3-4.2 Description of Significant Effect

a. Construction-Period Impacts

Construction activities could result in emissions of criteria pollutants on the peak day of construction that exceed SCAQMD thresholds for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and particulate matter (PM_{10}) (see Table 3-7 in the Final EIR/EA).

3-4.3 Proposed Mitigation

a. Fugitive Dust

The SCAQMD's *Rule 403 Implementation Handbook* contains compliance guidelines for large operations. While none of the alternatives would qualify as a large source, maximum mitigation for fugitive dust should be employed to protect sensitive receptors in the vicinity.

The following mitigation measures shall be employed for all three alternatives to protect sensitive receptors.

AQ-1 Water exposed surfaces three times a day.

AQ-2 Apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas.

AQ-3 Replace vegetative ground cover in inactive areas quickly, using perennials where possible.

AQ-4 Cover all stockpiles with tarps.

AQ-5 Install particulate filters on all diesel haul trucks.

AQ-6 Use tarps to cover loads on all haul trucks.

CARB's URBEMIS model, used for land development projects, estimates that a combination of fugitive dust measures similar to those shown here can reduce PM_{10} emissions by approximately 90 percent. The same controls would be needed for $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. This analysis assumes that particulate emissions would be reduced by 75 percent.

b. Equipment Emissions

AQ-7 Use particulate filters on all diesel equipment.

AQ-8 Turn off equipment when not in use more than 5 minutes.

These measures would reduce particulate emissions by 90 percent and other emissions by 10 percent. Gaseous emissions could be further reduced if exhaust gas recirculation (EGR) devices were used on all construction equipment.

c. Toxic Emissions

In addition, the following measure, which does not reduce emissions, is recommended to protect workers from particulate emissions:

AQ-9 Construction workers shall wear protective masks.

3-4.4 Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

3-4.5 Rationale for Finding

All feasible mitigation measures have been identified to reduce construction air quality impacts. Although air pollutants during construction would be substantially lessened, emissions of PM_{10} and NO_X would remain significant and unavoidable.

3-4.6 Reference

For a full discussion of air quality impacts, see Section 3-1.11 of the La Loma Bridge Rehabilitation Replacement Project Final EIR/EA.

3-5 Noise

3-5.1 Significance Criteria

For the purposes of the analyses in the EIR/EA and in accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project would have a significant impact under CEQA if it results:

- exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in Section 11.44.080 of the City's Noise Ordinance or the Noise Element of the City's General Plan;

- a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;
- a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

3-5.2 Description of Significant Effects

According to the noise analyses conducted for the EIR/EA (see Section 3-1.12 of the Final EIR/EA):

- construction would result in a temporary increase in local noise levels in the neighborhoods near the bridge;
- noise generated by most construction equipment/activities would be below the City's standard of 85 A-weighted decibels (dBA), at 100 feet;
- noise from the hoe rams and sandblasting are likely to exceed the City's standard of 85 dBA, a potentially significant impact;
- the daily L_{eq}s for most phases of construction are estimated to be between 70 and 74 dBA at the nearest residences;
- the daily L_{eq}s for phase 3 and phase 9 of construction are estimated to be 83 and 78 dBA, respectively. These phases are predicted to be substantially louder than the other phases due to the use of hoe rams (phase 3) and sandblasting equipment (phase 9).
- the construction contractor will be required to comply with Caltrans Standard Specifications and Standard Provisions, including limiting construction to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday; and
- additional measures will be necessary to reduce noise from the hoe rams and sandblasting.

3-5.3 Proposed Mitigation

As part of the construction contract, the contractor shall be required to follow the noise specifications in Section 7 of Caltrans Standard Specifications for Construction of Local Streets and Road (July 2002). The mitigation measures related to noise to be included in the construction contract are:

N-1 The contractor shall comply with all local sound control and noise level rules, regulations, and ordinances, which apply to any work performed pursuant to the contract.

N-2 Each internal combustion engine, used for any purpose on the job or related to the job, shall be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. No internal combustion engine shall be operated on the project without a muffler.

As a result, the contractor would be prohibited from working after 9 p.m. and before 7 a.m. on weekdays and Saturdays and anytime on Sunday or national holidays. Furthermore, pursuant to Section 9.36.120 of the City of Pasadena Municipal Code, the contractor would be required to ensure that no equipment exceeds 85 dBA measured at 100 feet. In order to demonstrate that this level would not be exceeded, the following measure shall also be included in the construction contract:

N-3 The contractor shall be required to provide the City with documentation prior to the start of construction demonstrating that each piece of heavy equipment that will be used on the construction site for more than 16 hours conforms to Section 9.36.120 of the City of Pasadena Municipal Code.

As the hoe ram and sandblasting are likely to generate noise levels in excess of the 85 dBA standard at 100 feet, additional mitigation is recommended.

N-4 Wherever feasible, the construction contractor shall do the following in order to reduce noise from hoe rams and sandblasting:

Hoe Ram

1. Use alternate methods for demolition and breaking concrete such as saw cutting.
2. Shorten the duration of phase 3 by adding extra equipment and workers or by working extended days (but still within the hours allowed by the Municipal Code).
3. Provide notice to local homeowners in advance of phase 3 construction activities (this will not decrease sound levels but is more of a courtesy).

Sandblasting

4. Enclose sandblasting activities with acoustical curtains or temporary, portable sound barriers.
5. Adjust the pressure and abrasive mix levels to the lowest possible levels.

Since construction activities would be temporary and would generally be below the City standards, with the implementation of measures N-1 through N-3 and, wherever feasible, N-4, noise impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant.

3-5.4 Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

3-5.5 Rationale for Finding

Construction activities would be temporary and limited to daytime hours. Additionally, noise from construction activities would fluctuate over the course of the construction period. Thus, in recognition of those facts and with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures identified above, construction noise impacts would be less than significant level.

3-5.6 Reference

For a full discussion of traffic impacts, see Section 3-1.12 of the La Loma Bridge Rehabilitation Replacement Project Final EIR/EA.

3-6 Biological Resources

3-6.1 Significance Criteria

In accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project would have a significant impact on wildlife resources if it would:

- 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;
- conflict with any local, state or federal policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or California Fish and Game Code 3503, 3503.5, and 3512;
- 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; or
- conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

3-6.2 Description of Significant Effects

a. Construction-Period Impacts

Construction of the proposed project would remove some trees and shrubs and disturb the ground below and adjacent to the current bridge footprint. These trees and shrubs serve as roosting, nesting, and feeding habitat for birds and other wildlife. The loss of this vegetation would not have a substantial adverse effect on wildlife. However, the removal or destruction of one or more active nests of native birds, whether nest damage was due to tree removal, bridge demolition, repair, or other construction activities, would be considered a violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and a significant adverse impact.

Several bat species may also forage in the area and use the bridge for roosting. Consequently, construction could result in removal of roosting locations for these bat species. This would be a significant adverse effect.

3-6.3 Proposed Mitigation

BWL-1 In order to avoid or minimize the potential to remove or destroy occupied nests of native birds, percussive activities and demolition of the bridge structure and construction activities that result in grading or in the removal of shrubs or trees shall be conducted during the non-breeding season for birds (approximately September 1 through February 15). This will avoid violations of the MBTA and CDFG Code Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513. If construction activities cannot avoid the bird nesting season, the City shall exclude birds from their nesting places on the bridge using netting or other effective measures to prevent birds from establishing nests on the bridge during the work period. The City shall retain the services of a qualified ornithologist to identify potential nesting areas and then retain the services of a qualified bird-netting installer to ensure that the correct netting is used and that it is installed correctly and will not trap birds or other wildlife. All excluded areas shall be inspected by a qualified biologist and certified to be free of animals before netting is installed. Additionally, the City of Pasadena shall retain the services of a qualified ornithologist to conduct a survey of the construction zone adjacent to and below the bridge. The ornithological survey shall occur not more than 2 days prior to the initiation of those construction activities to minimize the potential that bird nests are not initiated after the survey and prior to construction. If the ornithologist detects any occupied nests of native birds within the construction zone, the City shall conspicuously flag off the area(s) supporting bird nests and provide a minimum buffer of 100 feet between the nest and the limits of construction. The construction crew shall be instructed to avoid any activities in this zone until the bird nest(s) is/are no longer occupied per a subsequent survey by the qualified ornithologist. Alternatively, consultation shall occur, as appropriate, with the USFWS to discuss the potential loss of nests of native birds covered by the MBTA to obtain, if necessary per the USFWS, a permit authorizing activities that may otherwise result in MBTA violations. Coordination with USFWS and CDFG shall also occur to determine an

appropriate response if nests occupied by birds protected by the MBTA are discovered during the nesting bird survey.

Surveys by Stephanie Remington, bat specialist, detected several species of bats in the project area but did not confirm whether any species were using the bridge for roosting. However, Caltrans prohibits construction activities that would disturb a maternity roost or seasonal roost for bats, whether or not the bats are special-status species. In addition, because bat roosts can change seasonally and maternity roosts may not be formed until late spring, the bridge should be surveyed in June 2005 to assess the potential for its use as a maternity roost.

BSS-1 A bat specialist shall survey the bridge in the early summer, prior to construction, to assess the potential for its use as a maternity roost. In addition, the bat specialist will be contacted regarding recommended timing for construction to avoid impacts on roosting bats should they be present at the bridge; normally, the fall and winter seasons are best to avoid impacts on roosting bats. If construction cannot be conducted during the period recommended by a bat specialist, the specialist shall conduct a preconstruction survey to determine whether roosting bats are present and shall be present during construction in the event that a bat colony is discovered to provide recommendations regarding construction activities and timing to minimize impacts on roosting bats.

3-6.4 Finding

(X) **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.**

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

3-6.5 Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would reduce construction impacts to wildlife to a less than significant level.

3-6.6 Reference

For a full discussion of impacts to biological resources including wildlife and special-status species, see Sections 3-1.14 of the La Loma Bridge Rehabilitation Replacement Project Final EIR/EA.

3-6.7 Finding

(X) **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.**

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

3-6.8 Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures above would reduce construction impacts on special-status plant and wildlife species and habitat to a less than significant level.

3-6.9 Reference

For a full discussion of impacts to biological resources, see Section 3-1.14 of the La Loma Bridge Rehabilitation Replacement Project Final EIR/EA.

3-7 Significant or Potentially Significant Cumulative Impacts

3-7.1 Archaeological Resources

The archaeological survey conducted for the proposed project identified one historic site north of the bridge that could be associated with the construction of any of the bridges constructed on the site or it may represent a workers' construction camp or a prefabrication/staging area. Alternatively, the deposit could have been deposited following channelization of the Arroyo Seco in the 1930s. Consequently, the geographic scope of the area affected by potential cumulative archaeological impacts would consist of the area within the City of Pasadena or County of Los Angeles that could contain cultural resources from this same period, roughly the late 1800s through the 1930s. Related projects in the project area and other development in the county could result in the progressive loss of other, as-yet-unrecorded historic archaeological resources from this historical period. This loss, without proper mitigation, would be a significant adverse cumulative impact. It is also possible that other proposed improvements to the Arroyo Seco (see Table 1-1 in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR/EA for a general description of proposed Arroyo Seco improvements) could cumulatively affect the historical archaeological site north of La Loma Bridge described above. The proposed project includes mitigation that would avoid or reduce

potential impacts for all archaeological impacts. Related projects that are likely to affect archaeological resources may also implement similar mitigation in addition to data recovery excavations, monitoring, soils testing, photography, mapping, or drawing to adequately recover the scientifically consequential information from and about the archaeological resource. Consequently, after mitigation, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant adverse cumulative impact to archaeological resources.

a. Finding

(X) **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.**

(X) **Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.**

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

b. Rationale for Finding

All feasible measures have been identified to mitigate the proposed project's potential incremental contribution to cumulative impacts to archaeological resources. Further measures to mitigate the cumulative impacts of other related development located outside the City but within the cumulative impacts study area would be the responsibility and within the jurisdiction of other public agencies.

c. Reference

For a full discussion of impacts to archaeological resources, see Section 3-1.5 of the La Loma Bridge Rehabilitation Replacement Project Final EIR/EA.

3-7.2 Hydrology/Water Quality

Contamination of water bodies is generally a function of cumulative discharges. Point and nonpoint sources contribute various constituents in the form of effluent or stormwater runoff. EPA and the SWRCB have established several programs, including NPDES permits, to minimize polluted discharges. In the Los Angeles Watershed, surface and groundwater resources are impaired for several contaminants. Stringent NPDES permit requirements for waste load allocations and BMPs should begin to reduce the amount of constituents in the watershed's receiving waters. However, increasing development and urbanization will continue to cumulatively exert pressures on watershed health. Runoff from the growing urban areas—even with permits and BMP implementation—may continue to impair the Los Angeles River and

Watershed and result in significant adverse cumulative water quality impacts. However, the proposed La Loma Bridge project would implement BMPs that would meet pollutant removal requirements of the Los Angeles County MS4 permit and the General Permit for Construction Activity. It is anticipated that these BMPs would also be effective in meeting the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board's TMDL standards for removal of pollutants from stormwater discharged to the Los Angeles River and Watershed. Consequently, the proposed project's contribution to significant adverse cumulative water quality impacts would be minimized.

a. Finding

(X) **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.**

(X) **Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.**

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

b. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of BMPs and other measures in compliance with permit requirements would minimize the proposed project's impacts to water quality to the extent practicable. Further measures to mitigate the cumulative impacts of other related development located outside the City but within the cumulative impacts study area would be the responsibility and within the jurisdiction of other public agencies.

c. Reference

For a full discussion of impacts to hydrology/water quality, see Section 3-1.7 of the La Loma Bridge Rehabilitation Replacement Project Final EIR/EA.

3-7.3 Paleontological Resources

Previous geologic mapping of the overall study area (Lamar 1970; Dibblee 1989) indicates that the proposed project area includes surface sediments mapped as Quaternary alluvium and also the Topanga Formation. The Topanga Formation has high paleontologic sensitivity throughout its extent, while the overlying Quaternary alluvium has a moderate paleontologic sensitivity. Accordingly, the geographic scope of the area affected by potential cumulative paleontological impacts would consist of other areas in the region that are geologically similar to the project site and contain similar fossil resources.

Construction activities associated with some related projects could contribute to the progressive loss of paleontological resources and result in significant adverse cumulative impacts. The proposed project could also disturb or destroy paleontological resources that may exist on the site, a significant adverse impact. Thus, the combined effects of the proposed and related projects could result in adverse cumulative impacts to paleontological resources. However, mitigation measures have been identified (see Section 3-1.9 of the Final EIR/EA) that would avoid or reduce potential project-related impacts. These measures include monitoring, recovery, treatment, and deposit of fossil remains in a recognized repository. Similar measures may also be implemented for other related projects that have the potential to affect paleontological resources. Consequently, the incremental effects of the proposed project, after mitigation, would not contribute to a significant adverse cumulative impact to paleontological resources.

a. Finding

(X) **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.**

(X) **Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.**

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

b. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of proposed mitigation measures would reduce or avoid potential project impacts to paleontological resources, thereby minimizing the proposed project's contribution to adverse cumulative impacts to these resources. Further measures to mitigate the cumulative impacts of other related development located outside the City but within the cumulative impacts study area would be the responsibility and within the jurisdiction of other public agencies.

c. Reference

For a full discussion of impacts to paleontological resources, see Section 3-1.9 of the La Loma Bridge Rehabilitation Replacement Project Final EIR/EA.

4 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

4-1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would result in no structural or physical changes to the bridge or the surrounding environment. Consequently, it would not result in the adverse construction impacts that could occur under the build alternatives. However, under this alternative the bridge would continue to deteriorate if not properly maintained or repaired.

4-2 Concrete Box-Girder Bridge Replacement Alternative

Under this alternative the existing bridge would be replaced with an entirely new cast-in-place, post-tensioned concrete box-girder bridge. Structures of this type are commonly built throughout California and are considered the most cost-effective bridge replacement design.

This alternative would result in similar or slightly greater impacts (due to the slightly larger area that would be disturbed to demolish and construct a new bridge) than the preferred Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative in the following areas: Land Use; Population, Housing, and Employment; Community Impacts; Utilities; Public and Emergency Services; Traffic and Transportation; Archaeological Resources; Hydrology/Water Quality; Geology/Soils/Seismicity; Paleontological Resources; Hazardous Waste/Materials; Air Quality; Noise; Energy; and Biological Resources.

This alternative, unlike the preferred Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative, would result in significant visual and historic impacts due to the demolition of the La Loma Bridge, which is a significant visual and historical resource.

4-3 Concrete Box-Girder Bridge with Decorative Arches Replacement Alternative

This alternative would be similar to the concrete box-girder bridge alternative but would include decorative arch ribs. Given the architectural heritage of bridges in the City of Pasadena, an arch bridge is both a structurally viable and aesthetically pleasing bridge replacement alternative. This alternative would be in harmony with the City's tradition of arch bridges, but would have the economic advantages of modern construction materials and design techniques.

This alternative would result in impacts similar to those described above for the Concrete Box-Girder Bridge Replacement Alternative.

4-3.1 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR identify the "Environmentally Superior Alternative" among the alternatives considered. The No-Build Alternative would not result in the construction and operational impacts of the three build alternatives evaluated in this EIR/EA since no changes or improvements to the existing La Loma Bridge and Arroyo Seco would occur. However, under the No-Build Alternative, continued deterioration of the bridge could render it unusable as a vehicular and pedestrian bridge. Continued deterioration would also have an adverse effect on the qualities that make this bridge a visual and historic resource in the community. The bridge would also continue to pose a hazard to motorists and pedestrians, including pedestrians who use the trails under the bridge, in the event of a major earthquake.

The impacts of the Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative would be limited to the construction phase; no significant long-term operational impacts would occur. Additionally, construction impacts, which would be temporary, would be minor or can be mitigated to a less than significant level. The Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative would also have the beneficial effects of repairing and preserving an important historic and visual resource in the City. Proposed structural improvements and other repairs to the bridge to meet current seismic standards would result in important public safety benefits. Unlike the two replacement alternatives, the Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative would not result in the unavoidable significant historic and visual effects due to demolition of the existing La Loma Bridge. For these reasons, the Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative.

5 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative (i.e., the proposed project) could result in potentially unavoidable and significant construction air quality impacts. Construction air quality impacts, which would be temporary, would be substantially lessened with implementation of proposed mitigation measures; however, PM_{10} and NO_x pollutant emissions would still exceed recommended SCAQMD significance thresholds after mitigation, on the peak construction day.

The Final EIR/EA has identified these unavoidable significant impacts. Section 15093(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines* provides that when the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts that are identified in the EIR but are not at least substantially mitigated, the agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the completed EIR and/or other information in the record.

Accordingly, the City adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The City recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts would result from the implementation of the preferred Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative (proposed project). Having (i) adopted

all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected the alternatives to the project discussed above, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced the benefits of the proposed project against the significant and unavoidable effects, the City finds that the benefits outweigh and override the significant unavoidable effects for the reasons stated below.

Any one of the reasons for approval is sufficient to justify approval of the proposed project. These reasons summarize the benefits, goals, and objectives of the proposed project. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings and elsewhere in the Record of Proceedings. These overriding considerations of economic, social, environmental, and other benefits outweigh its environmental costs and justify the approval of the proposed project and certification of the EIR:

1. Implementation of the proposed Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative would fulfill the objectives of the project to construct a new or improved bridge that: (1) meets Caltrans design standards aimed at preventing structural failure; (2) is aesthetically pleasing; (3) minimizes maintenance and operating costs; and (4) minimizes impacts to the environment.

   Safety: The Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative would retrofit the bridge to meet current seismic design standards to prevent the bridge from collapsing under the maximum credible earthquake event. The existing bridge, if not repaired or replaced, would continue to deteriorate and could be susceptible to damage or collapse in the event of a major earthquake, posing a hazard to motorists and pedestrians traveling across the bridge and pedestrians or equestrians using the trails beneath the bridge.

   Aesthetics. The existing La Loma Bridge, which is a historical resource, is also a significant visual resource within the Arroyo Seco and the City. The improvements proposed under the Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative would have a beneficial visual effect. Deteriorating concrete would be removed and replaced in kind with concrete that matches the existing material in texture and color. The existing steel railings and existing light posts, which are not original to the bridge, would be replaced with railings and light posts that replicate the original bridge design. These improvements would result in a bridge that would look essentially the same as it did historically and one that would appear to have been "cleaned."

   Maintenance and Operating Costs. The proposed structural improvements and removal of deteriorating concrete, would result in a reduction in ongoing maintenance costs.

   Impacts to the Environment. Of the three build alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EA, the preferred Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative would result in the fewest impacts to the environment. This alternative would avoid the significant visual and historical impacts of the bridge replacement alternatives that would occur due to demolition of the bridge. The Bridge Retrofit and Rehabilitation Alternative would allow the existing La Loma Bridge, a significant historical resource listed on the National Register of Historic Places, to remain in place, on-site, and visually intact. Retrofit and rehabilitation of the bridge would be consistent with the City's General Plan objectives related to historic preservation and character and scale. Retrofit and rehabilitation would also comply with the goals of the

Lower Arroyo Seco Master Plan, which call for provision of a safe and secure environment for recreational activities and management and maintenance of the area to balance natural habitat, recreational needs, and public health and safety. This alternative would also result in slightly less extensive construction impacts than the replacement alternatives due to the smaller construction footprint.

2. Construction of the proposed project would create temporary jobs during design and construction phases of the project over the course of the next several years. These jobs would bring a boost to the local economy by way of increased consumer spending in the area and additional tax revenue.