

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Initial Study Checklist.....	2
Project Title.....	2
Lead Agency Name and Address .....	2
Project Location and Setting .....	2
Project Description.....	3
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, etc.).....	6
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:.....	9
Determination:.....	9
Evaluation Instructions:.....	9
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts: .....	10
Environmental Checklist.....	11
I. AESTHETICS:.....	11
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES .....	12
III. AIR QUALITY:.....	13
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	19
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	22
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS .....	23
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS .....	26
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....	28
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.....	30
X. MINERAL RESOURCES.....	31
XI. NOISE.....	32
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	34
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.....	35
XIV. RECREATION.....	36
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC .....	37
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	45
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE .....	47
References.....	48

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

### **PROJECT TITLE**

Glenn County 2009/10 Regional Transportation Plan Update

### **LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS**

Glenn County Transportation Commission (GCTC)  
777 North Colusa Street  
P.O. Box 1070  
Willows, CA 95988

### **CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER**

Peggy White, Program Manager  
777 North Colusa Street  
P.O. Box 1070  
Willows, CA 95988  
(530) 934-6540

### **PROJECT SPONSOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS**

Glenn County Transportation Commission (GCTC)  
777 North Colusa Street  
P.O. Box 1070  
Willows, CA 95988

### **PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING**

The project area consists of the entire County of Glenn. Glenn County is located in the northern Central Valley of California, approximately 75 miles north of Sacramento (Figure 1.1). The county seat is Willows. Glenn County is comprised of approximately 1,315 square miles making it one of the smaller counties in California. The County is bounded on the east by Butte County; the north by Tehama County; the west by Mendocino County and Lake County; on the south by Colusa County. The Sacramento River extends along the eastern boundary in a north-south direction and the western quarter of the county rises into the Pacific Coast Range where mountain peaks are in excess of 6,000 feet in elevation. Glenn County includes two incorporated cities (Willows and Orland), nine unincorporated communities (Hamilton City, Ord Bend, Artois, Elk Creek, Butte City, Bayliss, Afton, Codora, and Glenn), and numerous small settlements. The Grindstone Rancheria is located north of the community of Elk Creek and is the official recognized Tribal government in the County.

The county is predominately rural in nature with 24 percent of the land federally owned and 66 percent of the land used for agricultural croplands and pasture. Average annual precipitation varies from 15 inches in the southeast portion of the County to as much as 50-60 inches at the highest mountain elevations in the coast range.

The automobile is the predominant mode of travel within the County. The County is served by the Glenn County airport in Willows, the Orland-Haigh airport in Orland, and the Glenn Medical Center in Willows. Travel in Glenn is primarily automobile-oriented due to the rural nature of the local communities, low development densities, and limited options for using non-auto

modes of travel. The roadway network serving the County is comprised of approximately 1,123 miles of streets, roads, and highways. Approximately 110 miles of the system are US Highways and State Routes, 863 miles are county roads, approximately 71 miles are city streets (within the Cities of Orland and Willows), and approximately 79 miles are maintained by federal agencies (e.g., U.S. Forest Services, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, etc.)<sup>1</sup>.

## **GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING**

### *GLENN COUNTY, WILLOWS AND ORLAND GENERAL PLANS*

There are a variety of General Plan Land Use designations applicable throughout the entire County, which includes the entire project area. The proposed project was designed to be consistent with the General Plans of Glenn County, Williams and Orland. The Circulation Elements from each of these general plans were used as a reference during the development of the Glenn County 2009/10 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update. The proposed project is consistent with each of these general plans and does not include any proposed changes to the above-referenced general plans.

### *GLENN COUNTY, WILLOWS AND ORLAND ZONING CODES*

There are a variety of zoning designations applicable throughout the entire County, which includes the entire project area. The proposed project was designed to be consistent with the zoning codes of Glenn County, Williams and Orland.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Glenn County Transportation Commission (GCTC) is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Glenn County. The GCTC and Caltrans (District 3) mutually carry out the transportation planning process for Glenn County. One of the main responsibilities of the GCTC is the preparation and approval of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP serves as the planning blueprint to guide transportation investments in Glenn County involving local, state, and federal funding over the next twenty years. The horizon year for the 2009 Glenn County RTP is 2030. Transportation improvements in the RTP are identified as short-term (0-10 years) or long-term (11-20 years).

The overall focus of the 2009 RTP is directed at developing a coordinated and balanced multi-modal regional transportation system that is financially constrained to the revenues anticipated over the life of the plan. The coordination focus brings the County, Caltrans, cities of Orland and Willows, governmental resource agencies, commercial and agricultural interests, Grindstone Indian Rancheria, and citizens into the planning process. The balance is achieved by considering investment and improvements for moving people and goods across all modes including roads, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, trucking, railroad, and aviation. The previous RTP was adopted by the GCTC in 2005.

### *PURPOSE OF THE PLAN*

As defined by the 2007 RTP Guidelines, the purpose of the regional transportation plan is to accomplish the following objectives:

- Provide an assessment of the current modes of transportation and the potential of new travel options within the region

---

<sup>1</sup> 2007 Public Road Data: Statistical Information derived from the Highway Performance Monitoring System.

- Predict the future needs for travel and goods movement
- Identify and document specific actions necessary to address the region's mobility and accessibility needs
- Identify guidance and documentation of public policy decisions by local, regional, state and federal officials regarding transportation expenditures and financing
- Provide information for the development of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
- Help facilitate the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA)/404 integration process decisions
- Help identify project purpose and needs
- Provide estimates of emissions impacts for demonstrating conformity with the air quality standards identified in the State Implementation Plan (SIP)
- Promote consistency between the CTP, the RTP and other transportation plans developed by cities, counties, districts, private organizations, tribal governments, and state and federal agencies in responding to statewide and interregional transportation issues and needs
- Provide a forum for; (1) participation and cooperation and (2) to facilitate partnerships that reconcile transportation issues which transcend regional boundaries
- Involve the public, federal, State and local agencies, as well as local elected officials, early in the transportation planning process so as to include them in discussions and decisions on the social, economic, air quality and environmental issues related to transportation

The Glenn County Transportation Commission prepared the 2009 RTP update based on these objectives consistent with the 2007 RTP Guidelines (adopted September 20, 2007).

#### *PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED*

The RTP guidelines require that an RTP “provide a clearly defined justification for its transportation projects and programs.” This requirement is often referred to as either the Project Intent Statement or Project Purpose and Need. Caltrans’ Deputy Directive No. DD 83 describes a project’s “Need” as an identified transportation deficiency or problem, and its “Purpose” is the set of objectives that will be met to address the transportation deficiency. For Glenn County each table of projects by mode is located in Appendix A through J of the 2009/10 RTP Update. These appendices include a qualitative assessment of purpose and need indicating a project’s contribution to system preservation, capacity enhancement, safety, and/or multi-modal enhancements. These broader categories capture the intended outcome for projects during the life of the RTP and serve to enhance and protect the “livability” of residents in the County. The following definitions are used in the RTP document.

**System Preservation** – This category of improvement indicates a project that serves to maintain the integrity of the existing system so that access and mobility are not hindered for travelers. Improvements may include bridge repairs, upgrading of existing rail lines, airport

runway repairs, and upgrades to signs and traffic control devices and stripping. In addition, because Glenn County is very rural and contains several small communities, the lack of maintenance funding has resulted in a large amount of “deferred maintenance” that has actually lapsed into a serious need to “rehabilitate” roadways to maintain system preservation. Rehabilitation entails primarily overlay and/or chip seal work that can also be considered a safety improvement. The majority of road projects listed indicate either “rehabilitation” or “reconstruction” to maintain system preservation.

**Capacity Enhancement** – A capacity enhancement indicates a project that serves to increase traffic flows and to help alleviate congestion and improve LOS. This result may be achieved by adding an additional lane of traffic, adding a passing lane, and/or adding a turn-out for slow moving vehicles. Because Glenn County experiences large volumes of truck and recreational traffic on many of its roadways, the ability of vehicles to travel and desired speeds is sometimes restricted. Capacity enhancement projects are designed to increase travel speeds and provide for opportunities to pass slower vehicles safely. Additional capacity can also apply to airport projects where runways are added or extended. The desired outcome is to maintain acceptable LOS on State and regionally significant roads, and adequate capacity at the County’s two airports to meet existing and future demand.

**Safety Projects** – Safety improvements are intended to reduce the chance of conflicts between modes, prevent injury to motorists using the transportation system, and to ensure that motorists can travel to their destination in a timely manner. Safety improvements may include roadway and intersection realignments to improve sight-distance, pavement or runway resurfacing to provide for a smooth travel surface, signage to clarify traffic and aviation operations, congestion relief, and obstacle removal so that traffic flows are not hindered, and improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities to promote safe travel to desired destinations. In addition, bridge repairs and reinforcement serve to improve safety. The desired outcome is to reduce the incident of collisions on County facilities and the societal costs in terms of injury, death or property damage.

**Multi-modal Enhancement** – These type of improvements focus on non-auto modes of travel such as bicycling, walking and transit. Projects that are designated as multi-modal are designed to enhance travel by one or more of these modes, provide for better connectivity between modes, and to improve non-auto access to major destinations and activity centers. Typical projects include separated bike lanes, shared bike routes, sidewalks, transit amenities, street furniture, and signage.

Nearly all of the roadway and transportation projects (Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects) identified in the Glenn County 2009/10 RTP update are “system preservation” projects. There are no new roadways proposed as part of the proposed project. The RTP does not directly provide for the implementation of transportation projects and/or facilities. Rather, it identifies necessary improvements in order to provide the best possible transportation/circulation system to meet the mobility and access needs of the entire County.

Due to the regional nature of the RTP, the analysis in this Initial Study focuses on those impacts that are anticipated to be potentially significant on a regional system-wide level. As individual projects near implementation, it will be necessary to undertake project-specific environment assessments before each project is approved and implemented. Such future environmental review will be required in accordance with CEQA and, if federally funded, NEPA. Adoption of this Initial Study/Negative Declaration and approval of the RTP does not authorize Glenn County, Caltrans, or the cities of Willows and Orland to undertake construction of specific

improvement projects identified in the RTP without further environmental review and consideration.

*REGIONAL GOALS*

The following RTP goals, policies and objectives have been retained and updated from the 2005 RTP. These goals, policies and implementation measures have been modified to provide consistency with the overall County transportation goals addressed above as well as the new proposed goals contained in the Draft Glenn County General Plan update (2008).

- Goal 1: Upgrade and Maintain Existing Road System
- Goal 2: Provide A Safe Transportation System
- Goal 3: Align Financial Resources to Meet the Highest Demonstrated Transportation Needs.
- Goal 4: Promote Coordination
- Goal 5: Provide an Efficient and Effective Transportation System
- Goal 6: Promote Economic Development and Land Use Policies
- Goal 7: Provide Non-Auto Transportation Modes Consistent with Demand and Available Resources
- Goal 8: Develop a Comprehensive System of Bikeway Facilities to serve Glenn County.
- Goal 9: Increase the efficiency of the existing transportation system. Implement Transportation System Management (TSM) techniques where feasible.
- Goal 10: Reduce the Demand for Single Occupant Vehicle Travel through Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Techniques.
- Goal 11: Improve livability in the County through land use and transportation integration and decisions that encourage walking, transit, and bicycling.

**OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (E.G., PERMITS, ETC.)**

Glenn County will be the Lead Agency for the proposed project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15050. No specific permits are required to approve the proposed project. Future permit approvals varies among projects and may include, but are not necessarily limited to: Caltrans, Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Land Management, US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Aviation Administration, and the California Transportation Commission.

**Insert Figure 1**

*This page left intentionally blank.*

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

None of the environmental factors listed below would be potentially affected by this project, as described on the following pages.

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

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

X	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Peggy White, GCTC Program Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

In each area of potential impact listed in this section, there are one or more questions which assess the degree of potential environmental effect. A response is provided to each question using one of the four impact evaluation criteria described below. A discussion of the response is also included.

- **Potentially Significant Impact.** This response is appropriate when there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, upon completion of the Initial Study, an EIR is required.
- **Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** This response applies when 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.
- **Less than Significant Impact.** A less than significant impact is one which is deemed to have little or no adverse effect on the environment. Mitigation measures are, therefore, not necessary, although they may be recommended to further reduce a minor impact.
- **No Impact.** These issues were either identified as having no impact on the environment, or they are not relevant to the Project.

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

This section of the Initial Study incorporates the most current Appendix "G" Environmental Checklist Form, contained in the CEQA Guidelines. Impact questions and responses are included in both tabular and narrative formats for each of the 17 environmental topic areas.

### *I. AESTHETICS -- WOULD THE PROJECT:*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 or 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	

### *RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Response a-d): Less than Significant.** Views of scenic resources, including the Sutter Buttes, Coastal Range, Sierra Nevada, scenic water resources, and other scenic resources in the county are available from highways and roadways throughout the county. The proposed project does not entitle, propose, or otherwise require the construction of new roadways. The proposed project includes a variety of roadway improvement projects, which consist primarily of roadway rehabilitation efforts and roadway safety improvements. There are no new roadways proposed as part of the 2009 RTP update, and as such, the proposed project would not lead to indirect population growth as a result of access improvements into areas that are currently undeveloped. The proposed project identifies roadway and multimodal transportation improvement funding priorities that will be implemented over the next 20 years. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant or adverse changes to the visual quality of the county, and would not result in the introduction of increased nighttime lighting or daytime glare. This is a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

*II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: WOULD THE PROJECT:*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?				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

*RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

With over 1,000 farms, agriculture remains the primary source of Glenn County's economy. Major commodities include rice, almonds, dairies, walnuts and prunes. Approximately 66 percent of the land within the county is used for agricultural production, including croplands and pastures. According to the 2008 Glenn County Annual Crop and Livestock Report, the 2008 gross production of agricultural commodities was valued at \$558,467,000. This represents an increase of 13 percent from the 2007 gross production value of \$493,324,000.

Rice was the number one commodity with a total value of \$193,089,000. Almonds are in the number two spot with a value of \$87,931,000. Rice and almonds represent 59% of the top ten commodities for 2008.

**Response a): No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project would allow for roadway and multimodal transportation improvements throughout the County over the next 20 years. The proposed project would not result in the conversion of any agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses, and as such, would have no impact on any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide importance. There is no impact and no mitigation is required.

**Response b): No Impact.** The proposed project does not propose any changes to General Plan land use designations or zoning districts, and would have no impact on zoning for agricultural use. The proposed project would not result in conflicts with any Williamson Act contracts, nor would it result in the cancellation of any Williamson Act contracts. Implementation of the proposed project will have no impact on a Williamson Act contract, and no mitigation is required.

**Response c): No Impact.** See responses a) and b) above. The proposed project will have no impact on agricultural lands or operations.

*III. AIR QUALITY -- WOULD THE PROJECT:*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 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)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

*RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

Glenn County is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB is the northern half of California's Great Valley and is bordered on three sides (west, north, and east) by mountain ranges, with peaks in the eastern range above 9,000 feet. SVAB is approximately 13,700 square miles and essentially a smooth valley floor with elevations ranging from 40 to 500 feet. The rolling valley is interrupted by the Sutter Buttes, an area of 80 square miles in northern Sutter County, which rise abruptly to more than 2,100 feet above the valley floor.

The SVAB consists of 13 counties and is split into two planning sections based on the degree of pollutant transport from one area to the other and the level of emissions within each area. The Glenn County area belongs to the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin (NSVAB), which is composed of the seven northern-most counties of the SVAB. These counties include Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Shasta, Sutter, Tehama, and Yuba. The air basin of the Sacramento Valley is about 200 miles long in a north-south direction, and has a maximum width of about 150 miles, although the width of the valley floor only averages about 50 miles.

The NSVAB has been categorized as "moderately" non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter.

**Glenn County Air Pollution Control District**

The administration of air quality regulations in Glenn County is handled by the Glenn County Air Pollution Control District (APCD), a division of the County's Agriculture Department. The APCD is responsible for the preparation of plans for the attainment and maintenance of Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS), adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations for sources of air pollution, and issuance of permits for stationary sources of air pollution.

The APCD also inspects stationary sources of air pollution, regulates agricultural burning, responds to citizen complaints, monitors ambient air quality and meteorological conditions, and implements programs and regulations required by federal and state air quality regulations.

The APCD works to ensure a coordinated approach in the development and implementation of transportation plans throughout the county. This coordination ensures compliance with pertinent provisions of the federal and state Clean Air Acts, as well as related transportation legislation (such as the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, Transportation Conformity, and Transportation Improvement Plans).

### **Northern Sacramento Valley Air Quality Attainment Plan**

As specified in the California Clean Air Act of 1988 (CCAA), Chapters 1568-1588 it is the responsibility of each air pollution control district and air quality management district within the State to attain and maintain California's ambient air quality standards. The CCAA requires that an Attainment Plan (Plan) be developed by all non-attainment districts for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>), and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) that are either receptors or contributors of transported air pollutants. The purpose of the Plan is to comply with the requirements of the CCAA as implemented through the California Health and Safety Code (H&S Code). Districts are required to update the Plan every three years.

The Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV) is classified as a moderate nonattainment area for State 1-hour ozone standard. The NSV comprises the northern portion of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin and includes the counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Shasta and the northern portions of Yuba & Sutter (Feather River Air Quality Management District). The NSV is generally rural in nature, with a low population density and a predominately agricultural economy. Its industrial base is dominated by agricultural/construction support operations, although small scale manufacturing is also found throughout the region.

Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 41503(b) requires that control measures for the same emission sources be uniform throughout the air basin. To meet this requirement the NSV has coordinated the development of the Plan and established specific rule adoption protocols through the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Sacramento Basinwide Control Council.

The Plan was initially submitted to ARB on September 16, 1991 by the Shasta County APCD. ARB held a public hearing on the Plan on July 9, 1992 and found the Plan to conform to several elements of the CCAA, but also identified several deficiencies. ARB gave conditional approval of the Plan to allow time for completing plan modifications after consultation with the districts. The Plan includes the all feasible control measures applicable to the NSV, emission accounting and ranking of measures by cost-effectiveness, and provisions to develop area and indirect source control measures. The Plan did not fully satisfy the CCAA requirement for permitting rules and several districts did not make the cost-effectiveness findings.

After evaluating the progress achieved with the 1991 Plan, the NSV shifted the primary emphasis from the adoption of stationary source control measures to motor vehicle emission reductions. Because mobile sources are the single largest contributor to ozone pollution, the 1994 Plan concentrated on reducing these emissions through the implementation of Indirect Source Review (ISR) programs and Transportation Control Measures (TCMs). Several stationary source measures previously considered in the 1991 Plan were deemed not applicable or not offering cost-effective emission control and were removed from the list.

The 1997 triennial update to the Plan addressed the progress made implementing the 1994 Plan and proposed modifications to the strategies necessary to attain the State ozone standard at the earliest practicable date. Like the 1994 Plan, the 1997 Plan focused on the adoption and implementation of control measures for stationary sources, mobile sources, area wide sources, indirect sources and addressed public education programs. The Plan also addressed the transport of pollutants from the upwind metropolitan areas to the NSV. With the State Implementation Plan (SIP) as the state's established control strategy for the future, the ARB found that the NSV districts would not be required to prepare a comprehensive plan update for 1997. Instead, districts were directed to focus on implementing their existing control strategies and SIP commitments.

As with the 1997 Plan, the 2000 and 2003 Plan were focused on implementing existing control strategies and SIP commitments. In the 2000, 2003 and 2006 Plan updates, districts endeavored to incorporate three general principles to guide them in their planning process: (1) Air quality modeling to identify the reductions needed and to design effective emission reduction strategies; (2) Comprehensive emission reduction programs that take advantage of current emission control technologies; and (3) Address the impacts of pollutant transport in the attainment demonstration.

**Responses a-e): Less Than Significant.** It is the intention of the RTP to rehabilitate the current road base and improve existing and future circulation within the County wherever possible. With this focus, improvements in the RTP may benefit regional air quality by reducing congestion on major roads within the County. Some of the route improvements contemplated in the RTP could have direct impacts on air quality, sensitive receptors, or create objectionable odors on a project-specific basis during construction. The Clean Air Act sets national ambient air quality standards for various air pollutants, including carbon monoxide, ozone, oxides of nitrogen, sulfur dioxide and particulate matter.

Individual projects contemplated in the RTP will be subject to project-level environmental review prior to approval and construction. Measures, such as construction best management practices (BMPS), may be required for individual projects to reduce temporary short-term construction related impacts to air quality.

The project would not result in any indirect or cumulatively adverse impacts on air quality, as the project would not result in increased vehicle trips within the County or an overall increase in vehicle miles travelled as a result of implementation of the RTP.

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the air quality plan, or violate any air quality standard.

In 2006, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill (AB) 32 known as the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Section 38560.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The bill establishes a cap on statewide green house gas emissions and sets forth the regulatory framework to achieve the corresponding reduction in statewide emissions levels.

In January 2007, the Legislature asked the CTC to review the RTP guidelines to incorporate climate change emission reduction measures. The request emphasized that RTPs should utilize models that accurately measure the benefits of land use strategies aimed at reducing vehicle trips and/or trip length. The CTC staff established an RTP guidelines work group to assist in the development of "best practices" for inclusion in the RTP Guidelines. The Addendum to the 2007 RTP Guidelines (May 29, 2008) provides several recommendations for consideration by rural

RTPAs to address GHG. The following strategies from the guidelines have specific application to Glenn County.

- Emphasize transportation investments in areas where desired land uses as indicated in a city or county general plan may result in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction or other lower impact use.
- Recognize the rural contribution towards GHG reduction for counties that have policies that support development within their cities, and protect agricultural and resource lands.
- Consider transportation projects that increase connectivity or provide other means to reduce VMT.

The transportation planning literature recognizes three interrelated components that contribute to transportation emissions reductions. Those components include changes in vehicle technology (cleaner burning engines), alternative fuel sources, and vehicle use. The first two components are typically the responsibility of industry and national governmental interests. RTPAs and local governments have the ability to affect *vehicle use* by promoting transportation alternatives to the automobile, and by managing the demand for transportation. These efforts typically involve goals and policies and/or projects and programs focused on getting people out of their cars and into non-auto modes of travel (mode shifting). The following RTP goals are established for Glenn County to lessen dependence on the automobile and to promote mode shifting to other forms of transportation.

- **Goal 6** promotes coordination between economic development and land use policies including access to non-auto modes.
- **Goal 7** promotes a greater use of non-auto modes such as transit to reach as many people as possible in the County with improved transit service.
- **Goal 8** provides for development of a countywide system of bikeways
- **Goal 9** strives to manage traffic congestion through Transportation System Management (TSM) techniques.
- **Goal 10** reduces the Demand for Single Occupant Vehicle Travel through transportation demand management (TDM) techniques.
- **Goal 11** strives to improve livability in the County through land use decisions that encourage walking, transit, and bicycling.

The effectiveness of efforts by the RTPA to provide transportation alternatives and to implement TDM and TSM policies and strategies can be measured in terms of reductions in VMT or the expected growth in VMT. VMT reductions and speed correlate directly with reductions in GHG emissions.

Caltrans reports VMT by County on an annual basis. Their summary report “Vehicle Miles of Travel on State Highway System” for Glenn County covering the years 1999 through 2007 shows that between 1999 and 2004 VMT increased approximately 2.1 percent (compounded) per year on State highways in the County. However, since 2004, VMT in the County has actually

declined by approximately 0.4 percent per year through 2007. This reduction is attributed to a reduction in agricultural employment, higher fuel costs, and the State's declining economy.

A 2008 report by the Victoria Transport Policy Institute "Smart Transportation Emission Reductions - Identifying Truly Optimal Energy Conservation and Emission Reduction Strategies" - Todd Lippman, August 2008, states that most current transportation emission reduction programs focus on changing vehicle and fuel type rather than the amount people drive. Mileage reduction strategies tend to be ignored because many people assume that they are difficult to implement and may harm the economic well being of consumers. However, the report also states that many high-mileage motorists would prefer to drive less and have greater travel choices, provided those choices are convenient, comfortable and affordable. As with most rural counties, non-auto modes are limited and are not generally seen as a viable alternative to the automobile for economic and geographic reasons.

In recent years, Glenn County has experienced relative slow growth (less than 1.5 percent per year) in population and employment and is forecast to continue this trend through 2030. Based on this trend and the guidelines established in the Addendum to the 2007 RTP guidelines, the County is not required to run a network travel demand model to estimate VMT. The guidelines cite the lack of road congestion and the fact that emission changes from higher-MPG vehicles will continue to help the County comply with future emission caps established by the California Air Resources Board as part of AB 32.

The Caltrans report of annual VMT for State highways and county historical population trends from the DOF were used by the consultant to calculate VMT per capita for Glenn County. In 1990, VMT per capita was calculated to be approximately 11,405 annually. In 2007, this number increased to approximately 12,430 annually or about ½ percent a year on average. Glenn County will continue to monitor population and employment and VMT growth consistent with the RTP and the County's General Plan policies to track changes in travel demand.

The Glenn County 2009 RTP recognizes that TDM and other non-auto mobility options, including walking, biking and transit require coordinated land use decisions and improved infrastructure. To this degree, the goals and policies in the RTP are consistent with the County's proposed general plan revisions to provide a balanced multi-modal transportation system that includes non-auto choices for access and mobility. Goals proposed in the 2008 GP revision and update emphasize the following:

**Goal 7.01** *To develop and maintain an efficient, safe, and effective road system.*

**Goal 7.02** *To establish non-auto transportation modes consistent with demand and available resources.*

**Goal 7.03** *To provide for the orderly growth of the Willows Glenn County/Orland Haigh Field Airports and the area surrounding the airports within the identified planning boundary, and to safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airports and the public in general.*

**Goal 7.04** *To develop a comprehensive system of bikeway and pedestrian facilities to serve Glenn County*

**Goal 7.05** *To protect the quantity and quality of community water supplies.*

**Goal 7.06** *To provide quality wastewater service where appropriate to meet growth needs and allow for compact communities.*

**Goal 7.07** *To facilitate improvement and expansion of communication opportunities to serve County residents especially fiber-optic and wireless Internet access.*

**Goal 7.08** *To facilitate improvement of the power distribution and generation to serve County residents while addressing environmental and energy conservation goals.*

**Goal 7.10** *To support continued operation and expansion where feasible of existing rail transportation*

**Goal 7.11** *To reduce the County's reliance on land filling, reduce the volume of the solid waste stream, increase recovery of materials, and dispose of remaining waste in the most environmentally and fiscally responsible manner available.*

The County and cities are committed to implementing these types of policies and strategies that reduce reliance on the automobile and contribute to the reduction of GHG. As such, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to air quality and global climate change, and no mitigation is required.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- WOULD THE PROJECT:**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?			X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations 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 other means?			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 any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
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?			X	

Glenn County extends from high elevations (+7,000 feet) in the east slope of the North Coast Range to the low elevations in the broad flat alluvial plain of the Sacramento Valley. As a result of such major changes in elevation, Glenn County includes a great variety of climatic, soils and geographic conditions which, in turn, influence the distribution, variety, and abundance of the plant and animal species within the county. Glenn County contains seven major vegetation associations, which support a diverse array of plant and animal species.

1. Blue Oak-Digger Pine Woodlands
2. Coast Range Montane Forest
3. Chamise Chaparral and Northern Mixed Chaparral
4. Grasslands

- a. Non-Native Grassland Community
  - b. Valley Needlegrass Community
5. Riparian Communities
- a. Great Valley Willow Scrub
  - b. Great Valley Cottonwood Riparian Forest
  - c. Great Valley Mixed Riparian Forest
  - d. Great Valley Oak Riparian Forest
6. Wetlands and Vernal Pools
7. Mendocino National Forest

The variety of vegetative cover types in the county provide habitat for many different types of wildlife. Of particular significance is the large expanse of deer range located in western Glenn County and the winter waterfowl habitat located within and surrounding the Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge. Three major deer herds are located in the area, the Clear Lake Deer Herd, the Alder Springs Deer Herd, and the East Park Capay Deer Herd. The Alder Springs and East Park Capay herds are the principal herds within Glenn County and include resident and migratory Columbia blacktail and California mule deer. The migratory deer spend summers at high elevations in the North Coast Range and migrate to lower elevations in the winter.

The winter waterfowl habitat of the Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge is administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), encompassing over 10,000 acres and providing winter migratory habitat for over one million birds at the peak of migration (December-January). Over 200 species of birds have been recorded in the refuge, including 26 species of waterfowl and 20 species of shorebirds. The most abundant waterfowl include pintail, mallard, pigeon, snow geese, white-fronted geese, and cackling geese.

Within the Mendocino National Forest, the Forest Service maintains a habitat management program, the main objective of which is to maintain or enhance viable populations of fish and wildlife species. To ensure that viable populations of all species are maintained, several species have been selected as "management indicator species" (MIS) to function as barometers for wildlife communities. These include species designated as Sensitive by the Forest Service, species of local interest, and species listed as Threatened or Endangered by either the Federal or State government. These include the bald eagle, peregrine falcon, and spotted owl (Threatened/Endangered); fisher, goshawk and marten(sensitive), black-tailed deer, douglas tree squirrel and western gray squirrel (harvest); tule elk (special interest); and acorn woodpecker, pileated woodpecker, and California thrasher (maintenance).

The major aquatic resources found in Glenn County include the Sacramento River, Stony Creek, Wilson Creek, Willow Creek, Grindstone Creek, Elk Creek, Black Butte Reservoir, and Stony Gorge Reservoir. Drainages within the county are segments of the Central Valley subsystem of the Sacramento-San Joaquin drainage system. These resources include a variety of aquatic habitat types, including high altitude streams, rivers, reservoirs, sloughs, farm ponds, and marshes. Of the estimated 79 fish species that inhabit the subsystem, 47 are native and 32 were introduced.

High elevation streams along the east slope of the North Coast Range are occupied by species adapted to the cool, swift-moving, highly oxygenated waters. Such species include rainbow trout, brook trout, riffle sculpin, and speckled dace. Foothill streams generally flow in winter, but are intermittent in the summer. California roach are the typical native species of these streams due to their tolerance of low oxygen and high water temperatures; however, green sunfish and fathead minnows can also be found and, in winter, Sacramento suckers, squawfish, and other minnows may spawn and over summer in pools. The rivers and sloughs contain the widest variety of species, including resident and anadromous species.

Typical native anadromous species include Pacific lamprey, white sturgeon, chinook salmon, and steelhead trout. Resident native species include Sacramento blackfish, hardhead, hitch, Sacramento squawfish, California roach, Sacramento sucker, and Sacramento perch. Significant introduced species include threadfin and American shad, brown trout, carp, golden shiner, fathead minnow, channel catfish, black bullhead, mosquitofish, striped bass, black crappie, white crappie, green sunfish, bluegill, smallmouth bass, and largemouth bass. The principal reservoirs in the county, Black Butte and Stony Gorge, provide a typical warm water fishery including largemouth bass, smallmouth bass, white crappie, black crappie, channel catfish, striped bass, bluegill, carp, and Sacramento squawfish.

#### *RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Response a-f): Less than Significant.** The proposed project does not propose the construction of new roadways in areas of the county that have previously been undisturbed. Nearly all of the roadway projects identified in the RTP update consist of rehabilitation efforts, which would occur within the roadbeds of the existing roadways, and would not have the potential to impact any special status species or habitat. Individual projects identified in the RTP update that may include the widening of a particular roadway would be subject to project-level environmental review prior to approval and construction of the improvements. This future project-level environmental review of individual projects would identify the potential for impacts to any special status species, habitat, or wetlands. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly impact any biological resources, wetland resources, or conflict with any habitat conservation plan or local ordinance protecting natural and biological resources. This is a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

*V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- WOULD THE PROJECT:*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?			X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?			X	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

*RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Response a-d): Less than Significant.** The proposed project does not entitle, propose, or otherwise require the construction of new roadways. The proposed project includes a variety of roadway improvement projects, which consist primarily of roadway rehabilitation efforts and roadway safety improvements. There are no new roadways proposed as part of the 2009 RTP update, and as such, the proposed project would not lead to indirect population growth as a result of access improvements into areas that are currently undeveloped. The proposed project identifies roadway and multimodal transportation improvement funding priorities that will be implemented over the next 20 years. Nearly all of the roadway projects identified in the RTP update consist of rehabilitation efforts, which would occur within the roadbeds of the existing roadways, and would not have the potential to impact any known or previously undiscovered cultural resources. Individual projects identified in the RTP update that may include the widening or a particular roadway would be subject to project-level environmental review prior to approval and construction of the improvements. This future project-level environmental review of individual projects would identify the potential for impacts to any cultural, historical, paleontological or archaeological resources. This is a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

## VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			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 the 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 waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X	

Glenn County topography is typified by steeper terrain in the western portion of the county trending down to relatively flat features along its eastern boundary. Two major geologic provinces exist within the county and have a major influence on the county's topography. They are the Sacramento Valley which generally characterizes the eastern third of the county, and the Coast Range which dominates the western two-thirds.

The Sacramento Valley consists of nearly level terraces, smooth alluvial fans, narrow flood plains and water filled basins. Elevation ranges from approximately 100 feet above mean sea level (MSL) at the Sacramento River to approximately 300 feet above MSL at the western edge of the Valley, west of Interstate 5. A small portion of southeastern Glenn County, in the vicinity of Butte City, is located east of the Sacramento River. This is essentially an area of level flood plains and basins with little discernible slope.

West of the Valley province is the Coast Range, which can be further subdivided into the rolling terrain of the Coast Range foothills which increase in elevation from the easterly edge of the Valley to approximately 2,000 feet, and the mountainous Coast Range which rises to an elevation of almost 7,500 feet above MSL at Black Butte Mountain. The foothills consist of smooth, rolling to steep hills and narrow valleys with distinct areas of south to north drainage. Much of the mountainous region to the west of the foothills ranges above 6,000 feet and includes a portion of the crest of the Coast Range.

Similar to the county's terrain, rock types can be broadly divided into three different units which increase in age from east to west. In the east, geologic materials consist primarily of unconsolidated Pleistocene and Recent sediments (Qal) including alluvial fan deposits, stream channel deposits of the Sacramento River and inland basin deposits. Exposed at the lower elevations of the foothills are Tertiary sediments, primarily consisting of Pliocene sediments with some continental volcanics. At the higher foothill elevations, exposed outcrops are Cretaceous and Jurassic marine and non-marine sedimentary rocks, while the western mountainous region of the county is formed mainly of deformed Jurassic marine sediments and volcanic.

#### *RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Responses a-e): Less than Significant.** Seismicity is directly related to the distribution of fault systems within a region. Depending on activity patterns, faults and fault-related geologic features may be classified as active, potentially active, or inactive. The entire state of California is considered seismically active and is susceptible to seismic ground shaking, however, the most highly active fault zones are along the coastal areas.

*Fault Rupture.* A fault rupture occurs when the surface of the earth breaks as a result of an earthquake, although this does not happen with all earthquakes. These ruptures generally occur in a weak area of an existing fault. Ruptures can be sudden (i.e. earthquake) or slow (i.e. fault creep). The Alquist-Priolo Fault Zoning Act requires active earthquake fault zones to be mapped and it provides special development considerations within these zones. . While it is possible for a fault rupture throughout seismically active areas of California, there are no Alquist-Priolo Fault zones within Glenn County.

*Seismic Ground Shaking.* The potential for seismic ground shaking in California is expected. As a result of the foreseeable seismicity in California, the State requires special design considerations for all structural improvements in accordance with the seismic design provisions in the California Building Code. These seismic design provisions require enhanced structural integrity based on several risk parameters. Any future roadway improvements implemented as a result of adoption of the RTP would be subject to detailed engineering requirements to ensure structural integrity consistent with the requirements of state law. As such, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact from seismic ground shaking.

*Liquefaction.* Liquefaction typically requires a significant sudden decrease of shearing resistance in cohesionless soils and a sudden increase in water pressure, which is typically associated with an earthquake of high magnitude. The potential for liquefaction is highest when groundwater levels are high, and loose, fine, sandy soils occur at depths of less than 50 feet. Most areas of Glenn County are considered to be at a low risk of hazards from liquefaction. Any future roadway improvements implemented as a result of adoption of the RTP would be subject to detailed engineering requirements to ensure structural integrity consistent with the

requirements of state law. As such, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact from liquifaction.

*Landslides.* Landslides include rockfalls, deep slope failure, and shallow slope failure. Factors such as the geological conditions, drainage, slope, vegetation, and others directly affect the potential for landslides. One of the most common causes of landslides is construction activity that is associated with road building (i.e. cut and fill). The projects identified in the RTP consist primarily of roadway maintenance and improvement projects, and would occur within the existing right of way of the County's roadway system. As such, the potential for impacts related to landslides is considered less than significant.

*Lateral Spreading.* Lateral spreading typically results when ground shaking moves soil toward an area where the soil integrity is weak or unsupported, and it typically occurs on the surface of a slope, although it does not occur strictly on steep slopes. Oftentimes, lateral spreading is directly associated with areas of liquefaction. Glenn County is considered to be at a low risk of hazards of lateral spreading. Any future roadway improvements implemented as a result of adoption of the RTP would be subject to detailed engineering requirements to ensure structural integrity consistent with the requirements of state law. As such, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact from lateral spreading.

*Erosion.* Erosion naturally occurs on the surface of the earth as surface materials (i.e. rock, soil, debris, etc.) is loosened, dissolved, or worn away, and transported from one place to another by gravity. Two common types of soil erosion include wind erosion and water erosion. The steepness of a slope is an important factor that affects soil erosion. Erosion potential in soils is influenced primarily by loose soil texture and steep slopes. Loose soils can be eroded by water or wind forces, whereas soils with high clay content are generally susceptible only to water erosion. The potential for erosion generally increases as a result of human activity, primarily through the development of facilities and impervious surfaces and the removal of vegetative cover. Future roadway improvement projects would be required to implement measures during construction, including various BMPs, that would reduce potential impacts related to erosion. This is considered a less than significant impact.

*Expansive Soils.* Expansive soils are those that shrink or swell with the change in moisture content. The volume of change is influenced by the quantity of moisture, by the kind and amount of clay in the soil, and by the original porosity of the soil. Shrinking and swelling can damage roads and structures unless special engineering design is incorporated into the project plans.

Implementation of the RTP would not result in the use or expansion of any septic systems. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on this environmental topic, and no mitigation is required.

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- WOULD THE PROJECT:**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 reasonably 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 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?			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 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	

**RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

**Responses a-c): No Impact.** A “hazardous material” is a substance or combination of substances that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, may pose a potential hazard to human health or the environment when handled improperly. The proposed project does not propose new development or any use that would result in the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Furthermore, the proposed project would not result in a foreseeable upset, accident, or emission of hazardous materials. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on this environmental topic and no mitigation is required.

**Responses d): Less than Significant.** There is one location in Glenn County that is registered with the Department of Toxic Substances Control and included on the Cortese List. The site consists of a single building, occupying approximately 2,000 square feet, at 726 Fifth Street in Orland, Glenn County California. Orland Dry Cleaners is the apparent source of a groundwater plume that extends approximately 2.5 miles from the source in a southeast direction in the direction of groundwater flow to a depth ranging from approximately 12 to 127 feet below ground surface. The plume is approximately 4,000 feet wide.

This site is not proposed for disturbance or improvement as part of the RTP. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on this environmental topic and no mitigation is required.

**Response e-f): Less than Significant.** Appendix 4I of the RTP includes a list of proposed improvement projects related to aviation facilities in the County. The proposed aviation facility improvements consist primarily of rehabilitation efforts, and the implementation of other ancillary improvements such as fencing, lighting, etc. All improvements to aviation facilities within the County identified in the RTP are consistent with the applicable airport land use plans (ALUPs) and would not result in changes to the aviation and flight patterns surrounding County aviation facilities. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on this environmental topic and no mitigation is required.

**Response g): Less than Significant.** The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The improvements identified in the RTP would improve the transportation network in Glenn County, which would serve to improve emergency response times countywide. Construction activities associated with projects identified within the RTP may result in temporary lane closures that may temporarily impede emergency access to certain areas within the County during construction. However, each improvement project, when undertaken, will include measures to ensure that emergency access is not adversely impeded. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on this environmental topic and no mitigation is required.

**Response h): Less than Significant.** Wild fires are a major hazard in the State of California. Wild fires burn natural vegetation on developed and undeveloped lands and include timber, brush, woodland, and grass fires. While low intensity wild fires have a role in the ecosystem, wild fires put human health and safety, structures (e.g., homes, schools, businesses, etc.), air quality, recreation areas, water quality, wildlife habitat and ecosystem health, and forest resources at risk.

The proposed project consists primarily of projects that will improve and rehabilitate roadways throughout the County. There are no new homes, business or habitable structures proposed as part of the RTP. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in increased risks associated with wild fires. This is a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- WOULD THE PROJECT:**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 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)?			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 or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would 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 polluted runoff?			X	
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 structures which 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	

**RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

**Response a-j): Less than Significant.** Implementation of the proposed project would result in the improvement and rehabilitation of roadways and transportation infrastructure throughout Glenn County. The project would not result in the development or construction of housing or other habitable structures that would be at risk from flooding events. There are a small number of projects identified within the RTP that may increase the area of impervious surfaces within

the County. Such improvements consist primarily of roadway widening to address safety and operational concerns. The amount of impervious surfaces that may be added to the County as a result of project implementation is negligible, and would not result in impacts to groundwater recharge rates. The improvements identified in the RTP would not result in increased uses of ground or surface water, and would not directly or indirectly lead to population growth. As such, the project would not result in an increased demand for ground or surface water resources, and would have no impact on these environmental topics.

There is the potential for water quality impacts to occur during construction activities associated with the various projects identified in the RTP. Each project is subject to further project-level environmental review prior to approval and construction. During subsequent environmental review, potential project-specific construction impacts to water quality would be identified, and mitigation measures, in the form of BMPs would be identified and implemented to ensure that impacts to water quality are reduced or avoided. Impacts to these environmental topics are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

*IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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

*RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Responses a-c): No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project would result in improvements to the County’s transportation network. There are no changes to land uses or land use designations proposed as part of the RTP. The County General Plan, in addition to the General Plans of Willows and Orland were reviewed during preparation of the RTP, and the RTP is consistent with these documents. No housing would be removed as part of the proposed project, and there are no new roadways proposed that would divide an established community. Implementation of the RTP would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan. There are no impacts to land use associated with the proposed project and no mitigation is required.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- WOULD THE PROJECT:**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?				X
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?				X

**RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

**Response a-b): No Impact.** The Office of Mine Reclamation periodically publishes a list of mines regulated under SMARA that is generally referred to as the AB 3098 List. The Public Contract Code precludes mining operations that are not on the AB 3098 List from selling sand, gravel, aggregates or other mined materials to state or local agencies. There are 8 mines identified on the AB 3098 list in Glenn County. Table 1 identifies the active mines located in the county.

**Table 1 – AB 3098 List – Active Mines in Glenn County**

<i>Mine ID</i>	<i>Mine Name</i>	<i>Mine Operator</i>
91-11-0001	Watts Pit	Glenn Co. Dept. of Public Works
91-11-0002	Kaiser Pit	Glenn Co. Dept. of Public Works
91-11-0003	Stony Creek	Baldwin Contracting Company
91-11-0006	Stony Creek	North Valley Rock, LLC
91-11-0007	Orland Plant	Baldwin Contracting Company
91-11-0012	I-5 Pit	North Valley Rock, LLC
91-11-0015	Orland/Hambright	Baldwin Contracting Company
91-11-0017	Baldwin-Hunt East Pit	Baldwin Contracting Company

SOURCE: DEPARTMENT OF MINING AND GEOLOGY 2009

There are no active mines located within the areas proposed for improvement in the RTP. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or mineral resource recovery site. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on this environmental topic.

*XI. NOISE -- WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN:*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?			X	
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 levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels 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	

*RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Responses a-f): Less than Significant.** Implementation of the proposed project consists primarily of improvements to the existing transportation network in Glenn County. There are no new roadways proposed that would introduce new vehicle trips into areas not currently exposed to mobile noise sources from the existing transportation network. The improvements identified in the RTP would not directly result in increased vehicle trips on the County roadway network, and would therefore, not result in increased noise levels from vehicles travelling on existing roadways and transportation facilities in the County. The improvements to aviation facilities identified in the RTP would not result in increased or expanded flight operations, and would not result in increased noise from aviation sources.

Construction activities associated with the various improvements identified in the RTP could result in short-term temporary noise impacts in the immediate vicinity of the improvements. These noise increases would be temporary in nature, and construction activities in the vicinity of residences and other sensitive noise receptors would usually be limited to the daytime hours. There is the potential for nighttime construction to occur, primarily along I-5. However, as described throughout this initial study, subsequent environmental review of project-specific impacts would be required prior to approval and implementation of future improvements. This future environmental review would identify the potential for short-term construction noise

impacts to sensitive receptors, and assign mitigation measures as needed to reduce noise impacts. This is a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- WOULD THE PROJECT:**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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)?			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	

*RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Responses a-c): Less than Significant.** The proposed project consists primarily of the rehabilitation of the existing transportation network in Glenn County. There are no new roadways proposed that would extend vehicular access into areas of the County that are not currently accessible by area roadways. The project would not result in the direct or indirect inducement of population growth. The proposed project includes projects that would occur primarily within the right-of-way of the existing transportation network, and would not displace any persons or housing units. This is a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

*XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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	

*RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Responses a-e): Less than Significant.** As described throughout this initial study, the proposed project consists primarily of the rehabilitation and improvement of the existing transportation network in Glenn County. The projects included in the RTP would not extend roadway infrastructure into areas not currently served, and would not result in the direct or indirect growth of the County's population. As such, the demand for increased public services, including police protection, fire protection, schools, parks and other public facilities would not increase as a result of implementation of the proposed project. This is a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

*XIV. RECREATION*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

*RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Responses a-b): Less than Significant.** As described throughout this initial study, the proposed project consists primarily of the rehabilitation and improvement of the existing transportation network in Glenn County. The projects included in the RTP would not extend roadway infrastructure into areas not currently served, and would not result in the direct or indirect growth of the County’s population. As such, the demand for increased recreational facilities would not increase as a result of implementation of the proposed project. This is a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

***XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- WOULD THE PROJECT:***

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
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 (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X	

***Existing Traffic Volumes and LOS*****LOS Methodology**

LOS is a qualitative description of traffic flow from the perspective of motorists based on factors such as speed, travel time, delay, freedom to maneuver, volume, and capacity. Six levels are defined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2000)) from LOS A, as the least congested operating conditions, to LOS F, or the most congested operating conditions.

Table 2 defines each LOS designation.

TABLE 2 LOS DEFINITIONS/CHARACTERISTICS	
LOS	Description
A	Represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of other in the traffic stream
B	Stable flow, but the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable.
C	Stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interaction with others in the traffic stream.
D	Represents high density, but stable flow.
E	Represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level.
F	Represents forced or a breakdown in traffic flow.
<i>Source: Highway Capacity Manual - Transportation Research Board, 2000.</i>	

Table 3 provides the maximum standard daily capacity thresholds for each type of roadway in Glenn County. These capacity thresholds were updated from the 1993 Glenn County GP using the 2000 HCM. The urban thresholds were compiled from the 2008 Orland General Plan. The LOS designations in Table 4 and 5 were determined by comparing traffic volumes to Table 3.

TABLE 3 MAXIMUM DAILY VOLUME THRESHOLDS FOR HIGHWAY SEGMENTS					
Classification	LOS				
	A	B	C	D	E
4-Lane Major Freeway <sup>1</sup>	25,400	41,600	58,400	71,000	79,200
2-Lane, Class I Highway <sup>1</sup>	1,200	3,700	7,600	13,600	21,000
2-Lane, Class II Highway <sup>1</sup>	1,700	4,100	8,200	16,600	21,200
Rural Principal Arterial (2 lane)	2,600	5,900	10,300	16,900	20,200
Rural Minor Arterial (2 lane)	1,200	3,300	6,400	11,000	15,500
Urban Arterial (4 lane)	18,000	21,000	24,000	27,000	30,000
Urban Arterial (2 lane)	9,000	10,500	12,000	13,500	15,000
Urban Major Collector (2 lane)	7,620	8,890	10,160	11,430	12,700
Urban Minor Collector (2 lane)	4,800	5,600	6,400	7,200	8,000
Rural Major Collector (2 lane)	1,300	3,900	7,500	12,600	16,900
Rural Minor Collector (2 lane)	1000	3,000	5,500	8,750	11,200
Urban Local Road	2,700	3,150	3,600	4,050	4,500
Rural Local Road	600	2,000	3,500	4,900	5,500
Notes: <sup>1</sup> Based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Chapters 20 and 22, which provided maximum peak hour flows. The values in this table were converted to daily travel using the peak period percent (approximately 10 percent) for these facilities. The urban capacities were taken from the City of Orland 2008 General Plan Circulation Element.					

Existing Traffic Counts and LOS

Table 4 provides a summary of the State highways within the County and the current average daily traffic and LOS designation. All locations currently meet State and County concept LOS.

TABLE 4 EXISTING ADT ON STATE HIGHWAYS				
Route	Segment	Facility Type	Existing ADT	LOS
I-5	Colusa County Line to SR 162	4-Lane Freeway	25,100	A
	SR 162 to SR 32	4-Lane Freeway	26,500	A
	SR 32 to Tehama County Line	4-Lane Freeway	26,500	A
SR 32	I-5 to Orland City Limits	2-Lane Highway	9,300	C
	Orland City Limits to SR 45	2-Lane Highway	8,500	C
	SR 45 to Butte County Line	2-Lane Highway	11,600	C
SR 45	Colusa County Line to SR 162 East	2-Lane Highway	2,300	A
	SR 162 East to SR 162 West	2-Lane Highway	1,700	A
	SR 162 to SR 32	2-Lane Highway	2,300	A
SR 162	County Road 307 to I-5	2-Lane Highway	1,200	A
	I-5 to Tehama Street	4-Lane Highway	8,700	A
	Tehama Street to SR 45	2-Lane Highway	3,000	A
	SR 45 to Butte County Line	2-Lane Highway	2,100	A

Source: Caltrans Traffic Data Unit; Glenn County

Table 5 shows existing ADT and LOS on select County and City facilities. Note: While roadway LOS is acceptable at all locations, according to the PMS, the pavement condition of these roads varies from acceptable to very poor. Appendix 2A of the RTP provides the complete inventory of Glenn County road facilities including classification, existing and future ADT, and LOS that was developed in the 2005 RTP. The recent counts in Table 5 do not show significant growth to alter these previous estimates for future growth in 2030.

TABLE 5 EXISTING ADT ON SELECT COUNTY AND CITY FACILITIES				
Route	Segment	Facility Type	Existing ADT	LOS
<i>County</i>				
CR 99 (Hwy 99)	<i>South Glenn County Line to Road 57</i>	Rural Minor Arterial	1,286	B
	Road 48 to Bayliss Blue Gum Road	Rural Minor Arterial	3,250	B
	Road 27 to Road 17 ½	Rural Minor Arterial	2,950	B
	Road 7 to North Glenn County Line	Rural Major Collector	3,375	B
Road P	CR 15 to CR 18	Rural Minor Collector	1,034	B
Road P	0.2 miles E of Road P	Rural Minor Collector	1,730	B
Road 200	540 feet east of Road G	Rural Major Collector	2,839	B
Road 39	HWY 99 to HWY 45	Rural Major Collector	TBD	
East Street	South City Limits Orland to Yolo Avenue	Urban Local Road	TBD	
Tehama Street	W. Sycamore Street to West Wood Street	Urban Principal Arterial	TBD	
W. Sycamore Street	Villa Avenue to Tehama Street	Urban Minor Arterial	TBD	
<i>City of Willows</i>				
Villa Ave.	North of Sycamore St.	Urban Minor Arterial	2,125	B
French St.	West of Adams St.	Urban Major Collector	370	A
Green St.	East of Plumas St.	Urban Minor Collector	974	A
Humboldt Ave.	North of RR Tracks	Urban Minor Arterial	1,187	A
Humboldt Ave.	South of Green St.	Urban Minor Arterial	3,036	A
Laurel St.	West of Shasta Street	Urban Major Collector	1,468	A
Sycamore St.	West of Merrill Ave.	Urban Major Collector	2,403	A
Source: Glenn County; City of Willows 2009.				
Note: Segments in Italics shows road segments with 2009 traffic counts.				

**RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

**Responses a-b): Less than Significant.** Implementation of the proposed RTP would result in improvements and rehabilitation to the existing transportation and roadway network in Glenn County.

Table 6 provides traffic forecasts for the State highways in the County. The future volumes were calculated from Caltrans' historical average growth trends based on their highway count data. Compounded growth rates for each facility were then applied to existing counts to arrive at estimates for 2030. All facilities are forecast to operate within the concept LOS through 2030.

SR 32 is the most impacted roadway in the County, particularly through the City Limits of Orland, with LOS D. Without further improvements there is a concern that the LOS could become LOS E. ~~It is this circumstance that the GCTC is addressing with the proposed projects on County Road 27. The improvements on County Road 27 will interconnect with the recent improvement on County Road P to develop a truck route between I-5 on County Road 27 to County Road P to State Highway 32, east of the City of Orland; thereby, reducing truck traffic through the City of Orland and providing a safe, reliable and efficient route for trucks through the County to the east or west. State route 162 also shows LOS D between I-5 and First Street. This trend is forecast to continue through 2030.~~

Route	Segment	Facility Type	Existing ADT	LOS	2030 <sup>1</sup> ADT	LOS
I-5	Colusa County Line to SR 162	4-Lane Freeway	25,100	A	27,100	B
	SR 162 to SR 32	4-Lane Freeway	26,500	A	51,800	C
	SR 32 to Tehama County Line	4-Lane Freeway	26,500	A	46,700	C
SR 32	I-5 to Orland City Limits	Rural Principal Arterial	9,300	C	10,000	C
	Orland City Limits to SR 45	Rural Principal Arterial	8,500	C	12,500	D
	SR 45 to Butte County Line	Rural Principal Arterial	11,600	D	14,950	D
SR 45	Colusa County Line to SR 162 East	Rural Minor Arterial	2,300	B	2,660	B
	SR 162 East to SR 162 West	Rural Minor Arterial	1,700	B	2,300	B
	SR 162 to SR 32	Rural Minor Arterial	2,300	B	3,100	B
SR 162	County Road 307 to I-5	Rural Minor Arterial	1,200	A	1,560	A
	I-5 to First Street	Rural Minor Arterial	8,700	D	10,900	D
	First Street to SR 45	Rural Minor Arterial	3,000	B	5,400	C
	SR 45 to Butte County Line	Rural Minor Arterial	2,100	B	2,150	B

Source: <sup>1</sup>Caltrans Data Forecasting Unit and Counts; Glenn County; Fehr & Peers 2009.

**County Facilities**

The future forecasts for ADT and LOS for select County facilities are discussed below.

**County Road 9** is a Rural Major Collector and currently experiences LOS A. This road is experiencing growing usage, sometimes as an alternative for SR 32 through Orland. Some growth pressures are occurring in the Orland area as population increases. County Road 9 is predicted to experience an increase of approximately 400 ADT by 2030.

County Road 9 from County Road 202 to County Road T is classified as a Rural Major Collector and currently experiences LOS A with 1000 ADT and is projected to increase to 1,257 ADT by 2030. The area is zoned for agricultural use and those uses are actively pursued by residents.

**County Road D** from County Road 45 to County Road 57 operates at a LOS A and is expected to experience an increase of 125 ADT by 2030. County Road D is a Rural Minor Collector, for this segment, and is used to transport agricultural products from the south part of the County. This is also access to the County Landfill located in the central part of the County.

**County Road P** from County Road 33 to County Road 39 is a Rural Minor Collector for this segment and experiences LOS A with current traffic at 650 and anticipated to increase to 850 in 2030. This road segment is important for north-south travel in the County whether by automobile or truck. The area is zoned agricultural with rice, sunflowers, row crops and field crops grown on adjacent property.

**County Road P** from Willows Creek Bridge to County Road 60 is a Rural Major Collector and operates currently at LOS A with approximately 200 ADT and is projected to increase to 250 ADT in 2030 and continue to operate at LOS A. The area is zoned agricultural with numerous rice fields.

**County Road 200** from County Road 206 to the County Line operates at LOS A with current traffic at 525 ADT and predicted to increase to 675 by 2030. This road provides access to Black Butte, one of the County's water recreation areas, and provides truck access.

County Road 200 from County Road 206 to Interstate 5 operates at LOS D to the intersection of County Road 12. Current ADT is 5,050 and is projected to increase to 6,475 by 2030. The facility shows LOS B from County Road 12 to County Road E with 1,450 ADT currently and projected to increase to 1,850 by 2030; and LOS A from County Road E to County Road 206 with current ADT of 800 and projected to increase to 1,025 in 2030. The proposed road improvements in Chapter 4 will address the increased traffic volumes, especially to the west, and ensure that LOS (especially at the intersection with Interstate 5), would not deteriorate. The proposed project in the Action Element would interconnect to the other County Road 200 project from County Road 206 to the Tehama County Line.

**County Road 39** from County Road D to east 1 mile is classified as a Rural Major Collector and currently operates at LOS A with 625 ADT and projected to increase to 825 by 2030. The area is zoned agricultural and the area is in active production.

**Sixth Street in Orland** is classified as Urban Principal Arterial and operates at LOS D/E and is projected to increase to LOS E/F with ADT of 18,875 (South Street to SR 32) and 16,150 (SR 32 to north City Limits) by the year 2030. This 2008 STIP project would complement the recently completed realignment of SR 32 through Orland.

**Butte Street** functions as an Urban Minor Collector and operates at LOS A with ADT of 1,200 (South Butte Street) by the year 2030. Butte Street experiences considerable traffic as the connection between residential areas to the commercial downtown of Willows. The proposed improvements would connect to prior projects on SR 162 (Wood Street), Sycamore Street and north Butte Street project in the 2006 STIP Augmentation.

**Sacramento Street** functions as Urban Minor Collector for the east side of the City of Willows and operates at LOS A with an ADT of 975 by the year 2030. Sacramento Street provides a connection the residential area on the east side of Willows and to the commercial downtown. It also provides access to SR 162, and Wood Street to Interstate 5. The project will connect to prior projects on Sycamore Street and SR 162 (Wood Street).

**County Road V** functions as a Rural Local Road and as an alternative to SR 45 for north-south truck traffic for the agricultural community. The current ADT is 975 with 15% truck traffic. County Road V operates at LOS A. The area is zoned agricultural and the area is in active production.

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in population growth within Glenn County, and would not directly result in decreases in LOS on area roadways. The proposed project would improve traffic flows and operations throughout the County, and would not result in an LOS that exceeds applicable standards or thresholds, as described above. This is a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

**Responses c-g): Less than Significant.** As described throughout this initial study, implementation of the proposed project would assist in the improvement of the County’s transportation network across all modes of transit and transportation. The improvements proposed to aviation facilities in the County would not result in an increase in flights or a change in flight patterns. There are policies and programs included in the RTP that would improve public access to transit systems and alternative modes of transit, such as bicycle use. The various roadway improvements identified in the RTP would assist in the delivery of emergency services by improving the local and regional roadway network and eliminating existing safety and design hazards. The RTP and the projects included within were developed after careful review of the General Plans of the County and the cities of Willows and Orland. The RTP is consistent with the circulation elements of these General Plans, and would not result in conflicts or inconsistencies with the above referenced plans. This is considered a less than significant impact and not mitigation is required.

*XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- WOULD THE PROJECT:*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the 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 or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
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 projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?			X	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

*RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Responses a-g): Less than Significant.** Refer to Section VIII- Hydrology and Water Quality for a description of water supply and wastewater disposal.

The project consists of various roadway and transportation network improvement projects throughout the County. The project would not result in direct or indirect population growth, and as such, would not increase the demand for water supplies or the treatment and/or conveyance of wastewater. The various roadway and infrastructure improvements may require modifications or expansions to existing and future stormwater conveyance infrastructure adjacent to roadways proposed for rehabilitation or modification. As described throughout this initial study, projects identified in the RTP would be subject to project-level environmental review to determine if potential impacts to the County's stormwater detention and conveyance infrastructure may occur. This future project-specific environmental review may include mitigation measures, as appropriate, to avoid or lessen potential impacts to the stormwater infrastructure adjacent to roadway and other improvement projects.

Implementation of the projects identified in the RTP would not generate significant amounts of solid waste, and would not result in an exceedance of any landfill's capacity or violate any state, federal or local statutes related to the disposal of solid waste. This is considered a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

*XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

*RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS*

**Responses a), b), c): Less than Significant.** As described throughout the analysis above, the proposed project will not result in any changes to General Plan land use designations or zoning districts, would not result in annexation of land, and would not allow development in areas that are not already planned for development in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The proposed project would not result in new adverse environmental impacts. The project would not threaten a significant biological resource, nor would it eliminate important examples California history or prehistory. The proposed project does not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable, nor would it have substantial adverse effects on human beings. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on these environmental topics.

## REFERENCES

1. Glenn County General Plan- Volume III, Setting (June 1993)
2. Glenn County General Plan- Volume IV, Draft EIR (June 1993)
3. 2008 Glenn County Annual Crop and Livestock Report (Glenn County Agricultural Commissioner, 2008)
4. California Important Farmlands 2006 Map (California Department of Conservation, June 2008)
5. Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004. (Staff Final Report), (California Energy Commission, 2006)
6. A Manual of California Vegetation (Sawyer, John and Todd Keeler-Wolf 1995)
7. Terrestrial vegetation of California (Barbour and Major 1988)
8. Jepson Manual: Higher Plants of California (Hickman, James C. 1993)
9. Cal EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control, May 2008, Cortese List
10. Cal EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control, May 2008, Cleanup Sites and Hazardous Waste Permitted Facilities
11. California Department of Conservation, Mine Reclamation AB 3098 List (July 2009)
12. 2009/10 Draft Glenn County RTP (Fehr and Peers, September 2009)