UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
West Coast Region
777 Sonoma Avenue, Room 325
Santa Rosa, California 95404-4731

March 1, 2023 **Refer to NMFS No:** WCRO-2022-02705

Paul Andreano
California Department of Transportation, District 5
50 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Re: Endangered Species Act Section 7(a)(2) Biological Opinion for the Prado Road Bridge Replacement Project in the City of San Luis Obispo, California [Caltrans file: BRLS-5016(056)]

Dear Mr. Andreano:

Thank you for your letter of October 12, 2022, requesting initiation of formal consultation with NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) for the Prado Road Bridge Replacement Project in the City of San Luis Obispo, California.

The biological opinion concludes the proposed action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the threatened South-Central California Coast Distinct Population Segment of steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) or destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat for this species. NMFS believes the proposed action is likely to result in incidental take of steelhead, therefore, the enclosed incidental take statement includes the amount and extent of anticipated incidental take with reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions to minimize and monitor incidental take of threatened steelhead.

Please contact Matt McGoogan at matthew.mcgoogan@noaa.gov or (562) 980-4026 if you have a question concerning this consultation, or if you require additional information.

Sincerely,

Alecia Van Atta
Assistant Regional Administrator
California Coastal Office

Enclosure

cc: Kelda Wilson, Caltrans, D5 (kelda.wilson@dot.ca.gov)
Copy to ARN File #: 151422WCR2020CC00087

**Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7(a)(2) Biological Opinion**

Prado Road Bridge Replacement

NMFS Consultation Number: WCRO-2022-02705
Action Agency: California Department of Transportation

Affected Species and NMFS' Determinations:

| ESA-Listed Species | Status | Is Action Likely to Adversely Affect Species? | Is Action Likely to Jeopardize the Species? | Is Action Likely to Adversely Affect Critical Habitat? | Is Action Likely to Destroy or Adversely Modify Critical Habitat? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| South-Central California Coat Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) | Threatened | Yes | No | Yes | No |

**Consultation Conducted By:** National Marine Fisheries Service, West Coast Region

**Issued By**:

Alecia Van Atta
Assistant Regional Administrator
California Coastal Office

**Date**: March 1, 2023

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This Introduction section provides information relevant to the other sections of this document and is incorporated by reference into Sections 2 and 3, below.

## 1.1. Background

NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) prepared this biological opinion (opinion) and incidental take statement (ITS) portions of this document in accordance with section 7(b) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), as amended, and implementing regulations at 50 CFR part 402.

NMFS completed pre-dissemination review of this document using standards for utility, integrity, and objectivity in compliance with applicable guidelines issued under the Data Quality Act (DQA) (section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001, Public Law 106-554). The document will be available within two weeks at the NOAA Library Institutional Repository [https://repository.library.noaa.gov/welcome]. A complete record of this consultation is on file at the California Coastal NMFS office.

## 1.2. Consultation History

On April 17, 2020, NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) received the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) request [Caltrans File No. BRLS-5016(056)] for formal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Caltrans is the lead federal agency as assigned by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), pursuant to two Memoranda of Understanding, 23 USC 326 and 327, which allows Caltrans to approve Categorical Exclusions and Environmental Assessments. Caltrans' written request included a biological assessment (BA) (Caltrans 2022) describing the effects of the proposed action on the threatened South-Central California Coast (SCCC) Distinct Population Segment (DPS) of Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and designated critical habitat for the species in San Luis Obispo Creek. The request involves replacing and widening the Prado Road Bridge across San Luis Obispo Creek. Caltrans determined the proposed action may affect and is likely to adversely affect steelhead and critical habitat.

After careful review of the Caltrans' consultation request, NMFS determined the information provided was insufficient to develop a clear understanding of the proposed action's potential effects on steelhead and designated critical habitat for this species (50 CFR § 402.13). To this end, NMFS sent Caltrans a letter dated April 28, 2020, outlining the additional information necessary to initiate consultation. This letter also indicated that if this information was not received within 45 days, then the consultation request would be considered withdrawn and subsequently closed.

In a letter dated June 15, 2020, NMFS notified the Caltrans that the subject consultation had been closed because more than 45 days had expired and a response including information requested in NMFS' April 28, 2020, letter had not been received.

On October 17, 2022, NMFS received the Caltrans' letter requesting initiation of consultation which included the supplemental information regarding the proposed action that NMFS requested in its letter dated April 28, 2020. NMFS determined this supplemental information was sufficient to develop a clear understanding of the proposed action, including the effects of the action. As such, formal consultation was initiated on October 17, 2022.

On November 15, 2022, NMFS attended a meeting at the Prado Road Bridge site with representatives from Caltrans and Caltrans' consultants for the project. This meeting was used to discuss various design elements of the proposed action and assess habitat conditions and characteristics within the action area.

On July 5, 2022, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California issued an order vacating the 2019 regulations that were revised or added to 50 CFR part 402 in 2019 ("2019 Regulations," see 84 FR 44976, August 27, 2019) without making a finding on the merits. On September 21, 2022, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit granted a temporary stay of the district court's July 5 order. On November 14, 2022, the Northern District of California issued an order granting the government's request for voluntary remand without vacating the 2019 regulations. The District Court issued a slightly amended order two days later on November 16, 2022. As a result, the 2019 regulations remain in effect, and we are applying the 2019 regulations here. For purposes of this consultation and in an abundance of caution, we considered whether the substantive analysis and conclusions articulated in the biological opinion and incidental take statement would be different under the pre-2019 regulations. We determined our analysis and conclusions would not be different.

## 1.3. Proposed Federal Action

Under the ESA, "action" means all activities or programs of any kind authorized, funded, or carried out, in whole or in part, by Federal agencies (see 50 CFR 402.02).

*Overview of the Proposed Action*

The proposed federal action involves Caltrans oversight of funding from the FHWA to the City of San Luis Obispo (City) Department of Public Works for the associated construction involved with replacing and widening the Prado Road Bridge across San Luis Obispo Creek (proposed action). The proposed action is necessary because the existing bridge at this location has been classified as structurally deficient and deemed functionally obsolete. The proposed action generally involves removal and replacement of the existing bridge (123-feet long by 26.5-feet wide) with a new wider bridge. To accommodate the new larger bridge, the existing and separate bridge for the Bob Jones Bike Path located immediately downstream of the existing Prado Road Bridge will require a slight realignment and relocation of the eastern bike path bridge abutment. Best-management practices (BMPs) incorporated into the proposed action will be implemented prior to and during construction. Construction is expected to require 18 to 24 months to complete, with all in-creek work completed during the dry season between June 1 and October 31 of for two consecutive years. General categories of activities associated with the proposed action involve: (1) preparing the in-creek work area for construction in the dry, (2) construction activities within the dry work area, and (3) post-construction activities. Each of these is summarized as follows.

1. Preparing the work area for construction in the dry creek bed

To prepare the in-creek work area for construction in the dry creek bed, the proposed action involves the following measures:

- Having at least 2 biologists with experience in steelhead ecology and handling onsite during dewatering to oversee work-area isolation and dewatering activities, including relocating steelhead captured from dewatered area;

- The biologists identifying habitats within or immediately adjacent to the action area prior to diversion installation and dewatering that will serve as relocation sites for steelhead captured during the work area isolation and dewatering process (described below). Relocation sites would be chosen with adequate water quality (e.g., dissolved oxygen, temperature) and habitat features (e.g., depth, size, instream cover) for supporting steelhead;

- The biologists using block-nets (1/8-inch mesh minimum) to enclose the work area (about 580-feet) at the upstream and downstream ends prior to installing the cofferdams to prevent additional steelhead entering from outside and facilitate steelhead capture within the work area;

- The biologists using seines and dip nets to capture and relocate as many steelhead from the work area as possible prior to dewatering;

- Employing minimization measures to reduce risk of harm to captured steelhead such as keeping handling and holding times to a minimum, avoiding overcrowding of holding containers, keeping holding containers shaded and cool, using aerators to keep water in containers well oxygenated, segregating, and fish by size into holding containers;

- Isolating the in-creek work area through construction of two cofferdams (one at the upstream extent of the work area and one at the downstream extent) across the width of the channel and composed of bags filled with washed gravel and potentially a visqueen lining if necessary. Installing a reinforced concrete box culvert or pipe culvert between the cofferdams to direct creek-flow through the work area and sized appropriately to maintain steelhead passage;

- Using pumps with screened (3/32-inch mesh minimum) intakes to dewater the work area. As dewatering occurs, biologists will actively monitor the area to capture and relocate remaining steelhead;

- Pumping surface water in the work area to an upland area for natural infiltration into the ground or through a settling tank system to prevent turbid water from returning to surface flow in the creek;

- Collecting steelhead found dead within the work area and storing the individual in a ziplock bag with a label indicating fork length and weight of the specimen along with the location, date, and time of collection. These specimens will be transferred to a freezer and retained until the City or Caltrans can coordinate on desired timing and method of transfer to NMFS; and

- Keeping the in-creek work area devoid of water for up to five months (June 1 to October 31) each of two consecutive years while construction is completed.

2. Construction activities involve the following measures:

    - Having biologists onsite during construction to monitor the work activities, implement BMPs for erosion control (e.g., silt fencing, straw-rolls) as necessary, and continuously check to ensure erosion BMPs and the diversion continue to function properly;

    - Trimming or removing trees and shrubs in discrete locations of the action area;

    - Constructing a temporary work area access road into the creek on the western creekbank upstream of the bridge to allow access of equipment into the creek channel;

    - Staging, refueling, and cleaning equipment and machinery (e.g., larges excavators, bobcats, cranes, generators, etc.) only in confined areas a minimum of 60 feet from any aquatic areas;

    - Biologists and workers inspecting vehicles and equipment (at least once per day) to ensure all are free of fuel and lubricant leaks;

    - Implementing a Hazardous Materials Response Plan (HMRP) to allow for prompt effective response and remediation of accidental spills;

    - Using a crane to lift and swing the eastern side of the Bob Jones Bike Path bridge to a new alignment and abutment about 15-feet downstream from the current location while the western side the bike path bridge will pivot slightly with the new alignment but remain at the same location;

    - Using large machinery (e.g., cranes, excavators) to break apart and remove the existing bridge and associated components including the bridge deck, abutments, support girders, and row of 12 support piles (16-inch diameter) running longitudinally through the creek channel underneath the bridge. Concrete debris that inadvertently falls into the creek channel will be confined to the area within the isolated work area, collected, and removed offsite. The piles will be cut at three feet below the finished grade of the creek bottom;

    - Constructing the new bridge (about 120-feet wide) set on top of newly constructed

Cast-In-Drilled-Hole (CIDH) piles located along the top of both creekbanks above and behind the existing bridge abutments;

- Constructing a vertical retaining wall out of timber or concrete along 252-feet of the western creekbank and 202-feet along the eastern creekbank, set 8 to 12 feet in front of the new bridge abutments, from the bridge deck down to 15-feet below the creek grade;

- Installing ungrouted rock slope protection (RSP) along the upstream and downstream creek banks and protecting the ends of both retaining walls. The western creekbank will have about 96-linear feet (LF) (195 cubic yards; CY) and 88 LF (166 CY) of RSP on the southern (downstream) and northern (upstream) retaining wall ends, respectively. The eastern creek bank will have 156 LF (450 CY) and 84 LF (145 CY) of RSP on the southern (downstream) and northern (upstream) ends, respectively;

- Installing at least 1 to 3 habitat elements (i.e., rootwads, cabled large wood, or boulder features) within the action area; and

- Removing the in-creek diversion and all associated material (i.e., the cofferdam, gravel bags, culvert, equipment, etc.) at the end of dry season construction (not later than October 31) each year and restoring creek contours to pre-construction conditions.

3. Post-construction activities involve the following measures:

    - Recontouring and restoring the creekbank where the temporary access road was built;

    - Implementing an extensive revegetation effort with a proposed combination of planting about 90 trees (9 bay, 14 sycamore, and 66 willow cuttings), 270 shrub types (73 mulefat, 109 California Coffeeberry, 86 California blackberry) and applying a mix of native plants and grass via hydroseeding on over an acre of ground cover. These plantings and hydro seeding will be dispersed throughout the action area particularly in areas disturbed during construction including the RSP and temporary creek access road site;

    - Assessing and implementing additional planting and restoration as needed in accordance with a proposed Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) which provides for a 1:1 restoration ratio in-kind for temporary impacts and up to 3:1 restoration ratio in-kind for permanent impacts; and

    - Monitoring the action area for a minimum of 5-years after construction is complete for the purpose of documenting and reporting the progress and success of the overall establishment and growth of riparian vegetation at the site.

### 1.3.1. Other Activities

NMFS considered, under the ESA, whether or not the proposed action would cause other activities and determined it would not.

## 2. ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT: BIOLOGICAL OPINION AND INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

The ESA establishes a national program for conserving threatened and endangered species of fish, wildlife, plants, and the habitat upon which they depend. As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, each Federal agency must ensure that its actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species or to adversely modify or destroy their designated critical habitat. Per the requirements of the ESA, Federal action agencies consult with NMFS, and section 7(b)(3) requires that, at the conclusion of consultation, NMFS provide an opinion stating how the agency's actions would affect listed species and their critical habitats. If incidental take is reasonably certain to occur, then section 7(b)(4) requires NMFS to provide an ITS that specifies the impact of any incidental taking and includes reasonable and prudent measures (RPMs) and terms and conditions to minimize such impacts.

### 2.1. Analytical Approach

This biological opinion includes both a jeopardy analysis and an adverse modification analysis. The jeopardy analysis relies upon the regulatory definition of "jeopardize the continued existence of" a listed species, which is "to engage in an action that reasonably would be expected, directly or indirectly, to reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of a listed species in the wild by reducing the reproduction, numbers, or distribution of that species" (50 CFR 402.02). Therefore, the jeopardy analysis considers both survival and recovery of the species.

This biological opinion also relies on the regulatory definition of "destruction or adverse modification," which "means a direct or indirect alteration that appreciably diminishes the value of critical habitat as a whole for the conservation of a listed species" (50 CFR 402.02).

The designation of critical habitat for SCCC steelhead uses the term primary constituent element (PCE) or essential features. The 2016 final rule (81 FR 7414; February 11, 2016) that revised the critical habitat regulations (50 CFR 424.12) replaced this term with physical or biological features (PBFs). The shift in terminology does not change the approach used in conducting a "destruction or adverse modification" analysis, which is the same regardless of whether the original designation identified PCEs, PBFs, or essential features. In this biological opinion, we use the term PBF to mean PCE or essential feature, as appropriate for the specific critical habitat.

The ESA Section 7 implementing regulations define effects of the action using the term "consequences" (50 CFR 402.02). As explained in the preamble to the final rule revising the definition and adding this term (84 FR 44976, 44977; August 27, 2019), that revision does not change the scope of our analysis, and in this opinion, we use the terms "effects" and "consequences" interchangeably.

We use the following approach to determine whether a proposed action is likely to jeopardize listed species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat:

- Evaluate the rangewide status of the species and critical habitat expected to be adversely affected by the proposed action.
- Evaluate the environmental baseline of the species and critical habitat.
- Evaluate the effects of the proposed action on species and their critical habitat using an exposure–response approach.
- Evaluate cumulative effects.
- In the integration and synthesis, add the effects of the action and cumulative effects to the environmental baseline, and, in light of the status of the species and critical habitat, analyze whether the proposed action is likely to: (1) directly or indirectly reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of a listed species in the wild by reducing the reproduction, numbers, or distribution of that species; or (2) directly or indirectly result in an alteration that appreciably diminishes the value of critical habitat as a whole for the conservation of a listed species.
- If necessary, suggest a reasonable and prudent alternative to the proposed action.

The primary document Caltrans submitted for NMFS' consideration in the development of this biological opinion is the BA for the project (Caltrans 2022). The BA provides a detailed description of the proposed action, potential effects of the action on steelhead and critical habitat for this species, and measures to minimize these effects. To further inform the assessment of potential effects on threatened steelhead and critical habitat, NMFS relied on relevant ecological literature (referenced in this biological opinion), steelhead observations City staff noted during recent surveys and monitoring of San Luis Obispo Creek over the past several years, and NMFS' own field observations and knowledge of the watershed gained in numerous site visits to this creek over the past decade including a site visit to the Prado Road Bridge on November 15, 2022, with Caltrans.

## 2.2. Rangewide Status of the Species and Critical Habitat

This opinion examines the status of each species that is likely to be adversely affected by the proposed action. The status is determined by the level of extinction risk that the listed species face, based on parameters considered in documents such as recovery plans, status reviews, and listing decisions. This informs the description of the species' likelihood of both survival and recovery. The species status section also helps to inform the description of the species' "reproduction, numbers, or distribution" for the jeopardy analysis. The opinion also examines the condition of critical habitat throughout the designated area, evaluates the conservation value of the various watersheds and coastal and marine environments that make up the designated area, and discusses the function of the PBFs that are essential for the conservation of the species.

### 2.2.1. Status of the Species

*Oncorhynchus mykiss* is one of six Pacific salmon in the genus *Oncorhynchus* that are native to the coast of North America. The natural history of this species dictates the terminology fisheries biologists and resource managers use when discussing *O. mykiss*, its habitat, and distribution. If

the species remains in freshwater throughout their entire life cycle (and reside upstream of longstanding migration barriers), they are referred to as resident trout (non-anadromous), or rainbow trout. The anadromous or ocean-going form of *O. mykiss* are listed under the ESA (NMFS 2006) and is typically referred to as "steelhead." Globally, steelhead are found in the western Pacific through the Kamchatka Peninsula in Asia, east to Alaska, south to southern California, and even reported in Baja California del Norte (Ruiz-Campos and Pister 1995).

The listed unit of anadromous *O. mykiss* is termed a "distinct population segment" or DPS (NMFS 2006), and the listed unit contains several individual or fish-bearing watersheds. The DPS recognizes only the anadromous *O. mykiss*. In accordance with the listing decision, this biological opinion solely uses the DPS terminology and provides NMFS' conclusion as to the likelihood of jeopardy to the species based only on effects to the listed DPS. This biological opinion analyzes the effects of the proposed action on the following listed DPS and designated critical habitat, which occur in the action area:

| Salmonid Species | ESU/DPS Name | Original Listing | Revised Listing(s) | Critical Habitat Designations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Steelhead (*O. mykiss*) | South-Central California Coast DPS | FR Notice: 62 FR 43937 Date: 08/18/1997 | FR Notice: 71 FR 5248 Date:01/05/2006 | FR Notice: 70 FR 52488 Date: 09/02/2005 |

The threatened SCCC DPS of steelhead occupies rivers from the Pajaro River, Santa Cruz County, south to but not including the Santa Maria River, in Santa Barbara County. The decline of the species prompted listing of the SCCC DPS of steelhead as threatened on August 18, 1997 (62 FR 43937) and a revised listing on January 5, 2006 (71 FR 834). The status of the SCCC steelhead populations was assessed by NMFS' Biological Review Team (BRT) in 1996 (Busby et al.), 2005 (Good et al.), 2011 (Williams et al.), and 2016 (NMFS). Abundance of adult steelhead in the SCCC DPS declined from a historical high abundance of 25,000 returning adults, to an estimate of 4,750 adults in 1965 for five river systems (Pajaro, Salinas, Carmel, Little Sur, and Big Sur), to fewer than 500 adults (Boughton and Fish 2003; Good et al. 2005; Helmbrecht and Boughton 2005; Williams et al. 2011; Williams et al. 2016).

As part of the assessment and listing of SCCC steelhead, NMFS convened the BRT, composed of an expert panel of scientists. The BRT evaluated the viability and extinction risk of naturally spawning populations within each DPS. The BRT found high risks to abundance, productivity, and the diversity of the SCCC DPS and expressed particular concern for the DPS's connectivity and spatial structure. NMFS' latest 5-year status review for the SCCC DPS of steelhead states the following:

> "The extended drought and drying conditions associated with projected climate change has the potential to cause local extinction of *O. mykiss* populations and thus reduce the genetic diversity of fish within the South-Central California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area." (p. 55, NMFS 2016)

Moreover, NMFS' recent assessment of viability for steelhead indicates the SCCC Steelhead DPS may be currently experiencing an increased extinction risk (Williams et al. 2016).

#### 2.2.1.1. General Life History of Steelhead

*O. mykiss* possesses an exceedingly complex life history (Behnke 1992). Distinctly different than other Pacific salmon, steelhead adults can survive their first spawning and return to the ocean until the next year to reproduce again. For returning adults, the specific timing of spawning can vary by a month or more among rivers or streams within a region, occurring in winter and early spring. The spawning time frames depend on physical factors such as the magnitude and duration of instream flows and sand-bar breaching. Once they reach their spawning grounds, females will use their caudal fin to excavate a nest (redd) in streambed gravels where they deposit their eggs. Males will then fertilize the eggs and, afterwards, the females cover the redd with a layer of gravel, where the embryos (alevins) incubate within the gravel. Hatching time can vary from approximately three weeks to two months depending on surrounding water temperature. The young fish (fry) emerge from the redd two to six weeks after hatching. As steelhead begin to mature, juveniles or "parr" will rear in freshwater streams anywhere from 1-3 years. Juvenile steelhead can also rear in seasonal coastal lagoons or estuaries of their natal creek, providing over-summering habitat.

Juvenile steelhead emigrate to the ocean (as smolts) usually in late winter and spring and reach maturity at age 2-4, but steelhead can reside in the ocean for an additional 2-3 years before returning to spawn. The timing of emigration is influenced by a variety of parameters such as photoperiod, temperature, breaching of sandbars at the river's mouth and streamflow. Extended droughts can cause juveniles to become landlocked, unable to reach the ocean (Boughton et al. 2006).

Through studying the otolith (small ear stone) microchemistry of *O. mykiss*, researchers further understand the complex and intricate life history of steelhead. Specifically, resident rainbow trout can produce steelhead progeny; likewise, steelhead can yield resident rainbow trout progeny (Zimmerman and Reeves 2000). Additionally, evidence indicates that sequestered populations of steelhead (e.g., above introduced migration barriers) can exhibit traits that are the same or similar to anadromous specimens with access to the ocean. Examples include inland resident fish exhibiting smolting characteristics and river systems producing smolts with no regular access for adult steelhead. This evidence suggests the ecological importance of the resident form to the viability of steelhead and the need to reconnect populations upstream and downstream of introduced migration barriers. The loss or reduction in anadromy and migration of juvenile steelhead to the estuary or ocean is expected to reduce gene flow, which strongly influences population diversity (McElhany et al. 2000). Evidence indicates genetic diversity in populations of southern California steelhead is low (Girman and Garza 2006).

#### 2.2.1.2. Steelhead Habitat Requirements

Habitat requirements of steelhead generally depend on the life history stage. Steelhead encounter several distinct habitats during their life cycle. Water discharge, water temperature, and water chemistry must be appropriate for adult and juvenile migration. Suitable water depth

and velocity, and substrate composition are the primary requirements for spawning. Furthermore, dissolved oxygen concentration, pH, and water temperature are factors affecting survival of incubating embryos. The presence of interspatial spaces between large substrate particle types is important for maintaining water-flow through the nest as well as dissolved oxygen levels within the nest. These spaces can become filled with fine sediment, sand, and other small particles. Additionally, juveniles need abundant food sources, including insects, crustaceans, and other small fish. Habitat must also provide places to hide from predators, such as under logs, root wads and boulders in the stream, and beneath overhanging vegetation. Steelhead also need places to seek refuge from periodic high-flow events (side channels and off channel areas) and may occasionally benefit from the availability of cold-water springs or seeps and deep pools during summer. Estuarine habitats can be utilized during the seaward migration of steelhead, as these habitats have been shown to be nurseries for steelhead. Estuarine or lagoon habitats can vary significantly in their physical characteristics from one another but remain an important habitat requirement as physiology begins to change while juvenile steelhead become acclimated to a saltwater environment.

#### 2.2.1.3. Influence of a Changing Climate on the Species

One factor affecting the rangewide status of threatened steelhead, and aquatic habitat at large, is climate change (Munsch et al. 2022). For the Southwest region (southern Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Coast), the average temperature has already increased roughly 1.5ºF compared to a 1960-1979 baseline period (USGCRP 2009). High temperatures will become more common, indicating that southern California steelhead may experience increased thermal stress even though this species has shown to endure higher than preferable body temperatures (Spina 2007).

Precipitation trends are also important to consider. The Southwest region, including California, showed a 16 percent increase in the number of days with heavy precipitation from 1958 to 2007 (USGCRP 2009). Potential impacts to steelhead in freshwater streams include damage to spawning redds and washing away of incubating eggs due to higher winter stream flow (USGCRP 2009), and poor freshwater survival due to longer and warmer periods of drought (Mastrandrea and Luers 2012), which may lead to lower host resistance of steelhead to more virulent parasitic and bacterial diseases (Marcogliese 2001). Snyder and Sloan (2005) projected mean annual precipitation in central western California to decrease by 1.6 cm (2.8% percent) by the end of the 21st century.

Increased wildfire activity over recent decades reflects sub-regional responses to changes in climate, specifically observations of warmer and earlier onset of spring along with longer summer-dry seasons (Westerling and Bryant 2008). These wildfires periodically burn large areas of chaparral and adjacent woodlands in autumn and winter in southern California (Westerling et al. 2004). Wildfires can have long-term benefits for steelhead habitat (such as producing influxes of spawning gravels to the stream), but in the short-term they can be catastrophic due to accumulation of fine sediment that negatively affects spawning, foraging, and depth refugia (Boughton et al. 2007).

Changes in vegetation patterns for this region are forecasted to include substantial increases in the amount of grassland and decreases in most other vegetation communities (e.g., chaparral,

coastal scrub, blue oak woodland, and foothill pine). Estuarine productivity is likely to change based on changes in freshwater flows, nutrient cycling, and sediment amounts (Scavia et al. 2002). Additionally, upper ocean temperature is the primary physical factor influencing the distribution of steelhead in the open ocean, and a warming climate may result in a north-ward shift in steelhead distribution (Myers and Mantua 2013).

### 2.2.2. Designated Critical Habitat

Critical habitat for the SCCC DPS of steelhead was designated on September 2, 2005, and consists of the stream channels listed in (70 FR 52488). Critical habitat has a lateral extent defined as the width of the channel delineated by the ordinary high-water line as defined by the Corps in 33 CFR 329.11, or by its bankfull elevation, which is the discharge level on the streambank that has a recurrence interval of approximately two years (70 FR 52522). PBFs are components of stream habitat that have been determined to be essential for the conservation of the SCCC DPS of steelhead, and are specific habitat components that support one or more steelhead life stages and in turn contain physical or biological features essential to steelhead survival, growth, and reproduction, and conservation. These PBFs include:

1) Freshwater spawning sites with sufficient water quantity and quality and adequate accumulations of substrate (i.e., spawning gravels of appropriate sizes) to support spawning, incubation and larval development.

2) Freshwater rearing sites with sufficient water quantity and floodplain connectivity to form and maintain physical habitat conditions and allow salmonid development and mobility; sufficient water quality and forage to support juvenile development; and natural cover such as shade, submerged and overhanging large wood, log jams, beaver dams, aquatic vegetation, large rocks and boulders, side channels, and undercut banks.

3) Freshwater migration corridors free of obstruction with water quantity and quality 9 conditions and natural cover such as submerged and overhanging large wood, aquatic vegetation, large rocks and boulders, side channels, and undercut banks supporting juvenile and adult mobility and survival.

4) Estuarine areas that provide uncontaminated water and substrates; food and nutrient sources to support steelhead growth and development; and connected shallow water areas and wetlands to cover and shelter juveniles.

5) Marine areas with sufficient water quality to support salmonid growth, development, and mobility; food and nutrient resources such as marine invertebrates and forage fish; and near-shore marine habitats with adequate depth, cover, and marine vegetation to provide cover and shelter.

Designated critical habitat for the SCCC DPS includes 1,249-miles of stream habitat and three square miles of estuary habitat within Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and San

Luis Obispo counties from the Pajaro River Hydrologic Sub-area south to the Estero Bay Hydrologic Unit (to but not including the Santa Maria River Hydrologic Unit). There are 30 occupied hydrologic sub-unit watersheds within the freshwater and estuarine range of the DPS. Critical habitat has a lateral extent as defined by the bankfull discharge, also known as a 2-year flood event.

#### 2.2.2.1. Status of Designated Critical Habitat

Streams designated as critical habitat in the SCCC DPS have the above PBF attributes to varying degrees, depending on the stream location and the impacts associated with the watershed. NMFS' most recent status reviews for SCCC steelhead (NMFS 2016) identified habitat destruction and degradation as serious ongoing risk factors for this DPS. Urban development, flood control, water development, and other anthropogenic factors have adversely affected the proper functioning and condition of some spawning, rearing, and migratory habitats in streams designated as critical habitat. Urbanization has resulted in some permanent impacts to steelhead critical habitat due to stream channelization, increased bank erosion, riparian damage, migration barriers, pollution (NMFS 2016), and increased exposure to highway runoff. Many streams within the DPS have dams and reservoirs that reduce the magnitude and duration of flushing stream flows, withhold or reduce water levels suitable for fish passage and rearing, physically block upstream fish passage, and retain valuable coarse sediments for spawning and rearing. In addition, some stream reaches within the DPS' designated critical habitat may be vulnerable to further perturbation resulting from poor land use and management decisions.

## 2.3. Action Area

"Action area" means all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action (50 CFR 402.02).

The action area encompasses the riparian corridor to the top of bank along about 800-linear feet of San Luis Obispo Creek at the crossing of Prado Road. Prado Road Bridge is located about 1,400-feet east of the U.S. Highway 101 and 180-feet west of the intersection of Prado Road and South Higuera Street in the City of San Luis Obispo, California. The upper boundary of the action area begins about 100-feet upstream of the existing Prado Road Bridge and extends about 700-feet downstream from this bridge. The action area includes a (1) 600-foot segment of creek that will undergo construction activities, and (2) 200-foot segment of creek downstream from the construction area where effects of the proposed action such as elevated turbidity are anticipated to terminate.

## 2.4. Environmental Baseline

The "environmental baseline" refers to the condition of the listed species or its designated critical habitat in the action area, without the consequences to the listed species or designated critical habitat caused by the proposed action. The environmental baseline includes the past and present impacts of all Federal, State, or private actions and other human activities in the action area, the anticipated impacts of all proposed Federal projects in the action area that have already undergone formal or early section 7 consultations, and the impact of State or private actions which are contemporaneous with the consultation in process. The consequences to listed species

or designated critical habitat from ongoing agency activities or existing agency facilities that are not within the agency's discretion to modify are part of the environmental baseline (50 CFR 402.02).

### 2.4.1. Status of Aquatic Habitat in the Action Area

The active creek channel in the action area ranges from approximately 25 to 50-feet wide and alternates from shallow riffles to long shallow runs and pools usually not deeper than 6-inches to 1-foot at baseflow. The substrate of the creek through the action area is a mix of sand, gravels, and cobbles with sporadic larger rocks and boulders. There is a dense riparian zone that ranges from 50 to 100-feet on each side of the creek. Riparian vegetation in the action area includes many native trees (e.g., oak, willow, sycamore) and a few non-native trees (e.g., eucalyptus, palm). Immediately adjacent to the riparian zone are many commercial and residential developments with physical structures, paved parking lots, and/or landscaping with a variety of non-native plants. There appears to be perennial flow through the action area with lowest flows (usually less than one or two cubic feet per second) observed during late spring through fall. Overall, the PBFs of critical habitat for juvenile steelhead rearing (i.e., natural cover, shelter, water quality/quantity, and riparian) and spawning (i.e., spawning gravels and substrate of appropriate size and composition) exist throughout the action area. Additionally, the PBFs for migration are also considered suitable through the action area, as there is no obvious barrier to adult or juvenile steelhead migration.

### 2.4.2. Status of Steelhead in the Action Area

San Luis Obispo Creek is designated as a Core 1 steelhead population in NMFS' recovery plan (NMFS 2013). Core 1 populations are considered vital for the recovery of steelhead in their respective biogeographic population groups and are therefore considered highly important populations for recovering the species.

The population of steelhead in San Luis Obispo Creek, like streams throughout the SCCC DPS, has greatly decreased from historic levels as a result of anthropogenic impacts in the watershed. The current population size of steelhead in San Luis Obispo Creek, including the action area, is unknown. Previous steelhead surveys (Ally 2008) of San Luis Obispo Creek in the vicinity of the action area documented a general density of about 22 juvenile steelhead per 100-feet of creek. There have also recently been confirmed observations of juvenile and adult steelhead in San Luis Obispo Creek at locations near the action area (Freddy Otte, Fish Biologist, City of San Luis Obispo, personal communication, November 2022).

Overall, based on the above information and NMFS' observations of available in-creek habitat in the action area and experience with similar construction actions in this watershed, the portion of the action area to be dewatered is estimated with the potential to support the presence of up to 250 juvenile steelhead each construction season (up to 500 total individuals over two consecutive construction seasons) depending on flow conditions and overall production within the watershed during a given year. Adult steelhead are not expected to be present within the action area during the time of construction activities (June 1 to October 31).

### 2.4.3. Factors Affecting Species Environment in the Action Area and Vicinity

*Road Encroachment and Urban Development*

The action area is within the City of San Luis Obispo and immediately adjacent to and downstream of lands developed for commercial (e.g., office buildings, businesses, retail stores etc.) and residential use (e.g., private homes, condominiums, multi-unit apartment buildings etc.). Within this urban complex exists many paved streets and parking lots as well as several bridges that cross San Luis Obispo Creek. Past and present development of lands often results in an increase of impervious surfaces and runoff of pollutants to surface water. The effects on water quality from road-surface runoff are most likely to occur during the wet season. Once in surface water, pollutants of sufficient concentration may impair water quality and alter the characteristics of the channel bed. Runoff from road surfaces contains dirt, oils, automotive fluids, and petro chemicals that are harmful to aquatic life, including steelhead (Tian et al. 2022; Brinkmann et al. 2022). Long-term urbanization effects have been associated with lower fish species diversity and abundance (Wang et al. 2001; Violin et al. 2011). Further, road and urban development along the creek and within the action area have contributed directly (i.e., through encroachment) or indirectly (i.e., through flood control measures to protect these developments) to confining the stream channel, reducing or eliminating floodplain connectivity, and diminishing riparian vegetation. Consequently, the proliferation of urban areas within the action area and vicinity is of concern.

*Agricultural Development*

Cultivated fields and open farmlands exist in portions the San Luis Obispo Creek watershed upstream of the action area and can contribute to effects that extend into the action area. There is potential for increased turbidity or nutrient loading due to runoff into the creek from agriculture and/or livestock on these properties. High turbidity concentrations can cause fish mortality, reduce fish feeding efficiency and decrease food availability. Agricultural runoff can transfer nutrients and pesticides to the creek, which can lower dissolved oxygen levels by increasing algae growth in streams and decreasing forage for steelhead (Anzalone et al. 2022).

*Surface and Groundwater Diversion*

Within the San Luis Obispo Creek watershed there are numerous privately-operated surface and groundwater diversions used to supply water for a variety of uses (e.g., private home, agricultural). Water diversions have the potential to adversely affect the growth and survival of steelhead (Spina et al. 2006) in the action area. Groundwater and surface water pumping lower the water table, decreasing the amount and extent of surface water to support steelhead rearing and may contribute to the curtailment of flows able to sustain steelhead migration (Stillwater and Kear 2012). Further, reduced streamflow or stream drying can mean a significant reduction or loss of habitat and even mortality to steelhead (M. McGoogan, NMFS biologist, personal observation).

## 2.5. Effects of the Action

Under the ESA, "effects of the action" are all consequences to listed species or critical habitat that are caused by the proposed action, including the consequences of other activities that are caused by the proposed action (see 50 CFR 402.02). A consequence is caused by the proposed action if it would not occur but for the proposed action and it is reasonably certain to occur. Effects of the action may occur later in time and may include consequences occurring outside the immediate area involved in the action (see 50 CFR 402.17). In our analysis, which describes the effects of the proposed action, we considered the factors set forth in 50 CFR 402.17(a) and (b).

### 2.5.1. Effects of the Action on Critical Habitat for SCCC Steelhead

#### 2.5.1.1. Temporary Alteration of Aquatic Habitat

Installing cofferdams to isolate and dewater the work area is expected to temporarily prevent a portion of San Luis Obispo Creek from serving as a freshwater rearing site for threatened steelhead for approximately five months during the dry season (June 1 through October 31) for two consecutive years during construction. The temporary loss of habitat is expected to have at least a few effects, described as follows.

The temporary loss of habitat is expected to translate into temporary loss of aquatic macroinvertebrate forage within the action area. Aquatic insects provide a source of food for instream fish populations and may represent a substantial portion of food items consumed by juvenile steelhead. The effect of macroinvertebrate loss as a food source is expected to be negligible because food would be available upstream and downstream of the isolated area via drift through the diversion culvert. Consequently, the temporary loss of access to aquatic macroinvertebrates as a result of isolation activities is not expected to adversely affect forage opportunities within the area over the long term.

The temporary loss of habitat due to dewatering a portion of the creek represents an adverse effect to habitat for steelhead, for at least a few reasons. First, the loss of habitat translates into a loss of a freshwater rearing area, which is essential for the growth and survival of juvenile steelhead (the life stage expected to be present at the time the proposed action is implemented). Without freshwater rearing areas, the habitat cannot fulfill the intended conservation role for the species. Second, the quality and availability of habitat in the action area has already been diminished and reduced due to anthropogenic factors. Therefore, the loss of habitat due to isolation would perpetuate diminished availability. However, the area impacted by the cofferdams and dewatering is relatively small compared to the amount and extent of habitat available elsewhere in San Luis Obispo Creek and, perhaps more importantly, the cofferdams will be removed following completion of the proposed action and the creek bed and banks will be restored to pre-project conditions. Freshwater rearing habitat upstream and downstream of the action area will be unaffected by the proposed action and, therefore, continue providing the intended conservation role for the species. Overall, the loss of aquatic habitat associated with the dewatering will be temporary, and no long-term diminishment is anticipated in the physical capacity of the habitat to serve the intended functional role for steelhead.

#### 2.5.1.2. Alteration of Creekbank and Creek Bed

The manipulation and disturbance of the creek bed and creekbank can result in degradation to rearing habitat through loss of habitat complexity or changes to morphology and hydraulic conditions creating impediments to steelhead migration. However, review of this proposed action indicates substantive changes to channel morphology, channel hydraulics, or habitat complexity, are not expected for at least a few reasons.

First, although the placement of the water diversion, falsework for the bridge, and temporary access road into the creek will disturbed the creek bed and creekbank, these disturbances are expected to be temporary and minimal. Once construction is complete, all debris and construction materials associated with the bridge falsework and diversion will be removed from the creek, the temporary access road decommissioned, and the creek (including the access road) restored to pre-construction contours. In addition, a small portion of creek habitat will be restored with the removal of the existing bridge piers, which is expected to enhance passage conditions through the reach. As a result, no substantive change to the shape or natural substrate composition of the creek bed is expected. Therefore, these disturbances are not expected to diminish the function value of the habitat for spawning, rearing, or migration.

Second, the installation of the RSP and a retaining wall along both creekbanks are not expected to create velocity increases in flow that would reduce the functional value of migration through the action area for at least two reasons. One, much of the RSP will be buried in the creek bed or backfilled and expected to maintain the same geomorphic shape of the channel. Further, planting the backfilled RSP with native trees and other vegetation is expected increase roughness along the creekbank and thereby, contribute to decreasing water velocity at high flows. Two, in-creek installation of several anchored habitat features (e.g., root-wads) along the creekbank are expected to add additional roughness to the creekbank and create low-velocity refuges for steelhead during high flow events.

Finally, although the RSP and bridge retaining wall will limit lateral-channel migration, the habitat complexity in the action area is not expected to be appreciably reduced for a couple reasons. One, the planting of backfilled RSP with native vegetation is expected to provide natural-like riparian characteristics. This vegetation growth is expected to provide shade, cover, and habitat complexity. Further, the in-creek installation of the habitat features (e.g., root-wads) is expected create additional habitat complexity in the action area.

Overall, based on the foregoing, habitat complexity beneficial for rearing, substrate adequate for spawning, and channel hydraulics conducive for steelhead passage are, collectively, expected to be maintained in the action area. As a result, the proposed action is not expected to appreciably diminish the functional value of the action area for rearing, spawning, or migration.

### 2.5.1.3. Alteration of Water Quality

*Risk of Increased Sedimentation and Turbidity*

We expect the adverse effects to water quality resulting from increases in sedimentation and turbidity due to construction activities will be minimal and temporary for several reasons. First, the proposed action includes a number of sediment and erosion-control measures (e.g., installing silt fencing, straw-waddles, etc.) to reduce the likelihood sediment would enter the wetted stream channel. Second, the activities occurring in the wetted creek (i.e., installing the block-nets, seining, constructing the gravel-bag and visqueen barrier, and removing the barrier) are expected to be confined to localized areas and short lived (a few hours or less). Third, water pumped from the work area will be pumped to upland areas for natural ground infiltration or through a settling tank system, eliminating the potential of turbid water returning to the creek. Fourth, isolating and dewatering the work area prior beginning construction activities will allow equipment and crews to work in dry conditions and remove any debris from bridge demolition out of the dry in-creek work area, eliminating the potential for water-quality alterations during construction.

*Risk of Increased Pollutants*

Increases in pollutants from newly poured concrete (for components of the new bridge) or leaks from equipment are expected to be unlikely or minimal due to several proposed protective measures. First, newly poured concrete will be contained in place with forms and the isolated, dry work area will prevent wet concrete from entering surface water if a leak occurs. Second, equipment and machinery will be staged, cleaned, and refueled in a contained area, which will be a minimum of 60 feet from aquatic habitat. Third, a HMRP will be implemented to ensure fast, effective containment and cleanup of a spill should one occur. Finally, construction activities will be conducted during the dry season when streamflow is low and runoff from rainfall is unlikely.

### 2.5.1.4. Disturbance to Near Channel Vegetation

The bridge construction and associated placement of RSP has the potential to temporarily cause a discrete loss of shade and cover along San Luis Obispo Creek through the trimming and removal of trees and vegetation. This loss could degrade water quality through increase water temperatures (Opperman and Merenlender 2004). However, the loss of vegetation as a result of the proposed action is expected to be temporary and confined to small localized portions within the action area. Further, there is a large number of trees that will remain and a dense riparian canopy immediately upstream and downstream of the action area that will continue to provide shade and cover to this reach during and immediately after construction. In addition, native riparian vegetation will be replanted throughout the disturbed portions including within the backfilled RSP to minimize impacts from construction. Based on NMFS' experience observing the response of riparian vegetation to human-made disturbances, the riparian zone is expected to recover one to two years following the completion of construction. As a result, the proposed action is not expected to diminish the functional value of habitat for steelhead.

Additionally, Caltrans proposes monitoring to ensure the successful recovery of restoration and replanting areas within the action area for a minimum of five years following completion of the construction. However, currently the proposed monitoring lacks details regarding timing of annual report submission and how the monitoring information would be evaluated or used to ensure adequate site recovery. For example, the proposed action lacks specific criteria that will be used to determine when sufficient vegetation establishment has occurred at this site after construction is complete. Also lacking are the specific details of actions to be taken if monitoring data suggests site conditions are failing recovery criteria or trending in the wrong direction. Without clear success criteria or a plan to collect and respond to monitoring data that reveals deviations from habitat performance measures, proposed post-construction monitoring efforts have the potential to be ineffective for ensuring adverse effects are truly minimized.

### 2.5.2. Effects of the Action on SCCC Steelhead

The remaining portion of the effects analysis will focus on consequences to threatened SCCC steelhead in the action area as a result of the proposed action. The following section is organized to explain effects to this species based on expected effects on designated critical habitat. Because the timing of the in-channel work is outside the steelhead migration season, only juvenile steelhead are expected to be present in the action area and affected by the proposed action. Therefore, the following discussion focuses solely on consequences to juvenile steelhead.

#### 2.5.2.1. Capture and Relocation of Steelhead

Although there is risk of harm and mortality to steelhead inherent with handling and relocation, relocation efforts overall are expected to greatly reduce impacts to juvenile steelhead.

With respect to risk of harm to steelhead, handling can induce stress and temporary disorientation, leading to potential injury and mortality. Direct injury may impair steelhead movement, feeding, and survival. To minimize the risk of injury or mortality Caltrans proposes specific BMPs for capturing and relocating individuals. For example, Caltrans proposes employing biologists with experience handling steelhead. Further, prior to the start of construction and dewatering activities, the biologist will assess and identify sites for steelhead relocation that have appropriate water quality (e.g., dissolved oxygen, temperature) and habitat features (e.g., depth, size, instream cover) to support relocated individuals. Based on NMFS observation, there appears to be ample, sufficient in-creek habitat adjacent the action area for relocation. Although Caltrans will document the capture and relocation of juvenile steelhead within the dewatered area, the proposed action does not include a provision for notifying NMFS in real time if a steelhead mortality occurs, which can be important for identifying whether additional minimization measures are needed to protect steelhead.

Based on NMFS' observations of available habitat in the action area and experience with similar construction projects in this watershed, NMFS expects no more than a total of 250 juvenile steelhead will need to be relocated from the dewatered work area each construction season (no more than 500 total individuals over two consecutive construction seasons). NMFS expects up to 10 juvenile steelhead may be injured or killed as a result of the proposed action each

construction season (no more than 20 total individuals over two consecutive construction seasons). This estimated mortality is also based on NMFS' experience and knowledge gained on similar proposed actions in San Luis Obispo County during the last several years. Overall, based on NMFS' general familiarity of steelhead abundance in the SCCC DPS, and San Luis Obispo County streams in particular, the anticipated number of juvenile steelhead that may be injured or killed as a result of the proposed action is likely to represent a small fraction of the overall watershed-specific populations and the entire threatened SCCC DPS of steelhead. Therefore, the effects of the relocation on steelhead are not expected to give rise to population-level effects.

#### 2.5.2.2. Temporary Loss of Living Space

The temporary loss of habitat owing to isolation and dewatering of the in-creek work area could translate into an adverse effect on juvenile steelhead primarily through the short-term loss of a freshwater rearing area and displacement of steelhead presuming presence of this species. This could increase densities of steelhead in neighboring reaches of the creek outside the action area. However, based on our observations of the creek upstream and downstream of the action area, and our general familiarity of steelhead abundance, there appears to be ample, comparable habitat adjacent to the action area that can sufficiently support steelhead temporarily displaced or unable to use the isolated work area. Further, the effect of macroinvertebrate loss on juvenile steelhead is expected to be negligible because food from upstream sources would be available downstream of the dewatered area via drift through the diversion culvert. Overall, we anticipate this loss would be temporary, minimal, and affect only a small portion of the overall San Luis Obispo Creek steelhead population for a few months (June 1 to October 31) each of two consecutive dry seasons.

#### 2.5.2.3. Steelhead Movement and Migration

Steelhead movement is not expected to be substantially restricted through the action area in the short-term during construction or over the long-term after work activities are complete. Although steelhead will be temporarily excluded from the dewatered work area, the culvert selected for the diversion will be appropriately sized for passage of steelhead through the area. In the long-term, the post-construction shaping of the channel is expected to retain the basic pre-construction contours. Also, natural habitat characteristics are expected to form following extensive planting of vegetation within the backfilled RSP and natural creekbanks. Further, in-creek installation of several anchored habitat features (e.g., root-wads, large woody debris, boulder clusters) are expected to create low-velocity refuges for steelhead during high flow events. As such, characteristics and condition of the action area are expected to remain well within the ability for steelhead to pass through unimpeded.

#### 2.5.2.4. Altered Water Quality

The anticipated changes in water quality (i.e., increased sediment, turbidity, or pollutants) are not expected to translate into acute or chronic adverse effects on steelhead. Highly turbid water can result in decreased feeding, growth, and survival of juvenile steelhead (Thompson and Beauchamp 2016). Although certain activities associated with work area isolation (i.e., seining, diversion installation, diversion removal) may increase turbidity, the increase is expected to be

localized and last only a few hours or less. Further, installing sediment and erosion-control devices (e.g., straw-fiber rolls, silt-fencing) and isolating the work area from surface water is expected to eliminate the likelihood of sediment, debris, or pollutants entering surface water during construction. Therefore, effects of the proposed action on steelhead associated with increases in sedimentation and turbidity are expected to be minimal and temporary.

#### 2.5.2.5. Alteration of Channel Shading

As discussed previously (section 2.5.1.4), short-term effects to steelhead due to loss of shading are expected to be minimal and temporary primarily because vegetation trimming and removal will be localized and discrete, there will be a high number of trees still remaining in and adjacent to the action area, and there will be an extensive revegetation effort with a quick (one to two year) recovery time expected. Over the long-term, the native trees and vegetation planted in the backfilled RSP and on the creekbank are expected to increase shading in the action area. As such, alteration of shading due to the proposed action is not expected to impact the fitness of steelhead in the action area.

## 2.6. Cumulative Effects

"Cumulative effects" are those effects of future State or private activities, not involving Federal activities, that are reasonably certain to occur within the action area of the Federal action subject to consultation [50 CFR 402.02 and 402.17(a)]. Future Federal actions that are unrelated to the proposed action are not considered in this section because they require separate consultation pursuant to section 7 of the ESA.

Some continuing non-Federal activities are reasonably certain to contribute to climate effects within the action area. However, it is difficult if not impossible to distinguish between the action area's future environmental conditions caused by global climate change that are properly part of the environmental baseline *vs.* cumulative effects. Therefore, all relevant future climate-related environmental conditions in the action area are described earlier in the discussion of environmental baseline (Section 2.4).

NMFS is generally familiar with activities occurring in the action area, and at this time, unaware of such actions that would be reasonably certain to occur. Consequently, no cumulative effect is likely, beyond the continuing effects of present land uses reasonably certain to occur into the future (see Environmental Baseline, Section 2.4).

## 2.7. Integration and Synthesis

The Integration and Synthesis section is the final step in assessing the risk that the proposed action poses to the species and critical habitat. In this section, we add the effects of the action (Section 2.5) to the environmental baseline (Section 2.4) and the cumulative effects (Section 2.6), taking into account the status of the species and critical habitat (Section 2.2), to formulate the agency's biological opinion as to whether the proposed action is likely to: (1) reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of a listed species in the wild by reducing its numbers, reproduction, or distribution; or (2) appreciably diminish the value of designated or proposed critical habitat as a whole for the conservation of the species.

Juvenile steelhead are expected to be present in the action area during the proposed action and, therefore, subject to the effects from the proposed action. The adverse effects to steelhead include potential injury or mortality during the process of capture and relocation from the in-creek work area. However, precautions are proposed that are expected minimize the risk of injury and mortality to steelhead during capture and relocation and the nearby instream habitat in San Luis Obispo Creek is expected to suitably harbor the relocated steelhead. Further, the expected effects associated with the habitat alteration due to the temporary diversion will be brief and localized.

Based on the steelhead surveys and observations described in the environmental baseline, NMFS concludes non-lethal take of no more than 250 juvenile steelhead may be captured and relocated during the proposed action as a result of dewatering the in-creek work area each construction season (no more than 500 total individuals over two consecutive construction seasons), with a potential lethal take of no more than 10 juvenile steelhead each construction season (no more than 20 over two construction seasons), thus the risk of mortality is low. Based on NMFS' general familiarity of steelhead abundance in the SCCC DPS, and San Luis Obispo County streams in particular, the anticipated number of juvenile steelhead that may be injured or killed as a result of the proposed action is likely to represent a small fraction of the overall watershed-specific populations and the entire threatened SCCC DPS of steelhead. Therefore, the effects of the relocation on steelhead are not expected to give rise to population-level effects.

Overall, the impacts to critical habitat are expected to be temporary and not translate into a reduction in the functional value of the habitat in the long term. Vegetation trimming and removal is expected to be conducted at discrete locations, recover quickly with revegetation efforts, and not expected to decrease the functional value of the riparian zone. The planting of numerous trees and shrubs is expected to increase the benefits of the riparian zone (e.g., shading, cover, food production). The proposed bioengineered elements of the design (e.g., backfilling and planting the RSP and creekbanks with native trees and shrubs) and installing in-creek habitat features (e.g., root-wads, cabled wood or boulders) is expected to minimize the potential effects of RSP on habitat complexity and fluvial-geomorphic processes as well as assist in maintaining unimpeded conditions for steelhead migration. Therefore, rearing, spawning, and migration conditions are expected to be maintained which support the viability of the threatened SCCC DPS of steelhead.

We also considered the proposed action in the context of anticipated climate trends anticipated for the south-central region inclusive of the action area. The action area could be subject to higher average summer temperatures and lower precipitation levels in the future as a result of climate change, which would lead to higher creek temperatures and longer dry periods. Reduction in the amount of precipitation would reduce the amount and extent of flow. For this proposed action, these noted likely effects of climate change are unlikely to be measurably detected by the time construction is completed. Further, the short-term effects of the proposed action are expected to have completely elapsed prior to these climate-change effects.

## 2.8. Conclusion

After reviewing and analyzing the current status of the listed species and critical habitat, the environmental baseline within the action area, the effects of the proposed action, the effects of other activities caused by the proposed action, and cumulative effects, NMFS' biological opinion is the proposed action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the threatened SCCC DPS of steelhead or destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat for this species.

## 2.9. Incidental Take Statement

Section 9 of the ESA and Federal regulations pursuant to section 4(d) of the ESA prohibit the take of endangered and threatened species, respectively, without a special exemption. "Take" is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. "Harm" is further defined by regulation to include significant habitat modification or degradation that actually kills or injures fish or wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, spawning, rearing, migrating, feeding, or sheltering (50 CFR 222.102). "Harass" is further defined by interim guidance as to "create the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavioral patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering." "Incidental take" is defined by regulation as takings that result from, but are not the purpose of, carrying out an otherwise lawful activity conducted by the Federal agency or applicant (50 CFR 402.02). Section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2) provide taking that is incidental to an otherwise lawful agency action is not considered to be prohibited taking under the ESA if that action is performed in compliance with the terms and conditions of this ITS.

### 2.9.1. Amount or Extent of Take

In the biological opinion, NMFS determined incidental take is reasonably certain to occur as follows:

For reasons discussed in this biological opinion, NMFS determined the proposed action on San Luis Obispo Creek will result in the incidental take (capture, injury, and mortality) of juvenile steelhead when portions of the action area are dewatered. To this end, NMFS anticipates no more than 250 juvenile steelhead will be captured and relocated from the dewatered work area each construction season (no more than 500 total individual over two consecutive construction seasons) and no more than 10 juvenile steelhead may be injured or killed as a result of the proposed action each construction season (no more than 20 total individual over two consecutive seasons). Incidental take will have been exceeded if more than 250 juvenile steelhead are captured or more than 10 juvenile steelhead are killed as a result of the proposed action in a single construction season. The accompanying biological opinion does not anticipate any other form of take incidental to the proposed action.

### 2.9.2. Effect of the Take

In the biological opinion, NMFS determined the amount or extent of anticipated take, coupled with other effects of the proposed action, is not likely to result in jeopardy to the species or destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.

### 2.9.3. Reasonable and Prudent Measures

"Reasonable and prudent measures" are measures that are necessary or appropriate to minimize the impact of the amount or extent of incidental take (50 CFR 402.02).

NMFS determined the following reasonable and prudent measures are necessary and appropriate to minimize and monitor incidental take of steelhead. The results of the effect analysis provide the basis for the following reasonable and prudent measure:

1. Avoid and minimize harm and mortality of steelhead during the relocation activities.

2. Implement effective restoration, monitoring, and reporting activities to ensure adequate site recovery and minimization of effects on threatened SCCC steelhead and designated critical habitat for this species.

### 2.9.4. Terms and Conditions

In order to be exempt from the prohibitions of section 9 of the ESA, the Federal action agency must comply (or must ensure that any applicant complies) with the following terms and conditions. Caltrans or any applicant has a continuing duty to monitor the impacts of incidental take and must report the progress of the action and its impact on the species as specified in this ITS (50 CFR 402.14). If the entity to whom a term and condition is directed does not comply with the following terms and conditions, then protective coverage for the proposed action would likely lapse.

1. The following terms and conditions implement reasonable and prudent measure 1:

   A. The Caltrans or City biologist shall contact NMFS (Matt McGoogan, 562-980-4026 or matthew.mcgoogan@noaa.gov) as soon as practicable if one or more steelhead are found dead or injured. The purpose of the contact shall be to review the activities resulting in take and to determine if additional protective measures are required. All steelhead mortalities shall be retained, frozen as soon as practical, and placed in an appropriate-sized sealable bag that is labeled with the date and location of the collection and fork length and weight of the specimen(s). The biologist shall retain frozen samples until transfer of these samples (usually shipping overnight on dry-ice) can be coordinated with NMFS. Subsequent notification must also be made in writing to Matt McGoogan, NMFS, 501 W. Ocean Blvd., Suite 4200, Long Beach, California 90802-4213 and matthew.mcgoogan@noaa.gov within five days of noting dead or injured steelhead. The written notification shall include 1) the date, time, and location of the carcass or injured specimen; 2) a color photograph of the steelhead; 3) cause of injury or death; and 4) name and affiliation of the person whom found the specimen.

   B. The Caltrans or City biologist shall provide a written steelhead-relocation report to NMFS within 30 working days following completion of construction. The report shall include (1) the number and size of all steelhead relocated during the proposed action; (2) the date and time of the collection and relocation; (3) the location and habitat the

steelhead were released to; (4) a description of any problem encountered during the project or when implementing terms and conditions; and (5) any effect of the proposed action on steelhead that was not previously considered. The report shall be sent to Matt McGoogan, NMFS, 501 W. Ocean Blvd., Suite 4200, Long Beach, California 90802-4213 and matthew.mcgoogan@noaa.gov.

2. The following term and condition implement reasonable and prudent measure 2:

   A. Develop and implement a detailed Restoration Plan (Plan). Caltrans shall submit the draft Plan to NMFS (matthew.mcgoogan@noaag.gov) within 90 days of the date of this final biological opinion for review and comment. Within 90 days of receiving NMFS' comments on the draft Plan, Caltrans shall revise the draft Plan accordingly to produce and provide the final Plan to NMFS. At a minimum, the content of the Plan shall include: (1) the requirement to submit an annual report by January 31st following each year of monitoring, (2) the timing and schedule for planting the work area, (3) an irrigation plan (if any), (4) photo monitoring over time, (5) specific success criteria used to determine when revegetation is considered adequately established for the purposes of fulfilling proposed restoration ratios, and (6) a contingency plan describing actions to be taken if the restoration planting areas are not meeting success criteria.

## 2.10. Conservation Recommendations

Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA directs Federal agencies to use their authorities to further the purposes of the ESA by carrying out conservation programs for the benefit of the threatened and endangered species. Specifically, "conservation recommendations" are suggestions regarding discretionary measures to minimize or avoid adverse effects of a proposed action on listed species or critical habitat or regarding the development of information (50 CFR 402.02).

NMFS has no conservation recommendation related to this proposed action.

## 2.11. Reinitiation of Consultation

This concludes formal consultation for Caltrans' Prado Road Bridge Replacement project over San Luis Obispo Creek.

Under 50 CFR 402.16(a): "Reinitiation of consultation is required and shall be requested by the Federal agency or by the Service where discretionary Federal agency involvement or control over the action has been retained or is authorized by law and : (1) If the amount or extent of taking specified in the incidental take statement is exceeded; (2) If new information reveals effects of the agency action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not previously considered; (3) If the identified action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or critical habitat that was not considered in the biological opinion; or (4) If a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the identified action."

## 3. DATA QUALITY ACT DOCUMENTATION AND PRE-DISSEMINATION REVIEW

The Data Quality Act (DQA) specifies three components contributing to the quality of a document. They are utility, integrity, and objectivity. This section of the opinion addresses these DQA components, documents compliance with the DQA, and certifies that this opinion has undergone pre-dissemination review.

### 3.1. Utility

Utility principally refers to ensuring that the information contained in this consultation is helpful, serviceable, and beneficial to the intended users. The intended users of this opinion are Caltrans. Other interested users could include the City, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Individual copies of this opinion were provided to Caltrans. The document will be available within 2 weeks at the NOAA Library Institutional Repository [https://repository.library.noaa.gov/welcome]. The format and naming adhere to conventional standards for style.

### 3.2. Integrity

This consultation was completed on a computer system managed by NMFS in accordance with relevant information technology security policies and standards set out in Appendix III, 'Security of Automated Information Resources,' Office of Management and Budget Circular A-130; the Computer Security Act; and the Government Information Security Reform Act.

### 3.3. Objectivity

Information Product Category: Natural Resource Plan

***Standards:*** This consultation and supporting documents are clear, concise, complete, and unbiased; and were developed using commonly accepted scientific research methods. They adhere to published standards including the NMFS ESA Consultation Handbook, ESA regulations, 50 CFR 402.01 et seq., and the MSA implementing regulations regarding EFH, 50 CFR part 600.

***Best Available Information:*** This consultation and supporting documents use the best available information, as referenced in the References section. The analyses in this contain more background on information sources and quality.

***Referencing:*** All supporting materials, information, data and analyses are properly referenced, consistent with standard scientific referencing style.

***Review Process:*** This consultation was drafted by NMFS staff with training in ESA, and reviewed in accordance with West Coast Region ESA quality control and assurance processes.

## 4. REFERENCES


Alley, D.W. and C. Steiner. 2008. 2007 Juvenile Steelhead Distribution and Population Estimate for the Sun Luis Obispo Creek Watershed, San Luis Obispo County, California.

Anzalone, S. E., N. W. Fuller, K. E. Huff Hartz, C. A. Fulton, G. W. Whitledge, J. T. Magnuson, D. Schlenk, S. Acuña and M. J. Lydy (2022). "Pesticide residues in juvenile Chinook salmon and prey items of the Sacramento River watershed, California – A comparison of riverine and floodplain habitats." Environmental Pollution **303**: 119102

Behnke, R. J. 1992. Native Trout of Western North America (American Fisheries Society Monograph: No 6). American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.

Brinkmann, M., D. Montgomery, S. Selinger, J. G. P. Miller, E. Stock, A. J. Alcaraz, J. K. Challis, L. Weber, D. Janz, M. Hecker and S. Wiseman. 2022. Acute Toxicity of the Tire Rubber-Derived Chemical 6PPD-quinone to Four Fishes of Commercial, Cultural, and Ecological Importance. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* 9(4): 333-338.

Boughton, D. A., and H. Fish. 2003. New data on steelhead distribution in southern and southcentral California. National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruiz, CA.

Boughton, D. A., P. B. Adams, E. C. Anderson, C. Fusaro, E. A. Keller, E. Kelley, L. D. Lentsch, J. L. Nielsen, K. Perry, H. Regan, J. Smith, C. C. Swift, L. Thompson, and F. G. R. Watson. 2006. Steelhead of the south-central/southern California coast population characterization for recovery planning. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-394.

Boughton, D. A., P. B. Adams, E. C. Anderson, C. Fusaro, E. A. Keller, E. Kelley, L. D. Lentsch, J. L. Nielsen, K. Perry, and H. Regan. 2007. Viability criteria for steelhead of the south-central and southern California coast. NOAA Tech Memo NOAA-TM-NMFSSWFSC-407.

Busby, P. J., T. C. Wainwright, G. J. Bryant, L. J. Lierheimer, R. S. Waples, F. W. Waknitz, and I. V. Lagomarsino. 1996. Status review of west coast steelhead from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. NOAA Tech Memo (NMFS-NWFSC-27).

Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2022. Prado Road Bridge Replacement Project Biological Assessment. September 2022.

Girman, D., and J. C. Garza. 2006. Population structure and ancestry of O. mykiss populations in South-Central California based on genetic analysis of microsatellite data. Final Report for California Department of Fish and Game Project No. P0350021 and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Contract No. AWIP-S-1.

Good, T. P., R. S. Waples, and P. B. Adams. 2005. Updated status of federally listed ESUs of West Coast salmon and steelhead. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-66:598 pages.

Helmbrecht, S., and D. A. Boughton. 2005. Recent efforts to monitor anadromous Oncorhynchus species in the California coastal region: a compilation of metadata. NOAA Tech Memo (NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFCS-381).

Marcogliese, D. J. 2001. Implications of climate change for parasitism of animals in the aquatic environment. Canadian Journal of Zoology 79: 1331–1352.

Mastrandrea, M. D., and A. L. Luers. 2012. Climate change in California: scenarios and approaches for adaptation. Climatic Change 111: 5-16.

McElhany, P., M. H. Rucklelshaus, M. J. Ford, T. C. Wainwright, and E. P. Bjorkstedt. 2000. Viable salmonid populations and the recovery of evolutionarily significant units. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-42.

Munsch, S. H., Greene, C. M., Mantua, N. J., & Satterthwaite, W. H. (2022). One hundred-seventy years of stressors erode salmon fishery climate resilience in California's warming landscape. *Global Change Biology*, 28, 2183– 2201. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16029

Myers, K., and N. Mantua. 2013. Climate Change and Ocean Ecology of Northwest Steelhead. The Osprey. The Steelhead Committee of the International Federation of Fly Fishers. Issue No. 75: May.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2006. Endangered and threatened species: final listing determinations for 10 distinct population segments of west coast steelhead. Federal Register 71 (3): 834-862.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2013. South-Central California Coast Steelhead Recovery Plan. West Coast Region, California Coastal Area Office, Long Beach, California.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2016. 5-year review: Summary and evaluation of South-Central California coast steelhead distinct population segment. National Marine Fisheries Service, West Coast Region. California Coastal Office. Santa Rosa, California.

Opperman, J., and A. M. Merenlender. 2004. The effectiveness of riparian restoration for improving instream fish habitat in four hardwood-dominated California streams. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 24(3):822-834.

Ruiz-Campos, G., and E. P. Pister. 1995. Distribution, habitat, and current status of the San Pedro Mártir rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* nelson (Evermann). Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences. 94: 131-148.

Scavia, D., J. C. Field, D. F. Boesch, R. W. Buddemeier, V. Burkett, D. R. Cayan, M. Fogarty, M. A. Harwell, R. W. Howarth, C. Mason, D. J. Reed, T. C. Royer, A. H. Sallenger, and J. G. Titus. 2002. Climate Change Impacts on U. S. Coastal and Marine Ecosystems. Estuaries 25 (2):149-164.

Spina, A. P., M. R. McGoogan, and T. S. Gaffney. 2006. Influence of surface-water withdrawal on juvenile steelhead and their habitat in a south-central California nursery stream. California Fish and Game 92: 81-90.

Spina, A. 2007. Thermal ecology of juvenile steelhead in a warm-water environment. Environmental Biology of Fishes 80: 23-34.

Snyder, M. A., and L. C. Sloan. 2005. Transient future climate over the western United States using a regional climate model. Earth Interactions 9: Article No. 11.

Thompson, J. N., and D. A. Beauchamp DA. 2016. Growth of juvenile steelhead *Oncorhynchus mykiss* under size-selective pressure limited by seasonal bioenergetic and environmental constraints. Journal of Fish Biology 89: 1720–1739.

Tian, Z., M. Gonzalez, C. A. Rideout, H. N. Zhao, X. Hu, J. Wetzel, E. Mudrock, C. A. James, J. K. McIntyre and E. P. Kolodziej. 2022. 6PPD-Quinone: Revised Toxicity Assessment and Quantification with a Commercial Standard. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* 9(2): 140-146.

USGCRP (U.S. Global Change Research Program). 2009. Global climate change impacts in the United States: a state of knowledge report from the U.S. global change research program. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Violin, C. R., P. Cada, E. B. Sudduth, B. A. Hassett, D. L. Penrose, and E. S. Bernhardt. 2011. Effects of urbanization and urban stream restoration on the physical and biological structure of stream ecosystems. Ecological Applications 21:1932–1949.

Wang, L., J. Lyons, and P. Kanehl. 2001. Impacts of urbanization on stream habitat and fish Across multiple spatial scales. Environmental Management 28:255–266.

Westerling, A. L., D. R. Cayan, T. J. Brown, B. L. Hall, and L. G. Riddle 2004. Climate, Santa Ana winds and autumn wildfires in southern California. Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union, 85(31): 289–296.

Westerling, A. L., and B. P. Bryant. 2008. Climate change and wildfire in California. Climatic Change 87:S231-S249.

Williams, T. H., S. T. Lindley, B. C. Spence, and D. A. Boughton. 2011. Status review update for Pacific salmon and steelhead listed under the Endangered Species Act: Southwest. NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Santa Cruz, CA.

Williams, T. H., B. C. Spence, D. A. Boughton, R. C. Johnson, E. G. R. Crozier, N. J. Mantua, M. R. O'Farrell, and S. T. Lindley. 2016. Viability assessment for Pacific salmon and steelhead listed under the Endangered Species Act: Southwest. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-564.

Zimmerman, C. E., and G. H. Reeves. 2000. Population structure of sympatric anadromous and nonanadromous Oncorhynchus mykiss: evidence from spawning surveys and otolith microchemistry. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 57(10):2152-2162.