

**Lake County/Area Planning Council
NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

For review by interested agencies and the public in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, an analysis has been made of possible environmental impacts of the following project by Staff. Attached hereto is a copy of the Initial Study documenting reasons to support the above findings.

Project Title: Lake County Regional Transportation Plan

Description of Project: 2010 Lake County Regional Transportation Plan:

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a transportation planning document prepared by the Lake County/City Area Planning Council (APC). The Plan provides a vision of regional transportation goals, objectives and policies (short and long term). The RTP considers all modes of travel, including autos, trucks, bicycles, pedestrian (walking), aviation, buses (public transportation), and the related facilities needed for an effective transportation system. The Plan assesses current transportation issues, identifies needs and challenges, and suggests action to address these problems and improve the transportation system throughout the region. The Plan also considers funding options for projects included in the Plan.

Lead Agency Name and Address: Lake County/City Area Planning Council
367 North State Street, Suite 206
Ukiah, CA 95482

Location and Setting:

The Regional Transportation Plan area encompasses all of Lake County, including the incorporated cities of Lakeport and Clearlake. Lake County is located within the northern Coast Ranges of California and is bordered by the Counties of Mendocino, Sonoma, Napa, Yolo, Colusa, and Glenn. It is a mountainous area interrupted by the Clear Lake Basin. Lake County is a sparsely developed rural area. The majority of the population resides along the shores of Clear Lake. Agriculture and rangeland are the predominant land uses.

Findings Which Support a Negative Declaration:

1. Adoption of the Plan will not 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.
2. Adoption of the Plan will not 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.
3. Adoption of the Pan will not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Statement of Determination:

Although projects contained within the proposed Plan could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in adopting this Plan because all potentially significant effects (a) will be analyzed adequately in a project specific EIR or Negative Declaration prepared at the time of project development pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) the effects will be addressed by mitigation measures based on that analysis.

Reviewed and Considered by Lead Agency:

Lisa Davey-Bates, Executive Director
Lake County/City Area Planning Council

Date

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project title: Lake County 2010 Regional Transportation Plan
2. Lead agency name and address:
Lake County/City Area Planning Council (APC)
367 North State Street, Suite 206
Ukiah, CA 95482
3. Contact person and phone number:
Lisa Davey-Bates, Executive Director
(707) 263-7799
4. Project location:
The Regional Transportation Plan encompasses all of Lake County, including the incorporated cities of Lakeport and Clearlake.
5. Project sponsor's name and address:
Lake County/City Area Planning Council (APC)
367 North State Street, Suite 206
Ukiah, CA 95482
6. General plan designation: N/A
7. Zoning: N/A
8. Description of project:

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a transportation planning document prepared by the Lake County/City Area Planning Council (APC). The Plan provides a vision of regional transportation goals, objectives and policies (short and long term). The RTP considers all modes of travel, including autos, trucks, bicycles, pedestrian (walking), aviation, buses (public transportation), and the related facilities needed for an effective transportation system. The Plan assesses current transportation issues, identifies needs and challenges, and suggests action to address these problems and improve the transportation system throughout the region. The Plan also considers funding options for projects included in the Plan.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting:
The Regional Transportation Plan encompasses all of Lake County, including the incorporated cities of Lakeport and Clearlake. Lake County is located within the northern Coast Ranges of California and is bordered by the Counties of Mendocino (to the west), Sonoma and Napa (to the south) and Yolo, Colusa and Glen (to the east and north). The region is mountainous and dominated by Clear Lake in the center of the county. Lake County is a sparsely developed rural area, with the majority of the population residing along the shores of Clear Lake and in the southern region of the county in Middletown and Hidden Valley Lake. Agriculture, rangeland and timberland are the primary land uses. The northern portion of the county is primarily public lands with minimal development.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:
No other public agencies are required to approve this Regional Transportation Plan. However, the Plan documents proposed activities of other agencies in the region. Individual projects discussed in the Plan may require the approval of the responsible agency(s) in order to be implemented. Additional approval or permits may be required for specific projects by trustee agencies including the Department of Fish and Game and the Army Corps of Engineers.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed plan COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed plan 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 plan proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed plan MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed plan 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 plan 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

Signature

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

I. AESTHETICS:

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: Visual impacts and scenic quality are generally subjective. The RTP is a program level document which contains projects for which specific locations and designs often have yet to be determined. Some projects proposed in the RTP do have the potential to impact aesthetics if implemented. However, adoption of the Plan will not implement any projects discussed within the Plan. All potentially significant effects will be adequately assessed and mitigations addressed in specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of project development. There are no designated state scenic highways in Lake County.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST_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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: Adoption of the Plan will not directly or indirectly cause lands zoned for agricultural uses to be converted to other uses. It is possible that minimal impacts to agricultural lands could occur as a result of implementation of projects contained in the plan which require the acquisition of right-of-way of agricultural land (for roadway widening or expansion). The impacts and mitigations for the project would be addressed during the design and implementation of the individual project. The vision and principles of the Lake County 2030 Blueprint include reducing impacts of growth to agricultural lands and preserving farm land and agricultural resources in the region. All potentially significant effects will be adequately assessed and mitigations addressed in specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of project development.

III. 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.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: While adoption of the Plan will not impact air quality directly, some roadway projects contained in the plan, especially those that increase capacity, may have the potential to impact air quality if implemented. In addition, short term impacts may occur as a result of construction activities. The Lake County region has the cleanest air in the state, and consequently is not a non-attainment area. Components of the plan, including the Transit Element and Backbone Circulation Local Roads Element contain goals, objectives and policies designed to reduce use of and dependency on automobiles to help reduce congestion and vehicle miles traveled. These components of the Plan aim to reduce emissions and related impacts to air quality. All potentially significant effects will be adequately assessed and mitigations addressed in specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of project development.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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: Since the Plan is a program level document, adoption of the Plan would not significantly affect biological resources. It is possible that implementation of some projects contained in the Plan could impact biological resources, including sensitive species, riparian habitat, and movement and spawning of species. Some proposed projects may actually address existing impacts to biological resources, such as the replacement of existing bridges and water crossings that interfere with the movement of fish from Clear Lake into rivers and creeks. All potentially significant effects will be adequately addressed in specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of project development.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: Adoption of the RTP will not directly or indirectly impact cultural resources. Implementation of projects contained within the Plan could potentially impact archaeological and cultural resources. Tribal communities as well as state and federal agencies were consulted during the development of the Plan. The Tribal Transportation Element includes policies to provide for consultation and coordination with tribal communities in part to mitigate potential impacts to cultural resources early in the planning and design process for transportation projects. All potentially significant effects will be adequately assessed and mitigations addressed in specific environmental analysis.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The Plan is a program level document. Adoption of the Plan will not implement any projects discussed within the Plan. Therefore, adoption of the Plan will not directly impact geology or soils, or cause any of the impacts listed above. It is possible that some of the projects listed in the Plan could have a potential to cause such impacts, including landslides and erosion, particularly within the mountainous terrain of Lake County. However, further analysis of these issues would be speculative at this time. All potentially significant effect will be adequately assessed and mitigations addressed in specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of project development.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: It is possible that implementation of some of the projects in the Plan may increase the generation of greenhouse gas emissions primarily by increasing the automobile capacity of the roadway system. The Overarching Policies Element of the Plan discusses Objectives and Policies to reduce these potential impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. The Plan contains Objectives and Policies to support and increase transit use, bicycle transportation and improved pedestrian facilities throughout the region with the goal of reducing vehicle miles traveled and vehicle trips often associated with the production of greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles. Additional planning documents that support efforts to reduce automobile use include the Lake County 2030 Blueprint Plan, Safe Routes to School Plan, Regional Bikeway Plan and the Transit Development Plan. Past efforts to secure competitive grants for transit, bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements will continue under this Plan. The Plan provides guidance to local agencies that review and approve residential and commercial developments. The Plan includes transportation policies that aim to reduce greenhouse gas emissions which local agencies can utilize as greenhouse gas emission mitigations for development projects.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: While it is possible that implementation of projects discussed within the RTP could cause hazardous situations, particularly the disturbance of hazardous material sites, adoption of the Plan will not cause significant impacts. No proposed projects will be implemented by the adoption of the Plan. (g) The Plan does include policies in the Transit Element to improve coordination with County OES/Emergency Response Commander on emergency response planning activities. All potentially significant effects will be adequately assessed and mitigations addressed in specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of project development.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 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 which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: Adoption of the RTP will not significantly impact hydrology or water quality. Some projects discussed in the Plan have the potential to effect these resources, particularly in regard to runoff and storm water drainage, if implemented. The RTP is a program level document which contains project for which specific designs have not been determined. Further analysis of these issues would be speculative at this time. All potentially significant effects will be adequately assessed and mitigations addressed in the specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of project development.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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: Adoption of the RTP would not conflict with existing general plan or zoning ordinance, or any known habitat conservation plan. The RTP documents proposed activities of other responsible agencies within the region. There are objectives contained in the Plan, such as the Complete Streets objective, that aim to improve the connectivity of the transportation system which would help address existing barriers within and between communities. The Lake County 2030 Blueprint Plan, initiated in 2008 and scheduled for adoption in the fall of 2010, includes principles of Smart Growth and aims to improve coordination and collaboration at a regional level among agencies involved planning and policies for land use, transportation, housing and jobs. The Lake County 2030 Blueprint is a key source document which can function to support mitigations of potential future land use impacts.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: Adoption of the RTP will not result in a direct or indirect impact to mineral resources. The RTP is a program level document which contains project for which specific locations and designs have not been determined. No proposed projects will be implemented by adoption of the Plan. All potentially significant effects will be adequately assessed and mitigations addressed in specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of project development.

XII. NOISE:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: While adoption of the Plan will not impact noise, some projects contained in the plan, especially those that increase capacity, may have the potential to cause an increase in both temporary and permanent ambient noise levels in the project area(s) if implemented. However, further analysis of these issues would be speculative at this time. All potentially significant effects will be adequately assessed and mitigations addressed in specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of development. Some projects contained in the Plan may result in a reduction in existing noise levels through the use of rubberized asphalt, a material used increasingly as a noise mitigation on roadways in California.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: Adoption of the plan will not directly or indirectly impact population or housing. Increased or decreased housing, beyond that which is already possible based on current zoning and land use designations, would be caused by land use and planning decisions of individual jurisdictions. It is possible that some projects contained within the plan, particularly capacity increasing projects, would have an indirect growth inducing effect. The plan has the potential to improve connectivity between housing and destinations including employment areas, commercial areas, schools and recreational areas. While some projects contained in the plan may extend an existing roadway, they are not expected to result in substantial population growth. The implementation of some projects contained in the Plan may facilitate infill development and high density development consistent with Smart Growth principles by providing better connectivity within the community between housing and key destinations. Objectives and policies contained in the Plan support projects that improve access and mobility through all modes of travel, including pedestrian, bicycle and transit. Lake County 2030 Blueprint Plan promotes Smart Growth principles including infill and higher density housing within or near existing communities, and also encourages a range of housing choices to meet the needs of the current and future population of Lake County

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Would the plan 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: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: While it is possible that some projects discussed within the Plan, if implemented, could require increased maintenance of public facilities, specifically new roads/highway facilities, adoption of the Plan itself will not result in such impacts. Implementation of projects contained in the Lake County Safe Routes to School Plan could lead to improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities near schools.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

XV. RECREATION:

a) Would the plan 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?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

b) Does the plan include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Adoption of the Plan will not directly or indirectly impact recreation. Although it is anticipated that proposed projects will not impact recreation if implemented, any potential effects will be adequately assessed and mitigation addressed in specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of project development. While the Plan does not include recreational facilities, projects including roadway improvements and bike routes may improve access to existing and/or future recreational facilities. The Smart Growth principles and the Lake County 2030 Regional Blueprint encourage access to and use of public facilities and recreational areas. The potential increase in use is not expected to have a negative impact

XVI. TRANSPORTATION:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The focus of the Plan is the regional transportation system. The goals, objectives, policies and projects in the Plan would generally result in improved transportation and circulation for all users of the transportation system, as well as improved emergency access, if implemented. The Plan includes by reference a number of plans that aim to improve the performance and safety of public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Some areas of the region do not have adequate pedestrian facilities, and the current bicycle route network is fragmented. The Plan aims to address these inadequacies and provide guidance to local agencies to include such improvements as mitigations for specific development projects within their jurisdictions. Components of the Plan, if implemented, may also reduce hazards and improve safety on the roadway system. A project specific Environmental Impact Report is being developed for the Lake 29 Expressway Project which is the largest state highway project proposed in the Plan.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exceed 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) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may 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: It is possible that some of the projects contained in the Plan, particularly expansion or capacity increasing projects on the State Highway system, will result in our include the construction of storm water drainage facilities due to storm water treatment requirements of the Clean Water Act. Further analysis of this issue would be speculative at this time. All potentially significant effects will be adequately assessed and mitigations addressed in specific environmental analysis for each project at the time of project development.

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Does the plan 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the plan 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the plan have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The RTP is a program level document which lists proposed activities of other responsible agencies within the region. Specific designs and locations have yet to be determined for many of the projects contained within the Plan. It is possible that some projects discussed in the Plan have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, and therefore, would require a project specific EIR. Therefore, adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan will not result in significant environmental impacts.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083, 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080, 21083.05, 21095, Pub. Resources Code; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.