

DRAFT

**2004
Stanislaus Council of Governments
Addendum to the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan
Environmental Impact Report**

Lead Agency

Stanislaus Council of Governments
900 H Street, Suite D
Modesto, CA 95354

Contact Person

Mr. Gary Dickson, Director
Phone: (209) 558-7830

**Prepared by
Stanislaus Council of Governments**

June 2004

SECTION I

Project Background/Introduction

Project Description

The Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Stanislaus County and the incorporated cities of Ceres, Hughson, Modesto, Newman, Oakdale, Patterson, Riverbank, Turlock and Waterford. Our mission is to bring local government and the community together to solve regional problems, particularly in transportation.

Stanislaus County is located in the north San Joaquin Valley of Central California. Stanislaus County encompasses 1,521 square miles of land and is bounded by Santa Clara County to the west, San Joaquin County to the north, and Calaveras and Tuolumne Counties to the east, and Merced County to the south. Land use in Stanislaus County is predominantly agricultural, with most of the county zoned A-2, General Agriculture, under the Stanislaus County General Plan. However, for the past 40 years, the county has been changing from a rural agricultural region to an area that includes incorporated cities and towns. This conversion from nonagricultural land uses to other uses has occurred predominantly along local highways and freeways.

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) represents the blueprint for major transportation investments in the Stanislaus region over a 25-year period. The most recent RTP was adopted in 2001 and was recently reviewed to determine whether to incorporate new projects or implement changes in policy direction. The California Transportation Commission's guidelines for the preparation of RTPs state that "environmental analysis and development of alternatives to minimize adverse environmental impacts is fundamental to the transportation planning process." In addition, "the RTP and any subsequent revisions, amendments, or updates shall be in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)."

Consistent with these guidelines, a Program Environmental Impact Report was prepared and certified as part of the 2001 RTP. CEQA guidelines (Section 155168) define a Program EIR as, "an EIR that may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either geographically, or are logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions, or are in connection with issuance's of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways."

As a part of StanCOG's current review of the RTP, it is necessary to address any areas of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which might be substantially impacted by changes in projects or policy direction. CEQA section 15164 (a) states, "The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred." Section 15162 requires a subsequent EIR when one or more of the following conditions exist:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of a new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects of a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, or
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Findings

StanCOG, after reviewing the statistical and quantitative information developed from our latest transportation model, has determined that it would be appropriate to provide an Addendum to the 2001 EIR. The 2001 EIR was developed utilizing modeling based on the 1990 U.S. Census information that was updated in 2000. A more accurate assessment of current and projected data is now available due to our ability to utilize the more recent census data.

Our findings indicate that the project will not require major revisions of the EIR based on the facts that:

1. There are no new projects adopted in the revised RTP
2. No new project priorities have been established
3. There is no new information of substantial importance to the project
4. The only item to change is a clarification and revision of the population statistics and potential corresponding impacts.
5. Impacts and mitigation factors have been adequately addressed in the certified 2001 EIR and reviewed in this addendum.
6. Stanislaus County is in conformance with federal air quality standards.

After reviewing CEQA Section 15164, it has been determined that the obligation to prepare a Subsequent EIR was not met.

Planning Policy

The land use policies of the project area are contained in the Stanislaus County General Plan and the incorporated limits of the nine cities in the county. Each of the applicable general plan documents contains additional elements addressing issues such as conservation, safety, and transportation. The basic planning policy documents were adopted by their respective jurisdictions in accordance with state law and in compliance with the CEQA.

Each jurisdiction has developed and adopted other relevant plans and policy documents to address the areas of hazardous waste management, wastewater treatment, storm water, and water management plans. In addition, Stanislaus County, City of Modesto, Turlock, and Oakdale have adopted an airport land use plan. Each of these plans and policy documents were prepared and adopted in accordance with state law and in compliance with the CEQA.

StanCOG is the lead agency with respect to making environmental determinations on the RTP; however, other agencies will utilize this environmental document in subsequent specific project level environmental analysis. Federal, state, regional, and local governments and agencies use the RTP and its environmental documentation as a foundation for future decision making. Future permits and approvals by the local governments and agencies would be responsible for the preparation of specific environmental data and analysis of specific projects and project design. In this sense, the StanCOG RTP EIR functions as a "Tier 1" document.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this program, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. The addendum will address new projects, priorities, or changes in circumstances that might initiate a Subsequent or new Environmental Impact Report.

The environmental factors checked below are addressed in the 2001 Program Environmental Impact Report.

X	Aesthetics	X	Agriculture Resources	X	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources	X	Geology / Soils
X	Hazards & Hazardous Material	X	Hydrology / Water Quality	X	Land Use / Planning
X	Mineral Resources	X	Noise	X	Population / Housing
X	Public Services		Recreation	X	Transportation / Traffic
X	Utilities / Service Systems	X	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)	
On the basis of this initial evaluation:	
	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 “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.
X	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, nothing further is required.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

SECTION II
Assessment of Impacts
Environmental Checklist

Aesthetics – Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character of quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
Discussion: Specific impacts are delineated in the 2001 Program EIR and include mitigation measures. Impacts include road improvements that conflict with neighborhood/area character, change in light/glare radiating from roadways, implementation of bicycle projects, transit projects, and aviation projects. No project changes have been made in this area.				
Mitigation: No additional mitigation measures are required. Mitigation measures included in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report adequately address impacts.				
References: 2001 Program Environmental Impact Report (Chapter 14)				

Agriculture Resources – Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X
Discussion: All existing projects of the RTP have been reviewed under the 2001 Program EIR (Chapter 4). No new projects have been added to the RTP and effects of the transportation plan on agriculture in the county have not changed.				
Mitigation: Stanislaus County and the nine incorporated cities have codified measures to reduce impacts on agricultural resources. No additional mitigation is required.				

References: Chapter 4 of the 2001 Program EIR and the General Plans of Stanislaus County and the cities of; Turlock, Modesto, Patterson, Newman, Hughson, Waterford, Riverbank, Oakdale.

Air Quality – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerably 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 that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X
Discussion: Air Quality is in compliance with the Federal Air Quality Standards as shown in our Draft Conformity Analysis for the 2004 FTIP and RTP (see Table 7-1 of that document). Although air quality is poor in the San Joaquin Valley and a growing population will have a cumulative negative impact on the region, the Regional Transportation Plan is designed to improve the nature and flow of the traffic on county roads. In an “unconstrained” build out of the surface transportation system, traffic would experience fewer delays at intersections, greater LOS, and lower emissions. Emission rates for ozone and carbon monoxide continue to drop. Particulate matter levels are slightly higher but are in compliance with the emission budget established by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District and have continued to fall over the last five years (see appendix A).				
Mitigation: No additional mitigation measures are required. Measures covered in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report are adequate to mitigate impacts.				
References: California Air Resources Board, StanCOG RTP and 2001 Program EIR (Chapter 11), StanCOG Draft Conformity Analysis (2004), San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District				

Biological Resources – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 the local or regional plan, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X

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 ordinance?				X
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?				X
e) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
Discussion: The 2001 Program EIR addressed various habitat conditions throughout Stanislaus County and identified protected flora and fauna and it's preferred habitat.				
Mitigation: Mitigation is covered in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report and is adequate to address impacts				
References: California Department of Fish & Game's Natural Diversity Database, California Native Plant Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California (6 th Ed.), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, city and county general plans, StanCOG Program EIR (Chapter 6).				

Cultural Resources – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 10564.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique Paleontological resource of site of unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside the formal cemeteries?				X
Discussion: An inventory has been compiled of the indigenous and euro-american migration into Stanislaus County. Consideration was given to the developments in the valley from the impact of the Spanish settlements, the discovery of gold, and irrigation. It is noted that the San Joaquin Valley is one of the least researched areas in California.				
Mitigation: Appropriate mitigation is provided in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report.				
References: CEQA guidelines Section 15064.5, StanCOG Program EIR (Chapter 7).				

Geology and Soils – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effected, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				X

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?				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a 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?				X
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?				X
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?				X
Discussion: Several faults have been identified within the county but most have been inactive for the last 150 million years. The Ortigalita fault in the western portion of the county has been active in the last 12,000 years. Minor to moderate damage could be expected in the central and western portions of the county and considerable damage could be expected in the western portion. Landslides could be expected in the Diablo Range in western Stanislaus County. Soils in the county are alluvial in nature with prime agricultural areas located in the central portion of the valley. Some of the areas on the east and west sides of Stanislaus County are less productive (agriculturally) due to high clay content. Rock and gravel mining are taking place along the Tuolumne (in the Waterford area) and Stanislaus Rivers (between Riverbank and Knights Ferry). Stanislaus County is a major producer of construction sand and gravel. The alignments of highways proposed for modification in the RTP are located within existing right-of-way that has already been disturbed and in areas where there are no unique geologic or topographic features.				
Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required. Impacts and mitigation measures are addressed in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report.				
References: Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Uniform Building Code, RTP Program EIR (Chapter 9)				

Hazards/Hazardous Materials –

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant w/mitigation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of				X

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?				
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?				X
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?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
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				X
Discussion: Known and potential hazardous materials or waste sites have been identified in the RTP planning area. Construction could result in exposure to areas to hazardous wastes or materials. Stanislaus County and most of the cities have policies that address soil-related issues.				
Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required. Prior mitigation efforts as provided for in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report are adequate to address impacts				
References: 2001 RTP EIR (Chapter 9)				

**Hydrology and Water Quality –
Would the Project:**

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant w/mitigation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
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 (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)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate of amount of surface runoff in a manner which result in flooding on or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of				X

polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
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 flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
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?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
Discussion: Groundwater west of the San Joaquin River is deteriorating due to three major factors: a rising water table, saline build-up from leached irrigation runoff, draw-down of the regional groundwater system. East of the San Joaquin River, the water is currently good but may become worse due to increased pumping around Modesto and runoff of waste from prior dairy operations.				
Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required. Impacts are addressed in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report				
References: RTP Program EIR (Chapter 8).				

Land Use and Planning – Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant w/mitigation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

a) Physically divide an established community?				X
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?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
Discussion: The RTP does not physically divide any established community although the projects within the RTP do involve improvements on roads and highways that are located within city boundaries. These projects are designed to improve transportation in those areas by widening and other corridor improvements. Road and highway specific projects were developed in cooperation with the local jurisdictions and development projects by the local jurisdictions are included based on the transportation improvements. The Program EIR was completed to address any potential environmental effects. Specific projects are located in and between governmental jurisdictions. Consideration was given to environmental justice as well as land use and local zoning plans. In those instances where habitat conservation was a consideration, mitigation measures were utilized to offset the impacts.				
Mitigation: Site specific EIR's to address impacts as specified in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report				
References: 2001 RTP Program EIR and local general plans				

Noise – Would the project result in:

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant w/mitigation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in				X
--	--	--	--	----------

excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing without the project?				X
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Discussion: Construction of new improvements in the RTP will temporarily increase noise levels and ground borne vibration along segments of the street and highway system while under construction. It will also increase the ongoing traffic noise after construction by virtue of the increase in vehicle traffic in those areas. For the SR 132 (Yosemite Blvd., Modesto) corridor, which is within two miles of the City/County Airport, the noise impacts for widening and resurfacing will be temporary and should not expose people residing in those areas to excessive noise.				
Mitigation: Mitigation measures as addressed in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report and city/county general plans adequately address impacts.				
References: 2001 RTP Program EIR and local ordinances				

Public Services:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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 public services:				
Fire Protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X
Discussion: Impacts on public services will be addressed at the local jurisdictional level. Road improvements will generate a need for additional public services by virtue of accessibility to land for development. Local jurisdictional fee structures address increases in public services.				
Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required beyond those addressed in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report.				

References: StanCOG RTP Program EIR and local general plans

Population and Housing – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
Discussion: Road improvements will induce population growth on the transportation corridors that are being improved. It is for this reason that the road projects are a part of the RTP. Local jurisdictions plan for road improvements in order to accommodate growth for housing and jobs. Road improvements reduce the effects of population growth and environmental impacts associated with growth. Our most recent assessment (2004) indicates that population growth is less than previously forecast and impacts are lower than previously expected.				
Mitigation: The 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report adequately addresses impacts. No additional mitigation is required.				
References: 2001 RTP Program EIR, local general plans.				

Recreation:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
Discussion: Improved roads and highways may increase the use of neighborhood and regional facilities but it is doubtful that such usage would lead to the deterioration of such facilities. The RTP does not require the development of recreational facilities. The local fees of each jurisdiction finance recreational facilities. Park dedication fees on new development fund additional facilities.				
Mitigation: No mitigation is required.				
References: General Plans of Stanislaus County and incorporated cities				

Transportation/Traffic – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the				X

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)?				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
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?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (i.e., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
f) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (i.e., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
Discussion: Our recently completed modeling program (2004) projects lower than expected traffic impacts than previously forecast. Under the current model, impacts expected in 2025 are now fairly consistent with what we are projecting for the year 2030. The RTP will increase traffic and capacity of the street systems in the plan (see Appendix C). It is the objective of the RTP to increase capacity and usage of specific routes in the county to improve traffic flows to facilitate travel within the county and inter-regionally. The projects are designed to improve LOS by improving and widening major transportation corridors as part of a county-wide effort to reduce LOS impacts and air quality on local roads and highways. Improving these regionally significant routes will improve safety and emergency access. Implementation of the RTP will not conflict with the adopted policies, plans or programs of jurisdictions in the county.				
Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required. Mitigation as provided in the 2001 RPT Program Environmental Impact Report are adequate to address impacts.				
References: 2001 RTP Program EIR and jurisdictional general plans.				

Utility and Service Systems –
Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant w/mitigation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of he applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
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?				X
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?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new of expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity t serve the project’s projected demand				X

in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
Discussion: Portions of the RTP implementation could result in expansion of storm water basins to accommodate runoff of seasonal precipitation and relocation of utilities.				
Mitigation: Expand storm water basins consistent with CEQA requirements and work with utility districts to accommodate expansion.				
References: CEQA and CalTrans standards				

Mandatory Findings of Significance:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project 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?				X
b) Does the project have impacts that are 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)				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X
Discussion: No additional mitigation is required. Prior mitigation as prescribed for in the 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report will adequately identified impacts. All portions of the RTP, when implemented will have a positive effect on the environment. StanCOG has adopted a 2001 RTP that includes a certified Program EIR. The EIR identifies existing and potential negative impact to the environment and includes environmental justice issues. StanCOG will utilize CEQA, NEPA, CalTrans, and other regulatory agencies to ensure that programs and projects minimize all negative impacts.				

Ambient Air Quality Data from the Modesto 14th Street Monitoring Station

Pollutant Standards	1998	1999	2000	2003
----------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

OZONE

Maximum 1-hour concentration	0.134	0.119	0.131	0.110
Number of Days Standard Violated				
NAAQS (1-hour) > 0.12	3	0	1	N/A
CAAQS (1-hour) > 0.09	224	13	7	N/A

Carbon Monoxide (CO)

Maximum 8-hour concentration (ppm)	7.3	6.4	4.2	3.7
Maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)	9.4	11.4	6.2	N/A
Number of Days Standard Violated				
NAAQS (8-hour) > 9.0 ppm	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NAAQS (1-hour) > 35 ppm	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CAAQS (8-hour) > 9.0 ppm	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CAAQS (1-hour) > 20 ppm	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Particulate Matter (PM10)

Maximum 24-hour concentration*	125.0	132.0	112.0	70.0
Second-highest 24-hour concentration*	109.0	124.0	106.0	N/A
Average arithmetic mean concentration*	46.3	40.9	34.8	28.8
Average geometric mean concentration*	38.4	33.6	29.4	N/A
Number of Days Standard Violated				
NAAQS (24-hour) > 50*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CAAQS (24-hour) > 150*	11.0	27.0	18.0	N/A

*Micrograms per cubic meter, recorded every 6 days

CAAQS: California Ambient Air Quality Standard

NAAQS: National Ambient Air Quality Standard

ppm: parts per million

Source: State of California Air Resources Board

Appendix B

Population/Employment

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2030</u>
Population	446,997	821,963
Households		
Single	106,846	191,300
Multi	38,300	72,500
Employment	174,066	296,940

Source: StanCOG Adopted Land Use Projections 2003.

Appendix C

Projected Highway Volumes

Highway	Location	Traffic Volume (2001)	Traffic Volume (2005)
I-5	South of Fink Rd.	30,064	18,279
I-5	North of Howard Rd.	32,119	21,492
SR 33	North of Grayson Rd.	10,120	11,831
SR 33	South of West Stuhr Rd.	7,054	12,536
SR 33	South of Sperry Rd.	2,735	5,735
SR 99	North of Service Rd.	69,755	85,083
SR 99	South of West Main (Turlock)	43,819	48,931
SR 99	North of SR 219	57,756	83,376
SR 99	North of SR 132	77,005	99,534
SR 108	West of Coffee Rd.	14,937	17,382
SR 108	East of Clause Rd.	16,024	14,758
SR 108	North of Roseburg Ave.	29,812	29,480
SR 108/120	East of Sterns Rd.	13,036	14,036
SR 132	East of Geer/Albers Rd.	12,907	15,037
SR 132	West of San Joaquin River	23,488	15,497
SR 132	East of Carpenter Rd.	11,088	6,569
SR 132	West of El Vista/Mitchell Rd.	22,506	28,510
SR 165	North of SR 99	18,457	11,307
SR 219	East of SR 99	15,322	18,107
SR 219	West of SR 108	15,118	17,865

Streets/Roads

Street	Location	Traffic Volume (2001)	Traffic Volume (2003)
9 th Street	Tuolumne River	22,420	30,124
Briggsmore Ave.	West of McHenry Ave.	21,293	28,849
Carpenter Rd.	North of Tuolumne River	18,453	15,996
Claribel Ave.	South of Coffee Rd.	14,050	14,623
Claus Rd.	South of Orangeburg Ave.	14,030	17,498
Crows Landing Rd.	South of Hatch Rd.	27,022	29,554
Geer Rd.	West of Santa Fe Ave	5,503	14,445
Hatch Rd.	North of Mitchell Rd.	30,744	21,484
Keyes Rd.	West of Geer Rd.	2,363	809
Las Palmas Ave.	West of Faith Home Rd.	14,302	14,658
Santa Fe Ave.	North of Hatch Rd.	14,943	17,937
Sperry Rd.	West of Ward Ave.	2,629	2,665
West Main St.	East of Crows Landing Rd.	6,959	13,831

Projections in Person Trips and Vehicle Trips in Stanislaus County

	<u>2000</u>	<u>No Build</u>	<u>Pref. Alt.</u>	<u>Unconstrained</u>
Person Trips	1,720,085	3,105,684	3,106,045	3,106,045
Vehicle Trips	1,207,730	2,155,111	2,154,703	2,154,585
Percent Change	(42.4%)	(44.1%)	(44.2%)	(44.2%)

Source: Stanislaus Council of Governments 2004

Vehicles Miles Traveled

<u>Roadway Type</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>No Build</u>	<u>Pref. Alt.</u>	<u>Unconstrained</u>
Freeway	2,589,175	3,954,422	4,167,222	4,265,164
Arterial	5,801,461	10,040,792	10,082,484	10,785,145
Collector	999,261	1,899,772	2,076,004	2,084,471
Local	431,018	974,502	929,584	919,854
TOTAL	9,820,915	16,869,488	17,255,294	18,054,634

Source: Stanislaus Council of Governments 2004