



NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

DIST-CO-RTE: 04-ALA-84
PM/PM: 13.0/13.6
EA or Fed-Aid Project No.: 04-16030
Other Project No. (specify): 0400000429
Project Title: Alameda Creek Bridge Replacement Project
Environmental Approval Type: EIR/EA
Date Approved: 08/16/2017
Reason for Consultation (23 CFR 771.129), check one: <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: The final project design determined that the project would need additional temporary construction easement and fee take than was described in the Final EIR to construct the project. This additional area was studied and permitted prior to the project RTL milestone and does not affect environmental impacts or commitments.

NEPA CONCLUSION - VALIDITY

Based on an examination of the changed conditions and supporting information:

- 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- The original document or CE is no longer valid.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.

Brian Gassner

06/27/2022

Signature: Environmental Branch Chief

Date

Jack Slauw (Jun 27, 2022 13:57 PDT)

06/27/2022

Signature: Project Manager/DLAE

Date

NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

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:

- 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.

Brian Gassner

06/27/2022

Signature: Environmental Branch Chief

Date

Jack Slaw (Jun 27, 2022 12:57 PM)

Signature: Project Manager/DLAE

06/27/2022

Date

NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

CONTINUATION SHEET(S)

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

Since the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment with a Finding of No Significant Impact (EIR/FONSI) was issued, the final project design determined that the project would require additional right of way to construct. At final 100% design, bridge ended up being 15% longer than initial design identified in EIR/EA, which was only at 35% design level. The final design resulted in a need for additional right of way (ROW). Temporary construction easement (TCE) increased to provide areas to construct access roads for bridge construction, access to planting areas and access to hydroseeding areas.

This additional TCE and fee requirement was studied during the design phase and permitted prior to the project listing. The additional ROW requirements were not specifically documented in the first re-validation for the project. This re-validation seeks to remedy the administrative discrepancy in the environmental record.

Table 1. Revised Right-of-Way Requirements for Build Alternative 3B

Alt.	Alameda County		Alameda County		San Francisco Public		Total	Total
	Railroad (sq. feet)		Water District (sq. feet)		Utility Commission (sq. feet)		R/W Partial Acquisition Fee (sq. feet)	
3B	Fee	TCE	Fee	TCE	Fee	TCE		Area TCE (sq. feet)
EIR/EA	75,099	3,782	11,230	None	17,106	5.072	107,980	37,540
R/W need in final plans	71,688	86,820	21,794	2724	21,651	33,758	115,133	123,302

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

None

NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

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

N/A

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.

N/A