

STANCOG 2011 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Initial Study

Prepared for
Stanislaus Council of Governments

January 2010



STANCOG 2011 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Initial Study

Prepared for
Stanislaus Council of Governments

January 2010



2600 Capitol Avenue
Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95816
916.564.4500
www.esassoc.com

Los Angeles

Oakland

Olympia

Petaluma

Portland

San Diego

San Francisco

Seattle

Tampa

Woodland Hills

209299

TABLE OF CONTENTS

StanCOG 2011 Regional Transportation Plan Initial Study

	<u>Page</u>
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	5
Environmental Checklist	6
Aesthetics	6
Agricultural Resources	7
Air Quality	8
Biological Resources	9
Cultural Resources	10
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	11
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	13
Hydrology and Water Quality	15
Land Use and Land Use Planning	17
Mineral Resources	18
Noise	19
Population and Housing	20
Public Services	21
Recreation	21
Transportation and Traffic	22
Utilities and Service Systems	23
Energy	24
Mandatory Findings of Significance	25
Appendices	
A. RTP Project List	A-1

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Initial Study

1. **Project Title:** StanCOG 2011 Regional Transportation Plan
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Stanislaus Council of Governments
1111 I Street, Suite 308
Modesto, CA 95354
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Vince Harris, Executive Director
(209) 525-4600
4. **Project Location:** Stanislaus County
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG)
6. **General Plan Designation(s):** Various
7. **Zoning Designation(s):** Various

8. Description of Project:

Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the nine (9) incorporated cities in Stanislaus County and the County government. Through this Council, local governments work together to address current transportation and land use issues and plan for the future.

In accordance with California Government Code Section 65080, StanCOG is mandated to prepare and periodically update the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which defines the policies, plans and programs for the coordination and programming of transportation improvements throughout Stanislaus County. The RTP establishes regional transportation policy for Stanislaus County. It addresses all forms or modes of transportation, including automobiles, transit, non-motorized (including bicycle), passenger rail, freight and aviation facilities. The RTP serves as the planning blueprint to guide transportation investments involving local, state, and federal funding within Stanislaus County over a minimum of 20 years. The 2011 comprehensive update of the RTP will identify the facilities and programs that will be needed to meet travel demands to the year 2035.

Project Overview

The overall focus for the 2011 RTP is directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced multi-modal transportation system, while maintaining the integrity of the existing system. Critical to this focus are: (1) maintaining close coordination with Caltrans District 10 and with adjacent counties' transportation plans through the RTP planning process; and (2) maintaining consistency with the general plans of Stanislaus County and the incorporated cities to ensure that the interests of special districts, private organizations and residents, and state and federal agencies are addressed.

In addition, the 2011 RTP effort will include a first look at Sustainable Communities Strategies concepts for land use to help achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions that are consistent with state climate change legislation including AB 32 and SB 375. The limited availability of transportation funds for the COG requires a high degree of project development and prioritization so that the region, cities and county can benefit from all modes of transportation. The 2011 update will emphasize a regional approach to RTP issues and make recommendations relative to the integration of land use and transportation, commodity flows, and adequately address environmental and quality of life issues. In addition, the 2011 RTP will reflect a fiscally constrained environment and identify those projects (considered as Tier 1 projects) that have a secure or approved funding source. This list of Tier 1 projects is provided in Appendix A of this initial study.

Regional Transportation Plan

The 2011 Regional Transportation Plan will be multi-modal in scope. The RTP will address all of the elements of a modern transportation system, including roads, transit, non-motorized, aviation, goods movements, and potentially passenger rail. Special sections will address land-use, environmental quality, available funding and monitoring RTP implementation. The RTP will also address the 30-Year Transportation Expenditure Plan and how it will affect the future transportation system.

The RTP will present various alternatives or strategies, each representing a different focus or philosophy for transportation expenditures. The RTP will identify a "preferred alternative" that reflects not only the most efficient transportation system, but meets all federal and state requirements including "financial constraint." The RTP will reflect the current SAFETEA-LU (Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users) requirements, and will provide goals, objectives and strategies to allow for implementation of the preferred alternative. Additionally, the RTP must comply with Caltrans Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines (Gov. Code Sec. 14522). New federal transportation legislation will also be addressed during the development of the RTP.

The RTP project list shall be coordinated with the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) currently being prepared by StanCOG. The CMP serves to mitigate projects that produce congestion, a key factor addressed in the RTP.

The final draft of the RTP project list is attached to this initial study (Attachment A).

Regional Expressway Analysis

A Regional Expressway Analysis will also be prepared and will serve as an informational foundation for the RTP. This analysis will go beyond a road-centric analysis by considering a multi-modal system. The intent of the Analysis is to identify the deficiencies and possible improvements to the expressway system in Stanislaus County with connections to both San Joaquin and Merced County. The Regional Expressway Analysis will include a comprehensive multi-modal look at the expressway system in Stanislaus County, including the connections to the neighboring counties, an inventory of the system, identifying the deficiencies and the unused capacity, and making recommendations on the system.

Sustainable Communities Strategy

As noted previously, the 2011 RTP effort will include a first look at Sustainable Communities Strategies concepts for land use to help achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions that are consistent with climate change legislation including AB 32 and SB 375. A Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) is an enhanced land use element that sets forth a growth strategy for the region which strives towards achieving GHG emissions reductions and helps meet California's climate change goals. The California Air Resources Board (ARB) will not have the emissions targets available in time for the adoption of this RTP. However, the intent is to address SCS concepts in the RTP with the most current information available. The future 2015 RTP will include a full SCS.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting.

Stanislaus County is located in the heart of California's Central Valley, just east of the San Francisco Bay area and south of the cities of Sacramento and Stockton. It is also located in the northern portion of the eight-county San Joaquin Valley, the southernmost area of two areas that comprise the Great Central Valley (the San Joaquin Valley and the Sacramento Valley). Stanislaus County encompasses 1,521 square miles of land and is bounded by San Joaquin County to the north, Merced County to the south, Calaveras and Tuolumne Counties to the east, and Santa Clara County to the west. Land use in Stanislaus County is predominantly agricultural, with most of the County zoned for general agricultural use under the Stanislaus County General Plan. During the past four decades, Stanislaus County has been evolving from a rural, agricultural region to an area that includes incorporated cities and towns, most of which lie along local highways and freeways, such as Interstate 5 and State Route (SR) 99.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required

The RTP is developed by StanCOG, in accordance with the principals and in coordination with the agencies described above. StanCOG's Policy Board (Board) is responsible for adopting the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan. As part of the approval process, the StanCOG Board will certify the Final EIR in accordance with CEQA and with the appropriate findings, adopt a Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan (MMRP), and, if necessary, adopt a Statement of Overriding Consideration for any environmental effects that cannot feasibly be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Future local actions associated with individual transportation projects associated with the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Project-level environmental review;
- Approval of project design;
- Granting or procuring rights-of-way;
- Approval of engineering improvement plans; and
- Approval of construction bidding.

Additional subsequent approvals and permits that may be required from other agencies are identified below.

- Individual transportation projects involving the use of federal funds may be subject to the National Environmental Policy Act and other federal laws, and consultation with federal agencies may be required, based upon site conditions and the results of environmental review.
- A lead agency may be required to obtain a permit from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District for the construction of a proposed transportation project to address temporary emissions from construction equipment.
- A lead agency may be required, based on project designs and the results of environmental review for an individual project, to obtain National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System general and individual permits under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act for storm water drainage. These permits are issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region. In addition, the lead agency for each project must prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.
- Based on the environmental review associated with an individual project, a lead agency may need to procure a Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for fill of jurisdictional waters and/or a Section 401 Water Quality Certification or waiver from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Based on the location and environmental review associated with individual projects, a lead agency may need to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to obtain a biological opinion with regard to protected species.
- Based on the environmental review and analysis associated with an individual project, the lead agency may be required to obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code.
- For federally funded projects, consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act may be required to address potential impacts to cultural and historic resources.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The proposed project could potentially affect the environmental factor(s) checked below. The following pages present a more detailed checklist and discussion of each environmental factor.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology, Soils and Seismicity |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Land Use Planning |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial study:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, no further environmental documentation is required.



Signature

Brian J. Grattidge

Printed Name

January 7, 2010

Date

Vince Harris, Executive Director

For

Environmental Checklist

CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3) provides direction on the purpose of an initial study in regards to the preparation of an EIR. This section states that if an EIR is required, an initial study can assist in the preparation of the EIR, by (a) focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant, and (b) identifying the effects determined not to be significant. The lead agency (StanCOG) has determined that an EIR is necessary for the 2011 RTP. For this reason, the initial study identifies potentially significant environmental effects, but does not identify specific mitigation measures. The Draft EIR will consider the environmental effects identified below, and will describe feasible mitigation measures for those impacts found to be significant after further analysis.

Aesthetics

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1. AESTHETICS—Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway corridor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a-c) Construction of projects included in the RTP could result in impacts to scenic resources and/or scenic vistas. Most projects would occur in urbanized areas. However, some improvements in the smaller rural and suburban communities could significantly affect scenic views as well as neighborhood area character. Additionally, portions of the regional corridor projects would pass through agricultural areas and along the edges of urbanized areas. These impacts are potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- d) Construction of projects included in the RTP could result in substantial creation or change in light or glare. Proposed project improvements along roadways could create substantial new sources of light or glare. East-west asphalt transportation routes reflect glare from the sun during summer months that could impact motorists as well as adjacent land uses. Installation of overhead lighting could introduce a new source of light during nighttime hours, affecting views and casting light on adjacent properties. This impact is potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

Agricultural Resources

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES				
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.				
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) As of 2004, the County contained 8,501 acres of Prime Farmland, and 4,894 acres of Important Farmland (including statewide, unique, and locally important farmland). The construction of transportation facilities, included in the RTP, could result in the direct conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses (roadways). This impact is potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- b) Williamson Act contract lands account for approximately 70 percent of the land area in Stanislaus County. It is likely that at least some of the proposed facilities would displace or impair current or reasonably foreseeable agricultural operations on Williamson Act contract lands. This impact is considered to be potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- c) Some of the roadway projects may create short-term (construction) or long-term (operational) impacts to adjacent farmlands. Indirect effects have the potential to result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

Air Quality

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
3. AIR QUALITY				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has jurisdiction over most stationary source air quality matters in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB). The SJVAB is designated nonattainment for the federal and state ozone, PM10, and PM2.5 ambient air quality standards. Projects contained within the RTP may conflict with applicable air quality plans. Conformity analysis (for the Federal Clean Air Act) is part of the RTP process. This impact is potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

- b-d) Regional corridor projects and local traffic improvements and road maintenance projects would generate short-term increases in emissions resulting from a variety of construction-related activities (grading, excavation, employee vehicle and construction equipment exhaust, etc.). Wind-blown dust in construction areas would also contribute to fugitive dust and PM10 emissions. The RTP could also result in an increase in operational emissions of criteria air pollutants (ROG, NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5) from on-road motor vehicle traffic. These impacts are considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

- e) Because offensive odors rarely cause any physical harm and no requirements for their control are included in state or national air quality regulations, the SJVAPCD has no rules or standards related to odor emissions, other than its nuisance rule. Any actions related to odors are based on citizen complaints to local government agencies including the SJVAPCD. The SJVAPCD uses screening distances to determine the potential for odor impacts from various land uses. Land uses typically associated with odor nuisances are confined animal facilities such as dairies and feedlots, wastewater treatment facilities, and other industrial

uses. The transportation and roadway projects included in the RTP would not involve development of the types of land uses typically associated with odor issues. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Biological Resources

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES— Would the project:				
a) 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a, d) Construction and maintenance activities associated with regional corridor and local traffic improvement projects could result in the direct loss or indirect disturbance of special-status wildlife or their habitats, which are known to occur or could occur in the County. Impacts on special-status wildlife or their habitat could result in a substantial reduction in local population size, lowered reproductive success, or habitat fragmentation (including loss of migration corridors resulting from the construction of permanent transportation structures or features). These impacts are considered potentially significant. A list of

special status species known to occur in the region, as well as an evaluation of potential impacts to these species will be provided in the EIR.

- b) Construction activities could result in the disturbance or removal of riparian habitat. This impact could result in long-term degradation of a sensitive plant community, fragmentation or isolation of an important wildlife habitat, and disruption of natural wildlife movement corridors. This impact is considered to be potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- c) Construction could result in the disturbance or loss of waters of the United States, including creeks, rivers, streams, vernal pools, marshes, and other types of seasonal and perennial wetland communities. Wetlands and other waters of the United States could be affected through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption (including dewatering), alteration of bed and bank, and other construction-related activities. This impact is potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- e) Construction activities could result in conflicts with local policies or ordinances that protect locally significant biological resources, including heritage or native trees. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- f) Stanislaus County and its nine incorporated cities currently do not have any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) or Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) under the federal and state endangered species acts. No HCPs or NCCPs are known to be currently in development that could be adopted prior to approval of the 2011 RTP. Therefore there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Cultural Resources

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES— Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) Historic architectural resources may be impacted either directly through the demolition/relocation of bridges or other transportation infrastructure, or indirectly through significant changes in the historical setting of these structures as new transportation features are developed. Demolition of historically significant buildings is unlikely, but would be considered to be a significant impact to the environment. Therefore this impact is potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- b) Trenching and other subsurface excavation in areas known to contain archaeological sites, or suspected to have such sites, would disturb or destroy significant cultural resources. Additionally, sediment removal and other forms of excavation activities associated with roadway construction or other similar projects could result in significant impacts to unknown or poorly recorded cultural resources. Areas within the County constitute numerous physiographic contexts that would have been favorable for human settlement prehistorically. This impact is considered to be potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- c) Much of the area surrounding the project areas are unlikely to be underlain by fossil-bearing rock units. However, significant fossil discoveries can be made even in areas designated as having low potential and may result from the excavation activities related to the project. Excavation activities can affect these resources. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.
- d) As with all projects that involve ground disturbing activities and excavation, it is possible that project construction activities may result in the discovery of human remains. State and local laws are in place to cover these unexpected discoveries. Disturbance of human remains is a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6. GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY— Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<u>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</u>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a.i-a.iv) Buildings, roads, bridges and paved areas are potentially subject to damage from earthquakes. Ground shaking is an unavoidable hazard for facilities in the San Francisco Bay and San Joaquin/Sacramento Valleys region. Ground shaking within the RTP area could cause significant damage, if not collapse, of proposed structures if not constructed in accordance with applicable 2001 CBC requirements for Seismic Zone 3. These impacts are potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- b) Construction has the potential to expose bare soil to precipitation and subsequent entrainment in surface runoff. Construction activities involving soil disturbance, excavation, cutting/filling, and grading activities could result in increased erosion and sedimentation to surface waters. This impact is potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- c) In the event of an earthquake in the San Francisco Bay Region or along the east and west sides of the San Joaquin/Sacramento Valleys, seismic hazards related to ground shaking could occur in the RTP area. Liquefaction of localized unconsolidated sand deposits in areas of high groundwater could result in lateral spreading and settlement of soils beneath projects included in the RTP. This impact is potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- d) Typically, soils that exhibit expansive characteristics comprise the upper five feet of the ground surface. The effects of expansive soils could damage foundations of aboveground structures, paved roads and streets, and concrete slabs. Expansion and contraction of these soils, depending on the season and the amount of surface water infiltration, could exert enough pressure on structures to result in cracking, settlement, and uplift. Geotechnical investigations are required to determine expansion potential on individual sites, and cannot

be determined at a regional scale. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

- e) The RTP does not include any projects that would involve the construction or use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. There would be no impact. Therefore, this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<u>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</u>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) Operations of new and improved roadways would include use of these roadways by vehicles carrying potentially hazardous materials (gasoline tanks, etc.). Routine transport of hazardous

materials on project roadways represents a potentially significant impact. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- b) Construction could expose workers and residents to hazardous materials from accidental release of toxic chemicals and miscellaneous wastes during construction. During construction it is anticipated that limited quantities of miscellaneous hazardous substances, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, solvents, or oils, would be used. In addition, project operations would include the use of fuels and other hazardous materials. Accidental releases could pose both a hazard to construction employees as well as the environment. This is considered a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.
- c) Elementary, Junior High and Senior High schools are located throughout Stanislaus County within cities and unincorporated areas. New and improved roadways and other facilities included in the RTP may result in the construction and operation of projects within one-quarter mile of existing or proposed schools. Potentially hazardous materials would be used during construction of these projects. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.
- d) Construction of the transportation improvements could expose workers and residents to hazardous wastes or materials that are excavated, disturbed, or exposed during construction trenching or tunneling. Various hazardous waste or materials sites are currently located within Stanislaus County. Previously unidentified hazardous waste or materials sites could also be encountered during construction of individual projects included in the RTP. Consequently, construction could result in the exposure of workers or residents to hazardous wastes or materials, posing potential threats to their health. This is considered a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.
- e, f) Public and private airports in the jurisdiction of the Airport Land Use Commission (Commission) in Stanislaus County include Modesto City-County Airport (Harry Sham Field), Oakdale Municipal Airport, Patterson Airport, and Turlock Airpark. New and improved roadways and other facilities included in the RTP may result in land use conflicts and safety hazards associated with the proximity of these public and private airports and air strips. These impacts are considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- g) Emergency response and evacuation plans rely on clear access to area roadways during times of emergency. Construction work on roadways or within their rights-of-way have the potential to impair access for emergency needs. This impact is potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- h) The RTP does not propose to build habitable structures. For this reason, it is not anticipated that the project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. This impact is less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Hydrology and Water Quality

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY— Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of a site or area through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or by other means, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of a site or area through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or, by other means, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a, f) Construction could potentially violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or degrade surface or groundwater quality. The construction and long-term operation could result in significant water quality impacts to local waterways throughout the County, including the San Joaquin River, Stanislaus River, Tuolumne River, Dry Creek, Orestimba Creek, Hetch Hetchy Aqueduct, and several unnamed drainages. Construction activities involving soil disturbance, excavation, cutting/filling, stockpiling, and grading activities

- could result in increased erosion and sedimentation to surface waters. In addition, hazardous materials associated with construction equipment could adversely affect surface and groundwater quality if spilled or stored improperly. These impacts are potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- b) The San Joaquin groundwater basin is a vast aquifer extending north and south through the Central Valley and consisting of unconsolidated sediments derived from the Coast Ranges and the Sierra Nevada Mountains. Groundwater recharge in the County comes mostly from surface application of water from agricultural irrigation. Widening roadways and the construction of new roadways would result in an increase of paved (impermeable) surfaces. However, the average contribution to groundwater from percolating rainwater is considered minimal by the County. This direct impact is less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIR. Indirect effects to groundwater supply and groundwater recharge will be discussed in the growth inducement analysis in the EIR.
- c, d) Land clearing and grading associated with some of the projects included in the RTP would alter the existing drainage patterns within the vicinity of the individual projects and could result in excess soil erosion that would reach nearby wetlands and other waterways. The RTP would introduce new impervious surfaces, such as asphalt, that would prevent the natural drainage and infiltration of storm water through the soil. Surface water runoff generated from undeveloped, unpaved areas has greater volume and rate when the site is paved and the capability of surface water infiltration is reduced or eliminated. Increases in impervious surfaces and the resulting increases of surface water runoff volumes and rates can produce considerable changes to downstream hydrology in areas where portions of the drainage system are converted from pervious to impervious surfaces. These impacts are potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- e) The increase in impervious surfaces associated with road widening and new transportation projects are expected to contribute to a slight increase in runoff peak flows and volumes, compared to existing conditions. If post construction flows are not controlled, scouring and localized flooding could occur. As noted in the discussion for “c, d”, above, projects could create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater management systems due to increased impervious surfaces. This is considered a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.
- g) No housing is included as part of the RTP. Consequently, there will be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.
- h, i) Numerous dams are located upstream of the various project sites. The three major rivers, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne, which traverse Stanislaus County, have dams and large reservoirs located upstream from the County. The risk of flooding from dam failure is considered very low, since each of these dam structures are subject to a rigorous annual inspection program and the proposed transportation improvement projects would not affect their current structural integrity. Additionally, the RTP does not propose to

build habitable structures. For these reasons, it is not anticipated that the project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. This impact is less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIR.

- j) The RTP would not increase the likelihood of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Tsunamis originating in the Pacific Ocean would dissipate in the San Francisco Bay, and therefore, pose a negligible hazard to the County. The probability of a seiche occurring in the San Joaquin River, the Stanislaus River, the Tuolumne River, or in one of the many upstream reservoirs is considered minimal. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant and it will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Land Use and Land Use Planning

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING— Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) Implementation of the RTP could result in the physical division of an established community through the construction of individual transportation projects. The RTP includes a variety of projects within the cities and unincorporated County areas that could include, but are not limited to, widening, intersection improvements, road extension, and reconstruction. While most transportation projects undergo extensive design and planning phases to help minimize social (i.e., relocation, etc.) and environmental impacts, widening highways and limiting access to local streets from expressways may physically divide an established community. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- b) Implementation of the RTP could result in the potential for conflicts between highway projects and relevant land use plans. Transportation facilities included in the RTP could conflict with County and city land use policies and designations, including but not limited to, a general plan circulation element. The coordination of land use and transportation policy

is a part of the RTP development process. Nevertheless, conflicts would be considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

- c) Stanislaus County and its nine incorporated cities currently do not have any Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) under Section 10 of ESA. No HCPs or NCCPs are known to be currently in development and it is not expected that any will be adopted prior to conclusion of the CEQA process for the 2011 RTP. Therefore there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Mineral Resources

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
10. MINERAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a, b) According to the Stanislaus County General Plan, mineral resources located within the RTP area are primarily sand and gravel deposits. Small deposits of gold, clay and lead are also known to exist. The General Plan notes that the majority of sand and gravel deposits are situated beneath prime agricultural soils and riparian areas (old stream beds and adjacent to streams and rivers). Implementation of the RTP could result in the construction of transportation project on or near mineral resources which could affect their availability or value to other residents of the state. The potential loss of availability of mineral resources is considered a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.

Noise

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11. NOISE—Would the project:				
a) Result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a, c) Traffic associated with some transportation projects would result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the roadways. Improvements to roadways may lessen congestion and lead to less noise associated with vehicle idling. On the other hand, the increase in roadway capacity and average vehicle speeds could encourage vehicle use and lead to higher noise levels along these roadways in the future. Also, at some locations adjacent to noise-sensitive uses, it is possible that local planning standards and FHWA/Caltrans noise abatement criteria would be violated and that substantial increases in noise would occur. As described in the 2007 RTP, traffic noise from improvement projects, when compared to the existing scenario, would also exceed local planning standards and FHWA/Caltrans noise abatement criteria. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- b) Groundborne noise and vibration are typically associated with pile driving and heavy duty equipment operation in close proximity to vibration sensitive structures or receptors. The RTP includes replacement of several bridge structures that may require pile driving. Other groundborne noise and vibration may occur during construction of individual RTP projects. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- d) Construction and grading activities associated with individual project construction would temporarily and intermittently increase noise levels at nearby sensitive receptor locations.

Noise-generating construction activities associated with these projects could include demolition, grading and earthmoving activities, hauling of materials, roadway construction activities, and building of structures. Residences and other noise-sensitive uses adjacent to construction sites could be exposed to construction noise. Noise from construction-related activities has the potential to be substantially above exterior ambient sound levels. This impact is potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

- e, f) Airports within the RTP area include Modesto City-County Airport (Harry Sham Field), Oakdale Municipal Airport, Patterson Airport, and Turlock Airpark. Improvements at existing air facilities included in the RTP may result in noise conflicts associated with the proximity of these public and private airports and air strips to surrounding sensitive land uses. These impacts are considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

Population and Housing

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING— Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) Implementation of the RTP includes the construction of new and/or the expansion of existing transportation facilities which could indirectly induce population growth within portions of the County. While many of these transportation projects are designed to provide an adequate level of service to accommodate planned growth that is described and evaluated under the various general plans for Stanislaus County or cities within the County, the EIR for this RTP will evaluate the growth inducing impacts of the proposed RTP.
- b, c) Implementation of the RTP includes a variety of projects within the cities and unincorporated County areas that could include, but are not limited to, widening, intersection improvements, road extension, and reconstruction activities. While most transportation projects undergo extensive design and planning phases to help minimize social (i.e., relocation, etc.) and environmental impacts, widening highways and new transportation facilities can result in the displacement of existing housing units or commercial/retail structures. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

Public Services

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13. PUBLIC SERVICES— Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

ai-av) Implementation of the RTP would not result in the direct need for additional public services. This issue is not addressed further in the EIR.

Recreation

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14. RECREATION—Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b) Implementation of the RTP would not result in the direct need for additional parks and recreation services. This issue is not addressed further in the EIR.

Transportation and Traffic

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC— Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., conflict with policies promoting bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) Implementation of the RTP includes the expansion of existing and/or the construction of new transportation facilities. Expansion of this infrastructure has the potential to indirectly induce population growth in an area. While many of these transportation projects are designed to provide an adequate level of service to accommodate planned growth that is described and evaluated under the various general plans for Stanislaus County or cities within the County, implementation of the RTP could lead to an increase in traffic and vehicle trips through out the County. This impact remains potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- b) Traffic associated with projects in the RTP could violate, either individually or cumulatively, an LOS standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways and could create the need for capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities. Projects could add capacity to the regional roadway system through Stanislaus County. In creating greater capacity along existing or future roadway corridors, additional vehicles would presumably utilize these facilities. While the RTP projects would serve to improve LOS regionally and locally, projects could potentially introduce additional traffic to other local roadways thereby impacting LOS and creating the need for greater capacity or other improvements on those roadways. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

- c) The RTP includes some airport improvement projects. The potential for these projects to expand airports or increase flight capacity will be addressed in the EIR.
- d) Construction of RTP projects could result in the alteration of present patterns of vehicular circulation, increased traffic delay, and increased traffic hazards. Construction could result in lane or road closures, detours, open trenches on bikeway facilities or closure of bikeway facilities, and addition of construction trucks and equipment on the surrounding roadway system. This impact is considered potentially significant because construction could lead to traffic delays, temporary reductions in roadway LOS, damage to property, or injury. This impact will be addressed in the EIR.
- e) Emergency response and evacuation plans rely on clear access to area roadways during times of emergency. Construction work on roadways or within road rights-of-way have the potential to impair access for emergency needs. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.
- f) The project would not create direct needs for additional parking. Indirect impacts related to growth inducement will be discussed in the growth analysis section of the EIR.
- g) The RTP includes non-motorized facilities. In addition to local planning efforts, StanCOG prepared the *2008 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan* to identify the existing bicycle and pedestrian services and conditions, evaluate the need for improvements to the existing conditions, and develop a plan for increased future use. The transportation improvements included in the RTP are not expected to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. This impact is less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Utilities and Service Systems

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:				
a) Conflict with wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-g) Implementation of the RTP would not result in the direct need for additional utility or service systems. This issue is not addressed further in the EIR.

Energy

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
ENERGY—Would the project:				
a) Result in a substantial increase in overall per capita energy consumption?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new sources of energy supplies or additional energy infrastructure capacity the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Conflict with applicable energy efficiency policies or standards?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-d) Energy usage related to vehicle miles traveled will be considered in the EIR. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions related to energy usage will be analyzed. Energy usage and associated GHG emissions are considered potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE— Would the project:				
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) The project could impact fish or wildlife species or habitat, and could impact known historical resources. These impacts will be addressed in the Biological Resources and Cultural Resources sections of the EIR.
- b) The implementation of the project may result in impacts which are “cumulatively considerable” when added to impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. The potential cumulative impacts of the RTP will be examined in the EIR.
- c) Potential adverse effects to human beings, including air emissions, noise, and exposure to hazardous materials, will be examined in the EIR.

References

- StanCOG 2007a. Stanislaus Council of Governments. *2007 Regional Transportation Plan*. Approved 2007.
- StanCOG 2007b. Stanislaus Council of Governments. *2007 Regional Transportation Plan Final Supplemental Program EIR*. SCH No. 200122087. Certified May 2007.
- StanCOG 2008a. Stanislaus Council of Governments. *2008 Transportation Sales Tax Program Final EIR*. SCH No. 2008032118. Certified June 2008.
- StanCOG 2008b. Stanislaus Council of Governments. *2008 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan*. Prepared by Alta Planning + Design. September 2008
- Stanislaus County 1994. Stanislaus County General Plan Supporting Document – Conservation Element. Approved 1994.

Appendix A

RTP Project List



StanCOG 2011 Regional Transportation Plan
Tier I ROADWAY Projects

Project Details						Purpose/Need			
Location	Project Limits	Description	Total Cost	Construction Year	Funding Source	System Preserv.	Capacity Enhance.	Safety	Alt. Mode
Stanislaus Council of Governments									
SR-132	SR-132 Connectivity to SR-99		\$526,051,900	2028	STIP, IIP, Tax Measure		x		
SR-99	Carpenter Rd to San Joaquin County Line	Widen 6 to 8 lanes	\$128,006,000	2028	STIP, IIP, Tax Measure		x		
Total State			\$654,057,900						
Stanislaus County									
SR-99	SR-99 & Kiernan Ave (SR-219)	Interchange Replacement	\$66,150,500	2015	STIP, PFF		x		
SR-99	SR-99 & Hammett Rd	Interchange Replacement	\$172,094,500	2026	STIP, PFF		x		
North County Corridor	McHenry Ave to SR-120/108	Phase I: Construct 4-6 Lane Expressway	\$701,402,500	2028	STIP		x		
McHenry Ave	McHenry Ave @ Stanislaus River Bridge	Seismic Bridge Replacement	\$21,493,000	2015	HBP, PFF	x	x		
Shiloh Rd	Shiloh Rd @ Tuolumne River Bridge	Seismic Bridge Retrofit	\$1,648,000	2010	HBP, PFF	x			
Crows Landing Rd	Crows Landing Rd. & Grayson Rd	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$2,163,000	2010	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Las Palmas Ave	Las Palmas Ave & Elm Ave	Install Traffic Signal; Intersection Improvements	\$746,800	2010	PFF		x	x	
Las Palmas Ave	Las Palmas Ave & Sycamore Ave	Install Traffic Signal; Intersection Improvements	\$947,600	2010	PFF		x	x	
Santa Fe Ave & Terminal Ave	BNSF Railroad	Upgrade Railroad Crossings	\$601,000	2012	Section 130			x	
Albers Rd	Claribel Rd to Milnes Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$8,958,100	2022	PFF		x		
Hatch Rd	Faith Home Rd to Clinton Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$2,684,100	2010	PFF		x	x	
McHenry Ave	Ladd Rd to Houge Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$4,615,000	2011	STIP, PFF		x		
Crows Landing Rd	San Joaquin River Bridge	Seismic Bridge Replacement - 3-lane Bridge	\$10,609,000	2011	HBP/LSSRP	x	x		
Geer Rd	Geer Rd @ Tuolumne River Bridge	Seismic Bridge Retrofit	\$1,591,400	2011	HBP/LSSRP	x			
Grayson Rd	Grayson Rd @ Laird Slough Bridge	Seismic Bridge Retrofit	\$515,000	2010	HBP	x			
Hickman Rd	Hickman Rd @ Tuolumne River	Seismic Bridge Replacement	\$14,631,700	2013	HBP/LSSRP	x		x	
Hills Ferry Rd	Hills Ferry Rd @ San Joaquin River	Seismic Bridge Retrofit - Mandatory	\$1,125,600	2013	HBP/LSSRP	x			

Pete Miller Rd	Pete Miller Rd @ Delta Mendota Canal Bridge	Seismic Bridge Retrofit	\$546,400	2012	HBP/LSSRP	x			
Santa Fe Ave	Santa Fe Ave @ Tuolumne River Bridge	Seismic Bridge Replacement	\$25,504,100	2014	HBP/LSSRP	x	x		
Seventh St	Seventh St @ Tuolumne River Bridge	Seismic Bridge Replacement; 4 lane bridge with pedestrian access	\$35,666,400	2016	HBP	x	x		x
Claribel Rd	Claribel Rd & Coffee Rd	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches to 5 lanes	\$2,251,100	2013	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Crows Landing Rd	Crows Landing Rd & Hatch Rd	Upgrade Existing Traffic Signal & Intersection Infrastructure	\$499,600	2010	HSIP	x		x	
Crows Landing Rd	Crows Landing Rd & Keyes Rd	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$2,227,900	2011	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Crows Landing Rd	Crows Landing Rd & W. Main St	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$3,076,700	2011	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Crows Landing Rd	Crows Landing Rd & Fulkerth Ave	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$2,994,300	2015	PFF		x	x	
S. 9th St	S. 9th St & Latimer Ave	Extend left turn pocket (SB)	\$135,100	2013	HSIP			x	
Claribel Rd	McHenry Ave to Oakdale Rd	Widen to 5 lanes	\$15,875,400	2013	STIP, PFF		x		
Kiernan Ave (SR 219)	Dale Rd to McHenry Ave	Widen to 4-lane Expressway	\$139,610,800	2018	STIP		x		
Kilburn Rd	Kilburn Rd @ Orestimba Creek Bridge	Replace Bridge (Critical)	\$2,388,200	2015	HBP				
Crows Landing Rd	Crows Landing Rd & Carpenter Rd	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$2,975,200	2026	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Carpenter Rd	Carpenter Rd & Grayson Rd	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$2,533,600	2017	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Carpenter Rd	Carpenter Rd & Hatch Rd	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$1,791,100	2015	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Carpenter Rd	Carpenter Rd & Keyes Rd	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$2,768,500	2020	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Carpenter Rd	Carpenter Rd & W. Main St	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$3,074,700	2016	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Carpenter Rd	Carpenter Rd & Whitmore Ave	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$2,149,300	2015	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
W. Main St	W. Main St & Central Ave	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$6,523,900	2018	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Claribel Rd	Claribel Rd & Roselle Ave	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$2,388,200	2015	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Golden State Blvd	Golden State Blvd & Golf Rd / Berkeley Ave	Intersection Improvements	\$2,388,200	2015	CMAQ, PFF				

Santa Fe Ave	Santa Fe Ave & East Ave	Install Traffic Signal, New Railroad Crossing; Improve Approaches as Necessary	\$2,609,600	2018	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Santa Fe Ave	Santa Fe Ave & Keyes Rd	Install Traffic Signal; Upgrade Railroad Crossing Equipment; Widen Approaches	\$4,537,800	2023	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Santa Fe Ave	Santa Fe Ave & Main St	Install Traffic Signal; Upgrade Railroad Crossing Equipment; Widen Approaches	\$4,405,700	2022	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Santa Fe Ave	Santa Fe Ave & Service Rd	Install Traffic Signal; Upgrade Railroad Crossing Equipment; Widen Approaches	\$4,537,800	2023	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
W. Main St	W. Main St & Faith Home Rd	Install Traffic Signal; Widen Approaches	\$3,176,500	2023	CMAQ, PFF		x	x	
Carpenter Rd	Whitmore Ave to Keyes Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$5,534,500	2016	PFF		x		
Carpenter Rd	Keyes Rd to Monte Vista Ave	Widen to 3 lanes	\$3,783,900	2018	PFF		x		
Carpenter Rd	Monte Vista Ave to W. Main St	Widen to 3 lanes	\$3,737,500	2020	PFF		x		
Claus Rd	Terminal Ave to Claribel Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$2,648,600	2024	PFF		x		
Crows Landing Rd	Keyes Rd to Monte Vista Ave	Widen to 3 lanes	\$2,185,500	2012	PFF		x		
Crows Landing Rd	Monte Vista Ave to W. Main St	Widen to 3 lanes	\$2,388,200	2015	PFF		x		
Crows Landing Rd	W. Main St to Harding Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$2,533,600	2017	PFF		x		
Crows Landing Rd	Harding Rd to Carpenter Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$3,091,100	2019	PFF		x		
Crows Landing Rd	Carpenter Rd to River Rd/ Marshall Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$1,425,800	2021	PFF		x		
Crows Landing Rd	River Rd/Marshall Rd to SR-33	Widen to 3 lanes	\$15,112,300	2024	PFF		x		
Geer Rd	Taylor Rd to Santa Fe Ave	Widen to 3 lanes	\$4,418,000	2015	PFF		x		
Geer Rd	Santa Fe Ave to Hatch Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$3,927,000	2017	PFF		x		
Geer Rd	Hatch Rd to SR-132	Widen to 3 lanes	\$3,628,600	2019	PFF		x		
Albers Rd	SR-132 to Milnes Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$10,433,400	2028	PFF		x		
McHenry Ave	Houge Rd to San Joaquin County Line	Widen to 3 lanes	\$8,891,600	2013	STIP, PFF		x		
Santa Fe Ave	Keyes Rd to Geer Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$4,405,700	2022	PFF		x		
Santa Fe Ave	Geer to Hughson City Limit	Widen to 3 lanes	\$3,116,000	2024	PFF		x		
Santa Fe Ave	Hatch to Tuolumne River	Widen to 3 lanes	\$2,809,900	2026	PFF		x		
W. Main St	San Joaquin River to Carpenter Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$5,398,600	2020	PFF		x		
W. Main St	Carpenter Rd to Crows Landing Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$3,151,500	2013	PFF		x		
W. Main St	Crows Landing Rd to Mitchell Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$5,288,500	2016	PFF		x		

W. Main St	Mitchell Rd to Washington Rd	Widen to 3 lanes	\$3,783,900	2018	PFF		x		
Total County			\$1,390,306,600						
City of Ceres									
Central Ave	Central Ave & Don Pedro Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$257,500	2010	CMAQ		x	x	
Central Ave	Redwood Rd & Central Ave and Grayson Rd & Central Ave	Install Traffic Signals	\$1,066,700	2020	PFF		x	x	
Mitchell Rd	Mitchell Rd & Don Pedro Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$265,300	2011	CMAQ		x	x	
Various Locations	Various Locations	Install Traffic Signals	\$8,028,200	2030	CMAQ		x	x	
Crows Landing Rd	New Industrial St	Install Traffic Signal	\$296,300	2020	PFF		x	x	
Morgan Rd	Service Rd & Morgan Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$776,200	2015	PFF		x	x	
Service Rd	Blaker Rd & Service Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$360,500	2010	Prop 1B		x	x	
Various Locations	Various Locations	Reconstruct Major Streets (Annual Basis)	\$24,320,400	2030	RSTP	x			
Various Locations	Various Locations	Reconstruct various Alleys (Annual Basis)	\$335,300	2010	Prop 1B	x			
SR-99	Mitchell Rd/Service Rd	Construct New Interchange	\$174,598,200	2015	PFF		x		
Central Ave	Hatch Rd to Grayson Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$11,145,400	2025	PFF		x		
Crows Landing Rd	Service Rd to Grayson Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$4,526,500	2030	PFF		x		
Faith Home Rd	Grayson Rd to N of River Crossing	New 6-lane expressway	\$44,625,900	2030	PFF		x		
Grayson Rd	Ustick Rd to Central Ave	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$2,752,000	2030	PFF		x		
Hatch Rd	Herndon Rd to Faith Home Rd	Widen from 4 to 6-lane expressway & intersection	\$32,319,300	2030	PFF		x		
Hatch Rd	Hatch Rd & SR-99	Construct new Overpass	\$7,110,700	2030	PFF		x		
Mitchell Rd	River Rd to Service Rd	Widen to 4 lanes	\$10,705,500	2025	PFF		x		
Mitchell Rd	Service Rd to Grayson Rd	Widen to 6 lanes	\$4,760,300	2030	PFF		x		
Morgan Rd	7th St to Grayson Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$1,361,200	2020	PFF		x		
Service Rd	Ustick Rd to Faith Home Rd	Widen from 2 to 4-lane expressway	\$77,368,300	2030	PFF		x		
Whitmore Ave	Ustick Rd to Faith Home Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$3,400,800	2020	PFF		x		
Total City of Ceres			\$410,380,500						
City of Hughson									
Sante Fe Ave	Santa Fe Ave & Tully Rd / Pine St	Reconfigure Intersection; Intersection Improvements	\$1,935,900	2013	RSTP		x		
Locust St	Dominic Ave to Euclid Ave	Construct new 2-lane Minor Collector	\$1,107,400	2020	RSTP, Dev. Impact Fees		x		
Tully Rd	Tully Rd at Irrigation Canal Bridge	Widen bridge over Irrigation Canal to 3-lanes	\$802,400	2025	RSTP, Dev. Impact Fees		x		
Fox Rd	Fox Rd & 7th St	Intersection Improvements	\$285,200	2021	RSTP, Dev. Impact Fees		x		
Fox Rd	Fox Rd & Tully Rd	Intersection Improvements	\$293,800	2022	RSTP, Dev. Impact Fees		x		

Santa Fe Ave	Santa Fe Ave & Whitmore Ave	Intersection Improvements	\$492,000	2016	RSTP, Dev. Impact Fees		x		
7th St	Whitmore Ave to Santa Fe Ave	Improve to 2-lane Major Collector	\$1,344,000	2019	RSTP, Dev. Impact Fees		x		
Fox Rd	Fox Glen Dr to Geer Rd	Improve to 2-lane Constrained Major Collector	\$1,815,200	2023	RSTP, Dev. Impact Fees		x		
Whitmore Ave	Whitmore Ave @ BNSF Railroad Crossing	Grade Crossing Improvements	\$615,000	2016	RSTP		x		
Tully Rd	Santa Fe Ave to Whitmore Ave	Improvements to 2-lane Arterial	\$1,125,600	2013	RSTP		x	x	
Euclid Ave	Hatch Rd to Whitmore Ave	Construct 2-lane Major Collector	\$1,957,200	2018	Dev. Impact Fees		x		
Mountain View Rd	Hatch Rd to Santa Fe Ave	Construct new 2-lane street extension	\$950,100	2017	Dev. Impact Fees, Prop 42, RDA		x		
Santa Fe Ave	Santa Fe Ave & 7th St	Relocate Intersection and Intersection Improvements	\$2,304,600	2015	Impact Fees, Prop 42		x	x	
Total City of Hughson			\$15,028,400						
City of Modesto									
SR-99	SR-99 & Pelandale Interchange	Reconstruct to 8-lane Interchange	\$69,092,800	2014	STIP, STP, CFF		x		
SR-99	SR-99 & Standiford Interchange	Reconstruct to 8-lane Interchange	\$29,851,400	2015	STIP, STP, CFF		x		
SR-132	SR-99 to West of Dakota/Nebraska	Construct 4-lane Freeway	\$62,290,600	2020	STIP		x		
SR-99	SR-99 & Briggsmore Interchange	Reconstruct to 8-lane Interchange	\$89,975,300	2020	STIP, CFF		x		
Sylvan Ave	Coffee Rd to Oakdale Rd	Roadway Rehabilitation	\$2,121,800	2011	STP	x			
Pelandale Ave	Sisk Rd to Dale Rd	Roadway Rehabilitation	\$2,121,800	2011	STP	x			
Oakdale Rd	Scenic Dr to Oakdale Rd	Roadway Rehabilitation	\$5,304,500	2011	STP	x			
Needham St	12th St to L St	Roadway Rehabilitation	\$1,533,100	2014	STP	x			
Tuolumne Blvd	Roselawn Ave to Madera Ave	Roadway Rehabilitation	\$1,620,700	2014	STP	x			
Rosemore Ave	Kansas Ave to Blue Gum Ave	Widen Roadway to 2-lane collector and Rehabilitation	\$1,669,400	2014	STP	x	x		
Morton Blvd	Tuolumne Blvd to Yosemite Blvd (SR-132)	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$4,844,600	2015	STP		x		
Blue Gum Ave	Poust Rd to Rosemore Ave	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$6,028,100	2015	STP, CMAQ		x		
Claratina Ave	Coffee Rd to Oakdale Rd	Widen from 2 to 6 lanes	\$7,508,300	2015	CFF		x		
Oakdale Rd	Sylvan Ave to Floyd Ave	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$8,012,600	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Dale Rd	Kiernan Ave to Ladd Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$8,597,200	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
E. Briggsmore Ave	Claus Rd to GP Boundary (see Modesto General Plan)	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$8,664,600	2015	CFF		x		
Dale Rd	Pelandale Ave to Standiford Ave	Widen from 2 to 6 lanes	\$9,786,500	2015	CFF		x		

Kansas Ave	Morse Rd to 8th St.	Widen intersection to full extent of roadway (2-lanes)	\$10,030,100	2015	CMAQ		x		
Dale Rd	Pelandale Ave to Kiernan Ave	Widen from 2 to 6 lanes	\$10,975,800	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Oakdale Rd	Sylvan Ave to Claratina Ave	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$11,964,500	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Oakdale Rd	Floyd Ave to Briggsmore Ave	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$12,113,500	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Sylvan Ave	Roselle Ave to Claus Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$12,678,000	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
New Road between Finney and Dakota	Beckwith Rd to Murphy Rd	Construct 4-lane Minor Arterial	\$15,939,200	2015	CFF, DEVELOPER		x		
Pelandale/Claratina Expressway	Oakdale Rd to Roselle Ave	Extend as 6-lane Arterial	\$16,023,800	2015	CFF		x		
Pelandale/Claratina Expressway	McHenry Ave to Coffee Rd	Widen from 2 to 6-lane Expressway	\$17,910,800	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Standiford Ave	Dale Rd to Prescott Rd	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$19,316,500	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Coffee Rd	Mable Ave to Scenic Dr	Widen intersection to full extent of roadway (4-lanes)	\$19,343,700	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Paradise Rd	Carpenter Rd to Sutter Ave	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$21,558,900	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Roselle Ave	Floyd Ave to Claribel Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$29,660,300	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Beckwith Rd	SR 99 to GP Boundary	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$46,333,100	2015	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Briggsmore Ave	Prescott Rd to Oakdale Rd	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$58,942,300	2015	CFF		x		
I St	14th St to Downey Ave	Roadway Rehabilitation	\$2,129,600	2020	CMAQ, CFF	x			
B St	9th St to 12th St	Roadway Rehabilitation	\$3,629,500	2020	CMAQ, CFF	x			
Prescott Rd	Briggsmore Ave to Bangs Ave	Improve Intersections to full extent of roadway (4-lanes)	\$4,152,800	2020	CMAQ		x		
G St	Sierra Dr to 17th St	Roadway Rehabilitation	\$6,187,600	2020	CMAQ, CFF	x			
Woodland Ave	Carpenter Rd to Kearney Ave	Widen to 4 lanes	\$17,074,300	2020	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Floyd Ave	Oakdale Rd to 1,000 feet west of Oakdale Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$24,916,300	2020	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Brink Rd	Finney Rd to Carpenter Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$34,092,100	2020	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Crows Landing Rd	SR-99 to 7th St	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$9,243,200	2025	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Tully Rd	Pelandale Ave to GP Boundary	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$13,887,800	2025	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Carpenter Rd	Hatch Rd to Paradise Rd	Widen to 6 lane expressway	\$16,776,300	2025	CMAQ, CFF		x		
McHenry Ave	Standiford Ave to GP Boundary	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$16,785,900	2025	STIP		x		
Claus Rd	Briggsmore Ave to Sylvan Ave	Widen from 2 to 6 lane expressway	\$20,764,300	2025	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Mitchell Rd	Yosemite Blvd (SR-132) to	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$21,929,300	2025	CMAQ, CFF		x		

Claus Rd	Sylvan Ave to Claribel Rd	Widen from 2 to 6-lane expressway	\$23,560,300	2025	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Crows Landing Rd	Whitmore Ave to SR-99	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$31,212,900	2025	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Scenic Dr	Oakdale Rd to Claus Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$66,773,800	2025	CMAQ, CFF		x		
Total City of Modesto			\$934,929,800						
City of Newman									
Yolo Ave	R St to S St	Reconstruct Roadway	\$581,400	2020	RSTP	x			
SR-33	Inyo Ave	Install Traffic Signal	\$709,100	2013	CMAQ, CFF, Developer		x	x	
SR-33 (North)	Yolo St to 2,700' N	Install 4 Lane Arterial Roadway Improvements	\$5,453,900	2020	CMAQ, CFF, Developer		x		
Total City of Newman			\$6,744,400						
City of Oakdale									
G St	Maag Ave	Install Traffic Signal	\$318,300	2011	CMAQ		x		
Warnerville Rd	Yosemite Ave to Kaufman Rd	Construct New 4-lane Roadway	\$4,371,000	2012	CFF, Grants		x		
Kaufman Rd	Greger St to Patterson Rd	Widen Roadway to 4-lanes	\$2,813,800	2013	CFF, Grants		x		
SR 120	Oakdale Plaza	Install Traffic Signal	\$371,400	2011	CFF, Developer		x	x	
D St	Rodeo to Stearns Rd	Construct New 2-lane Roadway	\$2,892,200	2014	CFF, Grants, STIP		x		
Sierra Rd	5th St to Stearns Rd	Widen Roadways to 4-lanes	\$3,298,300	2020	CFF, RSTP, CMAQ		x		
F St	Maag Ave to Stearns Rd	Widen Roadway to 5-lanes	\$2,824,000	2015	CFF, RSTP, CMAQ		x		
Orsi Rd	Sierra Rd to F St	Construct New 2-lane Roadway	\$2,326,100	2015	CFF, STIP, Developer		x		
F St	Orsi Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$382,500	2012	CFF, RSTP, CMAQ		x	x	
Stearns Rd	A St to F St	Widen Roadway to 4-lanes	\$1,284,500	2014	CFF, Developer		x		
Stearns Rd	F St to Sierra Rd	Widen Roadway to 4-lanes	\$2,020,100	2015	CFF, Developer		x		
Total City of Oakdale			\$22,902,200						
City of Patterson									
Sperry Ave	Ward Ave to SR-33	Widen to 4-lanes; Realign and Reconstruct Roadway	\$7,164,400	2015	Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
2nd St (SR-33)	2nd St & Sperry Ave	Signalize and Realign Intersection	\$3,582,200	2015	Dev. Fees, CMAQ		x	x	
Sperry Ave	S. 1st St to Locust Ave	Construct new 3-lane Roadway Segment	\$5,970,300	2015	Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		

I-5	I-5 & Sperry Rd	Reconstruct Sperry Ave Interchange. Widen Sperry Ave (Rogers Rd to I-5)	\$13,842,400	2020	Dev. Fees, STIP		x		
Sperry Ave	Sperry Ave & Rogers Rd	Intersection Improvements	\$919,000	2020	Traffic Impact Fees		x		
Sperry Ave	Sperry Ave & American Eagle Dr	Intersection Improvements	\$771,800	2015	Traffic Impact Fees		x		
Sperry Ave	Sperry Ave & Las Palmas Ave	Install Traffic Signal	\$449,700	2015	Traffic Impact Fees		x	x	
Sperry Ave	Sperry Ave & Ward Ave	Intersection Improvements	\$895,600	2015	Traffic Impact Fees		x		
Sperry Ave	Sperry Ave & Del Puerto Ave	Intersection Improvements	\$1,194,400	2020	Traffic Impact Fees		x		
2nd St (SR-33)	2nd St & Las Palmas Ave	Intersection Improvements	\$392,100	2020	Traffic Impact Fees		x		
Ward Ave	Ward Ave & Salado Ave	Intersection Improvements	\$588,300	2020	Traffic Impact Fees		x		
SR-33	SR-33 & Zacharias Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$2,137,200	2020	Traffic Impact Fees		x	x	
SR-33	SR-33 & Baldwin Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$1,905,200	2020	Traffic Impact Fees		x	x	
SR-33	SR-33 & Rogers Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$1,832,600	2020	Traffic Impact Fees		x	x	
Total City of Patterson			\$41,645,200						
City of Riverbank									
Atchison St (SR-108)	Atchison St (SR-108) & Claus Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$1,432,900	2015	Dev. Fees		x	x	
Callander Ave (SR-108)	Callander Ave (SR-108) & Santa Fe Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$1,432,900	2015	Dev. Fees, Traffic Impact Fees		x	x	
Claus Rd	Claus Rd & Kentucky Ave	Install Traffic Signal	\$1,925,700	2025	Dev. Fees, Traffic Impact Fees		x	x	
Roselle Ave	Roselle Ave & Claribel Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$1,432,900	2015	Dev. Fees, Traffic Impact Fees		x	x	
Claus Rd	Claus Rd & Terminal Ave	Install Traffic Signal and Realign Intersection	\$4,814,200	2025	Dev. Fees, Traffic Impact Fees		x	x	
Central Ave	Kentucky Ave to Claribel Rd / Eleanor Rd (NCC Interchange)	Reconstruct Roadway and Extend Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk	\$37,205,900	2030	Dev. Fees, Traffic Impact Fees	x	x		
Eleanor Ave	Claribel Rd to Atchison Rd (NCC interchange)	Reconstruct Roadway and Extend Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk	\$37,205,900	2030	Dev. Fees, Traffic Impact Fees	x	x		

Atchison St (SR-108)	Atchison St (SR-108) & 1st St	Construct right-hand turn lane on SB First St Approach	\$1,925,700	2025	Dev. Fees, Traffic Impact Fees		x		
Roselle Ave	Santa Fe St to Claribel Rd	Reconstruct Roadway and Extend Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk	\$6,418,900	2025	Dev. Fees	x			
Terminal Ave	Patterson Rd to Claribel Rd	Reconstruct Roadway and Extend Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk	\$3,209,500	2025	Dev. Fees	x			
Claus Rd	Patterson Rd to Claribel Rd	Reconstruct Roadway and Extend Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk	\$7,979,600	2025	Dev. Fees	x			
Patterson Rd	Claus Rd to First St	Reconstruct Roadway and Extend Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk	\$6,265,300	2025	Dev. Fees	x			
Claribel Rd	Claus Rd to Oakdale Rd	Reconstruct Roadway and Extend Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk	\$6,490,600	2025	Dev. Fees	x			
Santa Fe St	Santa Fe St & BNSF Railroad	Install Grade Separation facilities	\$4,172,300	2025	Dev. Fees, Traffic Impact Fees, BTA			x	
Total City of Riverbank			\$121,912,300						
City of Turlock									
SR-99	SR-99 & Fulkerth Rd	Reconstruct Interchange	\$13,842,400	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Fulkerth Rd	Dianne to SR-99	Widen from 2 to 5-lane Arterial	\$336,400	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
W. Main St	Tegner Rd to Walnut Rd	Widen existing 2-5 lanes to 6-lane Arterial	\$2,227,400	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
W. Main St	Washington Rd to Tegner Rd	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$3,005,700	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Fulkerth Rd	Tegner Rd to Dianne Dr	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$672,800	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Monte Vista Ave	Olive Ave to Berkeley Ave	Install Median; Add one (1) lane	\$1,439,700	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Fulkerth Rd	Washington Rd to Tegner Rd	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$6,176,500	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Washington Rd	Linwood Ave to Fulkerth Rd	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$2,378,200	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Tegner Rd	Linwood Ave to W. Main St	Construct new 2-lane Industrial Collector	\$474,800	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
W. Canal Dr	SR-99 to Tegner Rd	Construct new 2-lane Collector	\$3,957,400	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
N. Olive Ave	Tuolumne Rd to Tornell Rd	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$827,800	2020	Dev. Fees		x		

N. Olive Ave	Canal Dr to Wayside Rd	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$1,080,000	2025	Dev. Fees		x		
N. Olive Ave	Wayside Dr to North Ave	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$970,400	2020	Dev. Fees		x		
W. Linwood Ave	Walnut Rd to Lander Ave	Widen from 2-lane to 3-lane Collector	\$1,048,200	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
W. Linwood Ave	Walnut Rd to Washington Rd	Widen from 2-lane to 3-lane Collector	\$6,178,700	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
W. Canal Dr	Washington Rd to Kilroy Rd	Construct new 2-lane Collector	\$4,528,900	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
East Ave	Golden State Blvd to Daubenberger Rd	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$6,937,100	2030	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Golden State Blvd	Taylor Rd to Monte Vista Ave	Complete 6-lane Boulevard	\$3,617,100	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Golden State Blvd	Monte Vista Ave to Fulkerth Rd	Complete 6-lane Boulevard	\$3,634,700	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
N. Kilroy Ave	W. Main St to W. Canal Dr	Construct new Collector	\$1,091,300	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Tegner Rd	Monte Vista Ave to Fulkerth Rd	Complete 2-lane Industrial Collector	\$736,800	2015	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Tegner Rd	Fulkerth Rd to north of Pedretti	Construct new 2-lane	\$1,088,100	2020	CMAQ,		x		
Monte Vista Ave	Washington Rd to SR-99	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$420,900	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Taylor Rd	Tegner Rd to Golden State Blvd	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Collector	\$552,400	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
S. Kilroy Ave	Spengler Way to W. Linwood Ave	Construct new Industrial Collector	\$1,020,600	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Lander Ave	Simmons Rd to SR-99	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$1,143,000	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Taylor Rd	Golden State Blvd to SR-99	Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial	\$131,600	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
W. Main St	Walnut Rd to SR-99	Widen from 5-lane to 6-lane Arterial	\$28,682,700	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Tegner Rd	W. Main St to Fulkerth Rd	Construct new 2-lane Industrial Collector	\$3,055,100	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Waring Rd	Hawkeye Ave to Linwood Ave	Construct new 2-lane Collector	\$7,116,800	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
Golden State Blvd	Golden State Blvd & F St	Install Traffic Signal	\$579,200	2012	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
SR-99	Lander Ave (SR-165) to S. City Limits	Construct New Interchange	\$42,786,800	2030	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, STIP		x		
SR-99	W. Main St	Construct New Interchange	\$24,742,000	2030	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, STIP		x		
SR-99	Taylor Rd	Reconstruct existing Interchange	\$9,746,100	2030	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, STIP		x		

Washington Rd	Linwood Ave to Monte Vista Ave	Construct 4-lane Expressway	\$39,267,300	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, STIP		x		
Golden State Blvd	Golden State Blvd & Taylor Rd	Widen Intersection from 2 to 4 lanes	\$3,408,100	2030	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x		
W. Main St	W. Main St & Washington Rd	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$310,500	2015	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
W. Main St	W. Main St & Tegner Rd	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$360,000	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
W. Main St	W. Main St & Dianne Dr	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$360,000	2020	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
W. Main St	W. Main St & Kilroy Rd	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$321,000	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
W. Linwood Ave	W. Linwood Ave & Washington Rd	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$321,000	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
W. Linwood Ave	W. Linwood Ave & Tegner Rd	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$321,000	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
W. Linwood Ave	W. Linwood Ave & Kilroy Rd	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$321,000	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
W. Linwood Ave	W. Linwood Ave & Walnut Rd	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$321,000	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
Tegner Rd	Tegner Rd & Spengler Way	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$321,000	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
W. Canal Dr	W. Canal Dr & Tegner Rd	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$321,000	2025	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
W. Canal Dr	W. Canal Dr & Washington Rd	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$431,400	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
W. Canal Dr	W. Canal Dr & Fransil Ln	Install Traffic Signal, Widen Approaches	\$431,400	2035	CMAQ, Dev. Fees, RSTP		x	x	
Total City of Turlock			\$246,070,400						
City of Waterford									
E St and Bentley St	E St from Main St to Yosemite Blvd (SR 132) and Bentley St from F St to D St	Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk; and Bike/ Pedestrian Improvements	\$1,591,400	2011	CMAQ, TE	x			x
Yosemite Blvd (SR-132)	Yosemite Blvd & Western Ave	Install Traffic Signal; Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk Improvements	\$874,200	2012	CMAQ, RSTP, HSIP		x	x	
Reinway Ave; Kadota Ave; and Welch St	Safe Routes to School Projects	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk; and Bike/Pedestrian Improvements	\$506,800	2017	SR2S	x			x
Yosemite Blvd (SR-132)	Yosemite Blvd & Tim Bell Rd	Re-align Intersection; Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk Improvements	\$2,790,500	2030	CMAQ, RSTP, Dev. Fees			x	
Total City of Waterford			\$5,762,900						
Total Tier I Roadway Costs			\$3,849,740,600						

StanCOG 2011 Regional Transportation Plan
Tier II ROADWAY Projects

Project Details					Purpose/Need			
Location	Project Limits	Description	Total Cost	Construction Year	System Preserv.	Capacity Enhance.	Safety	Alt. Mode
Stanislaus County								
North County Corridor	SR-99 to McHenry Ave	Construct 4-8 Lane Expressway	\$1,725,273,100	2035		x		
Total County			\$1,725,273,100					
City of Ceres								
Crows Landing Rd	Crows Landing Rd & Grayson Rd	Install Traffic Signals	\$415,300	2020		x		
Crows Landing Rd	Crows Landing Rd & Hackett Rd	Install Traffic Signals	\$427,800	2021		x		
Grayson Rd	Grayson Rd & Central Ave	Install Traffic Signals	\$1,174,900	2022		x		
Grayson Rd	Grayson Rd & Morgan Rd	Install Traffic Signals	\$1,210,100	2023		x		
Hatch Rd	Hatch Rd & Faith Home Rd	Install Traffic Signals	\$0	2024		x		
SR-99	Hatch Rd & SR-99	Reconstruct Interchange	\$0	2020				
Roeding Rd	Roeding Rd & Faith Home Rd	Install Traffic Signals	\$0	2025		x		
Whitmore Ave	Whitmore Ave & Boothe Rd	Install Traffic Signals	\$0	2026		x		
Whitmore Ave	Whitmore Ave & Faith Home Rd	Install Traffic Signals	\$0	2027		x		
Total City of Ceres			\$3,228,100					
City of Hughson								
Santa Fe Ave	Hatch Rd to N. City Limit	Widen to 4-lane Expressway	\$13,174,500	2017		x		
Santa Fe Ave	N. City Limit to S. City Limit	Widen to 4-lane Arterial	\$9,374,100	2017		x		
Hatch Rd	Santa Fe Ave to Geer Rd	Widen to 4-lane Expressway	\$26,617,400	2018		x		
Total City of Hughson			\$49,166,000					
City of Modesto								
Hatch Rd	Crows Landing Rd to SR-99	Widen to 4 lane expressway	\$31,623,000	2025		x		

Hatch Rd	Carpenter Rd to Crows Landing Rd	Widen to 4 lane expressway	\$39,545,200	2025		x		
El Vista Ave/Oakdale Rd	Briggsmore Ave to Yosemite Blvd	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$47,858,200	2025		x		
Morse Rd	Shoemake Ave to new Brink Ave	Construct 4-lane road	\$17,361,700	2025		x		
Carpenter Rd	Whitmore Ave to Hatch Rd	Widen to 6-lane expressway	\$18,873,300	2025		x		
Tully Rd	Standiford St to Pelandale Ave	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$9,628,300	2025		x		
Shoemake Ave	Morse Rd to Brink Ave	Widen from 2 to 4-lane expressway	\$20,485,100	2025		x		
Oakdale Rd	Claribel Rd to Claratina Ave	Widen from 2 to 6 lanes	\$14,251,800	2025		x		
Prescott Rd	Bangs Ave to GP City Limits	Construct 2 to 4 lanes	\$15,661,300	2025		x		
Yosemite Blvd (SR-132)	Sante Fe Ave to City Limit	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$5,861,700	2025		x		
Dakota Ave	North Ave to Salida Blvd	Widen from 2 to 6 lanes	\$36,543,800	2020		x		
Whitmore Ave	Carpenter Rd to Morgan Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$40,993,900	2020		x		
Carpenter Rd	Maze Blvd (SR-132) to SR-99	Widen to 6-lane Expressway	\$32,749,900	2020		x		
Carpenter Rd	Paradise Rd to Maze Blvd (SR-132)	Widen to 6-lane Arterial	\$21,256,900	2020		x		
Maze Blvd	MID Lateral #5 to SR-99	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$27,201,500	2015		x		
Briggsmore Ave	Oakdale Rd to Roselle Ave	Widen from 4 to 6-lane Expressway	\$21,090,400	2015		x		
Paradise Rd	Carpenter Rd to GP Boundary (see Modesto General Plan)	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$16,748,800	2015		x		
Briggsmore Ave	Roselle Ave to Claus Rd	Widen from 4 to 6-lane Expressway	\$17,403,600	2015		x		
Claratina Ave	Roselle Ave to BNSF RR	Construct 4-lane Arterial	\$15,907,700	2015		x		
Morgan Rd	Hatch Rd to Whitmore Ave	Widen Roadway to 4-lanes	\$12,685,200	2015		x		
Maze Blvd	Morse Rd to MID Lateral #5	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$13,857,300	2015		x		
Coffee Rd	Mable Ave to Claribel Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$14,365,900	2015		x		
Morse Rd	California Ave to Brink Ave	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$11,119,100	2015		x		
Lincoln Ave	Yosemite Blvd (SR-132) to Scenic Dr	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$10,626,200	2015		x		
Lakewood Ave	Scenic Dr to Briggsmore Ave	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$8,944,000	2015		x		

Norseman Dr	Yosemite Blvd (SR-132) to End	Construct two-lane Collector	\$5,281,600	2015		x		
Nebraska Ave	Maze Blvd (SR-132) to Service Rd	Widen Roadway to 4-lanes	\$2,367,100	2015		x		
Mariposa Rd	Yosemite Blvd (SR-132) to Beaver Creek Ct	Widening at intersections	\$1,432,900	2015		x		
SR 132 East	SR-99 to Santa Fe Ave	Improved connection to SR-99 (may include new interchange at SR-99 and widening of SR-132)	\$128,376,600	2025		x		
SR-99	Ceres to Kiernan Ave (SR 219)	Widen to 8 lanes	\$144,423,600	2025		x		
9th St	Carpenter Rd to River Rd	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$25,354,400	2025		x		
Scenic Dr	Rose Ave to Oakdale Rd	Widen to 6 lanes	\$19,102,500	2020				
Sylvan Ave	Oakdale Rd to Roselle Ave	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$21,870,900	2020		x		
McHenry Ave	Approx. Coralwood Rd to Claratina Ave - West side	Widen from 6 to 8 lanes	\$16,207,600	2025		x		
McHenry Ave	Briggsmore Ave to Needham St	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$29,851,400	2015		x		
Briggsmore Extension - East	Claus Rd to Albers Rd	New 4-lane expressway	\$21,256,300	2020		x		
Claus Rd	Briggsmore Ave to Claribel Rd	New 6-lane expressway	\$16,448,300	2025		x		
Standiford Ave/ Sylvan Ave	Prescott Rd to Oakdale Rd	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$17,972,800	2025		x		
Briggsmore Ave	Sisk Rd to Claus Rd	Widen to 6 lanes	\$40,689,000	2025		x		
Carpenter Rd	Maze Blvd (SR 132) to Hatch Rd	Widen to 4 lanes	\$24,391,600	2025		x		
Claribel Rd	McHenry Ave to Claus Rd	Widen to 4 lanes	\$40,117,700	2025		x		
Claus Rd	Yosemite Blvd (SR 132) to Claribel Rd	Widen to 4 lanes	\$12,837,700	2025		x		
Parker Rd ALT to Briggsmore Ave	East of Claus Rd to Albers Rd	New 4/5-lane expressway	\$19,256,500	2025		x		
7th St	Morgan Rd to K St	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (Excluding bridge)	\$14,442,400	2025		x		
Lincoln/Lakewood Bridge	Lincoln/Lakewood Rd @ Dry Creek Bridge	Construct a new bridge Crossing over Dry Creek	\$7,221,500	2025		x		
Total City of Modesto			\$599,820,800					
City of Newman								
Inyo Ave	L St to Canal School Rd	Reconstruct Roadway	\$3,367,700	2020		x	x	
Canal School Rd	Inyo Ave to Hills Ferry Rd	Reconstruct Roadway	\$2,686,000	2020		x	x	
Hills Ferry Rd	Driskell Ave to Brookhaven Dr	Reconstruct Roadway	\$2,686,000	2020		x	x	

SR-33 (South)	Inyo Ave to 1,750' S	Install 4 Lane Arterial Roadway Improvements	\$3,925,000	2020		x	x	
Total City of Newman			\$12,664,700					
City of Oakdale								
Yosemite Ave	Warnerville Rd to Patterson Rd	Widen Roadway to 4 lanes	\$3,541,100	2020		x		
Orsi Rd	Sierra Rd to Warnerville Rd	Construct New 2-lane Roadway	\$7,783,000	2025		x		
Crane Rd	Greger St to Patterson Rd	Widen Roadway to 5-lanes	\$5,616,500	2025		x		
Walnut St	Willow Glen Ave to Crane Rd	Construct New 2-lane Roadway	\$2,964,200	2020		x		
J St	Orsi Rd to Stearns Rd	Construct New 2-lane Roadway	\$2,224,200	2025		x		
Crane Rd	Crane Rd & Patterson Rd	Install Traffic Signal	\$401,200	2025		x		
Orsi Rd	Orsi Rd & J St	Install Traffic Signal	\$401,200	2025		x		
Crane Rd	West Bridge to F St	Widen Roadway to 4 lanes	\$5,896,900	2020		x		
Crane Rd	Crane Rd @ Stanislaus River	Construct Crane Rd Bridge	\$40,178,100	2030		x		
Lexington Ave	Crane Rd to Yosemite Ave	Construct New 4-lane Roadway	\$7,433,800	2030		x		
Yosemite Ave	Lexington Ave	Install Traffic Signal	\$744,200	2030		x		
Crane Rd	Lexington Ave	Install Traffic Signal	\$465,100	2030		x		
Lexington Ave	Yosemite Ave to Stearns Rd	Construct New 4-lane Roadway	\$5,391,500	2035		x		
Willowood Dr	Extend from Greger St to Patterson Rd	Construct New 2-lane Roadway	\$6,418,900	2025		x		
Poplar St	Extend from Lee Ave to Crane Rd	Construct New 2-lane Roadway	\$3,460,600	2020		x		
Various Locations	Various Intersections	Six (6) new Traffic Signals	\$3,019,300	2035		x		
North County Corridor	Various Locations	Associated Improvements	\$20,909,800	2030		x		
Total City of Oakdale			\$116,849,600					
City of Patterson								
I-5	San Joaquin County Line to Sperry Ave	Widen 4-6 lanes (San Joaquin CL to Sperry Ave)	\$152,039,700	2035		x		
Zacharias Rd	Raines Rd to I-5	Extend Zacharias Rd west and construct new Interchange at I-5	\$111,617,700	2030		x		
North Expressway	Las Palmas Ave to San Joaquin River	Construct new 4-lane expressway to Las Palmas Ave at San Joaquin River	\$65,793,000	2025		x		

Rogers Rd	Delta Mendota to Zacharias Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$11,073,900	2020		x		
Rogers Rd	South of Sperry Ave	New 5-lane Collector Street	\$9,689,700	2020		x		
Park Center Dr	South of Sperry Ave	New 3-lane Collector Street	\$5,970,300	2015		x		
Baldwin Rd	Keystone Pacific Pkwy to Zacharias Rd	Widen 2 to 4 lanes	\$5,970,300	2015		x		
Ward Ave	SR 33 to Patterson City Limits	Widen 2 to 4 lanes and realign intersection	\$23,532,000	2020		x		
SR 33	Within Patterson City Limits	Widen 3 to 5 lanes within Patterson City Limits.	\$69,761,100	2030		x		
M St	Ward Ave to 1st St	Widen to 4-lanes	\$16,047,100	2025		x		
Orange Ave	Locust Ave to Sycamore Ave.	Widen from 2 to 3 lanes (Add center turn lane)	\$27,684,700	2020		x		
South Expressway	S of Las Palmas from W of San Joaquin River to Sperry Rd & I-5 Interchange	Construct new 4-lane Expressway	\$38,818,700	2035		x		
Total City of Patterson			\$537,998,200					
City of Turlock								
East Ave	Santa Fe Ave to Turlock City Limit	New 4/5-lane expressway	\$40,926,500	2030		x		
Golden State Blvd	Monte Vista Ave to Berkeley Rd	New 4-lane expressway	\$44,542,300	2035		x		
Taylor Rd	Washington Rd to Golden State Blvd	Construct 4-lane expressway	\$7,100,800	2030		x		
E. Linwood Ave	Berkeley Ave to Johnson Rd	Construct new 4-lane expressway	\$14,384,500	2035		x		
E. Linwood Ave	Golden State Blvd to Waring Rd	Widen from 2 to 4-Lane Collector	\$3,682,300	2030				
Monte Vista Ave	Berkeley Ave to Quincy Rd	Widen from 2 to 4-lane Arterial	\$6,124,800	2035		x		
Taylor Rd	Golden State Blvd to Berkeley Ave	Widen to 4-lanes	\$39,508,800	2035		x		
Total City of Turlock			\$156,270,000					
City of Waterford								
Church St	Main St to Rose Ct	Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk; Right-of-Way; and Drainage	\$826,500	2026	x			
S Western Ave	Washington Rd to Riverside Rd	Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk; and Right-of-Way	\$58,000	2014	x			
F St	F St & La Gallina Ave	Re-align and Reconstruct Intersection	\$1,315,200	2028			x	

Skyline Blvd	Yosemite Blvd to Bentley St	Re-construct; Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk, Drainage Improvements	\$2,709,200	2029	x				
Hickman Rd	Hickman Rd @ Waterford Bridge	Hickman Bridge Replacement (Waterford Portion)	\$107,600	2019	x				
C St, Covey St	Covey St from Tim Bell Rd to C St; C St from Covey St to Welch St	Reconstruct; Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk; and Right-of-Way	\$401,200	2025					
Pasadena Ave	Yosemite Blvd (SR 132) to Kadota Ave	Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk; Right-of-Way; and Overlay	\$389,500	2024	x				
Kadota Ave	Reinway Ave to Pasadena Ave	Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk; and Right-of-Way	\$558,100	2030					
Riverside Rd	Western Ave to Yosemite Blvd (SR 132)	Reconstruct; SD Facilities, Guard Rail	\$808,800	2035	x				
Total City of Waterford			\$7,174,100						
Total Tier II Roadway Costs			\$3,862,502,500						

StanCOG 2011 Regional Transportation Plan
Tier I BICYCLE and PEDESTRIAN Projects

Project Details						Purpose/Need			
Location	Project Limits	Description	Total Cost	Construct. Year	Funding Source	System Preserv.	Capacity Enhance.	Safety	Alt. Mode
Stanislaus County									
Claribel Rd	Oakdale Rd to McHenry Ave	Add Class I bike path in conjunction with Claribel roadway widening	\$1,890,900	2013	STIP, TE, PFF				x
Pirrone Rd	Hammett Rd to Pelandale Rd	Add Class II bike lanes	\$281,400	2013	TE, CMAQ				x
Total County			\$1,890,900						
City of Ceres									
Hatch Rd	Payne Ave to Central Ave	Hatch Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase III	\$257,500	2010	CMAQ				x
Hatch Rd	Richland Ave to Central Ave	Construct Bike/Ped Facility (3 phases)	\$265,300	2011	CMAQ				x
Mitchell Rd	TID Lateral from Hatch Rd to Fowler Rd	Mitchell Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase I	\$281,400	2013	CMAQ				x
Mitchell Rd	TID Lateral from Fowler Rd to Whitmore Ave	Mitchell Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase II	\$298,600	2015	CMAQ				x
Mitchell Rd	TID Lateral From Whitmore Ave to Roeding Rd	Mitchell Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase III	\$316,700	2017	CMAQ				x
Mitchell Rd	TID Lateral from Roeding Rd to Service Rd	Mitchell Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase IV	\$326,200	2018	CMAQ				x
Hatch Rd	East Gate Blvd. to Faith Home Rd	Hatch Rd TID Bike/Ped Project - Phase IV	\$401,200	2025	CMAQ				x
Various Locations	Various Locations	Misc. Bike/Pedestrian Facility Projects	\$346,100	2020	CMAQ				
Mitchell Rd	TID Lateral from Service Rd to Rhode Rd	Mitchell Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase V	\$8,028,800	2030	CMAQ				x
Total City of Ceres			\$10,521,800						
City of Hughson									
Citywide	Various Locations	Construct Class I, Class II, Class III Bikeway Improvements (Per Master Plan)	\$164,000	2012	BTA, CMAQ				x
Hatch Rd	Santa Fe Ave to Geer Rd	Construct Class I Bike Path	\$675,400	2013	CMAQ				x
Whitmore Ave and 7th St	Whitmore Ave (600' E) and 7th St (600' S)	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk, Pedestrian Improvements	\$1,507,100	2014	CMAQ				x
Locust St	Tully Rd to 7th St	Sidewalk In-Fill	\$283,300	2010	CMAQ				x

Hughson Ave	Santa Fe Ave to 7th St	Streetscape Improvements - ADA & TE improvements	\$1,194,100	2015	CMAQ				x
Walker Ln / 2nd St	Tully Rd to Fox Rd	Sidewalk In-Fill	\$347,800	2014	CMAQ				x
Whitmore Ave	Southside of Whitmore between Santa Fe Ave & 7th St	Sidewalk In-Fill	\$418,000	2015	Assessment District, CMAQ				x
Total City of Hughson			\$4,589,700						
City of Modesto									
G St	9th St	Railroad crossing improvements - Tied to Roadway Project	\$34,800	2014	CMAQ, CFF				x
G St	8th St	Railroad crossing improvements - Tied to Roadway Project	\$34,800	2014	CMAQ, CFF				x
G St	1st St to 9th St	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$58,000	2014	CMAQ, CFF				x
G St	9th St to Burney	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$69,600	2014	CMAQ, CFF				x
Pelandale Ave	SR-99 Overpass	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$300	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Burney St	G St to 19th St	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$600	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Lakewood Dr	Scenic Dr to 300' North of Scenic Dr	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$600	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Roselle Ave	200' South of Talbot to 200' South of Turpin	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$600	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Maze Blvd (SR 132)	Emerald Ave to Carpenter Rd	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$1,200	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Maze Blvd (SR 132)	Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr to Emerald Ave	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$1,200	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Roselle Ave	MID Lateral to Pocket Ave	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$1,200	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Roselle Ave	Pocket Ave to North Rosebrook Dr	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$1,200	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Roselle Ave	100' North of Turpin to Patterson Rd	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$1,800	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Brink Ave	Collegiate Lane to North Ave	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$2,200	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Lakewood Ave	150' South of Laramie Dr to Briggsmore Ave	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$2,400	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Sylvan Ave	Boyce Lane to Oakdale Rd	Signage/stripping- Tied to Roadway Project	\$2,400	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Roselle Ave	Briggsmore Ave to Floyd Ave	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$4,200	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x

Pelandale Rd	Dale Rd to Tully Rd	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$5,100	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Standiford Ave	West of Prescott Rd to Dale Rd	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$6,000	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Paradise Rd	Sutter Ave to Ohio Ave	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$8,400	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
1st St	G St to Paradise Rd	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$12,000	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Burney St	19th St to Scenic Dr	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$12,000	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Lakewood Ave	Middleboro Place to 150' South of Laramie Dr	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$12,000	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Roselle Ave	200' South of Turpin to 100' North of Turpin	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$12,000	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Maze Blvd (SR 132)	Carpenter Rd to Paradise Rd	Signage/stripping or widening	\$16,800	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Lakewood Ave	300' North of Scenic Dr to Middleboro Place	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$23,900	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
14th St	D St to H St	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$35,900	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Dale Rd	Pelandale Ave to Snyder Ave	Widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$35,900	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
La Loma Ave	at Dry Creek	Railroad crossing improvements - Tied to Roadway Project	\$35,900	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Lincoln Ave	at Dry Creek	Railroad crossing improvements - Tied to Roadway Project	\$35,900	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Paradise Rd	1st St to Sutter Ave	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$47,800	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Oakdale Rd	Sylvan Ave to Mable Ave	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$59,800	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Dale Rd	Standiford Ave to Snyder Ave	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$83,600	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Roselle Ave	Floyd Ave to Sylvan Ave	Widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$83,600	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x

Oakdale Rd	Sylvan Ave to Floyd Ave	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$95,600	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Carpenter Rd	Maze Blvd (SR 132) to Blue Gum Ave	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$167,200	2015	CMAQ, CFF				x
Scenic Dr	Downey Ave to Bodem St	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$27,700	2020	CMAQ, CFF				x
Scenic Dr	Oakdale Rd to McGuire Dr	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$27,700	2020	CMAQ, CFF				x
Scenic Dr	Coffee Rd to Rose	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$69,300	2020	CMAQ, CFF				x
Scenic Dr	Rose Ave to Oakdale Rd	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$69,300	2020	CMAQ, CFF				x
Scenic Dr	Bodem St to Coffee Rd	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$83,100	2020	CMAQ, CFF				x
MID Canal System	MID Lateral 5 and 6	Construction Improvements - Class I Trail along MID Lateral 5 & 6	\$27,684,700	2020	CMAQ, CFF				x
Hetch Hetchy ROW	Semallon Dr to Riverbank	Construction Improvements - Class I Trail	\$27,684,700	2020	CMAQ, CFF				x
9th St	Tully Rd to Coldwell Ave	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$1,300	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
El Vista Ave	Scenic Dr to Edgebrook Dr	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$1,700	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Oakdale Rd	Pouty Way to SR 108	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$2,500	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
7th St	H St to B St	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$4,100	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Claus Rd	Scenic Dr to Yosemite Blvd (SR 132)	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$4,200	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Yosemite Blvd (SR 132)	La Loma Ave to Groveland St	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$6,500	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Mitchell Rd	Yosemite Blvd (SR 132) to Finch Rd	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$9,700	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Claus Rd	Briggsmore Ave to Townsend Ave	Signage/Striping	\$12,600	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Briggsmore Ave	McHenry Ave to Held Dr	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$13,500	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x

Briggsmore Ave	McHenry Ave to Prescott Rd	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$14,500	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
El Vista Ave	Encina Ave to Roble Ave	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$16,100	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Yosemite Blvd (SR 132)	La Loma Ave to Frazine Rd	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$20,900	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
9th St (SR 132)	H St to J St	Widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$32,100	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
El Vista Ave	Edgebrook Dr to Ellis St	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$32,100	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
El Vista Ave	Ellis St to Encina Ave	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$32,100	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
9th St	Needham St to Tully Rd	Widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$32,100	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Oakdale Rd	Morrill Rd to Pouty Way	Widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$32,100	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
El Vista Ave	Roble Ave to Yosemite Blvd (SR 132)	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$64,200	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Standiford Ave	Dale Rd to Future Brink Rd	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$80,300	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Claus Rd	Scenic Dr to Briggsmore Ave	Signage/stripping - Tied to Roadway Project	\$96,300	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr	Paradise Rd to Maze Blvd (SR 132)	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$112,400	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
9th St	G St to Needham St	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$128,400	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Oakdale Rd	Briggsmore Ave to Scenic Dr	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$144,500	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
La Loma Ave	James St Roundabout to Yosemite Blvd (SR 132)	Signage/stripping or widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$160,500	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
9th St	Coldwell Ave to Briggsmore Ave	Widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$160,500	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Oakdale Rd	Mable Ave to Morrill Rd	Widening - Tied to Roadway Project	\$321,000	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Yosemite Blvd (SR 132)	I St to Geer Rd/Albers Rd	Signage/stripping or widening	\$401,200	2025	CMAQ, CFF				x
Virginia Corridor	Briggsmore Ave to San Joaquin County Line	Trail Improvements	\$48,141,200	2025	PROP 84, DEMO				x

Tuolumne River Restoration Project	Mitchell Rd to Carpenter Rd	Trail Improvements	\$51,350,700	2025	PROP 84, DEMO				x
Total City of Modesto			\$158,082,300						
City of Newman									
Canal School Rd	Inyo Ave to Sherman Pkwy	Construct Class I Bike Lane	\$1,019,600	2012	CMAQ				x
Total City of Newman			\$1,019,600						
City of Oakdale									
Valley View Multi-Use Trail, Phase I	Kerr Park to Stanislaus River	Construct Class I Bike Lane	\$437,100	2012	CMAQ				x
Cottle's Trail Multi-Use Trail	A St to the Oakdale Plaza Shopping Center	Construct Class I Bike Lane	\$506,500	2013	CMAQ				x
Total City of Oakdale			\$943,600						
City of Riverbank									
Stanislaus River Crossing	Stanislaus River Crossing	Pedestrian Bridge over Stanislaus River	\$7,313,100	2035	Dev. Fees, Traffic Impact Fees, BTA, Other				x
Hetch Hetchy Trail	Hetch Hetchy Trail	Construct Class I Bike/Ped Trail	\$1,178,100	2025	Dev. Fees, Traffic Impact Fees, BTA, Other				x
Stanislaus River Park Trail	Stanislaus River Park Trail	Construct Class I Bike/Ped Trail	\$857,100	2025	Dev. Fees, Other				x
Total City of Riverbank			\$9,348,300						
City of Turlock									
W. Cananl Dr	SR-99 to Tegner Rd	Construct Class I Bike Path	\$970,500	2035	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
Swanpark Dr	Quincy Rd to Waring Rd	Construct Class I Bike Path	\$1,056,800	2035	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
Quincy Rd	Swanpark Dr to E. Monte Vista Ave	Construct Class I Bike Path	\$905,800	2035	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
Canal Rd & Diane Rd	Canal Rd & Diane Rd	Construct Bicycle Parking Area	\$258,800	2035	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
Taylor Rd	Crowell Rd to McKenna Rd	Construct Class I Bike Path	\$692,600	2015	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
Fulkerth Rd	Fulkerth Rd at SR-99	Construct Class II Bike Lane	\$205,200	2020	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
Fulkerth Rd	Dianne Rd to SR-99	Construct Class II Bike Lane	\$182,200	2020	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
W. Main St	Tegner Rd to Walnut Rd	Construct Class II Bike Lane	\$378,800	2025	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
W. Main St	Washington Rd to Tegner Rd	Construct Class II Bike Lane	\$266,800	2025	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x

Fulkerth Rd	Tegner Rd to Dianne Dr	Construct Class II Bike Lane	\$301,000	2020	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
Taylor Rd	Golden State Blvd to SR-99	Construct Class II Bike Lane	\$195,500	2020	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
Washington Rd	Linwood Ave to Fulkerth Rd	Construct Class II Bike Lane	\$738,200	2025	BTA, SysDev, CMAQ, RSTP				x
Total City of Turlock			\$6,152,200						
City of Waterford									
Hickman Rd	Yosemite Blvd to Bridge (Overlook Park, SW corner of Intersection)	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk; Bike/Pedestrian and Roadside Rest Improvements	\$1,304,800	2018	CMAQ, TE, EEMP, BTA				x
Tuolumne Pedestrian Bridge	Appling Rd over Tuolumne River	Construct new pedestrian bridge	\$2,076,400	2020	CMAQ, BTA				x
WID Canal Bike/Ped Trail	Tim Bell Rd to MID Canal Terminus (Phase I)	Install Class I Bike Path - Phase I	\$734,300	2022	CMAQ, BTA				x
Total City of Waterford			\$4,115,500						
Total Tier I Bike and Pedestrian Costs			\$196,663,900						

**StanCOG 2011 Regional Transportation Plan
Tier II BICYCLE and PEDESTRIAN Projects**

Project Details					Purpose/Need			
Location	Project Limits	Description	Total Cost	Construction Year	System Preserv.	Capacity Enhance.	Safety	Alt. Mode
Stanislaus County								
Various Locations	Various Locations	Install 'Share the Road' signs on various County Roads	\$84,500	2013			x	x
Total County			\$84,500					
City of Ceres								
Hatch Rd	Morgan Rd to Herndon Rd	Construct Bike/Ped Facility (3 phase project)	\$1,604,800	2025				x
TID Lateral #2	Ustick Rd to Mitchell Rd	Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility	\$3,289,700	2025				x
El Camino Ave	Whitmore Ave to Service Rd	Signage/Striping	\$7,800	2015				x
Herndon Rd	Joyce Rd to Whitmore Ave	Signage/Striping or widening	\$16,800	2015				x
Joyce Rd	Bystrum Rd to Herndon Rd	Signage/Striping	\$6,000	2015				x
Mitchell Rd	Hatch Rd to Tenaya Rd	Signage/Striping or widening	\$304,900	2025				x
Mitchell Rd	Service Rd to Hatch Rd	Signage/Striping	\$16,100	2025				x
Roeding Rd	Ceres Main Canal to 6th St	Signage/Striping	\$4,200	2015				x
Rhode Drive	Mitchell Rd to Esmar Rd	Signage/Striping	\$4,200	2020				x
Rhode Drive	Esmar Rd to Nunes Rd	Signage/Striping or widening	\$110,800	2020				x
Whitmore Ave	Mitchell Rd to Blaker Rd	Signage/Striping	\$9,000	2015				x
Whitmore Ave	Blaker Rd to Fiesta Way	Widening	\$650,600	2020				x
Mitchell Rd	Service Rd to Rhode Rd	Widening	\$23,900	2015				x
Whitmore Ave	300' w/o Morgan Rd to Crows Landing Rd	Signage/Striping or widening	\$128,400	2025				x
Total City of Ceres			\$6,177,200					
City of Oakdale								
Valley View Multi-Use Trail, Phase II	Kerr Park to Valley View Park	Construct Class I Bike Lane	\$1,229,900	2016				x

Total City of Oakdale			\$1,229,900					
City of Patterson								
Sperry Ave	Ward Ave to Rogers Rd	Install Class I Bikeway	\$2,747,800	2020				x
Total City of Patterson			\$2,747,800					
City of Turlock								
Monte Vista Ave	Olive Ave to Berkeley Ave	Class II Bike Lanes	\$217,400	2020				x
Fulkerth Rd	Washington Rd to Tegner Rd	Class II Bike Lanes	\$528,400	2035				x
W. Canal Dr	SR-99 to Tegner Rd	Class II Bike Lanes	\$1,268,100	2035				x
W. Linwood Ave	Walnut Rd to Lander Ave	Class II Bike Lanes	\$528,400	2035				x
Tegner Rd	Monte Vista Ave to Fulkerth Rd	Class II Bike Lanes	\$338,600	2035				x
Tegner Rd	W. Main St to Fulkerth Rd	Class II Bike Lanes	\$339,200	2020				x
Dianne Rd	W. Main St to Fulkerth Rd	Class II Bike Lanes	\$339,200	2020				x
Walnut Rd	W. Linwood Ave to Canal Dr	Class II Bike Lanes	\$234,000	2020				x
Waring Rd	Hawkeye Ave to Linwood Ave	Class II Bike Lanes	\$509,000	2035				x
E. Tuolumne Rd	Quincy Rd to Daubenberger Rd	Class II Bike Lanes	\$261,000	2035				x
Taylor Rd	Crowell Rd to McKenna Rd	Class II Bike Lanes	\$692,600	2015				x
Total City of Turlock			\$5,255,900					
City of Waterford								
Tuolumne River Bike/Ped Trail	Reinway Ave to Riverwalk Park	Install Class I Bike Path	\$2,202,900	2022				x
WID Canal Bike/Ped Trail	Western Ave to Kadota Ave	Install Class I Bike Path - Phase II	\$311,600	2024				x
WID Canal Bike/Ped Trail	Kadota Ave to Rienway Ave	Install Class I Bike Path - Phase III	\$418,800	2034				x
Total City of Waterford			\$2,933,300					
Total Tier II Bike and Pedestrian Costs			\$18,428,600					

**StanCOG 2011 Regional Transportation Plan
Tier I TRANSIT Projects**

Project Details					Purpose/Need			
Location	Description	Total Cost	Construct. Year	Funding Source	System Preserv.	Capacity Enhance.	Safety	Alt. Mode
Stanislaus County								
StaRT Buses	Purchase and Install Electronic Fareboxes in all StaRT buses	\$620,800	2010	ARRA, Prop 1B, 5311, LTF				x
StaRT Buses	Purchase and Install Security Camera System in all StaRT buses	\$211,700	2010	OHS, Prop 1B			x	x
StaRT	Purchase a dial-a-ride 22' bus	\$128,800	2010	ARRA	x			x
Various Locations	Purchase ten (10) bus stop facilities	\$74,300	2011	CMAQ, Prop 1B	x			x
StaRT Buses	Install new information technology systems in transit buses	\$689,600	2011	CMAQ, Prop 1B				x
City of Turlock	Turlock Transfer Facility	\$2,121,800	2011	CMAQ, Prop 1B		x		x
StaRT	Rebuild 40-foot CNG Buses	\$1,623,000	2014	CMAQ, Prop 1B	x			x
StaRT	Purchase multiple 40-foot CNG Buses	\$2,318,600	2014	CMAQ, Prop 1B				x
Various Locations	Purchase Bus Stop Facilities	\$101,400	2017	CMAQ, LTF	x			x
StaRT	Rebuild 40-foot CNG Bus	\$855,500	2021	CMAQ, LTF	x			x
StaRT	Replace multiple 40-foot CNG Buses	\$5,874,200	2022	CMAQ, LTF	x			x
StaRT	Replace multiple 40-foot CNG Buses	\$3,507,100	2028	CMAQ, LTF	x			x
StaRT	Purchase Bus Stop Facilities	\$136,500	2025	CMAQ, LTF	x			x
Stanislaus County	Multi-Modal Transfer Facility	\$5,375,700	2019	CMAQ, Prop 1B, 5311				x
StaRT	Purchase 40-foot Buses	\$4,152,800	2020	CMAQ, LTF				x
StaRT	Rebuild CNG Buses	\$1,558,000	2024	CMAQ, LTF				x
Total County		\$29,349,800						
City of Ceres								
Whitmore Ave & Mitchell Rd; Mitchell Rd & Fowler Rd; Blaker Rd & Kinser Rd; Mitchell Rd & Service Rd	New Shelters w/ Lighting, Benches & Litter Receptacles	\$68,600	2010	Prop 1B				x
Various Locations	Bus Stop Improvements - Shelters, Benches, Pads, & Litter Receptacles	\$377,500	2035	LTF				x
Various Locations	Bus Turn-outs	\$345,100	2035	LTF				x
Ceres Area Transit (CAT)	Transit Plan - Study for future routes in newly annexed areas, new schools & transit center	\$47,800	2015	LTF				x
Ceres Area Transit (CAT)	Purchase Low Floor 35' CNG Busses (2)	\$1,149,000	2020	LTF	x			x

Total City of Ceres		\$1,988,000						
City of Modesto								
Modesto Area Express (MAX)	Construct new bus maintenance facility and yard at Jefferson St & 8th St	\$21,218,000	2011	CMAQ/FTA		x		x
MAX	Purchase 150 buses @ \$400,000 each	\$75,259,400	2030	FTA/LTF	x	x		x
MAX	Bus Stop and Station Improvements @ Various Locations	\$9,301,500	2030	FTA/LTF	x	x		x
Downtown Transit Center; Amtrak Station	Rehab and renovate Downtown Transit Center (9th St & J St) and Amtrak Station (Briggsmore Ave & Held Dr)	\$7,789,900	2030	FTA/LTF	x			x
MAX	Shop Trucks and Various Support Equipment	\$5,580,900	2030	FTA/LTF	x			x
MAX	Federally Mandated Training and Education	\$744,200	2030	FTA/LTF				x
MAX	Maintenance on Vehicles and Facilities	\$111,617,700	2030	FTA/LTF	x			x
MAX	Capital Purchases and Preventive Maintenance	\$111,617,700	2030	FTA/LTF	x			x
MAX	Non Fixed Route Paratransit Services	\$3,720,600	2030	FTA/LTF				x
MAX	Safety and Security Capital Expenses for Transit Center and Bus Yard	\$3,720,600	2030	FTA/LTF			x	x
MAX	Transit Enhancements	\$1,860,300	2030	FTA/LTF				x
MAX	Upgrade to Fareboxes, AVL systems, Computer Systems and other Technology Improvements	\$11,161,800	2030	FTA/LTF	x			x
MAX	Various Projects in Smaller Cities in the Modesto UZA	\$2,232,400	2030	FTA/LTF				x
MAX	Lease Transit Administrative Facility	\$2,790,500	2030	FTA/LTF				x
Total City of Modesto		\$368,615,500						
City of Turlock								
Turlock City Limits	Construct Intermodal Transfer Center based on Transit Study	\$3,582,200	2015	FTA/LTF				x
Turlock Corporation Yard	Backup CNG Fueling Compressor	\$597,100	2015	FTA/LTF				x
Turlock Corporation Yard	Construct operations office and bus storage facility	\$2,985,200	2015	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Purchase 4 buses @ \$400,000 each	\$2,026,900	2017	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Purchase 3 buses @ \$400,000 each	\$1,815,200	2023	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Purchase 4 buses @ \$400,000 each	\$2,889,800	2029	FTA/LTF				x
Dial-a-Ride	Purchase 4 buses @ \$160,000 each	\$699,400	2012	FTA/LTF				x
Dial-a-Ride	Purchase 2 buses @ \$160,000 each	\$371,000	2014	FTA/LTF				x
Dial-a-Ride	Purchase 5 buses @ \$160,000 each	\$1,043,900	2018	FTA/LTF				x
Dial-a-Ride	Purchase 5 buses @ \$160,000 each	\$1,140,700	2021	FTA/LTF				x
Dial-a-Ride	Purchase 5 buses @ \$160,000 each	\$1,283,800	2025	FTA/LTF				x
Dial-a-Ride	Purchase 5 buses @ \$160,000 each	\$1,402,900	2028	FTA/LTF				x
Dial-a-Ride	Purchase 5 buses @ \$160,000 each	\$1,578,900	2032	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Bus Stop and Station Improvements @ Various Locations	\$1,488,300	2030	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Shop and various support equipment	\$651,200	2030	FTA/LTF				x

BLAST	Federally Mandated Training and Education	\$279,100	2030	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Maintenance on Vehicles and Facilities	\$1,488,300	2030	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Capital Purchases and Preventive Maintenance	\$1,488,300	2030	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Non Fixed Route Paratransit Services	\$930,200	2030	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Safety and Security Capital Expenses for Transit Center and Bus Yard	\$744,200	2030	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Transit Enhancements	\$744,200	2030	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Upgrade to Fareboxes, AVL systems, Computer Systems and other Technology Improvements	\$744,200	2030	FTA/LTF				x
BLAST	Various Projects in Smaller Cities in the Modesto UZA	\$558,100	2030	FTA/LTF				x
Total City of Turlock		\$30,533,100						
Total Tier I Transit Costs		\$430,486,400						

**StanCOG 2011 Regional Transportation Plan
Tier II TRANSIT Projects**

Project Details				Purpose/Need			
Location	Description	Total Cost	Construct. Year	System Preserv.	Capacity Enhance.	Safety	Alt. Mode
Stanislaus County							
ACE / HSR Rail Overlay	Stanislaus County Commuter Rail	\$0	2035				x
Stanislaus County	California High Speed Rail, Merced to Sacramento Link	\$0	2035				x
Total County		\$0					
Total Tier I Transit Costs		\$0					

**StanCOG 2011 Regional Transportation Plan
Tier I AVIATION Projects**

Project Details					Purpose/Need			
Location	Description	Total Cost	Construction Year	Funding Source	System Preserv.	Capacity Enhance.	Safety	Alt. Mode
City of Modesto								
Modesto City-County Airport	Terminal Program NEPA	\$382,500	2012	FAA, PFC	x			
Modesto City-County Airport	Utility Master Plan (Sign Plan/Elec./Util. Study)	\$206,000	2010	FAA, PFC	x			
Modesto City-County Airport	Rehab/Expand NW Term. Apron (Const)	\$1,236,000	2010	FAA, PFC		x		
Modesto City-County Airport	Terminal Expansion (Design)	\$1,725,500	2012	FAA, PFC		x		
Modesto City-County Airport	Enhance Airport Storm Drain System (Design)	\$446,800	2011	FAA, PFC				
Modesto City-County Airport	Terminal Expansion (Const. Phase-1)	\$8,626,800	2012	FAA, PFC		x		
Modesto City-County Airport	Enhance Airport Storm Drain System (const. Phase-1)	\$1,150,300	2012	FAA, PFC		x		
Modesto City-County Airport	Terminal Expansion (const. Phase-2)	\$8,885,600	2013	FAA, PFC		x		
Modesto City-County Airport	Enhance Airport Storm Drain System (const. Phase-2)	\$1,184,800	2013	FAA, PFC		x		
Modesto City-County Airport	Construct Maintenance Building (Design)	\$0	2014	FAA, PFC	x		x	
Modesto City-County Airport	Construct ARFF Building (Design)	\$579,700	2014	FAA, PFC	x		x	
Modesto City-County Airport	Rehab Runway (Airfield Pavement Maintenance, Design)	\$231,900	2014	FAA, PFC	x			
Total City of Modesto		\$24,655,900						
City of Oakdale								
Oakdale Municipal Airport	Fencing and Security Cameras	\$546,400	2012	FAA, State			x	
Oakdale Municipal Airport	Runway/Taxi Maintenance and Upgrades	\$546,400	2012	FAA, State	x			
Total City of Oakdale		\$1,092,800						
City of Turlock								
Turlock Municipal Airport	Airfield: Slurry and Restripe Runways	\$82,400	2010	FAA/State	x			x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Navigational Aids: Install AWOS	\$154,500	2010	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Install Obstruction lights on utility poles	\$1,100	2010	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Apron and Taxiway rehabilitation and drainage improvements	\$1,648,000	2010	FAA/State	x			x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Improve access road	\$185,400	2010	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Construct 20 new hangars	\$643,800	2010	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Construct additional vehicular parking	\$77,300	2010	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Install perimeter fencing and gates	\$442,900	2010	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Relocate runway 12-30 & build new entry/exit connector taxiways	\$3,186,400	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Develop Pavement Maintenance Plan	\$11,300	2013	FAA/State	x			x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Install MIRL on Runway 12-30	\$135,100	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Install 2 PAPIs	\$84,500	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Install 2 REILs	\$84,500	2013	FAA/State				x

Turlock Municipal Airport	Install MITL on formal runway and new taxiways	\$40,600	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Install airfield signage	\$135,100	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Install 12,000-gallon fuel tank	\$202,600	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Construct pollution abatement facility	\$202,600	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Construct 20 new hangars	\$703,500	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Extend fire protection system	\$405,200	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Airfield electrical service infrastructure	\$168,900	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Additional drainage improvements	\$1,409,200	2013	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Extend runway 12-30	\$692,200	2020	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Extend entry/exit connector taxiways	\$519,100	2020	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Relocate PAPIs	\$16,700	2020	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Relocate REILs	\$16,700	2020	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Extend MITL	\$49,900	2020	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Extend MIRL	\$33,300	2020	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Install 12,000-gallon fuel tank	\$249,200	2020	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Construct 20 new hangars	\$865,200	2020	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Construct new terminal/administration building facility	\$519,100	2020	FAA/State				x
Turlock Municipal Airport	Construct maintenance/storage building	\$103,900	2020	FAA/State				x
Total City of Turlock		\$13,070,200						
Total Tier I Aviation Costs		\$38,818,900						

**StanCOG 2011 Regional Transportation Plan
Tier II AVIATION Projects**

Project Details				Purpose/Need			
Location	Description	Total Cost	Construction Year	System Preserv.	Capacity Enhance.	Safety	Alt. Mode
Stanislaus County							
Crows Landing Air Facility	Crows Landing Air Facility Runway Improvements	\$1,060,900	2011				x
Total County		\$1,060,900					
City of Modesto							
Modesto City-County Airport	Construct T-Hangar Unit	\$707,400	2025				
Modesto City-County Airport	Construct T-Hangar Unit	\$707,400	2025				
Modesto City-County Airport	Construct Air Cargo Building	\$232,700	2025				
Modesto City-County Airport	Construct T-Hangar Unit	\$1,414,800	2025				
Modesto City-County Airport	Construct new entrance for general aviation and park use; Two-lane roadway, drainage, road lighting, perimeter fence	\$1,267,800	2025				
Total City of Modesto		\$4,330,100					
City of Turlock							
Turlock Municipal Airport	Acquire aviation easement over 3 acres (northwest)	\$0	2020				
Turlock Municipal Airport	Acquire aviation easement over 3 acres (southeast)	\$0	2020				
Total City of Turlock		\$0					
Total Tier I Aviation Costs		\$5,391,000					