder Creek crossing, the sidecast material would be used as an earthen dam to temporarily dewater the trench. In addition, downstream flows would be maintained by culverting the streamflow around the work area. Excess dirt would be hauled off site to a disposal site chosen by the contractor. The Morrison Creek crossing would be made by tunneling. A permanent access road approximately 360 feet long would be constructed on the south side of Elder Creek to connect the BR6A access road with Bradshaw Road. The access road would be graded and surfaced with gravel like those of the BR6A project.

To minimize individual and cumulative adverse effects to waters, the applicant has stated they will use various best management practices during construction. The applicant is also proposing to restore some affected areas to pre-construction contours and purchase wetland mitigation credits at a Corps and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service approved wetland mitigation bank.

AREA DESCRIPTION: Most of the project area is typical of Central Valley grass land habitat. Fallow rice fields dominate the southern half of the BR6A study area south of Florin Road. During field studies vernal pools were generally dominated by spikerush (*Eleocharis macrostachya*) and coyote thistle (*Eryngium castrense*). Vernal pool associate species include common tarweed (*Hemizonia pungens*), turkey mullein (*Eremocarpus setigerus*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), and smooth spike-primerose (*Epilobium pygmaeum*). Seasonal wetlands were dominated by hariy willow herb (*Epilobium ciliatum*), yellow water primrose (*Ludwigia peplodies*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), dotted smartweed (*Polygonum punctatum*), and dallis grass (*Paspalum dilatatum*). Freshwater marsh areas are dominated by narrowleaf cattails (*Typha angustifolia*), common nutsedge (*Cyperus eragrostis*) and yellow water primrose (*Ludwigia peplodies*). Elder and Morrison Creeks are typical of valley perennial to intermittent stream channels, with occasional riparian species such as willows (*Salix spp.*) and Himalyan blackberry (*Rubus procerus*) and surrounded by valley oak woodland.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Endangered & Threatened Species: The applicant has stated that surveys conducted by Jones & Stokes biologists in September 2000 and February, March, April, May, and June 2001, indicate that vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*), midvalley fairy shrimp (*B. mesovallensis*), vernal pool tadpole shrimp (*Lepidurus packardi*), and giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*) could occur in the project area. Pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, the Corps has initiated Section 7 consultation for potential affects to the above listed species.

Cultural Resources: The applicant has made the following statements regarding cultural resources. The BR6A project site was examined by a Jones & Stokes archaeologist on October 30, 2000. No cultural resources were identified. No evidence of historic properties in the project area were found on historic maps. No previously recorded resource sites occur within the project area. Cultural resource evaluations have been updated as of November 2002, to include minor changes in the interceptor alignment. Two cultural resources could potentially be affected by the BR6B portion of the project.

The District Engineer has made these determinations based on information provided by the applicant and on the Corps' preliminary investigation.

Alternatives: The applicant has submitted a preliminary alternative alignment analysis (AAA) for the BR6A portion of the project. The AAA states that the BR6A will be as efficient as possible, negotiating utility conflicts, property severance issues, environmental concerns, and conforming to the North Vineyard Station as much as possible. The AAA also stated that the major factor in the BR6A alignment is to maintain adequate flow velocities under the force of gravity and meet tie-in points at the Bradshaw/Central Junction structure and the BR6B. Some alternative alignments resulted in increased pipeline length and decreased slope, and were abandoned by the applicant due to the pipeline's inability to carry peak flows without significant surcharging and unacceptable headloss. The applicant has also indicated a new alternatives analysis will be provided.

The applicant has used the following criteria to determine the final alignment of BR6A. Minimize stream and vernal pool crossings, minimize parcel severance, minimize number and size of deflections, stay within the 600-foot utility corridor defined in the North Vineyard Station Adopted Plan, 90-degree crossing of the railroad, and pipeline permanent easement to remain outside of future concrete-lined creeks and detention basins. The final length of BR6A is 14,954 feet, with a slope of 0.0007 ft/ft.

The following is a summary of the applicant's AAA evaluation of four alternatives. Alternative 1 would split from the Elder Creek corridor and follow Florin Road east to Bradshaw Road, where it would tie in to the BR6B sewer section, adding approximately 2,550 feet to the length of BR6A. Alternative 2 would follow Elder Creek until the pipeline reached the northern edge of properties along Florin Road, and then head east along property lines to then follow Bradshaw Road to intersect with BR6B. Alternative 2 would add approximately 1,740 feet to BR6A. The applicant has also stated that alternative 2 would cost approximately $27,224,727 compared to the proposed route at $21,654,366. The applicant has dropped alternatives 1 and 2 from consideration because they would require added length and a slope too flat to adequately convey flow under gravity. Additionally, alternative 2 was dropped from consideration because of the added cost.

Alternative 3 would follow a southern Elder Creek route, avoiding vernal pools and creek crossings. The BR6A and BR6B tie-in point would move south approximately 360 feet. The applicant dropped this alternative from consideration because it may adversely affect an aggregate and ready-mix business.

Alternative 4 was proposed by landowners to avoid crossing their property. This alignment follows Gerber Road east and Passalis Lane North, then would follow the Elder Creek corridor. This alternative would add 760 feet to the length of BR6A. The applicant dropped this alternative from consideration due to the decrease in pipeline slope.

The applicant has also stated that a realignment that follows Florin and Bradshaw Roads would increase surcharging of the Central Interceptor, and is not feasible due to schedule constraints, impacts to homeowners, CEQA delays, redesign, public outreach, and easement acquisition. However, this alternative may be less damaging to the aquatic environment. Additionally, it appears that a Gerber Road to Bradshaw Road alignment has not been evaluated.

Other federal, state and local permits: The applicant has stated that Section 401 water quality certification has been received for BR6A. An addendum for the additional water quality issues and certification associated with the BR6B as well as minor changes in the placement of the BR6A interceptor will be sent to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The applicant has also stated that a 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement has been submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), Region 2. The agreement with DFG is pending approval of the final project design.

Consideration of Comments: Interested parties are invited to submit written comments on or before **March 14, 2003**. Personal information in comment letters is subject to release to the public through the Freedom of Information Act. Any person may request, in writing, within the comment period specified in this notice that a public hearing be held to consider this application. Requests for public hearings shall state, with particularity, the reasons for holding a public hearing.

The decision whether to issue a permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable impact including cumulative impacts of the proposed activity on the public interest. That decision will reflect the national concern for both protection and utilization of important resources. The benefit which reasonably may be expected to accrue from the proposal must be balanced against its reasonably foreseeable detriments. All factors which may be relevant to the proposal will be considered including the cumulative effects thereof; among those are conservation, economics, aesthetics, general environmental concerns, wetlands, cultural values, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, flood plain values, land use, navigation, shoreline erosion and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation, water quality, energy needs, safety, food and fiber production, mineral needs, consideration of property ownership, and in general, the needs and welfare of the people.

The Corps of Engineers is soliciting comments from the public; Federal, state, and local agencies and officials; Indian Tribes; and other interested parties in order to consider and evaluate the impacts of this proposed activity. Any comments received will be considered by the Corps of Engineers to determine whether to issue, modify, condition or deny a permit for this proposal. To make this decision, comments are used to assess impacts on endangered species, historic properties, water quality, general environmental effects, and the other public interest factors listed above. Comments are used in the preparation of an Environmental Assessment and/or an Environmental Impact Statement pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. Comments are also used to determine the need for a public hearing and to determine the overall public interest of the proposed activity.

This public notice, including Figures 4 through 6 in color, may be obtained through our web-site at www.spk.usace.army.mil/cespk-co/regulatory/PNs. If additional information is required, please contact the applicant Kyle Frazier at (916) 876-6029, his wetland consultant Samuel Garcia at (916) 503-6681, or Justin Cutler, Room 1480 at the letterhead address, e-mail: Justin.Cutler@usace.army.mil, or telephone (916) 557-5258.

Michael J. Conrad, Jr.
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

Attachment: 19 Drawings